

2012

PARKING INCOME GENERATION STUDY



June 2012

Executive Summary

1. Parking Services has been set income generation targets in the Council budget meetings of 2011 and 2012. The targets are based on additional income from increased parking charges and from the identification and implementation of other options. This report sets out the options that have been identified and are proposed to be implemented.
2. The amount of additional income Parking Services is required to generate is £603,000 in 2012/13, rising to £1.106million in 2013/14 and rising further to £1.606million in 2014/15 and subsequent years. These figures do not allow for annual inflation.
3. The estimated total annual net income that could be generated from the implementation of all the options identified and the parking charge increase on 1 April 2011 is £900,300. However, a number of assumptions have been made and income generated will need to be monitored to evaluate if these assumptions are correct.
4. The options proposed in this report will also address a number of longstanding issues relating to parking in Calderdale including: rationalisation of different parking tariffs and stay periods, problems with availability of parking, potential road safety issues, balancing parking charges against parking supply and demand and inconsistencies between free and pay and display on and off street parking.
5. A key consideration in evaluating the options has been the potential impact on the economy of Calderdale. Current initiatives, such as free parking during the Christmas period, will be retained. However, it should also be recognised and acknowledged that further initiatives could be driven and implemented by local traders, such as refunding of parking charges subject to a minimum spend, and that these are implemented successfully in other authorities.
6. The options discussed in this report, when considered together, are balanced. However, it has to be acknowledged that the income targets set are very challenging and that even if all nine options are endorsed fully by Cabinet and are implemented there will still be a potential shortfall in income. This is estimated to be **£289,000 in 2012/13, £357,000 in 2013/14 and £461,000 in 2014/15 onwards**, excluding inflation. The 2014/15 figure assumes additional income of approximately £245,000 from a further increase in parking charges, based on additional revenue from the increase on 1 April 2011.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 At the Council budget meeting in Spring 2011 an additional income target of £453,000 was set for Parking Services in 2011/12. This consisted of £403,000 from increased parking charges and £50,000 from measures identified from a parking income generation study to be carried out by Parking Services.
- 1.2 The additional income targets for 2012/13 and 2013/14 were set at £603,000 consisting of £403,000 from increased parking charges and £200,000 from further measures identified from the parking study (phase 1).
- 1.3 At the Council budget meeting held on 27 February 2012 the income targets for Parking Services were increased further. An additional target of £503,000 was agreed for 2013/14 and £600,000 for 2014/15 onwards arising from the parking study (phase 2). A further income target of £403,000 was agreed for 2014/15 onwards by increasing car parking charges further.
- 1.4 The total income required to be generated by Parking Services as a result of the budget decisions made in 2011 and 2012 are given in Table 1 below:

Year	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15 onwards
Income target – budget 2011*				
Increased parking charges	403,000	403,000	403,000	403,000
Parking study phase 1	50,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Parking study phase 2	0	0	0	0
Total income target, budget 2011	453,000	603,000	603,000	603,000
Income target – budget 2012*				
Increased parking charges	0	0	0	403,000
Parking study phase 2	0	0	503,000	600,000
Total income target, budget 2012*	0	0	503,000	1,003,000
Combined income target 2011 and 2012 budgets*	453,000	603,000	1,106,000	1,606,000

Table 1. Income targets for Parking Services 2011/12 to 2014/15

* All income targets are subject to annual inflation and so increase year on year. The figures given in the table above **do not** include annual inflation.

- 1.5 This parking income generation study report outlines the work that has been carried out to identify if and how these income targets can be achieved. The assumption that an increase in on and off street car parking charges would generate the income target of £403,000 set for 2011/12 and subsequent years has also been reviewed and challenged. It is considered that the assumption is fundamentally incorrect owing to basic economics, with a greater supply of parking than demand in many of the Council's car parks, particularly in Halifax town centre. This has put further pressure on the need to identify additional measures to generate the income targets set.
- 1.6 The Council increased on and off street parking charges on 1 April 2011. This resulted in an increase in revenue in 2011/12 of £244,602 consisting of £173,052 from on street parking and £71,550 from car parks (exclusive of VAT). The income target set was £403,000, and so there was a shortfall in income of £158,398.
- 1.7 For the long stay car parks in Halifax Town centre there was actually a decrease in revenue in 2011/12 of £24,330 compared with that in 2010/11 as a result in the increase in parking charges.
- 1.8 Given that increasing parking charges will simply encourage drivers to park in cheaper car parks operated by private companies a key factor in increasing revenue is to increase patronage. However, this is in conflict with the aspirations and policies of the Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) where parking charges are seen as a demand management measure. By increasing parking charges there is less incentive for commuters to drive and park and more incentive for them to use alternatives, such as the bus, train or car sharing. A fundamental objective of LTP3 is to use parking supply and price to discourage long stay commuter parking and encourage short stay visitor and shopper parking.
- 1.9 Whilst parking charges and enforcement are perceived negatively by motorists, parking is an important tool in managing traffic safely and effectively. It helps to address poor and inconsiderate parking behaviour which can affect local businesses and the smooth flow of traffic on our roads. A number of the parking proposals put forward will address long standing parking issues and frustration by local residents and businesses and have wider health and economic benefits. In addition a number of the Council's car parks have been awarded 'The Safer Parking Award' and provide safe parking for drivers and their vehicles. Future investment will be required to these to maintain this standard of safe parking.

2.0 Previous work carried out

- 2.1 The Council's Parking Services has had a budget deficit problem for a number of years. After a projected deficit of £480,000 in the third quarter of 2008/09 a proposal to increase parking charges was made. However, owing to the economic downturn it was argued that this could potentially damage local trading.

- 2.2 Facing a further budget deficit in 2009/10 the Council's Regeneration and Development Scrutiny Panel proposed a review of the Council's parking strategy. This review started in July 2008 and a final report (1) was submitted to the Scrutiny Panel in July 2009 and to Cabinet on 24 August 2009.
- 2.3 The review was comprehensive and set out an overall parking policy for the Council, taking into consideration regional and national policy. Policy recommendations were made and work streams were identified to achieve the recommended outcome for the following areas:
- Corporate
 - Charging
 - Quality and quantity of provision
 - Enforcement and control
 - Accessibility
 - Residents' parking
 - Permits
 - Other vehicles
 - Events management
- 2.4 The work streams were relatively high level, with significant work required to support them.
- 2.5 Although the report was accepted the policy recommendations were not progressed owing to a lack of resources. The budget pressures in Parking Services continued to increase, as well as in other service areas of the Council. Faced with funding cuts from Government the Council evaluated all service areas and identified where savings could be made and alternative sources of income.
- 2.6 Parking was identified as an area where additional revenue could be raised through a combination of increasing parking charges and through implementation of other measures. In order to identify and assess these other measures a parking income generation study has been carried out. The options identified in the study are not fully compatible with the policy recommendations for charging in the Parking Review report and the work streams identified in that report have not been developed as part of this study. Whilst it is still an aspiration to develop the work streams the ongoing financial pressures do not support this at the current time.

3.0 Scope of the parking income generation study

- 3.1 Initially the intended scope of the parking income generation study was to identify and evaluate options for further car parking income other than from the increase of car parking charges. The Council budgets set in 2011 and 2012 had already assumed additional income by increasing both on and off street parking charges in 2011/12, with a further increase in 2014/15.
- 3.2 After initial consideration of occupancy rates of the council's car parks and those of private operators it is clear that commuters are parking in the

cheaper privately-operated car parks, particularly in Halifax town centre. As there is greater supply than demand this is decreasing patronage and income to the Council. Increasing the hourly rate of the Council's car parks, particularly the long stay ones, will therefore not result in the target income set as drivers will park in alternative cheaper car parks.

- 3.3 This has put a greater pressure on the identification of other ways of generating income and the scope of the study has been expanded to identify measures to generate the income assumed from increased parking charges.
- 3.4 A total of 8 options have been considered. These are discussed in more detail in Section 4.0.

4.0 Options considered

- 4.1 The following options have been considered as part of the study:

1. Review of the parking charge and stay period in Halifax;
2. Changes to the Council's Essential User car parking permits;
3. Removal of free parking on Saturdays;
4. Introduction of an evening parking charge in Halifax;
5. Conversion of free car parks to pay and display;
6. Review of parking at Skircoat;
7. Introduction of an administration charge for the processing of residents' parking permits;
8. Introduction of pay and display on Skircoat Road.

