

**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
20th February 2014**

Title: Residents' Parking Scheme Cross-Party Working Group Report

Ward: Not applicable

Member presenting report: Chair of the Working Group Cllr Mark Weston

Contact Officer, Siân Parry, Scrutiny Officer

Contact telephone number: 0117 922 2074

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Board considers the Working Group report attached at Appendix A and also any further comments/recommendations (to be circulated prior to the meeting) from the Sustainable Development & Transport Scrutiny Commission held on the 13th February.

That the Board refers the report and its comments to the full Council for discussion, and to the Mayor for response.

Summary

See Executive Summary and Recommendations at Page 1.

The significant issues in the report are:

See Appendix A – Terms of Reference at Page 6 and key issues discussed in the Executive Summary and Recommendations at Page 1.

Policy

Following the Sustainable Development & Transport Scrutiny Commissions in May and June considering the Mayor's Residents Parking Scheme proposals, Full Council agreed on 18th June that the Mayor should halt the process and meet with an all-party working group in order to produce a more gradual phased approach with greater consultation and input from local residents and businesses. Subsequently the Cabinet meeting on 27th June agreed various changes to the programme, but the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board supported the suggestion that a working group should scrutinise the implementation of the proposals. It delegated this task to the SD&T Commission and the Group was set up with its first meeting held on 8th October

Consultation

The Group's work programme was produced in consultation with the Service Director Transport and other officers within the Place Directorate. Resident and business groups were invited to discuss RPS with the Working Group.

Other Options Considered

None

Risk Assessment

None undertaken for this report

Public Sector Equality Duties

None undertaken for this report.

Legal and Resource Implications

None sought

Appendices

Appendix A – Residents' Parking Scheme Cross-Party Working Group Report

Access to Information

Sustainable Development and Transport Scrutiny Commission Papers:

28th May 2013

20th June 2013

Full Council 18th June 2013

Cabinet 27th June 2013



BRISTOL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

The Report of the Residents' Parking Scheme Cross-Party Working Group

Final Report February 2014

The report sets out recommendations to the Mayor on the implementation of the Residents Parking Schemes programme

Contents Page

Page Number

<i>Executive Summary and Recommendations</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Terms of Reference</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Key Themes</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>3.1 Current Situation and Implementation</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>3.2 Communications, Engagement and Consultation</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>3.3 Wider Transport Policy</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>3.4 Costs and Charging Policy</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>3.5 Design and Tailoring of Schemes to Local Communities</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>3.6 Baseline Evidence and Data</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Appendix 1: Representatives attending</i>	
<i>Appendix 2: Residents' and Business Group's Views</i>	
<i>Appendix 3: Cotham case study, Extraordinary Factors etc</i>	
<i>Appendix 4: Benchmarking Information</i>	

Executive Summary and Recommendations

1. Introduction

The Group met four times between October 2013 to January 2014 before writing its final report. This Executive Summary describes the key issues that the Group discussed, alongside recommendations to the Mayor.

2. Key issues and Recommendations

2.1 Communications, Engagement and Consultation

The Group found that the rushing out of the various schemes without fully formed and presented data and proper consultation, including changes to boundaries, stages and timescales has made the subsequent consultation process difficult. This has led to a great deal of confusion for many residents and businesses in the areas being taken forward currently. As a consequence this has forced local people to set up their own consultation processes in some areas. The Group do believe that officers have learnt from this process and will be able to improve on subsequent parking zone consultations; however this cannot hide the fact that the quality of the current consultations has been uneven.

The role of the Neighbourhood Partnerships and ward councillors was examined and the Group agreed that Neighbourhood Partnerships were a good vehicle for engaging with local residents. However they should not be solely relied on. For example initiatives such as the postcards being used in more recent schemes were considered invaluable. In addition it was felt that ward councillors had been heavily involved in the decisions about the consultation process in the relevant wards and had played their role in disseminating information.

The Group was particularly sensitive to the needs of equalities groups having heard for example about people needing to attend mosques for prayers on a Friday and the process for the retention of disabled parking bays, and these should be taken into account in the engagement and consultation processes.

The Full Council motion in June 2013 stated that a true consultation should allow residents to reject the scheme and the Group still considers this vital for a meaningful consultation. The Group accepts that it is now too late to alter the inner scheme consultation process; however, it felt that the concerns expressed by the public would have been lessened by the adoption of the philosophy embodied in the Council's own excellent Statement of Community Involvement drawn up for planning policy and development management (due for review this year) across the whole spectrum of the authority's activities.

Recommendation 1:

That for any future schemes coming forward in 2014, the consultation process must be robust. It is essential that the parameters of the consultation are clear (i.e. what can be changed through consultation and what can't). The Council must explain the consultation stages with a timetable of how the scheme will be delivered. Clear lines of communication must be opened with residents and businesses with prompt feedback given to queries and face-to-face meetings held where requested. The website must be constantly updated and it is critical to engage with traders, businesses and other commercial interests with a named RPS liaison officer.

