

## Eco Impact Checklist

<b>Title of report: Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review</b>				
<b>Report author: Jacob Pryor</b>				
<b>Anticipated date of key decision: 06/06/23</b>				
<b>Summary of proposals:</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove reductions provided to low emissions vehicles, currently free below 100g CO2 and half price between 101 and 110g CO2. Justification related to existing government policy change to remove many of the reductions offered to lower emissions vehicles through VED due to fairness and a gradual move to lower emissions vehicles and also the fact that a parking space is not directly related to vehicle emissions so the link is tenuous at best.</li> <li>Double cost of second permits, from £112 to £224, and multiply third permits by 2.5 times from £224 to £560. Justification relates to use of space, most RPS areas are older housing with limited parking space and high density. Second and third vehicles place an increased impact on other users and this needs to be better reflected in the permit cost. Road space is becoming increasingly valuable as the city adapts to climate change. Space is needed for street trees, SUDS, electric vehicle charge points, cycle hangars and other features. The costs of second and third permits needs to better reflect the impact these vehicles have on available space.</li> <li>Increase CPZ permit fee from £50 to £250. Fees for CPZ permits do not currently reflect the value of on street parking spaces in the city centre which is at an increasing premium with the rapidly increasing number of residents and the need to adapt the city centre to better serve the needs of people and respond to the changes required to our streets by the climate and ecological emergencies.</li> </ul>				
Will the proposal impact on...	Yes/No	+ive or -ive	If Yes...	
			Briefly describe impact	Briefly describe Mitigation measures
Emission of Climate Changing Gases?	Yes	+ive	The impact of this proposal is net positive. Increasing tariffs for 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> cars/vans and CPZ permits should over time reduce vehicle numbers resulting in fewer emissions of Climate Changing Gases. The removal of discounts for low emission vehicles may serve as a short-term disincentive, but given the increasing efficiency of the fleet, keeping this reduced tariff in place would eventually work against the objective it is trying	

			to achieve by incentivising free permits for all new cars. Most plug-in vehicles rely on home charging points associated with off-street parking, so there should be little impact on current permit holders.	
Bristol's resilience to the effects of climate change?		+ive	Over time the proposal should see a reduction in vehicles parked on the highway in CPZ and RPS areas. This provides an opportunity to reallocate this space to resilience enhancing assets such as trees, Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs) and Cycle Hangars	
Consumption of non-renewable resources?		+ive	Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) vehicles, Hybrid and Battery Electric Vehicles (BEV) all require the consumption of non-renewable resources in their construction and ongoing operation. Disincentivising their use will help to reduce the city overall consumption of non-renewable resources.	
Production, recycling or disposal of waste		+ive	Vehicles require ongoing maintenance, parts replacements and end of life disposal/recycling. Disincentivising vehicle ownership will help to reduce the production, recycling or disposal of waste	
The appearance of the city?		+ive	Reducing overall car use will provide opportunities for reallocating highway space for improved public realm including	

			tree planting, SUDS, benches and parklets	
Pollution to land, water, or air?		+ive	<p>ICE, Hybrid and BEVs all emit particulate matter into the air though tyre and component wear. In addition Hybrid and ICE vehicles emit NO<sub>2</sub>. Reducing our reliance on vehicles is one of the most effective ways to reduce harmful air pollution.</p> <p>It should be noted that as the beneficial reductions in NOx and particulate emissions take place, harmful pollution from ground level ozone is likely to increase (NOx emissions prevent the atmospheric chemical reaction that generate ozone), so there may be no overall health benefit.</p>	
Wildlife and habitats?		+ive	Although likely to only have a minor impact, the planned reallocation of space to 'street greening' will likely have some benefits for wildlife and habitats	

**Consulted with:**

**Summary of impacts and Mitigation - to go into the main Cabinet/ Council Report**

The significant environmental impacts of these proposals are likely to be a gradual reduction in the number of residential parking permits issued due disincentivising on-street parking for private vehicles. Fewer vehicles is likely to reduce emissions, some air pollution and the use of non-renewable resources in the short term and the reallocation of highways space for greening projects, sustainable drainage systems, places to sit and play, and cycle parking in the medium to long term.

There are no harmful impacts to mitigate, but it will be important to ensure that projects to reallocate road space to purposes with environmental benefits as the number of vehicles falls actually take place.

The net environmental effects of the proposals are likely to be beneficial in the short term, although the benefits from reduced emissions will be neutral over the medium and long terms as

average vehicle would have reduced due to other policies.

**Checklist completed by:**

Name:	Jacob Pryor
Dept.:	Strategic City Transport
Extension:	
Date:	18/05/2023
Verified by Environmental Performance Team	Giles Liddell, Project Manager - Environmental