A more detailed breakdown of the capital and revenue costs for each of these options is given in Table 5.

4.2 Option 1. Review of the parking charge and stay period in Halifax

Off street parking

- 4.2.1 Over the last 5 years it is evident that off street parking income achieved is reasonably constant, but a slow decline in overall occupancy is noticeable. One reason for this is the range of car parking on offer, certainly within Halifax, resulting in migration to cheaper tariff options offered by private car parks. These are particularly attractive to commuters.
- 4.2.2 The Council and private parking stock and charges in Halifax have been reviewed. There is a greater supply of parking in Halifax than there is demand and so a competitive pricing strategy is needed to attract customers.
- 4.2.3 The current Council charges for long stay parking in Halifax are not attractive to commuters compared to those offered by a number of private operators. The option of increasing car park charges to generate additional income would therefore not be a viable solution.

- 4.2.4 It is therefore proposed that long stay parking charges are reduced to attract more customers in to the Council's car parks. This also has benefits to commuters and the wider local economy in the current difficult economic period.
- 4.2.5 Currently the cheapest daily charge by a private car park operator is £2.50 and the most expensive is £6.00. The average is approximately £3.75 compared to the Council's daily charge of £5.00.
- 4.2.6 It should be noted that cost is not the only factor in influencing parking behaviour, but it is the main one. Proximity to workplace and personal safety/security are other key factors.
- 4.2.7 The following pricing structure is proposed for the Council's long stay car parks in Halifax:
- stays between 1 and 5 hours 50p per hour (as existing);
 - stays of 6 hours and longer £3.00
- 4.2.8 In order to generate additional income with a reduced daily charge the occupancy rate needs to be increased. An analysis of existing occupancy rates and the rates needed to generate the same income as that generated currently indicate that this will be most easily achieved at the Council's larger car parks: High Street, North Bridge, Cow Green and Mulcture Hall Road.
- 4.2.9 Other Council long stay car parks will need an increase in occupancy of 20% or more. It is considered that additional income generation from these car parks is therefore less certain and will be limited.
- 4.2.10 The Council's long stay car parks fall into a middle and outer ring surrounding the town centre. The introduction of a £3.00 daily charge Monday to Friday for the outer ring car parks will free up the more popular middle ring smaller car parks for shoppers and visitors.
- 4.2.11 It is therefore proposed to introduce a £3.00 maximum daily charge Monday to Friday at the following car parks:
- High Street
 - North Bridge
 - Cow Green
 - Cross Hills
 - King Street
 - Hanover Street
 - Victoria Street
 - Mulcture Hall
 - Union Street
 - Prescott Street (to be converted from a short stay to a long stay car park).

4.2.12 It is also proposed to convert St John's Lane car park to a short stay car park (70p/hour and maximum stay 4 hours).

4.2.13 It is difficult to forecast the additional income that will be generated by the implementation of this option. However, we do have evidence that demonstrates that every price increase in parking charges the Council has made has failed to generate the desired income gain and has resulted in reduction of occupancy levels. The aspiration is to increase income by 10% which equates to **£53,000**. It is therefore proposed that if this option is implemented it is monitored over a period of 12 months to determine if the aspired level of income is being generated and if the option is viable in the longer term.

On street parking

4.2.14 It is considered that if the pricing structure is changed for the Council's long stay car parks in Halifax town centre then the on street parking charges also need to be reviewed and revised.

4.2.15 On street parking is currently divided into an inner and outer zone in Halifax, with a tariff set at £1/hour for inner zone and 50p for outer zone streets. This dual tariff regime is based on a premium parking opportunity in the inner zone, reflected by usage: there is an uptake of 68% for the inner zone parking compared to only 38% for the outer zone. Inner zone competition from the private sector is also limited, further explaining the success of these parking assets.

4.2.16 It is recommended that the inner zone remains unaltered but that the charges for the outer zone are revised to implement consistent parking time limits and charges. This will also make it easier and clearer for drivers to understand. Currently there is a mixture of time limited stay periods consisting of 30minutes, 1hour, 2hours, 4hours and all day. This is not necessary as the bay turnover is less of a concern in comparison to the inner core bays where the shopping environment dictates a constant flow of visitors and introduces a demand element.

4.2.17 By increasing stay periods and allowing all day parking in selected outer zone bays at a competitive tariff it will open up these assets to a new market and hence income opportunity.

4.2.18 Ideally we want commuters to use the long stay car parks and the proposed £3.00 daily charge will assist this. We also want to ensure parity with the on street parking bays.

4.2.19 An analysis of increased occupancy required to offset a decrease in parking charges for on street parking indicates that there is a higher risk to the generation of additional income if a £3.00 daily charge is introduced and there is a risk that we would lose income. It is also clear that a blanket policy of changing all outer zone bays to all day stay would be inappropriate as many would have to reach near maximum occupancy levels to generate additional

income. It is possible to identify a split between potential long stay and medium stay bays based upon the current income achieved and by geographical location.

4.2.20 The following is proposed:

- Reconfiguration of the outer zone bays to either 4hour or all day (10 hours plus) stay periods. This will generate a higher customer base by expanding the use of bays to longer stay customers while still allowing use by short stay customers. It is proposed to retain the existing hourly charge of 50p.
- Implementation of a reduced maximum daily charge of £3.50 for the new long stay bays. It is considered that the slightly higher maximum daily charge will encourage the majority of commuters to use the Council's long stay car parks.

4.2.21 The aspiration is to increase income by 10% which equates to **£38,000**. However as already outlined for off street parking this is a speculative forecast only and if this option is implemented income generation would be monitored over a 12 month period to assess longer term viability.

4.2.22 If the aspired income is realised from both the off and on street proposals a total of **£91,000** additional income would be generated.

4.2.23 The associated capital costs for the on and off street proposals are estimated at **£52,000**. This involves amendment of the existing Parking Order(s), new signs and updates to the software of the pay and display machines over a large geographical area.

4.2.24 There are no significant revenue implications. The Council's current parking enforcement contract includes for the patrolling of these car parks and on street parking bays. The simplified time limits and common tariffs should make it easier for the Civil Enforcement Officers to monitor parking.

Option 1 summary

Potential income generation per annum	£91,000
Capital costs to implement	£52,000
Annual revenue costs	£500

4.3 Option 2. Changes to the Council's Essential User car parking permits

- 4.3.1 This option is included in this income study report for completeness but does not need Cabinet approval to implement. It will be implemented from 1 November 2012 by Parking Services. All Directorates will be informed of the changes in advance in order for them to make provision within their budgets.
- 4.3.2 Currently Council staff that are required to use their car as part of their job and travel more than 1500 miles per year are eligible for an Essential User car parking permit. This entitles them to free parking in one of the Council's pay and display car parks.
- 4.3.3 The full cost of an annual permit is £660 plus VAT. For essential car users a charge of £262 is made to the service area that employs an essential user. No VAT is payable on this amount. The remaining £398 and the VAT on the full £660 is absorbed by Parking Services.
- 4.3.4 There are currently 295 staff who have Essential User parking permits. This results in a loss of potential income to Parking Services of £117,410 exclusive of VAT each year.
- 4.3.5 It is proposed that the subsidy by Parking Services is removed and that initially the full cost of Essential User parking permits is paid for by the relevant service area. This would not generate any additional income for the Council as a whole but it would remove the unfair burden placed on Parking Services.
- 4.3.6 This option is linked to Option 1. If a daily charge of £3 is implemented in the Council's long stay car parks it is proposed to reduce the cost of an Essential User permit. This means that the potential income generation will also decrease. The revised cost of a permit has not been agreed at this stage, but will be in the order of £500 plus VAT.
- 4.3.7 Based on a revised permit cost of £500 the estimated 'additional' income raised would be $(500 \times 295) - (262 \times 295) = \textbf{£70,210}$. This assumes a 100% uptake, which may not be realised.
- 4.3.8 The capital costs to implement the option are estimated to be £2,000. The annual revenue costs are estimated as £1,500.