2.2 Wider Transport Policy

Considering RPS within the wider context of transport policy for the city including improvements to public transport, park-and-ride and parking provision, the Group was concerned about the potential impact of demand rising for this provision without concomitant increase in supply.

When discussing the impact on bus services with First West of England, it was apparent that they had a responsive commercial model with up to a 3 month delay in providing extra buses and services. The Group was disappointed to note that the model did not take account of strategic issues such as RPS but relied solely on passenger uptake.

Public transport initiatives such as the Greater Bristol Bus Network (GBBN) bus corridors were discussed and the Group felt that the impacts of GBBN on parking and retail should be reviewed before any further RPS schemes are planned. St Pauls Unlimited contested that bus fares should be lower for people on benefits and this should be considered by the bus operators.

Recommendation 2: that the Mayor should work with all transport providers to carry out an urgent and fundamental review of the bus network throughout the city.

The locations of park-and-rides around the city are not helpful to people trying to access Clifton and other areas in the north of Bristol and routes need to be examined, for example a suggestion from a Traders' Association was to have a circular route linking up the Bath Road and Portway park-and-ride via Clifton.

Recommendation 3: that the Mayor should undertake a review of park-and-ride provision to ensure that the inner ring area is served adequately and with the routes better reflecting the destinations that people want to travel to, e.g. the Zoo.

Representatives from Clifton Village commented that there was one bus route and no car parking provision in the Village and this made the pressure on on-road parking even more acute. Further exploration of such provision needs to be done (see Cope's study for Bedminster Town Team regarding fundamentals for the high street and recommendations to ensure RPS benefits both residents and retailers). Other suggestions from business and residents' groups e.g. Gloucester Road Traders' Association and Winning Whiteladies Association should be taken into account.

Recommendation 4: that alongside the implementation of the inner ring RPS, off-street parking should be reviewed and the feasibility of new provision explored.

2.3 Costs and Charging Policy

The Group discussed many aspects of the financial background to RPS and its validity, value for money and robustness and the changes necessary to the Scheme given that the outer ring implementation had been put on hold. The Group was concerned about the affordability for low income individuals, families and small businesses given that the cost of permits has increased for new schemes, even though there is no relationship between the permit price and the payback borrowing period on schemes.

The Group heard that the price of permits for the existing schemes were going to be increased in line with the new schemes. Of particular note was that the proposed income streams would lead to a repayment on the capital for the inner scheme within 7 years. Previously when the outer scheme was being proposed alongside the inner scheme this repayment date was 10 years, clearly illustrating how the inner scheme permit holders would be subsidising those in the outer scheme.

Since the 'outer ring' scheme has been put on hold, the Group was concerned what the income would be used for after the repayment had been achieved. It was felt that by extending the repayment time back to the original 10 years for the inner scheme that the price could be dropped for residents within the inner zone.

Recommendation 5: That the Mayor should re-examine the permit pricing model. The Group considers permits should be as low a price as possible.

2.4 Design and Tailoring of Schemes to Local Communities

During 2013, the SD&T Commission received many representations from residents, community groups, councillors and business representatives about possible changes to the proposed schemes or completely alternative schemes

for their areas. The Group was clear that alternative schemes should be considered as part of the consultation process, and urged the Mayor to take into account the vast amount of consultation already done by local people and councillors in Clifton, Ashley and St Paul's. The principle of tailoring the scheme to reflect the needs of the local community was supported by the Group, e.g. extending free parking to one hour in some areas. The Group was concerned that when alternative schemes were proposed by residents or other community groups, it appeared that these had been dismissed by officers without a clear explanation as to why that is.

Recommendation 6: That where possible alternative schemes should be considered and incorporated by the officers into the final model. Where a proposal is not feasible then a clear explanation as to why should be made available to the public.

The Group discussed the flexibility and types of permits, particularly for individuals or organisations who needed a city-wide or mobile business permit. These issues have been taken on board by officers during the implementation of RPS. The Group also considered the outer boundaries of proposed schemes and the potential impacts on the outer ring and concluded that a formal review was needed of current schemes being implemented, including emerging traffic patterns before any further schemes are taken forward.

Recommendation 7: That the Mayor should carry out a formal review of current schemes being implemented, including emerging traffic patterns and the impacts on the outer ring before any further schemes are taken forward. A report detailing the review findings should be brought to SD&T Commission at an appropriate time before the Mayor makes any decisions on the outer ring.

2.5 Baseline Evidence and Data

The Group considered the information it requested following on from the early Commission discussions in spring 2013 such as analysis of costs and income, comparative data etc. No examples or options were presented on the schemes that other core cities have in place which include everything from no fees to higher fees than Bristol. Much was made of other core cities having RPS and some evidence was presented, but no in-depth comparisons. The Group agreed that if the outer ring is explored in future, early provision of relevant data analysis to scrutiny and to the public including current traffic studies should be made.

