

## Appendix E

# Increasing Visitor Parking Charges

**Department**  
Community Services

**Person Responsible**  
Mark Fairchild

**Created**  
27<sup>th</sup> August, 2015

**Last Review**  
10<sup>th</sup> September, 2015

**Status**  
Assessed

**Next Review**  
10<sup>th</sup> September, 2016

## Stage 1 Screening Data

### **1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.**

The proposal to increase visitor parking charges is aimed at enabling the Council to better control demand for kerbside parking space within Controlled Parking Zones in Brent.

The rationale for the increase in visitor parking charges is: 1) that there is evidence of excessively high levels of demand for parking in certain parts of Brent, especially in those Controlled Parking Zones which are close to neighbouring boroughs; 2) that there is evidence of commuter parking, which is likely due to the current low price of visitor parking; 3) to better align our pricing with those of neighbouring boroughs; 4) to encourage take up of more sustainable modes of transport by pricing the daily visitor parking product to at least match the cost of a return bus journey; and 5) to improve air quality in Brent and reduce carbon emissions.

### **2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.**

The following key stakeholders are affected or potentially affected by the changes made:

Residents of Brent who live in a CPZ area and who receive visitors who travel by car, and people who visit residents living in CPZs.

The GLA has estimated that the London Borough of Brent's population in 2015 is 321,000. Controlled Parking Zones cover 49% of Brent's residential addresses. This therefore equates to approximately 157,000 residents of CPZs potentially affected by the changes to daily visitor parking, together with their visitors.

### **3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?**

The proposal to increase visitor parking charges may adversely affect those residents who live in CPZs and receive visitors who provide them care. This may particularly affect elderly residents, or those with disabilities.

**3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups?  
If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted**

The proposal to increase visitor parking charges may adversely affect those residents who live in CPZs and receive visitors who provide them care. This may particularly affect elderly residents, or those with disabilities.

**3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?**

The proposal to increase visitor parking charges does not change or remove the service provision of visitor parking.

**3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?**

Approximately half of the borough is affected; no specific geographic areas within Brent's Controlled Parking Zones have been identified as having known equalities issues with regard to age and disability.

**3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?**

The proposal to increase visitor parking charges would make it more expensive for residents who live in CPZs and receive visitors who provide them care. This may particularly affect elderly residents, or those with disabilities.

**3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives?**

The proposal does not specifically relate to any of the Equality objectives in the Council's Equality Strategy 2015-19.

**Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?**

Yes

**4. Use the comments box below to give brief details of what further information you will need to complete a Full Equality Analysis. What information will give you a full picture of how well the proposal will work for different groups of people? How will you gather this information? Consider engagement initiatives, research and equality monitoring data.**

Information on other parking products will be researched. This is with the intention of mitigating against the effects that an increase in the cost of visitor parking will have on those residents who live in CPZs and receive visitors who provide them care.

## Stage 2: Analysis

### 5. What effects could your policy have on different equality groups and on cohesion and good relations?

#### 5.1 Age (*select all that apply*)

- ☐ Positive
- ☐ Neutral
- ☒ Negative

#### Please give details:

The proposal to increase visitor parking charges may adversely affect those residents who live in CPZs and receive visitors who provide them care. This may particularly affect elderly residents.

#### 5.2 Disability (*select all that apply*)

- ☐ Positive
- ☐ Neutral
- ☒ Negative

#### Please give details:

The proposal to increase visitor parking charges may adversely affect those residents who live in CPZs and receive visitors who provide them care. This may particularly affect disabled residents.