Option 2 summary

Potential income generation per annum	£70,210
Capital costs to implement	£2,000
Annual revenue costs	£1,500

4.4 Option 3. Removal of free parking on Saturdays

4.4.1 There is currently free parking on Saturdays in four long stay pay and display car parks in Halifax and one in Hebden Bridge.

4.4.2 Free Saturday parking was introduced in Autumn 2008 as a strategy to encourage trade during the Christmas period. It has been continued since as an economic stimulus, approved by the Council's Cabinet.

4.4.3 One of the key concerns with the Halifax car parks is that they are used primarily by Saturday employees, so that the benefit to shoppers – the intended beneficiaries – is limited.

4.4.4 A number of options have been considered:

- i. Continue with free parking on Saturdays;
- ii. Charge a daily low cost flat rate;
- iii. Charge between 8am and 10am only to discourage commuter use.

For both options ii. and iii. the existing six weeks with free parking during the Christmas trading period would be maintained to support local businesses and traders.

4.4.5 It is acknowledged that the introduction of a charge on Saturdays will influence parking behaviour and that drivers may choose to park elsewhere.

4.4.6 A flat rate of £1 or £2 per day has been considered. The latter charge is considered to be unattractive to shoppers as it represents a 4 hour stay period at the existing 50p per hour tariff.

4.4.7 It is considered that the introduction of a charge between 8am and 10am may be misunderstood by customers and it clearly targets Saturday workers and those people who want to shop early whilst it is quiet.

4.4.8 The preferred option is to implement a flat rate daily charge of £1. It is considered that this has the potential to maintain the existing customer base as it will provide the cheapest parking in Halifax of both other Council and private sector options.

4.4.9 Based on a daily charge of £1 and the current Saturday occupancy levels the income generated will be in the order of **£13,190** as detailed in Table 2.

4.4.10 Minimal costs will be incurred to deliver this option. The main cost will be associated with the amendment of the current Parking Order, provision of signing and updating of software for the pay and display machines. The total estimated cost of this capital work is **£9,000**.

4.4.11 There are no significant revenue implications. The Council's current parking enforcement contract includes for the patrolling of these car parks on Saturdays.

Car Park	Spaces	Occupancy rate on Saturdays	Approximate annual income based on a flat rate Saturday charge of £1*
Mulcture Hall Road	168	97%	£7500
High Street	238	34%	£3720
Cross Hills	12	67%	£370
Victoria Street	30	57%	£780
Station Road, Hebden Bridge	28	64%	£820
Total			£13,190

Table 2. Income generation forecast based on a flat rate Saturday charge

*Based on 46 weeks per year.

Option 3 summary

Potential income generation per annum	£13,190
Capital costs to implement	£9,000
Annual revenue costs	£0

4.5.2 Option 4. Introduction of an evening parking charge in Halifax

- 4.5.1 Parking charges are currently enforceable between 8am through to 6pm Monday to Saturday for both on and off street pay and display spaces, with some exceptions on Saturdays, as discussed previously.
- 4.5.2 Many other Local Authorities charge a nominal flat rate fee for evening / night time parking in recognition of high parking demand for the night time social economy. This strategy is likely to be viable in Halifax only.
- 4.5.3 An analysis of occupancy of the Council's on street parking bays in the evening indicates 70% occupancy, which is slightly higher than the day time occupancy.
- 4.5.4 A nominal evening charge of £1.00 would generate some additional income for the Council but would not be prohibitive and would not impact adversely on the town's evening economy. The nominal charge would need to be applied to all Council on and off street parking pays to prevent migration to free spaces elsewhere.

- 4.5.5 It was originally proposed that the flat rate evening tariff was payable between 6pm and 10pm Monday to Saturday. This was anticipated to generate an additional **£74,480** per year.
- 4.5.6 Further feasibility work has been carried out for this proposal and it has been determined that an evening tariff cannot be implemented without significant and cost-prohibitive software changes to the pay and display machines. It is therefore proposed that an evening charge is implemented by extending the current hours of payment from 18:00 to 20:00. For Halifax town centre this would be £1.40 for on street parking and short stay car parks and £1.00 in the long stay car parks. It is considered that the additional income will still be in the region of £74,480 when costs are averaged over all CMBC car parks.
- 4.5.7 The associated capital costs to implement are estimated to be **£47,000** but there is scope to reduce these costs if the option is delivered with options 1 and 3.
- 4.5.8 There will be additional revenue costs associated with cash processing, enforcement and the processing of Penalty Charge Notices. These costs are estimated at £7,200.

Option 4 summary

Potential income generation per annum	£74,480
Capital costs to implement	£47,000
Annual revenue costs	£7,200

4.6 Option 5. Conversion of free car parks to pay and display

- 4.6.1 The Council's Parking Services team operates 75 public car parks Borough-wide. 43 of these are pay and display and the remaining 32 have no parking fee.
- 4.6.2 However, all the car parks need ongoing maintenance works and this is funded from the Parking Services budget. The income generated from parking charges is used to carry out maintenance, such as surfacing, cleaning, provision of lighting and pay and display machines. Currently there is a funding gap between the work required and the funding available. Consequently the condition of the Council's car parks will deteriorate further over time.
- 4.6.3 A review of the car parks which are currently free has been carried out to identify those where a parking charge may be appropriate and sustainable. A number of the free car parks are in a generally poor condition and would require significant capital funding to bring them up to the standard of other Council pay and display car parks. It is therefore not proposed to introduce

charging at these car parks at this time. A number of them could be considered for disposal. This is outside the scope of this report.

4.6.4 It is recognised that the introduction of parking charges is likely to result in a displacement of vehicles and problems with poor and inconsiderate parking elsewhere. There may also be a knock-on effect on the local economy and businesses. These factors have been taken into account in identifying which free car parks are suitable for conversion to pay and display.

4.6.5 14 of the 32 car parks have been identified as suitable for the introduction of charging, as listed below. A list of the 32 car parks is given in Appendix 1.

- Halifax Town Hall
- King Cross, Haugh Shaw Road West
- King Cross, Queens Road
- Wakefield Road, Hipperholme
- Mill Lane, Brighouse
- Bank Street, Brighouse
- Church Lane, Brighouse
- Lambert Street, West Vale
- Rochdale Road, West Vale
- Royd Lane, Ripponden
- Burnley Road, Mytholmroyd
- Oxford Road, Todmorden
- Dalton Street, Todmorden
- Dale Street, Todmorden.

4.6.6 It is proposed that the Town Hall car park is restricted to use by Councillors only from Monday to Friday but that an hourly charge of 70p is introduced. Councillors would be issued with a permit (at no cost) to demonstrate to the Civil Enforcement Officers that they are eligible to park there, but they will have to display a valid parking ticket. The car park will be available to the public on Saturdays at the same hourly charge.

4.6.7 A scheme is currently being developed for King Cross funded by the Local Transport Plan Integrated Block capital funding. This is to address the current traffic issues in the area and concerns raised by bus operators. The proposals for Haugh Shaw Road West and Queens Road car parks will be considered as part of the capital scheme.

4.6.8 It is considered that a 40% average occupancy rate is realistic and achievable across the 14 car parks. This would generate an annual income in the region of £195,000.

4.6.9 The capital costs to implement this proposal will be high as significant work will be required, including pay and display machines, refurbishment of the car parks as appropriate to payable standards and the promotion of a legal parking places order. The costs are estimated to be approximately **£194,000**.

4.6.10 There will be significant additional revenue costs estimated at £45,000.

4.6.11 Ideally the civils work would be carried out in two stages: the Upper Valley car parks and the Lower Valley car parks. This would result in time and cost savings compared to carrying out the works to each car park as a separate scheme rather than part of a larger scheme. However in reality the programme is likely to be heavily influenced by the consultation and the car parks may have to be dealt with in a more ad hoc way as separate schemes.

Option 5 summary

Potential income generation per annum (based on existing on street charges)	£195,000
Capital costs to implement	£194,000
Annual revenue costs	£45,000

4.7 Option 6. Review of parking at Skircoat

4.7.1 A strategic parking review is currently ongoing in the Skircoat Ward to address competing kerbside parking demand by residents, hospital staff, hospital visitors and local businesses. The review will be concluded in 2012/13.