Recommendation 8: That if the outer ring is explored in future, early provision of relevant data analysis to scrutiny and to the public including current traffic studies should be made.

2.6 Council Governance

The Group heard that members of the public had difficulty accessing key RPS documents before public Scrutiny and Cabinet meetings in sufficient time to consider them and put forward their views for example it was queried why questions could only be asked 3 days before a meeting and yet papers were released for that meeting only 5 days prior to it. The Group considered that from its experience over the last year, this aspect of Council governance needed to be examined and improved so that the public could access relevant information for the decision-making process in good time. This is also partly about the consultation process being robust enough so that people's views are taken into account at an early stage in policy formulation, as stated in section 2.1.

Recommendation 9: that the Mayor should consider how to improve the public's access to information during the decision-making process.

1. Introduction

Following the Sustainable Development & Transport Scrutiny Commissions in May and June considering the Mayor's Residents Parking Scheme proposals, Full Council agreed on 18th June that the Mayor should halt the process and meet with an all-party working group in order to produce a more gradual phased approach with greater consultation and input from local residents and businesses. Subsequently the Cabinet meeting on 27th June agreed various changes to the programme, but the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board supported the suggestion that a working group should scrutinise the implementation of the proposals. It delegated this task to the SD&T Commission and the Group was set up with its first meeting held on 8th October

The Group met four times between October 2013 to January 2014 before writing its final report.

2. Terms of Reference

Purpose

In the light of the decision taken by Cabinet on 27th June 2013 (whereby significant changes had been made to the programme since the motion to establish a cross-party working group was passed by Full Council on 18th June), the purpose of the group was to conduct a review of the process for consulting on and implementing the programme of RPS areas, to ensure this fully satisfies the expectations of Council. As part of this, the working group followed up the previous recommendations of the Sustainable Development & Transport Scrutiny Commission and investigated their practical implementation.

Accountability

Accountability was delegated from OSMB to the Sustainable Development & Transport Scrutiny Commission. A short feedback report was prepared for the Commission's 19th December 2013 formal meeting.

Remit

- Involvement of ward councillors;
- Consultation with local people;
- Tailoring schemes to local communities, including their facilities;
- Engagement with businesses and business representatives;
- Role of Neighbourhood Partnerships;
- Process for receiving and acting on comments and suggestions;
- Transparency of decision making on the final Traffic Regulation Order objection report;
- Communication and information provision through scheme implementation;
- Opportunities presented by scheme review.

Meetings

The Group held four meetings between October 2013 and January 2014. The meetings comprised written and/or verbal updates from officers on each aspect of the Group's remit, discussion and questions for clarification and a review of the various aspects within the overall brief. Information on past and current practice in Bristol and experience from elsewhere, including on consultation, was sought and used as part of the review.

As Commission meetings are held in public, public statements were requested on, for example alternative schemes and these were fed into the overall consultation process. The Group also invited in residents' and traders' groups in January to discuss their views on the RPS implementation process (see Appendix 1 for details attendance). Each group was invited to give a short presentation of their concerns – some of these were presented at SD&T Commission's Public Forum on 19th December (circulated to the Group) and these are publicly available, i.e. BID Clifton Village, Keep Clifton Special, Ashley Ward RPS Action Group; others are summarised in Appendix 2.

Membership

The Group comprised:

Councillor Mark Weston (chair) Conservative
Councillor Charles Lucas Conservative
Councillor Christian Martin Liberal Democrat
Councillor Fi Hance Liberal Democrat
Councillor Daniella Radice Green
Councillor Steve Pearce Labour
Councillor Margaret Hickman Labour
Councillor Jason Budd Independent

(It was originally agreed that the Group would have 2 members per party, but the Green Party proposed that Councillor Radice would be their only representative.)

The Group was supported by Peter Mann Service Director Transport and Helen Minnery Project Manager with other officers as necessary. Councillor Mark Bradshaw Assistant Mayor was invited.

3. Key Themes

The Group agreed priority areas of work within its remit and these are detailed below based on the following themes:

- Current situation and implementation
- Communications, engagement and consultation
- Wider transport policy
- Costs
- Design and tailoring of schemes to local communities
- Baseline evidence and data
- Council decision-making

3.1 Current situation and implementation

The Group discussed the current situation and the implementation process with officers. It was explained that there would be delegated decisions on all the inner ring schemes and the timescales took into account the May elections, potential build time for each scheme and community engagement etc. The changes to the overall programme were discussed, for example in Clifton and Redland, but it was clarified that there were no changes as to who was being consulted and how consultation will take place.

3.2 Communications, Engagement and Consultation

The Group discussed the details of the consultation process which included online dialogue and face-to-face meetings. Officers outlined that the business sector was starting to see the need for the schemes and to be involved; they were submitting written statements. The Group also discussed the needs of mosques, churches and schools and their parking issues. It was explained that lessons from the City Centre parking scheme would be used, for example in developing travel plans for staff, and disseminating information on public and other forms of transport that could be used. There would also be more support for travel planning for small businesses and other organisations and advice on off-street parking.

