

Report to: Executive Board – 7th February 2005

CHARGING FOR RESIDENTS' PARKING PERMITS

Report of:	<i>Strategic Director, Physical Environment</i>	WARDS AFFECTED ALL
Report Author:	<i>William Reed Tel no. 01865 252230 Email: wreed@oxford.gov.uk</i>	
Lead Member Responsible:	<i>Councillor Turner (Portfolio Holder, Strategic Housing, Planning and Economic Development)</i>	
Overview and Scrutiny Committee Responsibility:	<i>Environment</i>	
Key Decision:	<i>No</i>	

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report addresses the County Council's invitation to the City Council to meet part or all of the net cost of administration and enforcement of residents' priority parking in Oxford. The report contains the following appendices:-

1. Appendix 1 – report considered by the County Council's Executive on 21st September 2004
2. Appendix 2 – resolution of the County Council's Executive of 21st September 2004
3. Appendix 3 – extract from Government Guidance on Local Authority Enforcement of Waiting and Parking Controls
4. Appendix 4 – County Council's On-Street Parking Account Summary – 2003/04

This report argues that residents' parking is but one of a number of inter-related transport policy elements designed to bring about environmental benefits for all who work, shop, visit or live in Oxford and those benefits should be paid for, not by one group of beneficiaries (i.e car owners who live in Residents' Parking Zones) but by all beneficiaries through Council Tax. It also points out that there is no need to charge for residents' parking permits because the County Council's car parking account is in surplus and not in deficit.

The report argues that the County Council cannot justify the injection of further funding into the Oxford and Botley Special Parking Area. It suggests that it is inappropriate, against Government Guidance and against Oxford's transport and traffic policies that Oxford City residents should be charged for residents' parking permits. Moreover, the Executive Board may want to resolve that it would be inappropriate for a charge to be made for residents' permits even if the Special Parking Area is extended to the whole of Oxfordshire.

Balanced Transport Policy and Oxford Transport Strategy

1. Residents' priority parking was one of the five essential elements of the Balanced Transport Policy, adopted by the Council in March 1973. Each of the elements were inter-related. The adoption of the Balanced Transport Policy followed the Council's rejection of new road building which favoured the private motorist at the expense of other road users. New road building would have brought about negligible environmental benefits in Oxford outside the City centre. The Balanced Transport Policy sought to achieve a balanced approach to provision for public transport, cycling, walking and the private car. The introduction of residents' parking schemes in pursuance of the Balanced Transport Policy was never intended to be an end in itself. Rather, the purpose was to prevent the transfer of non-residential parking to residential areas from areas or employers where parking is restricted, and thereby to encourage the use of other modes of transport, in particular park and ride and public transport.
2. The first Residents' Parking Zones were introduced in South and East Oxford in Autumn 1973 and in West Oxford and Jericho in early 1974. Other residents' parking schemes followed, including for the City centre, so that there are now 20 residents' parking schemes in various parts of the City. There has never been a charge for residents' parking permits. There is a charge for business permits and for hotel and guest house permits.
3. The Oxford Transport Strategy, which represents the current transport policy framework, is essentially focused upon traffic movement in the City centre. But the Strategy does include the extension of residents' parking and the more effective enforcement of on-street parking controls.

Charging for Residents' Parking Permits

4. Following the introduction of the first residents' parking schemes in 1973 and 1974, and the steady development of residents' parking in Oxford, the City Council undertook two major policy reviews, one in 1981 and one in 1991. The 1981 review resulted, among other things, in the introduction of visitor parking and the extension of the hours of parking control to 24 hours a day (and the rejection of charging for permits). Later, in 1991 a subsequent review resulted in a decision to consult upon charging on a pilot basis for permit parking in the South Oxford Residents' Parking Zone because of the cost of operating residents' parking schemes. Eventually however, this decision was overtaken

by one (in June 1992) to pursue the introduction of a limit on the number of permits per household.