4.7.2 The zone under consideration encompasses 1477 properties with an adjacent on street parking potential of approximately 1749 spaces. Currently this total is apportioned into 324 designated resident permit bays, 52 free limited waiting bays, 23 pay and display bays and 1350 free unrestricted bays. Pay and display bays therefore currently represent less than 2% of the potential on-street parking stock available.

4.7.3 It is proposed that a dual tariff is introduced to meet the needs of long stay commuter parking to the hospital and short stay visitor- based parking on streets radiating outwards from the hospital. The existing 80p / hour charge in Dudwell Lane will be retained and introduced for Dryclough Lane and Godfrey Road. A charge of 40p / hour will be introduced on Skircoat Green and Stafford Road for long stay to be consistent with Calderdale's existing outer district charge. The higher charge on Dudwell Lane, Dryclough Lane and Godfrey Road reflects their proximity to the hospital and use by visitors. It is competitive with the hospital car park which has charges of £1.50 minimum for 2 hours, £2.50 for up to 4hours and £5 for 24hours, every day between 8am and 8pm.

4.7.4 It is anticipated the short stay bays will generally be busier than long stay ones given the visitor numbers to hospital.

- 4.7.5 Observations have shown occupancy levels of around 50% in the early morning through to the evening, possibly reflecting shift patterns, out-patient clinics and visitors. Given this demand it would be viable to maximise the parking income from 8am to 8pm in line with the payable hours at the hospital car park.
- 4.7.6 The concept design for the on street parking proposals is complete and preliminary consultation has been carried out with Ward Members and the public via a Ward Forum. The proposals will provide significant benefits to residents and visitors to the hospital as well as generating income for the Council.
- 4.7.7 Table 3 gives the potential income generation based on charging being in force between 8am and 8pm, 365 days a year. This is based on an average 40% occupancy (the Halifax average).

Street	Long Stay Parking 40p / hr	Short Stay Parking 80p / hr	Approximate annual income 40p at 40% occupancy	Approximate annual income 80p at 40% occupancy
Dudwell Lane		99		£138,758
Dryclough Lane		20		£28,032
Godfrey Road		54		£75,686
Skircoat Green	113		£79,190	
Stafford Road	35		£24,528	
Total			£103,718	£242,476

Table 3. Potential income generation in Skircoat

- 4.7.8 The potential annual income generation is therefore approximately **£346,194**.
- 4.7.9 There will be high capital costs associated with the proposal as it covers a large area. 24 new pay and display machines will be required, plus extensive lining and signing and the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order. The estimated cost is **£164,000**.
- 4.7.10 There will also be annual revenue costs incurred. These are estimated as £60,000 and are largely for maintenance of parking machines, enforcement and the processing of Penalty Charge Notices.

Option 6 summary

Potential income generation per Annum	£346,194
Capital costs to implement	£164,000
Annual revenue costs	£60,000

4.8 Option 7. Introduction of an administration charge for the processing of residents' parking permits

- 4.8.1 Residents' Parking Permits are issued free of charge currently to households in Calderdale. A maximum of three permits are issued: two for residents and one for visitors. There are currently 3600 permits in circulation.
- 4.8.2 As outlined in 4.8 a new permit zone is being developed at Skircoat. A number of other permit zones have been requested by residents or are being considered by the Council. It is estimated that the number of permits issued during 2012 will increase to 4200.
- 4.8.3 It is not considered unreasonable to charge an administrative fee for the issue of permits and a number of other Councils have adopted this as policy. Legitimate expense is incurred by the Council in administering permits and patrolling on street for compliance. The estimated cost per year is £80,000 and this cost is met by Parking Services currently.
- 4.8.4 Permit zones are valuable to residents and are much sought after. It is considered that a fee to maintain this privilege could be acceptable to the majority of residents.
- 4.8.5 A sample research into other local authority charging policies is outlined in Table 4 below.

Local Authority	Permit cost – first permit (£)	Permit cost – second permit (£)	Other costs
Barnet	100		
Burnley	15.60	26	
Chorley	15	35	220 - Business
Cambridge	71	-	
Derby	25	50	
Kirklees	30 – now scrapped	-	
Lincoln	26	52	
North Yorkshire	15	-	
Newcastle	free	50	100 – 3 rd vehicle
Preston	28	43	
South Ribble	28.50	-	
Scarborough	17	27	44 – 3 rd vehicle
Sheffield	20	60	40 – Business; 90 – 3 rd vehicle
Wyre	25	-	
Woking	50	-	
York	110	-	

Table 4. Sample local authority residents' parking permit charges

- 4.8.6 In order to recover the current administration costs of £80,000 per year a permit cost of £25 is required based on a flat rate scheme and an 80% take up.
- 4.8.7 Existing permit data reveals 70% of households hold three permits, with 25% holding two and 5% holding one permit. As demonstrated by the sample charges given in Table 4 an incrementally higher permit charge for second and third vehicles is not uncommon. It can be argued that this policy helps to discourage high family vehicle ownership which can contribute to parking issues and potential conflict with neighbours as well as being in conflict with environmental policies and strategies at both the local and national level.
- 4.8.8 Consideration has been given to implementing a rising tariff but has been discounted at the current time. It is considered that it will be easier for residents to understand a single charge irrespective of the number of permits they wish to have and the associated administrative costs to the Council will be lower.
- 4.8.9 This option would need to be implemented at the same time as option 2 or afterwards to avoid a free permit scheme being implemented initially, which would then need to be converted to a payable one.
- 4.8.10 Implementation of this option will enable Parking Services to rationalise renewal dates of permits to ensure that they can be managed efficiently. It is proposed to move to three renewal periods, with new permit schemes fitting in with these.
- 4.8.11 The estimated capital costs for this option are £5,000.
- 4.8.12 The additional annual revenue costs for processing the permits are estimated to be £5,000.

Option 7 summary

Potential income generation per annum	£80,000
Capital costs to implement	£5,000
Annual revenue costs	£5,000

4.9 Option 8. Introduction of pay and display on Skircoat Road

- 4.9.1 The road network bordering 'outer zone' pay and display areas of Halifax town centre offer opportunities for free parking and the areas are sufficiently close to the centre to attract a commuter base. Skircoat Road, adjacent to the Shay Stadium, has been identified as being at near parking capacity each day. This is in clear avoidance of charges.

- 4.9.2 Given the location of Skircoat Road to the stadium, Lloyds Banking Group headquarters and the town centre it is considered that this road should be converted to on street pay and display. The introduction of parking bays would control the existing parking problem whilst generating income.
- 4.9.3 The introduction of 40 pay and display bays may displace some parking to the Council's town centre long stay car parks, particularly if a £3 daily charge is introduced. This would support the overall strategy to encourage commuters to park in these car parks. Some may use a privately-operated car park.
- 4.9.4 It is considered that 40% occupancy is achievable and realistic if an hourly charge of 50p is introduced, subject to a maximum daily charge of £3.50. The charges would be in force between 8am and 4pm Monday to Friday and 8am and 6pm on Saturday outbound on the A629 owing to the bus lane and between 8am and 6pm Monday to Saturday inbound. The charges would be payable throughout the year. This would generate approximately **£17,500** per annum.
- 4.9.5 The capital costs for implementation are estimated to be **£30,000**.
- 4.9.6 The annual revenue costs are estimated to be £2,500.

Option 8 summary

Potential income generation per annum (based on existing on street charges)	£17,500
Capital costs to implement	£30,000
Annual revenue costs	£2,500

5.0 Programming and implementation

5.1 All of the options, except options 2 and 7, require the amendment of an existing traffic regulation order (TRO) or the implementation of a new one. This is a well-defined legal process with a number of required stages. Some options will involve more initial preparatory and design work to enable the TRO to be amended or implemented. A number of the options are likely to generate more objections than others, with a longer time period to consider and respond to the objections.

5.2 Typical timescales for the amendment of an existing TRO or implementation of a new one are as follows:

Preparation and consultation	6 weeks
Advertisement of the TRO	4 weeks
Consider objections received	8 weeks
Report to the Panel (details of objections and proposed action)	2 weeks
Seal order	3 weeks
Total time for TRO	23 weeks

5.3 When the TRO is amended or made the signs and parking meters can be ordered and the implementation works can be carried out. The procurement of the works will depend on whether all the options are approved by Cabinet and can be 'packaged up' to rationalise the construction, and whether they are carried out by the Highways Term Maintenance Contractor (HTMC) or through a competitive tender process. Initially it is proposed that discussions are held with the HTMC to determine if the works can be carried out to the timescales and programmes required without affecting the delivery of other programmed and committed work, and subject to compliance with the Council's legal and financial requirements.