Redland Girls' School was discussed as an example where the permit allocation has been negotiated with them individually. Officers explained that the Council needs to have a process which is equitable and weighs up how many permits should be available for each organisation. The Group discussed the possibility of quantifying the number of organisations and consequently the permits needed. However, officers explained that this is being clarified through informal consultation and will be implemented on an individual basis.

Role of Ward Councillors and Neighbourhood Partnerships

The informal stage of the process was agreed by Cabinet in June 2013. Local councillors were asked in each area what their views were and Clifton Village and Clifton West carried on to the fast-track stage, whilst Clifton East requested an informal consultation stage. The advantages of the informal stage were discussed and officers outlined that all additional schemes have this built in. Neighbourhood partnerships have been a helpful resource for officers to use as a vehicle for consultation but there was an overreliance on these and the initiative of postcards etc in more recent schemes was valuable. The Group agreed it was essential to tell people what the response is and what can and can't be done.

The Group agreed that the Council needs to learn from the process over the last year and plan ahead/communicate better although some businesses haven't responded until very recently and this has proved difficult for officers to take their views into account. The Group supported having a named facilitation officer who has worked really hard in the Clifton area and agreed there is no magic wand for communicating with traders. The parameters of any consultation need to be stated very clearly.

Regarding the need for a high quality consultation process, the Group discussed the exemplar Statement of Community Involvement (see link?) which was produced by the Council in 2008 to apply to planning policy and development management. The Group agreed that the adoption of the philosophy embodied in the SCI (due for review this year) should be considered across the whole spectrum of the authority's activities.

The Traffic Regulation Order Process

There was general confusion about what consultation meant to the public and this has added to the problems experienced in different areas. Officers explained the TRO process which is a legal process with the legal notice posted on lampposts in the relevant area and proposals for objections requested. These are each logged

and registered and then the Council responds as part of a formal legal report. A decision is then delegated (under delegated powers confirmed in June 2013) to the Service Director Transport in discussion with the Cabinet member and signed off and an order is made.

Opportunities presented by Scheme Reviews

Every scheme is reviewed after 6 months, and every resident and business is written to and asked for their views including councillors and neighbourhood partnerships. A new TRO proposal is drawn up and this is formally consulted on again; reviews of, for example disabled parking bays, parking hours, yellow lines etc can be done as part of the general TRO process, and then this is done on an annual basis thereafter.

Council Governance

The Group heard that members of the public had difficulty accessing key RPS documents before public Scrutiny and Cabinet meetings in sufficient time to consider them and put forward their views for example it was queried why questions could only be asked 3 days before a meeting and yet papers were released for that meeting only 5 days prior to it. The Group considered that from its experience over the last year, this aspect of Council governance needed to be examined and improved so that the public could access relevant information for the decision-making process in good time. This is also partly about the consultation process being robust enough so that people's views are taken into account at an early stage in policy formulation.

3.3 Wider Transport Policy

Impact on Public Transport

The Group queried the extra capacity needed in public transport and whether that had been modelled. Officers explained that information was not collected on a scheme by scheme basis but assumptions can be made from pay and display revenue. GBBN ensures that enhancements can be made relatively straightforwardly and there is a £2 million bus subsidy from the Council at present. The Group expressed concerns about the potential increase in demand and whether the network could accommodate it.

Paul Matthews Managing Director of First West of England attended the Group to discuss the potential impact of RPS on the bus network. He stated that First had an on-going dialogue about strategic issues with the Council, Cabinet member and the Mayor, but the network responds directly to demand. If there is potential growth in a particular area they would develop the market. For example recently with GBBN and the reduction in fares, there has been very strong growth and 12 vehicles have been added in the last 12 months. So they can provide additional capacity and will do so in response to RPS as it comes in.

Officers stated that the Council is confident that demand can be met and the model allows this. The Group queried the impact of the inner ring implementation on the outer ring and officers contested the model will still work. Congestion affects buses and their reliability, so as RPS comes in bus passengers will rise. There was no research available on other cities apart from London where demand restraint was considerable, but the network is always under review to meet new demand e.g.

Southmead Hospital development. The Group heard that new provision can come on stream quite quickly although this varies depending on the recruitment of staff and procurement of vehicles as necessary – for the latter this can take up to 3 months.

Regarding the fares consultation, First discussed this with the Mayor, but the implementation was a commercial decision to benefit all customers. First recognises there is a long way to go, but they are trying to encourage more people to travel by bus and are increasing investment accordingly. It has not been specifically targeted at RPS areas.

Resident and business groups raised the issue of inadequate park-and-ride facilities before their areas and officers stated that the operation had been extended by 2 hours. Routing was actively under discussion but it was not a short-term fix. Brislington and Portway links were being examined but there were considerations about funding issues and also whether it was commercially viable.

