

## Summary: Intervention & Options

<b>Department /Agency:</b> <b>The Royal Parks</b>	<b>Title:</b> <b>Impact Assessment of proposed amendments to The Royal Parks and Other Open Spaces Regulations 1997 - DRAFT</b>	
<b>Stage:</b> Consultation	<b>Version:</b> DRAFT	<b>Date:</b> 30 January 2009
<b>Related Publications:</b> The Royal Parks and Other Open Spaces Regulations 1997 (as amended); The Royal Parks Regulations - Consultation on Amendments to the Regulations January 2009.		

**Available to view or download at:**

<http://www.royalparks.org.uk>

**Contact for enquiries:** David McLaren/Julia Frayne

**Telephone:** 020 7298 2018/2008

**What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?**

The Royal Parks are owned by the Sovereign in right of the Crown, but were passed to the Government under the Crown Lands Act 1851 to be managed as public open space. They are now the responsibility of the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, who delegates their day to day operational management to The Royal Parks (TRP).

The Royal Parks Regulations regulate the conduct of persons using the Parks. They can only be amended by Statutory Instrument under the Parks Regulation (Amendment) Act 1926. TRP has reviewed the current regulations and recommends a number of changes.

**What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?**

The principal Royal Parks Regulations were last revised in 1997 (although there have been some minor amendments since then).

We keep the regulations under general review, and the intended effect of these changes is to ensure that the rules which set out what you may do in the Royal Parks remain relevant, fair, appropriate, comprehensive and free of redundant references.

**What policy options have been considered? Please justify any preferred option.**

We have considered leaving the regulations as they are. However, we believe that implementing the changes set out here is a more effective, a fairer and more responsible way of discharging the responsibility to secure the proper management of the Royal Parks.

**When will the policy be reviewed to establish the actual costs and benefits and the achievement of the desired effects?** The Royal Parks will undertake a review of the effectiveness of any changes within 18 months of their implementation.

**Ministerial Sign-off** For SELECT STAGE Impact Assessments:

*I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.*

Signed by the responsible Minister:

..... Date:

## Summary: Analysis & Evidence

<b>Policy Option:</b>	<b>Description:</b>
-----------------------	---------------------

<b>COSTS</b>	<b>ANNUAL COSTS</b>	Description and scale of <b>key monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups' One-off costs will include investing in car parks, including pay-and-display machines, signage etc. We estimate no net average annual cost and that the scheme would be self-financing.			
	<b>One-off</b> (Transition) <span style="float: right;">Yrs</span>				
	<b>£ 2.9m</b>				
	<b>Average Annual Cost</b> (excluding one-off)				
	<b>£ 0.00</b>	<b>Total Cost (PV)</b>	<b>£</b>		
Other <b>key non-monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups'					

<b>BENEFITS</b>	<b>ANNUAL BENEFITS</b>	Description and scale of <b>key monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups' No net monetised gain to TRP - revenue raised from the scheme would be reinvested in the maintenance of the car parks and associated infrastructure.			
	<b>One-off</b> <span style="float: right;">Yrs</span>				
	<b>£</b>				
	<b>Average Annual Benefit</b> (excluding one-off)				
	<b>£</b>	<b>Total Benefit (PV)</b>	<b>£</b>		
Other <b>key non-monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups' Improved park atmosphere; better enforcement of the regulations; reduced traffic congestion within the Parks; less degradation to the fabric of car parks and relevant roads.					

**Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks** That income/annual operational costs of the parking scheme will not represent a net burden to TRP; that proposed fees, combined with external parking initiatives, will mean no significant additional inconvenience to local residents; that there will be no significant increase in the number of PHVs licensed by the PCO.

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	<b>Net Benefit Range (NPV)</b> £	<b>NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate)</b> £
-----------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	Greater London			
On what date will the policy be implemented?	During 2009/10			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	TRP and MPS			
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£ no additional			
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	Yes			
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	No			
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£			
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	£			
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	Yes/No			
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	No	No	N/A	N/A

<b>Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline</b> (2005 Prices)			(Increase - Decrease)
Increase of	£ 0.00	Decrease of	£ 0.00
		<b>Net Impact</b>	<b>£ 0.00</b>

Key: Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices (Net) Present Value

## Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

[Use this space (with a recommended maximum of 30 pages) to set out the evidence, analysis and detailed narrative from which you have generated your policy options or proposal. Ensure that the information is organised in such a way as to explain clearly the summary information on the preceding pages of this form.]

### Background

1 The Royal Parks, which comprise over 5000 acres of historic parkland in and around London, are: Bushy Park, The Green Park, Greenwich Park, Hyde Park, Kensington Gardens, The Regent's Park & Primrose Hill, Richmond Park, and St James's Park. The Royal Parks also manages a number of other open spaces in London - including Victoria Tower Gardens, Grosvenor Square Gardens and Brompton Cemetery - where the Royal Parks Regulations also apply.