5.4 A proposed programme of work is given in Appendix 2. This programme is based on all eight options being approved by Cabinet in August 2012 and the current engineering and project management resources available in Highways and Engineering. It also takes into consideration that options 1, 3 and 4 and options 6 and 7 need to be delivered together. The capital costs in Table 5 are based on this programme.

5.5 The programme is provisional and will be reviewed and revised once Cabinet has reached a decision on the options proposed. A risk register for the design and implementation phase of the study will also be drawn up as part of the project management process. This will be monitored and updated as an integral part of scheme implementation. Any risks to delivery will be mitigated if possible or will be escalated to senior managers via the Council's Making a Difference Performance Management system, and the impact on revenue generation will be recorded.

6.0 Financial considerations

- 6.1 The estimated capital cost to implement the eight proposed options is £503,000. A breakdown of these costs is given in Table 5. Table 5 also summarises the annual revenue costs that will be incurred. An estimate has been included for ongoing maintenance of signs, lines and parking meters and replacement. All costs are 2012/13 costs and do not include for annual increases in inflation.

Table 5 Breakdown of costs

All costs are in £k

Parking Income Report Cost Analysis		Charge and Stay review	Essential User Permits	Saturday Charging	Evening Charges	Conversion of free car parks	Skircoat Review	Residents Permits	Pay & Display Skircoat Rd	
		Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	
Capital	P&D Machines	0	0	0	0	60	80	0	14	
	Civils	0	0	0	0	89	45	0	4	
	Signs	31	0	1	31	17	15	0	3	
	TRO/Parking Orders	5	2	5	5	5	6	5	5	
	Software changes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Hardware Changes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Staffing/Overtime	15	0	2	10	22	17	0	4	
	Advertising/Marketing	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	
Capital Total		52	2	9	47	194	164	5	30	503
Revenue	Cash processing	0.5	0	0	0.2	6	2	0	0	
	Transport	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	
	Machine Maintenance	0	0	0	0	9	13	0	2.5	
	Car Park Maintenance	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	
	Rates	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Enforcement	0	0	0	5	10	25	0	0	
	Notice Processing	0	0	0	2	5	10	0	0	
	Permit Processing	0	1.5	0	0	0	5	5	0	
Revenue Total		0.5	1.5	0	7.2	45	60	5	2.5	121.7
Total Expenditure		52.5	3.5	9	54.2	239	224	10	32.5	624.7
Projected Income		91	70.21	13.19	74.48	195	346.19	80	17.5	887.57
Less VAT		9	0	2	3	32.5	0	0	0	47
Ongoing annual maintenance	1% per annum of capital costs assumed									5.03
Replacement costs	Replacement of machines, signs and lines in year 15 assumed (but does not include inflation)									252

- 6.2 The capital funding required will need to be secured through Prudential borrowing and paid back on an annual basis. The amount that will have to be paid back depends on the length of the repayment period. Assuming an interest rate of 4.5% the annual payment for different repayment periods is given below.

Repayment period (years)	Annual repayment (£)	Total repayment (£)
5	114,580	572,900
10	63,570	635,700
15	46,840	702,600
20	38,670	773,400
25	33,920	848,000

- 6.3 The repayment period should not exceed the life of the assets being commissioned and it is proposed that the borrowing is paid back over a period of 10 years. That means that the gross income generated will need to be reduced by £63,570 each year to cover the cost of borrowing.
- 6.4 The gross income will also need to be reduced by the additional annual revenue costs associated with the options and VAT at 20% on income from car parks. VAT is not payable on income from on street parking.
- 6.5 A total cost of £5,000 has been allowed for in the capital costs for advertising and marketing of options 1,3,4,5 and 7. It is considered that it is important to carry out this work so that the public understand why the changes are being made, how they will affect them and to limit the number of Penalty Charge Notices following implementation. A positive marketing exercise was carried out when the Council implemented Civil Parking Enforcement and this was well received by the public.
- 6.6 It is proposed that the advertising and marketing work is procured via the Council's Communications team. Highways and Engineering have no budget for marketing and all corporate communications are carried out by the Communications team. The annual programme is subject to prioritisation and resources available and is agreed at the beginning of each financial year. It is hoped that some communication and marketing for the implementation of the options can be included in the 2013/14 communications programme. The sum of £5,000 is proposed as a contingency should insufficient funds be available corporately.
- 6.7 The capital cost estimates given in Table 5 assume that all the options will be delivered as totally separate schemes, and so are conservative. If Cabinet approves all or a number of the options savings can be secured through rationalisation of the implementation programme, as set out in the programme in Appendix 2. This includes combining activities such as consultation,

processing of traffic regulation orders, procurement of signs and parking machines and construction on site.

- 6.8 Assuming implementation of **all** the options by July 2013 in accordance with the draft programme then the full annual income would not be realised until 2014/15. Repayments of prudential borrowings will commence in 2013/14 based on capital expenditure incurred in 2012/13 but full repayment will begin in 2014/15.
- 6.9 The expenditure/income profile based on Cabinet approval of all options and the provisional programme is given in Appendix 2. This indicates that the gross income achievable in 2012/13 is £70,210 from the implementation of Option 2, essential user permits. Significant income would not be generated until 2013/14 and the estimated gross income in 2013/14 is £638,270. The maximum estimated additional gross income would not be realised until 2014/15 and is estimated to be £887,570 (or £841,000 excluding VAT). A further breakdown is given below.

2012/13

Expenditure (£)		Gross Income (£)	
Capital repayment	N/A	Option 2	70,210
Revenue costs	1,500		
VAT	0		
Sub-totals	1,500		70,210
Net additional income	68,710		

2013/14

Expenditure (£)		Gross Income (£)	
Capital repayment (1)	43,000	Options 1-8, ongoing implementation during 2013/14	638,270
Revenue costs	91,400		
VAT (2)	0		
Sub-totals	134,400		638,270
Net additional income	503,870		

1. Assumed that the first capital repayment would be made on capital expenditure incurred in 2012/13 of £343,000.
2. Deducted from gross income figure

2014/15

Expenditure (£)		Gross Income (£)	
Capital repayment (1)	63,570	Options 1-8 full implementation by 1 April 2014	887,570
Revenue costs	121,700		
VAT	47,000		
Sub-totals	232,270		887,570
Net additional income	655,300		

1. Assumed that the first full capital repayment would be made in 2014/15

- 6.10 The additional income generated in 2011/12 from the increase in parking charges on 1 April 2011 was £244,600 of which there was actually a net loss in income of £24,330 for the long stay car parks. It is considered that £245,000 is likely to continue to be achieved as an additional income after implementation of the options, and may be increased owing to the provision of additional parking facilities. If it is assumed that £245,000 will be generated year on year then the combined maximum additional income that could be generated in 2012/13 is approximately **£313,710**, in 2013/14 is **£748,870** and in 2014/15 is **£900,300**.
- 6.11 The income targets set assume a further increase in parking charges on 1 April 2014. If this parking increase achieves a similar additional income to that introduced on 1 April 2011 then an additional £245,000 would be raised. That would increase the potential income in 2014/15 to **£1,145,300**. However, this is highly speculative and ongoing monitoring of income in 2012/13 and 2013/14 will give a clearer understanding of whether this may be achievable.
- 6.12 If a number of the options were combined as discussed the total expenditure could be reduced. However, it should be noted that a number of assumptions have been made in estimating the income for each of the options and that ongoing monitoring of income will be needed to validate these assumptions after implementation of the options.

7.0 Other considerations

- 7.1 Capital funding, via prudential borrowing, has already been approved for the conversion of Bridge Lanes car park in Hebden Bridge to a pay and display car park. The total capital funding estimate given in section 6 and Table 5 includes the capital cost for Bridge Lanes.
- 7.2 Feasibility and preliminary design work has been carried out in the development of the options. However, some options are at a more advanced stage of development than others. It is possible that issues will emerge as further work and consultation is carried out which may require amendments to some of the proposals. It is anticipated that these will be minor in nature. If there are any significant issues which require a major change to any of the

options then these will be brought to the attention of Cabinet for further discussion and agreement.