3.4 Costs and Charging Policy

The charging policy was examined covering residential permits, business permits, city-wide permits, and the cost of implementation and expected revenue. Officers outlined the financial framework which had been discussed at the Resources Commission earlier in the year. The Group focused on the inner ring as the outer ring is on hold. Issues were raised as follows:

- Penalty charges were excluded as this was imprudent financially; fees and charges meant Pay and Display; assumptions had been made on take-up numbers, but officers were happy the estimates were sound. The Group requested the income from penalty charges.
- The cost and definition of disabled parking bays/spaces were discussed and the Group asked to see the overall breakdown of cost. The requirement for these bays was reviewed at a review point.
- The Redland figures were queried and whether they had been calculated on the old proposed scheme. Officers agreed that these were the old figures before the scheme had been revised and would send updated estimates to the Group.
- The cost of permits in the existing schemes compared with the new schemes were queried, the rates of pay back and how these were calculated. If the new schemes were successful in generating income, would the price of the permits be reduced? Officers explained that this was not in the financial model and it could not be changed partway through the process. The loan may be paid off earlier or a decision could be taken to reduce the permit price at the end of the 6 years. On-going costs would still need to be found after this period. There is potential for variation, but the new schemes were expected to break even. It was suggested that it should not become an income stream and that after the loan is repaid, further discussions need to take place about permit pricing.
- It was pointed out that as reviews of schemes were undertaken and changes in Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) were made/ statutory consultation was carried out, the pricing was being proposed to be standardised at the new rate. All schemes would require TRO amendments, however minor. It was

queried whether deprivation rates in Easton and St Philips would be taken into account; officers replied that these areas would be consistent with the overall approach.

- The Group queried the breakeven point between £30 and £48? And what price would the inner ring be if it was a 10 year payback period? Would this include the surplus? Officers explained that the original Resources Scrutiny Commission paper modelled the whole scheme at £30 and the bottom line would be to extend the period of the loan. The Group suggested that the cost of the annual reviews could vary and the reduction for low emission cars could have an impact on the revenue, as the budget was intended to be cost neutral.
- The Group learned that the budget and costings had been calculated to fit around the figure of £48 – but the calculation spreadsheet it considered demonstrated payback and affordability at the £30 level charged in the existing schemes; once paid back, the Group considered that fees should be removed altogether. The Group did not have an opportunity to revisit the costings, but heard that it was not a revenue raiser for the council. However, the on – going £500k annual costs were not revisited nor drilled down any further past initial concerns. The Group considered that there are no safeguards that the revenue won't simply be allocated into the RPS budget on an annual basis creating a new revenue stream and removing it from the central budget. The Group also raised concerns when it learned that penalties charges don't go into paying off the scheme; this money needed to be accounted for.
- The relationship between the inner and outer rings was discussed and officers explained that the outer ring was less financially viable as it is resourced from a Council loan. Officers outlined that the outer ring would take 14 years to pay back if done in isolation, whereas the existing schemes were supported by the Local Transport Plan and therefore were cheaper to implement.
- Indirect costs were discussed and clarified, i.e. data collection costs and remit of annual review of each area (signage, lines, maintenance) £450k, whilst direct costs products £562k, the overall capital interest repayment equalled £3.5m over 6 years in total.
- The Group queried the income from the existing schemes and requested a comparison of predicted versus actual income on those. It also queried how enforcement would work and how parking services would deal with this.
- Officers explained that enforcement will be done in conjunction with the rollout and is included in the revenue costs. The monitoring of the schemes was queried and how this will be broken down, particularly the data from the existing schemes. It was explained that the programme is being monitored as a whole rather than individual schemes and this is part of the annual review including other issues such as knock-on effects. A 'steady state' is needed to judge the success of the implementation; the Group felt that this may be an issue as schemes roll out.

3.5 Design and Tailoring of Schemes to Local Communities

Permits

The Group questioned the information that is available for particular areas, for example parking spaces, businesses, and consequently the number of permits necessary and more generally the underlying purpose of RPS. Officers explained that not all of this data is available at this time. They also outlined that the principle of permit allocation would be applied to all areas but only if it works; retrofitting would only be used if previous schemes need to change, and a review system is built in so that changes can be made anyway. For example Kingsdown has had regular reviews and slight changes have been made depending on the benefits and whether there is the demand. Data from the Census, Travel to Work Areas and car ownership details have been used to inform this process. The Schemes are flexible enough to deal with issues raised in each area, for example Cotham South – it was not possible to estimate how many permits businesses would take up and the actual permits allocated were lower than expected. It is not possible to extrapolate from this to other areas.

The Group queried whether empty spaces would be made available further down the line for businesses or commuters? Officers agreed this would be considered following review and it was why they're being cautious about permit numbers. Business permits are subject to operational need.