#### 5.3 Gender Identity and Expression (*select all that apply*)

- ☐ Positive
- ☒ Neutral
- ☐ Negative

#### Please give details:

No impact identified

#### 5.4 Marriage and Civil Partnership (*select all that apply*)

- ☐ Positive
- ☒ Neutral
- ☐ Negative

#### Please give details:

No impact identified

**5.5 Pregnancy and Maternity (*select all that apply*)**

- ☐ Positive
- ☒ Neutral
- ☐ Negative

**Please give details:**

No impact identified

**5.6 Race (*select all that apply*)**

- ☐ Positive
- ☒ Neutral
- ☐ Negative

**Please give details:**

No impact identified

**5.7 Religion or belief (*select all that apply*)**

- ☐ Positive
- ☒ Neutral
- ☐ Negative

**Please give details:**

No impact identified

**5.8 Sex (*select all that apply*)**

- ☐ Positive
- ☒ Neutral
- ☐ Negative

**Please give details:**

No impact identified

**5.9 Sexual orientation (select all that apply)**

- ☐ Positive  
☒ Neutral  
☐ Negative

**Please give details:**

No impact identified

**5.10 Other (please specify) (select all that apply)**

- ☐ Positive  
☒ Neutral  
☐ Negative

**Please give details:**

No impact identified

**6. Could any of the impacts you have identified be unlawful under the Equality Act 2010? Prohibited acts include direct and indirect discrimination, harassment, victimisation and failure to make a reasonable adjustment.**

- ☐ Yes  
☒ No

**7. Please provide a brief summary of any research or engagement initiatives that have been carried out to formulate your proposal.**

The research activities which informed the visitor parking charges proposal were:

- Benchmarking cost comparison with public transport fares
- Benchmarking cost comparison with other London local authorities
- Analysis of booked visitor parking sessions data
- Analysis of the policy objectives of the Parking Strategy and Long Term Transport strategy

**What did you find out from consultation or data analysis?**

That the cost of visitor parking charges in Brent is low in comparison to neighbouring London boroughs; that there is evidence of excessively high levels of demand for parking in certain parts of Brent, including commuter parking; and that a price increase which is better aligned

with those of neighbouring boroughs would encourage take up of more sustainable modes of transport and contribute towards improving air quality in Brent.

**Were the participants in any engagement initiatives representative of the people who will be affected by your proposal?**

Not applicable

**How did your findings and the wider evidence base inform the proposal?**

The findings have identified a clear and robust rationale for increasing the cost of visitor parking.

**STAGE 3: ACTION PLANNING**

**8. What actions will you take to enhance the potential positive impacts that you have identified?**

Not applicable.

**9. What actions will you take to remove or reduce the potential negative impacts that you have identified?**

The following measures are in place to mitigate the adverse impacts that an increase in the cost of visitor parking will have on residents who live in CPZs and receive visitors who provide them with care.

Measure 1: The Council provides an Essential User Permit to charitable and public sector organisations which provide essential formal care and services to people who live or work in Controlled Parking Zones. The eligibility criteria states that “any person who performs a statutory service on behalf of the Council, including social housing management and residential or community care management, or is a health visitor, general practitioner, district or community nurse, midwife, chiropodist, dentist or osteopath employed by the National Health Service, or who provides home visiting on behalf of a religious or non - profit making charitable organisation”. The residents who receive care visits from an Essential User Permit holder will be unaffected by the proposal to increase visitor parking charges.

Measure 2: Residents are currently able to purchase a Visitor Household permit, which allows their visitors to park in any resident or shared use bay, within the resident’s street in the Zone shown on the permit. This permit may be displayed in any vehicle. This product is currently priced at £110, and it is proposed to increase this to £165. The proposed increase (50%) is proportionately less than the increase applied to daily visitor permits (at least 100%). At its current price, and even with the proposed increase, it offers a significantly cheaper alternative to daily visitor permits for those residents who receive regular visitors to their property. Residents who purchase the Visitor Household permit and receive care visits will be affected to a lesser extent than other residents by any increase in the cost of the Visitor Household permit price; the purchase of this permit by those residents who receive care visits means that they will not be disproportionately affected by the proposal to increase visitor parking charges.

**10. Please explain how any remaining negative impacts can be justified?**

The Visitor Household permit is universally available to all residents who live in a CPZ, therefore there are no remaining negative impacts.