8.0 Equality Impact Assessment

8.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out for all options. This is given in Appendix 3.

References

1. Parking Review – Report of the Regeneration and Development Scrutiny Panel July 2009.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Supporting information

- List of free car parks in Calderdale
- Location plan showing the existing car park provision in Halifax

Appendix 2 Provisional Programme of works and expenditure/income profile

Appendix 3 Equality Impact Assessment

Appendix 1 – Supporting information

List of free car parks in Calderdale

Car Park	Number of spaces
Halifax	
Town Hall	14
King Cross	63
Queens Rd	30
Towngate, Northowram	13
Staups Lane, Stump Cross	10
Brighouse	
Bank St	48
Mill Lane	23
Church Lane	51
Wakefield Rd, Hipperholme	24
Crowtrees, Rastrick	19
Elland	
Crown St	14
Lambert St, West Vale	21
Brig Royd, West Vale	44
Stannary, Stainland	12
Stainland Rd, Stainland	48
Bowling Green, Stainland	3
Sowerby Bridge	
Ashtree	5
Royd Lane, Ripponden	30
Station Rd, Luddenden Foot	17
Hebden Bridge	
Tanpits	4
Bridge Lanes	28
Billy Lane, Old Town	6
Burnley Rd, Mytholmroyd	26
St Michael's Square, Mytholmroyd	12
Towngate, Heptonstall	45
Bowling Green, Heptonstall	35
Todmorden	
Dalton St	23
Oxford St	26
Stansfield Rd	35
Dale St	10
Fielden Sq	5
Blind Lane	31

Council Car Parks

1 - Alford Place,	11 spaces
2 - Bull Green,	39 spaces
3 - Cow Green,	276 spaces
4 - Grassfields,	10 spaces
5 - Hanover St,	24 spaces
6 - High St,	236 spaces
7 - King St,	58 spaces
8 - Mulberry Hall,	168 spaces
9 - North Bridge,	271 spaces
10 - Northgate,	32 spaces
11 - Prescott St,	22 spaces
12 - St John's Way,	26 spaces
13 - Thomas St,	14 spaces
14 - Union St,	30 spaces
15 - Victoria St,	39 spaces
Total - 1954	

Private Car Parks

A- Alfred St,	35spaces
B- Bull Green,	82 spaces
C- Bowling Dyke,	56 spaces
D- Broad St,	429 spaces
E- Dean Clough, Lee bridge	640 spaces
F- Dean Clough, Multistorey	160 spaces
G- Dean Clough, Crib Ln	295 spaces
H- Eureka	482 spaces
I- Glyn Webb,	130 spaces
J- King St,	190 spaces
K- Mount St,	85 spaces
L- New Road,	56 spaces
M- Penine,	123 spaces
N- Rail strn,	40 spaces
O- Sainsbury,	530 spaces
P- South Parade,	47 spaces
Q- Westgate,	30 spaces
R- Workshops,	309 spaces
S- Wellington St,	35 spaces
T- Wickes,	145 spaces
Total - 3889	

Not to scale 72/684/102

DATE	ISSUED FOR	DATE	ISSUED FOR
10/1/82	REVENUE BUREAU	10/1/82	ISSUED FOR
PROJECT TITLE			
PARKING REVIEW			
ISSUED FOR			
HALIFAX - CAR PARKS			
Council and Private facilities			
		South of Halifax HEAD OF PUNNETT & INDIAN NORTHWEST HALIFAX, N.S.	
OFFICE PROJECT NUMBER		ISSUED FOR	
000000		Information	
DESCRIPTION	DATE	DATE	DATE
Not to scale	7/2/84	10/1/82	10/1/82
REVISION			

APPENDIX 2 – PROGRAMME OF WORKS

</

APPENDIX 2 – EXPENDITURE/INCOME PROFILE

Appendix 2: Expenditure/income profile based on the provisional programme																		
	Cabinet Approval: Aug -2012												Aug 2013 to Mar 2014	Expenditure (£) 2012/13	Expenditure (£) 2013/14	Total Scheme Expenditure (£)	Income (£) 2012/13	Income (£) 2013/14
	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12	Jan-13	Feb-13	Mar-13	Apr-13	May-13	Jun-13	Jul-13							
Total Capital Expenditure (£)	-22,000	-36,000	-57,000	-57,000	-57,000	-57,000	-57,000	-50,300	-50,300	-37,900	-21,500	0	-343,000	-160,000	-503,000			
Total Revenue Expenditure (£)	0	0	0	-1,500	0	0	0	-5,200	-200	-850	-5,850	-79,300	-1,500	-91,400				
Total Gross Income (£)	0	0	0	70,210	0	0	0	82,560	2,560	16,350	45,200	491,600				70,210	638,270	
Total Net income (£)	-22,000	-36,000	-57,000	11,710	-57,000	-57,000	-57,000	27,060	-47,940	-22,400	17,850	412,300						

Everyone different everyone matters



Equality & Community Cohesion Impact Assessment (EIA)

Parking income generation study

Economy and Environment Directorate

June 2012

Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

PART A : Initial Assessment to determine relevance if a full Impact Assessment is required

Directorate: Economy and Environment	Date commenced: May 2012
Service Area: Parking Services	Date completed: June 2012
Service / Policy / Function or Procedure to be assessed: Income generation from parking. A total of nine options have been identified to increase parking revenue in support of income targets set for Parking Services.	Lead Officer: Carolyn Walton
Is this: New / Proposed , Existing or Changing	

What are the aims and objectives / purpose of this?

There are a number of inconsistencies and long standing issues relating to parking in Calderdale. A comprehensive review has been carried out, key action areas have been identified and high level policy recommendations have been set out. Further work has been carried out to identify how current issues can be addressed, whilst also generating income for the Council.

Income targets have been set for Parking Services by Council members in the budget meetings in 2011 and 2012. The Service has been tasked with identifying options to generate income from parking in Calderdale to meet these targets.

Full details are given in the report *Parking Income Generation Study 2012*.

Further information about parking in Calderdale and policy recommendations is given in the report *Parking Review – Report of the Regeneration and Development Scrutiny Panel July 2009*.

Please indicate its relevance to equality by selecting YES / NO / NOT SURE in each box below:

Is this relevant to:	Age	Disability	Gender	Race	Religion & belief	Gender Reassignment	Pregnancy and Maternity	Sexual orientation
Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Advancing equality of opportunity	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fostering good community relations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

If **NOT RELEVANT**, the Impact Assessment is now complete - please send a copy to your Directorate Equality Champion & to the Cohesion and Equality Team.

If **RELEVANT**, a full Impact Assessment needs to be undertaken (**PART B**).

Level of priority (if new/proposed policy/service): **High** ~~Medium~~ ~~Low~~

PART B : Full Impact Assessment

Who benefits and how do they benefit?	<p>Residents of Calderdale, visitors, local businesses and commuters will all benefit from a number of the options proposed as a result of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheaper all day parking in the Council's long stay car parks in Halifax Town centre • Greater control of unregulated on street parking • A simpler pricing structure that is easier for people to understand.
What outcomes are sought and for whom?	<p>The key outcome is increasing revenue to meet the income targets set for Parking Services.</p> <p>The proposals will also address known and long standing parking issues and ensure effective management of parking within the Borough.</p>
Are there any associated policies/functions/services or procedures?	<p>A major review of parking in Calderdale commenced in 2008 which was detailed in the report: <i>Parking Review – Report of the Regeneration and Development Scrutiny Panel July 2009</i>.</p> <p>The review was comprehensive and set out an overall parking policy for the Council,</p>

	<p>taking into consideration regional and national policy. Policy recommendations were made and work streams were identified to achieve the recommended outcome for the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate • Charging • Quality and quantity of provision • Enforcement and control • Accessibility • Residents' parking • Permits • Other vehicles • Events management <p>These work streams have not been carried out owing to ongoing funding constraints and the income generation targets set for Parking Services.</p> <p>There is still an aspiration to take forward the policy recommendations if funding becomes available in the future.</p> <p>Calderdale Council implements Civil Enforcement of parking in the Borough. This is currently carried out by Vinci Park Limited on behalf of the Council through a formal contract arrangement.</p>
--	---