The Group requested an operational definition for business permits. Officers explained that the vehicle needed to be insured for business use and there would be a customer/business permits mix for new schemes. These permits varied in price depending on their purpose.

The Group agreed to examine Cotham South and Clifton Village as case studies to establish what has happened so far, the changes that have been made, the data available, the engagement process and lessons learnt.

Case Study: Cotham South

Case study details for Cotham South were scrutinised (see Appendix 3) and the following queries were raised:

- Would RPS lead to residents tarmacking over their front gardens? It was explained that there were very few instances of this because of the cost of doing so compared with the price of the permit. It would also be more difficult in a conservation area. There had been one application for a change of access.
- Changing yellow lines is not a problem for disabled parking bays at the moment as the Council absorbs costs, but they may review this. People do need to pay to have a dropped kerb.
- A car has to be registered in the name of the person living at the address; complications may arise with students who may have a car registered under a parent's name. HMOs are treated as an individual address unless the property is divided into separate households. At the review stage a follow-up survey is sent to all households as they may have visitor, resident or business

permits or may wish to apply for one.

- How were the number of spaces calculated in Cotham? It was explained that this is estimated by looking at the amount of parking space in each street, but the number of spaces cannot be calculated exactly due to different parking patterns, type of vehicles etc.
- How many 2nd and 3rd permits have been requested? Officers said they were not sure that they could provide the data for both residents and businesses, but would produce the data if it is available.
- Regarding permits and allocations for schools, officers outlined the experience from the Cotham South scheme where Cotham school, following engagement, requested no permits although 2 business and 5 customer permits were offered. Other schools were discussed, for example in Clifton and individual agreements were being negotiated with schools. The Group made the point that many of these establishments had low-paid staff who may not be able to pay parking fees. Officers explained that in Kingsdown, the University of Bristol owned several streets and it was imperative that the operational impact was analysed and a scheme was designed that works.

Equalities Issues

It was queried whether a solution would be found for mosques in Lawrence Hill and Eastern regarding Friday prayers and asked whether muslims were disproportionately affected as a result of their faith. What steps have been taken to mitigate the equality duty? Officers explained that there would be a business permit allocation, free pay and display parking for thirty minutes and longer stays for £1 an hour. There would be a better opportunity to park once the schemes in place than before as there is currently very little parking. It was queried that as this was a TRO issue, would it need to be applied across Bristol and if so, could this be varied? Was it within their scope to alter for example the length of free parking e.g. up to an hour.

Officers explained they didn't want a discretionary enforcement regime and that a full Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out (circulated to the Group). There are other faith groups that could be similarly affected for example, people attending church services during the week.

Alternative schemes

Resident and business groups suggested alternative schemes such as those at south-east stations serving London which have a very short operating period, but officers stated that for Bristol these schemes would be too easy for people to work around so they have little benefit. Residents can ask for extended hours after the review process if 9 to 5 p.m. is inadequate.

Residents groups were keen to see their proposed solutions put into place to see if they work for 6 months and then review. They were willing to pay for it with support from the Council but would like an assurance that the Council will consider schemes in areas which are not yet directly affected and discuss these with residents. The point was made that different areas need different schemes (Pay-and-display machines in Cotham and Redcliffe are not being used, so are a waste of resources).

Officers suggested that as one scheme at a time has to be introduced, the inner ring needs to be reviewed once it is in a 'steady state'. Residents' and business groups were concerned that this would be too late.

3.6 Baseline Evidence and Data

The Group had requested data on comparative schemes across the country and officers explained that there is no national model; Bristol's approach was very flexible but would circulate data they had, see Appendix 4.

Organisations Invited to SD&T Commission RPS WG 14th January 2014

Organisation	Contact Person	Attending
Ashley Ward RPS action group	Robert Duxbury Chair	Robert Duxbury
BID Clifton Village	Rosie Simon	Janet Williams/Alison Bracey
Richmond Hill Area Residents' Association (RHARA)	Jane Phillips	Pat Smith
Gloucester Road Traders Association		Michel Khan
St Paul's Unlimited	Benjo Wood	Musnilya Babatunji/ Tracey Edwards- Brown/Sam Parker
Keep Clifton special	Bernard Cook	Nigel Furey/Steve Smith
Hotwells and Clifton wood Community Association	Dennis Gornall Chair	Dennis Gornall
Clifton and Hotwells improvement Society	Brian Worthington /Linda Reeves Edwards	Brian Worthington /Linda Reeves Edwards
Whiteladies Traders Association (Winning Whiteladies)	Ken Simpson	Ken Simpson
Windmill Hill Group	Thom Oliver	No
Westbury Park Community Association	Jeff Bishop	No
Our Streets Our Scheme	Jon Rogers	Jon Rogers

Residents' and Traders' Groups Views

The Group invited in residents' and traders' groups to discuss their views on the RPS implementation. Each group was invited to give a short presentation of their concerns – some of these had also been presented at SD & T Commission's Public Forum on 19 December (circulated to the Group), i.e BID Clifton Village, Keep Clifton Special, Ashley Ward RPS Action Group so are not given in detail here.