2 The Royal Parks are owned by the Sovereign in right of the Crown, but the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport has management powers for them under the Crown Lands Act 1851. The Royal Parks is an Executive Agency of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport and manages the Parks on behalf of the Secretary of State.

### Why is government intervention necessary?

3 The Park Regulations, which set out what you may do in the Royal Parks, are made under powers granted to the Secretary of State under the Park Regulations (Amendment) Act 1926. This means that changes to the regulations can only be made by Statutory Instrument.

4 The principal regulations are The Royal Parks and Other Open Spaces Regulations 1997 (SI 1997 No.1639) (as amended).

5 The regulations are kept under general review by The Royal Parks, and updated periodically. The last major changes to the principal regulations were made in 1997 (although there were some minor amendments in 2004). This **draft Impact Assessment** considers a number of changes that The Royal Parks has identified as desirable, and comments are invited on its content.

### Details of the regulation changes

6 We are carrying out public consultation on our proposals to make the following changes to the Royal Parks Regulations:

- Introduce parking charges in Bushy and Richmond Parks
- Set a 20mph speed limit for motor vehicles within Greenwich and Bushy Parks
- Exempt licensed Private Hire Vehicles (PHVs) from the general prohibition on commercial vehicles driving through the Royal Parks
- Make it explicit that licensed Hackney carriages ("black cabs") and Private Hire Vehicles (PHVs) that drive through the Royal Parks may bear advertisements
- Clarify that horse owners who use the Royal Parks are exempt from the general requirement that visitors clean up after their animals
- Clarify where, in Bushy Park, people may sail a model boat
- Increase the existing parking charges in Hyde Park, Greenwich Park and The Regent's Park.

### Consultation

7 The Royal Parks will carry out a full consultation exercise, from 30 January to 1 May 2009, engaging with stakeholders throughout the process.

## Costs and benefits

### Introducing parking charges in Richmond and Bushy Parks:

8 Some visitors to Richmond and Bushy Parks may oppose the introduction of a charge where previously they had parked for free. The Royal Parks visitor surveys (see [www.royalparks.org.uk](http://www.royalparks.org.uk)) show that 80-90% of visitors to both parks currently arrive by private car, and they may well interpret this as imposing a charge on their visit to the park.

9 We consider, however, that our proposed charging rates are set at a reasonable level, and that those who choose not to drive will still be able to visit, by making use of nearby public transport and cycle routes. There will continue to be free parking provision within the parks for Blue Badge holders.

10 The Parks provide a unique setting for those who are licensed to run businesses within their boundaries. These businesses provide a facility for our visitors, and the park location is an important element in the offer they make to their customers. We consider that the parking charges we propose are set at a level that will not significantly affect the customer base of these businesses.

11 Residents living near to park entrances may be concerned that park visitors will seek to avoid the new parking fees by parking in the local streets instead, and that this will cause congestion. We consider that our rates are set at a level that will discourage such behaviour, given that residents' parking restrictions are already in place in many areas and that a number of locations around the parks already charge a similar or higher amount to that proposed here. It is also the case that the car parks in Richmond Park in particular, are already often completely full at weekends, so the pattern of parking outside the park should not significantly alter at those times. The proposal may in fact lead to a reduction in car congestion if more people use other means to visit the parks.

12 We anticipate that this measure will ease congestion around popular parking areas within the parks, such as Pembroke Lodge, where currently, on busy weekends, long lines of cars queue along the road to wait for a space. There may also be a reduction in wear and tear to park roads and car parks.

13 A number of the parking areas in the parks are in a very poor condition. Income from the charges would be re-invested to improve these areas.

### Reduction of speed limit in Bushy and Greenwich Parks

14 The reduction of the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph in Greenwich and Bushy Parks may be unpopular with some drivers, who could consider it an inconvenience. However, the principal purpose of park roads is to enable those who want to visit the parks to do so. They are not there to provide a speedy short cut. We consider that reducing the speed limit will have a negligible impact on drivers, but will lead to an improved park atmosphere, including less noise and less likelihood of collision between motor vehicles and pedestrians, cyclists and wildlife. It will almost certainly lessen the seriousness of collisions if they do occur: evidence from the Department for Transport indicates that if a pedestrian is hit by a car travelling at 30mph their chance of survival is 80%, whereas if the vehicle is travelling at 20mph their chance of survival increases to 97%.

15 If we proceed with this change, we will implement road engineering solutions to aid enforcement.

### Taxis and Private Hire Vehicles (PHVs)

16 The Royal Parks Regulations currently prohibit any vehicle that is "constructed, adapted or in use as a trade vehicle" from using the Royal Parks as a through route without express permission. The only general exception is for licensed Hackney carriages ("black cabs"), on the grounds that they provide a service for visitors. The rule is designed to limit the amount of unnecessary traffic in the Parks. However, private hire vehicles in London are now licensed by the Public Carriage Office (PCO), and we

understand from the PCO that a wider cross-section of people use a PHV than use a black cab. There are, therefore, positive grounds to consider allowing PHVs into the Parks.