How will this service be delivered (e.g. direct service delivery, outsourced etc.)?	<p>The design of the options will be carried out by the Council's Highways and Engineering team and implemented through the Highways Term Maintenance Contract.</p> <p>Parking enforcement will be carried out by Vinci Park Limited under the existing contract.</p>
If external partners are involved in delivering the service, who are they?	Vinci Park Limited carry out civil enforcement of parking on behalf of Calderdale Council.
How is the service publicised and how do people access and/or request it?	<p>Information about car parking and the Council's car parks is available on the Council's website. Members of the public can also speak to Parking Service's staff at their office on Mulcture Hall Road or by contacting them by telephone or e-mail.</p> <p>In the near future general enquiries about parking will be dealt with by the Council's Customer Contact centre as part of the Council's policy to have a single contact point for all queries.</p> <p>There is clear signing in the Council's car parks and adjacent to on street parking bays which sets out the charge tariffs and stay periods, and when charges are enforced.</p>

What evidence/data already exists about the service and its users? (In terms of its impact on the 'equality strands', i.e. ethnicity, gender, disability, age, religion/belief, sexual orientation etc)

Evidence	Details
-----------------	----------------

<p>Research:</p> <p>Any local, regional or national research available to help inform this EIA?</p>	<p>The following policies and strategies are relevant to this EIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and Road Traffic Regulation (Parking) Act 1986; • Traffic Management Act 2004; • The Yorkshire and Humber Regional Spatial Strategy and Regional Transport Strategy; • Local Transport Plan 3.
<p>Consultation:</p> <p>Has there been any consultation with, or input from, service users, staff or other stakeholders?</p> <p>If so, with whom, how were they consulted and what did they say?</p>	<p>Public consultation</p> <p>As part of the review carried out in 2008 and 2009 public consultation was carried out using questionnaires and roadshows in Brighouse, Halifax and Hebden Bridge attended by Council officers and elected members. The roadshows were publicised through Calderdale Call, in the local press and by direct invitation to interested groups.</p> <p>Only 100 people attended the roadshows and 87 questionnaires were returned. Issues identified in relation to Equality and Diversity were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enforcement should prioritise disabled bays. - Criteria considered when choosing where to park include security/safety and cost. - When asked 'should all users pay for the cost of providing the facilities that they use?' 68.8% agreed with the statement, 17.2% disagreed and 14.1% did not answer. - 70% of respondents supported the reinvestment of surplus income

	<p>from parking in either the parking service or road safety improvements and 25% felt it should be used to preserve other Council services.</p> <p>Other issues raised were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resident parking. - Prohibition of driving restrictions to try and provide for resident parking. - Allegations of 'sustained abuse' of the waiting restrictions in Brighouse by a certain group, to the detriment of shoppers. <p>Further details of the consultation and the responses received are given in Appendix 2 to the Report of the Regeneration and Development Scrutiny Panel.</p> <p>Preliminary consultation has been carried out in the Skircoat ward about the proposals for on street parking and resident permit bays through the Ward Forum.</p> <p>Full public consultation has been carried out for Bridge Lanes car park in Hebden Bridge and the proposal to convert it from a free car park to a pay and display one.</p> <p>Other consultation</p> <p>An officer project team has been established to carry out the income study, with representation from Parking Services and Highways and Engineering. Vinci Park Ltd have also had some input in relation to operational issues.</p>
<p>Monitoring: What equality monitoring information/data is currently gathered. Are there any significant gaps?</p> <p>What is the profile of current users/beneficiaries, and</p>	<p>The nature of Parking Services makes it difficult to collect equality information in a comprehensive and systematic way. However, information is available from a variety of other areas, for example:</p>

<p>staff compared to the local demographic profile?</p>	<p>The Council holds basic information about Blue Badge holders and residents or members of the public who have parking permits. The Blue Badge Scheme is administered by Social Services. Parking Services do not hold any information about residents/members of the public who hold permits other than the name and address of the main applicant.</p> <p>The Council holds equality information about its employees who have essential user parking permits.</p> <p>Equality information is gathered from the Council's annual staff survey and 57% of staff completed the 2011 survey.</p> <p>The 2010 staff travel survey was incorporated into the 2010 staff survey and 2142 out of 4457 employees completed the travel survey (48%). This indicated that 76% of CMBC staff travel to work by car and that 13% car share.</p> <p>Information about how much the Council's long and short stay car parks and on street parking bays are used is based on the amount of money collected from machines, but it does not provide a breakdown of the users.</p> <p>There are clear trends dictated by user group. Eg commuters tend to park in long stay car parks and shoppers/visitors tend to use the short stay or on street parking facilities. Those parking in the vicinity of the hospital are</p>
---	---

	generally staff of the hospital or visitors to it.	
Quality Assurance: Any complaints, compliments, satisfaction surveys or customer feedback to help inform the EIA?	Customer complaints and compliments are held on the corporate system.	
If information/data gaps are uncovered from the above assessment, what are they and how will you address them?	<p>There is a lack of data relating to all users of the Council's on and off street parking.</p> <p>The proposal is to monitor the use of our parking stock after the options set out in the Income Generation Study report are implemented. This will identify if patronage is increasing or decreasing and will identify if there are any issues. These issues will be analysed and consideration of equality and diversity factors will be part of this analysis.</p> <p>The Council already monitors income from its parking stock on a monthly basis so any significant changes will be identified at an early stage.</p>	
Barriers: What are the potential or known barriers for the different 'equality strands' set out below? Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where you provide your service, e.g. the facilities/premises; • Who provides it, e.g. are staff trained and representative of the local population/users? • How it is provided, e.g. do people come to you or do you go 	Solutions: What can be done to minimise or remove these barriers to make sure everyone has equal access to the service? Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other arrangements that can be made to ensure people's diverse needs are met; • How your actions might help to promote good relations between communities; 	

<p>to them? Do any rules or requirements prevent certain people accessing the service?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When it is provided, e.g. opening hours? • What is provided, e.g. does the service meet everyone's needs? How do you know? <p>* Some barriers are justified, e.g. for health or safety reasons, or might actually be designed to promote equality, e.g. single sex swimming/exercise sessions, or cannot be removed without excessive cost. If you believe any of the barriers identified to be justified then please indicate which they are and why.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How you might prevent any unintentional future discrimination.
<p>Background information is given in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking Review – Report of the Regeneration and Development Scrutiny Panel July 2009; - Parking income generation study 2012. <p>These two documents set out the existing evidence base relating to the Council's parking asset and the current issues and problems. The issues are common to all the equality groups.</p> <p>General comments and barriers</p> <p>The options set out in the Parking income generation study will provide both advantages and disadvantages across all equality groups. The key impact will be financial. It is proposed to reduce the cost of all day parking in the Council's long stay car parks in Halifax town centre to increase the use of these car parks by commuters. However it is proposed to introduce parking charges in areas of Halifax on the edge of the town centre, and in other district centres (Elland, Brighouse, Hebden Bridge, Mytholmroyd, Hipperholme, Todmorden). The introduction of charging will address a number of existing issues such as anomalies of free parking in areas where charging is implemented and problems with inconsiderate and inappropriate parking. Whilst the introduction of charging for car parking will have an impact the charges proposed are low and are considered to be proportionate and appropriate for the type and location.</p> <p>A petition has been submitted to the Council by residents and local businesses in Brighouse opposed to the introduction of on street parking charges on the basis that this would adversely impact on the local economy. However, there are opportunities for local businesses to work with the Council and implement initiatives such as the reimbursement of parking charges to customers on spending a minimum amount. This is operated successfully in other towns with no adverse impact on the local economy.</p>	

The proposed charges for processing requests for parking permits are intended to cover Council staff costs only. A number of local authorities already charge for residents parking permits and so a precedent has been set. Consideration has been given to providing the option of paying by installments but the proposed cost of £25 is not considered to justify this and would increase administration costs further.

All of the options implemented will be subject to ongoing monitoring and review. Monitoring will be in terms of monthly income generated. If any issues are identified these will be analysed to determine the main reason(s), including any equality and diversity factors. Feedback, such as compliments and complaints, will also inform the monitoring and review process.