Clifton and Hotwells Improvements Society

The views of members differ across the Society, but generally they are resentful of commuters. Businesses will be affected by RPS e.g. the Zoo, and the park-and-ride bus should stop at the Zoo and the Clifton village regularly – this could be free. The Society sympathises with other speakers from Clifton, but stated that their consultation was satisfactory and officers have been extremely helpful. Their view was that it was difficult to reconcile different interests and the schemes should be implemented and then reviewed.

Richmond Hill Area Association

This includes about 500 homes and the Students Union. They have controlled parking in Park Place and the RPS is good news and really important to residents. However there has been a lack of consultation and people haven't been written to from the outset; the first contact was in September 2013 and decisions were taken by the autumn. Boundaries were a big issue for the Clifton area, as residents in Richmond Hill can't park in other areas of Clifton and there is a much higher proportion of residents living near the boundaries. Officers commented that boundaries were drawn along main streets. Because Clifton West and Clifton village were merged there have been impacts on Richmond Hill. RPS is not about traffic and streets, but about people and communities.

Hotwells and Cliftonwood Community Association

The Association is happy with the boundaries and the positive consultation sessions held with officers and the Neighbourhood Partnership. Changes were made to the hours of the scheme in December i.e. Monday to Saturday up to 7 p.m. at night with additional cost to the residents. This was not on the website and the Association queried how costs are being met and whether this still includes bank holidays. Officers said this was not the case.

Our Streets Our Scheme (St Andrews)

They are aware that there is no data or evidence for this area as yet but are concerned about the impacts at the boundaries of areas being implemented early in the process. They want to explore ideas for alternative schemes possibly into Bishopston and St Andrews. (The Group has also received the report by Councillors' Hoyt and Telford on Ashley residents' views, November 2013 and an updated statement from the Ashley Ward RPS Action Group).

St Paul's Unlimited

Representatives were concerned about the cost of the scheme and didn't agree that they should pay. Bus fares should be reduced so that people on benefits can afford them – people on benefits in London pay £7.50 a week, but here people drive because it's cheaper to carry children around by car. The area has many isolated and vulnerable residents and people who attend churches and need parking nearby. Communications from the Council have been non-existent and although consultation was undertaken in 2012, the results of this have not been made public. Residents want to be engaged but have not been given the relevant information.

Gloucester Road Traders' Association

The Association has held 12 meetings locally and suggests there are common sense ways of reducing commuters. Their view was that the current transport system is inadequate; the size of buses needs to be reviewed and smaller buses could be used; there should be an HGV ban on corridors in peak hours; one side of Gloucester road could be non-parking in peak hours; road signage is too great at the moment. The road has a small car park and a one hour wait time for shopping areas is needed; park-and-ride services need to be looked at and the worst hit are the most vulnerable. Customers' needs should be taken into account and home care workers will be affected. A review of GBBN was promised during 2013/14 but this hasn't taken place, Gloucester Road has also lost its car park and large developments are coming on stream such as Sainsbury's and Southmead Hospital. Officers stated that Bristol Water works have affected the buses on GBBN so the review has been delayed.

Montpelier

The representative raised issues regarding visitors passes (of which more are needed), the operational hours should be limited to 2 hours and the costs of the scheme. The boundaries are too small and create cross boundary issues; parking such as pavement parking is mainly a residents' issue rather than commuting and there are issues around safety at night. There is need for proper consultation on the scheme and residents would prefer shared space. They have produced a video on YouTube but this has been ignored by the Mayor.

Whiteladies Traders' Association (Winning White ladies)

This Association represents 200 businesses and business rates and parking had been raised as key issues 12 months ago. Three hour parking slots are too short and the pay-and-display will contribute to a decline in local businesses, for example some large businesses may be moving out of the area due to RPS. Consultation has been poor, but businesses still have to pay the rates; in Cotham North, half of the businesses didn't know about the consultation. Clifton Down car park is the only major car park in the area and additional park-and-ride routes were suggested up Whiteladies Road from the Bath Road. Cotham Hill businesses were broadly in favour of RPS, but business has declined after 5 p.m. and on Saturdays – they have asked for the hours to be extended. GBBN has impacted on the left-hand side of Whiteladies and the introduction of 4 hour parking on the Downs contributes to the difficulties.