17 There may be concerns that making this concession will lead to an overall increase in traffic within the Parks. This is not our expectation. Enforcement of the rule against PHVs has always been difficult because they were not easily identifiable as commercial vehicles, and have in practice been using our Park roads for many years. If we implement this measure we would expect little increase in PHV traffic within the Parks, and believe that the change would go unnoticed by the majority of visitors.

18 PHVs using the Parks will be subject to the strict licence conditions set down by the PCO. We believe that passengers who use PHVs will welcome the proposal. We do not consider that it will disadvantage drivers of black cabs or their passengers.

19 Following the introduction of a clearer PHV licensing and identification scheme by the PCO, we anticipate that enforcement of the restrictions on commercial vehicles will be more effective.

### Other Proposed Regulation Changes

20 We consider that the other changes we propose to make to the Parks Regulations (which are set out at paragraph 6 above) will not have a significant impact on those who visit the Royal Parks.

### **Those affected by the proposed changes to the regulations**

21 These changes will, potentially, affect: Park visitors; local residents around the Parks; local authorities; PHV drivers and their passengers; public transport providers; those running licensed businesses in the Parks; and the Metropolitan Police Service.

### **Enforcement, sanctions and monitoring**

22 The Royal Parks Regulations are enforced by an Operational Command Unit (OCU) of the Metropolitan Police Service. The OCU has its headquarters at the Old Police House in Hyde Park, but has sub-stations in other Royal Parks. The Police are primarily responsible for monitoring compliance with the regulations. They liaise regularly with Park Managers and have frequent tasking meetings with The Royal Parks Directors, Park Managers, and Park stakeholders, including the Friends Groups. This is monitored by a Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership. In the majority of cases, breaches of the regulations are punishable by a Level 1 fine in a Magistrate's Court.

### **Impact on equality and human rights**

23 As an Agency of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, The Royal Parks has specified responsibilities to promote equality and eliminate unlawful discrimination, and must assess all of its policies and practices in relation to their consequences in this regard. Neither the Department nor the Agency considers that the proposed changes will impact on equality or human rights issues.

### **Implementation/delivery plan**

24 The Royal Parks will write directly to key stakeholders – including local MPs, local authorities, Friends of the Parks groups, relevant businesses and the Metropolitan Police Service - informing them of any changes that are made. An explanation of the changes will also be posted on park notice boards, on The Royal Parks website, and announced through appropriate media. We will undertake a review of the effectiveness of any changes, including an assessment of their ecological impact, within 18 months of their implementation.

### **Comments**

Please send your comments on this Impact Assessment to:

[Consultation@royalparks.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Consultation@royalparks.gsi.gov.uk)

Or write to:  
Consultation - Regulations Review  
The Royal Parks  
The Old Police House  
Hyde Park  
London W2 2UH

Closing date for comments is **1 May 2009**.

A summary of responses will be published shortly after the closing date for consultation. All information in responses, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure under Freedom of Information legislation. If a correspondent requests confidentiality, this cannot be guaranteed and will only be possible if considered appropriate under the legislation. Any such request should explain why confidentiality is necessary. Any automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not be considered as such a request unless you specifically include a request, with an explanation, in the main text of your response. If you need a copy of this document in another format, such as large print, please telephone 020 7298 2008 or 020 7298 2018.

If you have any questions or complaints about the process of consultation on this paper, please contact: Julia Frayne, The Royal Parks, The Old Police House, Hyde Park, London, W2 2UH ([Consultation@royalparks.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Consultation@royalparks.gsi.gov.uk)).

## Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

Use the table below to demonstrate how broadly you have considered the potential impacts of your policy options.

**Ensure that the results of any tests that impact on the cost-benefit analysis are contained within the main evidence base; other results may be annexed.**

Type of testing undertaken	<i>Results in Evidence Base?</i>	<i>Results annexed?</i>
Competition Assessment	Yes/No	Yes/No
Small Firms Impact Test	Yes/No	Yes/No
Legal Aid	Yes/No	Yes/No
Sustainable Development	Yes/No	Yes/No
Carbon Assessment	Yes/No	Yes/No
Other Environment	Yes/No	Yes/No
Health Impact Assessment	Yes/No	Yes/No
Race Equality	Yes/No	Yes/No
Disability Equality	Yes/No	Yes/No
Gender Equality	Yes/No	Yes/No
Human Rights	Yes/No	Yes/No
Rural Proofing	Yes/No	Yes/No

## Annexes

No annexes attached at this stage.