Age	<p>There is no data on the age profile of users. However, commuters tend to use the long stay car parks so will generally be between the ages of 17 and 65.</p> <p>It is likely that there is a higher proportion of older people who use the on street parking Monday to Friday during the day. This group is more likely to have mobility issues.</p> <p>Those under the age of 17 will already be dependent on public transport, friends or relatives.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that older users may have concerns about personal safety.</p>	<p>There are no changes proposed that would adversely affect any particular age group. In terms of the proposals for parking charges in the Skircoat area this will benefit all ages in gaining access to the hospital as it will be easier to park closer to the hospital.</p> <p>The proposed (and current) pricing regime reflects the proximity of car parks to key services and businesses and so accommodates users of all ages.</p> <p>A number of the Council's car parks have the Park Mark award. On street parking in town centres tends to be in busy, well-lit areas. The proposals will not adversely impact on older people in terms of personal safety. The existing parking stock will still be available and the proposed addition of parking bays will increase choice. Safety will be considered in the provision of new on and off street parking proposals and feedback from stakeholder consultation will also be taken into consideration.</p>
Disability	<p>Currently disabled people are eligible for a Blue Badge, subject to meeting set criteria.</p>	<p>There are no changes proposed to the Blue Badge system. It is not envisaged that there will be any additional barriers related to the parking proposals in Halifax Town centre. There is currently dedicated disabled parking in the hospital car park at Skircoat and this will not be affected by the proposals.</p> <p>Provision of dedicated disabled parking bays will be based on national guidance for the new on and off street parking</p>

		<p>proposals. Provision at existing car parks and on street locations is not affected.</p> <p>The Council currently complies generally with the requirements of the DDA in most of its off street car parks. Some long stay car parks do not comply as the disabled bays tend to be empty most of the time and this has caused complaints from others not being able to park.</p>
Gender	<p>There is no data on the gender profile of users.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that women may have a greater concern about personal safety.</p>	<p>There are no changes proposed that are considered to adversely impact on gender.</p> <p>A number of the Council's car parks have the Park Mark award. On street parking in town centres tends to be in busy, well-lit areas. The proposals will not adversely impact on women in terms of personal safety. The existing parking stock will still be available and the proposed addition of parking bays will increase choice. Safety will be considered in the provision of new on and off street parking proposals and feedback from stakeholder consultation will also be taken into consideration.</p>
Race	There is no data on the race profile of users.	There are no changes proposed that are considered to adversely impact on race.
Religion or belief	There is no data on the religious/belief profile of users.	There are no changes proposed that are considered to adversely impact on religion/belief.
Gender Re-assignment	There is no data on gender re-assignment of users.	There are no changes proposed that are considered to adversely impact on people who have had gender-reassignment.
Pregnancy and Maternity	No data.	There are no changes proposed that are considered to adversely impact on pregnant women.
Sexual orientation	No data, but it is referenced from community feedback and engagement that there is a higher representation of the LGBT community in Hebden Bridge.	There are no changes proposed that are considered to adversely impact on sexual orientation.

If posts are affected or deleted, please list how this may affect how the Council ensures that its workforce is reflective of the community we serve. (Please note that if these numbers are so small it is important the individuals are not identified).

Not applicable at this time. No Council posts will be affected by the proposals. Additional resource may be needed by the Council's Parking Enforcement Contractor.

There will be an impact in terms of the Essential User permits in the future if there is a change to the terms and conditions of staff requiring them to pay for their permits if they are an essential user. However, this would be subject to a separate detailed Equality Impact Assessment and this option is not being considered at this time.

Employee Characteristic	No Negative Impact	Negative Impact/barriers – please state what this may be	Solutions: are there any ways in which you could mitigate the impact
Age			
Disability			
Gender			
Gender reassignment			

Pregnancy & maternity			
Marriage and Civil Partnership			
Race			
Religion or belief			
Sexual Orientation			

Further Consultation:

Having established the barriers and potential solutions, do you need to consult with users/beneficiaries or others to ensure your response is appropriate?

YES X

NO ☐

If **YES**, how will this be done?

As part of scheme development and implementation consultation will be carried out. This includes local elected members, local businesses and residents, plus other relevant stakeholders.

If **NO**, how can you be sure you know enough?

If a new/proposed policy: Will the policy be adopted? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

If an existing policy: Are changes necessary? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

If a changing policy: Are the changes necessary? **Yes** ☒ **No** ☐

Monitoring:

If you have answered 'Yes' above, how you are going to ensure the solutions you have identified are effective?

The policy changes have been identified to meet income targets set for Parking Services. They will need to be approved by Cabinet before they can be implemented.

Monitoring will consist of income received. This will be compared to previous year's income on a like for like basis for existing on street and off street parking bays. The total income will be compared against the income targets set and the anticipated revenue, as set out in the Parking income generation study report. The monitoring will identify if there are any fundamental issues with assumptions made, which will be investigated. Complaints and compliments are likely to be relevant to this and these are also likely to highlight any particular equality issues.

It should be noted that this process is already in place and that parking issues raised by the public are investigated. Fluctuations in revenue from different car parks and on street parking is analysed monthly and has been used to inform the options proposed.

PART C : Equality Action Plan

Barriers identified	Solutions identified	Action required	Resource implications	Timescale	Lead Officer
Older users	The proposals will increase the choice and availability of parking in town and district centres. The implementation of appropriate parking time periods and charging will also ensure that poor parking is reduced, minimising any road safety hazards and risks to vulnerable people such as children and older people, as well as benefitting other people.	A road safety audit will be carried out at feasibility/design stage and after construction of any proposals to ensure that all road safety issues are identified and addressed. Consultation with appropriate stakeholders will be carried out.	Consultation and road safety audits are an integral part of scheme design and costs for these activities will be included in the scheme budget.	On going as part of scheme design and construction.	Carolyn Walton
Personal safety/crime (older users, disabled users and women most likely	Existing measures, such as CCTV, street lighting etc, will be reviewed, as will local crime information to establish any key trends or concerns. Consideration will be	Analysis of crime data and liaison with local community safety teams and police as part of scheme development. Consideration of	If additional safety measures are required these will add cost to a scheme and may make it unviable financially.	On going as part of scheme design and construction.	Carolyn Walton

to feel vulnerable)	given to additional measures required.	mitigating measures if problems identified, such as improved lighting or additional CCTV.			
Provision of parking for disabled people	Government guidance on the provision of parking bays for disabled people will be implemented in the scheme proposals.	Requirement for dedicated disabled parking bays will be incorporated into scheme design.	No significant resource implications – part of scheme development and design.		Debbie Calcott
Socio-economic	<p>No change to the criteria for Blue Badge holders.</p> <p>Ongoing monitoring of use of the Council's parking stock.</p> <p>Analysis of complaints and compliments received.</p>	<p>Continuation of existing analysis.</p> <p>Implementation of surveys/consultation to gather more data if appropriate.</p>	Minimal. This work is already carried out by Parking Services.	On going	Debbie Calcott

PART D : Summary for Publication

Directorate:	Date commenced:
Service Area:	Date completed:
Service / Policy / Function or Procedure to be assessed:	Lead Officer:
Is this: New / Proposed <input type="checkbox"/> Existing <input type="checkbox"/> Changing <input type="checkbox"/>	

What are the aims and objectives / purpose of this?

--

Adverse effects

Found

☐

Not Found

☐

Outcome

Policy amended

☐

Consultation undertaken

☐

Involvement: Please indicate who carried out the Equality Impact Assessment and how other stakeholders were involved.

Summary of Outcome: Were barriers identified, and have plans been put in place to minimise these?

Will the new policy be adopted?

Yes

☐

No

☐**Equality Action Plan**

(Insert Equality Action Plan here, or, if no further action is required as a result of the EIA, please explain why.)

PART C : Equality Action Plan

Barriers identified	Solutions identified	Action required	Resource implications	Timescale	Lead Officer

Signed off by Head of Service:	Geoff Willerton	Date: 2 July 2012
Agreed by DMT:	Ian Gray	Date: 4 July 2012
Lead Officer:	Carolyn Walton	
Contact: Tel:	01422 392167	e-mail address: Carolyn.walton@calderdale.gov.uk