Key points

More general discussion ensued with the groups and the following points were made:

- regarding the park-and-ride facilities, officers stated that the operation had been extended by 2 hours and routing was actively under discussion but it was not a short-term fix. Brislington and Portway links were being examined but there were considerations about funding issues and also whether it was commercially viable.
- Councillors were given a choice about an informal consultation stage, then moving onto the formal consultation on the Traffic Regulation Order. Clifton councillors decided to go for a fast-track directly to the TRO stage but it was essential to tell people what the response is and what can and can't be done.
- Alternative schemes were discussed such as those at South-East stations serving London which have a very short operating period, but officers stated that for Bristol these schemes would be too easy for people to work around so they have little benefit. Residents can ask for extended hours after the review process if 9 to 5 p.m. is inadequate.
- Residents' groups were keen to see their proposed solutions put into place to see if they work for 6 months and then review. They were willing to pay for it with support from the Council but would like an assurance that the Council will consider schemes in areas which are not yet directly affected and discuss these with residents. The point was made that different areas need different schemes (Pay-and-display machines in Cotham and Redcliffe are not being used, so are a waste of resources). Officers suggested that as one scheme at a time has to be introduced, the inner ring needs to be reviewed once it is in a 'steady state'. Residents' and business groups were concerned that this would be too late.

**Residents' Parking Scheme
Information for cross-party working group
14th January 2014**

This note contains the following:

- Section A** – Cotham RPS case study
- Section B** – Extraordinary factors
- Section C** – Updated Redland RPS figures

Section A: Cotham RPS case study

Background

- The proposals for Cotham RPS were developed in autumn 2011, following the successful six months review of Kingsdown RPS.
- Some key improvements were made to the operating principles of the scheme, particularly around permit issue.
- All households without off-street parking were invited to apply for three residents' permits rather than two, all businesses were invited to apply for two operational business permits and the customer permit was introduced.
- The scheme became operational on 1st December 2012.

Permit numbers

The tables below shows the number of properties eligible for permits and the number of permits issued in the first year of the scheme.

Residential addresses

Number of households	2,569
Number of residents' permits issued	1,562

Non-residential addresses

Number of businesses	120
Number of business permits issued	43
Number of businesses with business permits	32
Number of customer permits issued	49
Number of businesses with customer permits	18
Number of businesses with business and customer permits	11

Information about other schemes

In Redcliffe RPS, there are 55 businesses. We have issued 77 business permits and 7 customer permits. The number of business addresses in the Clifton scheme areas is:

Cliftonwood & Hotwells – 98

Clifton Village – 350 in southern section, 64 in the former Clifton West.

Section B – Extraordinary factors

Our general approach to developing schemes is to tailor them to local needs wherever possible. Truly extraordinary factors need a bespoke approach and full consideration of the details. Our initial thinking regarding Southville RPS and its proximity to Bristol City Football Club is just taking place. We are considering a number of options, such as 'flap' signs which are in effect only on match days or perhaps longer hours of operation for the scheme itself. We are currently researching how sports stadia elsewhere operate.

Section C – Updated Redland information

The new area is approximately half of that previously proposed. Its costs and income are estimated to be reduced by half also, which results in less than a 5% variation in overall outturn.

Borrowing too has been based on the original proposals, the reduction in the size of the Redland area will make a marginal difference to the overall financial case. Bearing in mind the assumptions that have been made, the change in the Redland area is likely to have an effect within the expected tolerances and, therefore, does not affect the overall financial model.

Benchmarking: Permit type, eligibility and cost

Appendix 4

Type of permit	Local authority	Who can apply	Cost
Dispensation permit	Nottingham	Official visitors, eg health and social care workers, contractors required to carry out work at a property	£100 p.a. (1 permit carrying up to 3 registration numbers)
Trade permit	Bath & NE Somerset	Plumbers, builders etc working on a property with a zone	Zone 1 - £3 per hour; All other zones - £6 per day
Trade permit	Sheffield	Landlords, registered utility companies and builders (or similar trades people) working on properties within permit schemes	£62.50 for book of 25 daily scratch cards (maximum 4 books per application)
Landlords permit	Bath & NE Somerset	Certified landlords of property within scheme areas	Zones 1-3 - £350 All other zones - £1,000
Business permit	Bath & NE Somerset	Business requiring customer parking in an RPS area	1 st permit - £110 p.a. 2 nd permit - £165 p.a.
Medical permit	Bath & NE Somerset	Carers, midwives, district nurses or anyone that regularly visits housebound residents for care purposes	Zones 1-16, £60 p.a.
Carers permit	Sheffield	Official carer or medical organisations and agencies	£10 for one year (number of permits will be confirmed on receipt of application)
Medical permit	Southampton	Midwives, district nurses, physiotherapists who provide a service in the home	Free; must be renewed every year
Temporary business permit	Southampton	Workmen carrying out maintenance	Zones 1-12 and 16 – £14 Zones 13-15 – Free Permits valid for two weeks
Resident carers' permit	Sheffield	Residents that need essential care at home	£10 for one year. Usually limited to 1 per household.
Essential visitors' permit	Southampton	Residents requiring regular care visits	Free
Visitors' permit	Nottingham Liverpool	Residents can apply for one or two visitors' permits that can be provided to their visitors on arrival.	Free of charge