

Parking Control Account Briefing

Points addressed:

- (i) Some background on the account in terms of the statutory framework and the expenditure and income that goes through it, and transfers to general fund*
- (ii) Detailed breakdown of expenditure and income 2006/07 outturn, 2007/08 original budget and forecast, and provisional 2008/09 budget.*
- (iii) Members will want some explanation of the main areas of spending and income, and the overall strategy being adopted.*
- (iv) Potential efficiency proposals and other saving opportunities including fees and charges*

Detail:

- (i) Statutory framework*

Road Traffic Regulations Traffic Act 1984 as amended and Road Traffic Act 2004

Once the costs of the parking facilities and administration have been met, the use of any surplus by the council is confined to provision of transport improvements under the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 (section 55) and, local environmental improvements following the Traffic Management Act 2004 (section 95).

- (ii) Breakdowns of expenditure & income*

See separate paper.

- (iii) Strategy*

See separate table, plus the other information as follows.

The Council's existing parking policies are set out in the Local Implementation Plan ("LIP"). The LIP was approved by the Executive Committee, subject to minor amendments, in January 2006 and subsequently given formal approval by the GLA. Chapter 7 of the LIP, the Parking and Enforcement Plan ("PEP"), therefore constitutes the Council's current statutory position on parking.

The PEP sets out a series of aims, objectives and priorities for parking in Brent. It then addresses specific policy areas relating to resident's parking, public on and off street parking, parking for specific user groups and events, and parking in new developments, operating hours for CPZ's, residents parking permit charges, on and off street parking tariffs, numbers of off street public parking spaces, projected parking income etc.

Allied to the PEP, officers are currently in the process of recommending to the Executive to approve a series of policy issues (following on from the 2006 approval of the LIP above) **for example,**

- Further development and consultation on the proposed introduction of 1 hour controlled parking zones.
- Introduction of a 3 year rolling programme of CPZ reviews.
- The removal of existing bank holiday parking restrictions in Controlled Parking Zones: E, W, KD, KG, KL, KM, KR, with the exception of retaining parking restrictions in Zones KD KG, KL, KM and KR during the Notting Hill carnival weekend.
- Review of resident's parking permits/household, number; cost based on CO2 emissions, on the D.V.L.A bandings, etc.
- To develop a more flexible approach to business parking permit allocation
- A full CPZ signage review as part of the development of the Public Realm Design Guide.
- Investigations into the practicalities and cost/resourcing implications of introducing new technology, e.g. phone/internet payment, electronic permit recognition, CCTV/moving enforcement methods.
- No further expansion of the voucher parking system which should continue to be operated in trial areas, but be phased out in favour of more advanced technology.
- That the Executive approve the submission of a separate report dealing specifically with issues relating to Pay and Display parking.

(iv) *Potential efficiency proposals and other saving opportunities*

The financial implications of each proposal will have to be studied in-depth and analysed in turn by Officers when it is put to the Executive for approval.

The parking contract costs are to a large extent fixed. However, the provision of on-street hours and removal services can be and is used according to need. The provision is varied as required, for example, it is increased to meet the demands of Wembley Protective Parking Scheme (WPPS) event days and reduced soon after the event to a low level to provide a reactive service.

Some of the income has to be used to maintain the parking service, infrastructure, replacement and repairs and introducing new ideas and technology. For example the WPPS scheme has led to a significant increase in work requiring additional resource.

It is important to note that future decisions on issues such as free permits, '1 hour free parking', reduced charges for small engine vehicles are all likely to have the effect of reducing income.

Effects of legislation have to be taken into account, for example, the effect of proportionality, following the introduction of differential parking. Vehicles parked in parking bays can not generally be removed. The change has a significant impact on the income all authorities from removal of vehicles.

Parking control is constantly reviewing its operation, **for example**, currently,

- They are looking into generating additional income from the disposal of unclaimed vehicles after removal by auctioning instead of scrapping them
- They have negotiated with the contractor to upgrade 1 removal truck, at no additional cost to the council to cater for the removal of heavier vehicles which will provide a cost saving of £400.00/each event day
- Following the introduction of differential charging a full review of deployment is being carried out to see if any reduction in the current operating hours should be made.
- All contractor vehicles are being fitted with tracking, including mopeds, at no additional cost to the council to improve efficiency.

- The cost of the permit issue operation for Event days has been reduced significantly and still being reduced further.

Further Background Information on the focus of strategy, policy

House Commons Select Committee Report on Parking Policy and Enforcement (14 June 2006) reminds local authorities not to get tempted to use civil parking enforcement to raise additional revenue. If local councils set revenue targets, these will override the traffic management objectives which must govern the use of the surpluses generated. In order to relieve undue pressure on Parking Managers, it must be made absolutely clear. The Department and Transport and the Audit Commissions must uphold this principle and challenge any authorities that appear to be doing otherwise in the operation of their parking enforcement. The focus here is clearly on transport priorities and not financial targets.

London Councils Operational Guidance picks up on the above and states that for good governance, enforcement authorities need to forecast revenue in advance. But raising revenue should not be an objective, nor should authorities set targets for revenue or the number of PCNs they issue.