5. In 1995/1996, in the context of the decriminalisation of parking offences, the City Council initially rejected a proposal to charge for residents' parking permits. Officers were asked to look at increasing pay-and-display parking and charging for park and ride parking to ensure that the Special (decriminalised) Parking Area (comprising the whole of the City area and Botley) would be self-financing. However, the City Council subsequently accepted that charging needed to be introduced "in order to offset any deficit in anticipated revenue" on local authority enforcement of waiting and parking controls.
6. Charging for residents' parking permits (at a charge of £50 per permit) in all Residents' Parking Zones was advertised for public comment. In the light of the responses, the City Council decided in November 1996 "to make no charge for residents' parking permits and that they should continue to be issued without limit on numbers per dwelling". The City Council also decided:-
 - "(1) That enforcement should be by negotiation with local residents (for example during the hours and in the areas where enforcement was felt most to be needed);
 - (2) That each Controlled Parking Zone featuring a residents' parking scheme be treated equally as far as enforcement was concerned, the financing of enforcement under a local authority enforcement regime being met from fines for illegal parking, from on-street parking surpluses and, if necessary and as achieved, off-street parking surpluses;
 - (3) That if residents of particular Controlled Parking Zones wanted additional enforcement, that would be available at an extra annual charge."

The resolution set out above is therefore the Council's current policy position.

Highways Agency Agreement and Decriminalised Parking

7. The City Council terminated the Highways Agency Agreement (whereby the City Council acted as the County Council's agent on traffic management matters) with the County Council in November 2002. The County Council as highway authority is therefore now solely responsible for traffic management and on-street parking in Oxford. The City Council runs City centre and suburban off-street car parks. The County Council is now considering how to meet the cost of residents' parking in Oxford. But when the Highways Agency agreement was handed back to the County Council there was no intention that the City Council would itself continue to meet the costs of residents' parking.
8. In establishing decriminalised parking enforcement and setting up a Special Parking Area for Oxford City and Botley the County Council had to and still has to have regard to Government Guidance, and the law. The relevant part of the Government Guidance on local authority enforcement of waiting and parking

controls forms Appendix 3 to this report. The Guidance says, in summary, that the arrangements have to be self-financing. The Guidance does not separate out different elements of car parking income (i.e. it does not separate out income from on-street (pay and display) parking charges) but, rather, it looks at income and expenditure in the round. It therefore requires that the Special Parking Area is self-financing taking into account the income from on-street pay and display parking and the income and expenditure from enforcement.

The County Council's On-Street Parking Account

9. A summary of actual expenditure and income on the County Council on-street parking account (which includes residents' parking enforcement under the Special Parking Area) as reported to the County Councils Executive on 16th June 2004 is contained in Appendix 4 to this report. This shows the account in surplus by nearly £1million. Most of that surplus relates to the Oxford City Special Parking Area. The final column of Appendix 4 (not reported in that form to the County Executive) "strips out" the Abingdon and Henley details and shows just the figures that relate to Oxford.
10. Back in 1988 the County Council resolved that "any surplus accruing to the on-street parking account should be used, as far as legislation permits, for agreed projects in the Oxford City area within the responsibility and scope of the (relevant Committee), such projects and expenditure to be in line with and supportive of the Oxford City Council's Balanced Transport Policy". The commentary in the covering report to the County Executive on 16th June 2004 says that accumulated surplus on the on-street parking account for the end 2003/04 is £1.020 million. The Executive decided that the accumulated surplus be carried forward in 2004/05.

Local Transport Plan – Extension of Special Parking Area

11. The County Council's current Local Transport Plan 2001 – 2006 contains as an objective "to provide or seek the provision of effective parking enforcement". The Plan then discusses parking policies in the County (with particular reference to Oxford) and acknowledges that the decriminalised parking system for Oxford and Botley has provided effective at improving enforcement. The Plan then says that "the potential for introducing special parking areas and decriminalised parking powers in other towns will be investigated". It now appears that the County Council, in its consultation on the Local Transport Plan for 2006 onwards is seeking to firm up on an expansion of decriminalized parking arrangements to cover the whole of Oxfordshire.

Response to the County Council

12. The County Council's accounts for the Special Parking Area show the account in overall surplus. It is therefore unnecessary to charge for permits to balance

income and expenditure as this would increase the surplus contrary to Government Guidance.

13. Residents' parking in Oxford is designed to address wider objectives than simply enabling residents to park outside or near to their homes. It is part of a broader City-wide (and beyond) transport and parking policy. It is designed to encourage a switch from car to public transport as part of a carrot and stick approach. The "carrot" is the park and ride and the "stick" is the removal of general public parking from residential streets in the residential areas that ring the City centre, and in residential areas that adjoin or in which exist major employers or suburban shopping centres. Minimising non-residential traffic on the City's radial roads, together with the provision of bus lanes, assists park and ride and other bus services to keep to time and represents an attractive alternative to the private car. The reduction of non-residential traffic also improves environmental conditions for all those who live on or adjacent to the radial roads.
14. It is not generally the residents in Residents' Parking Zone that create the parking problems in residential areas and it might be considered unjust to expect residents to pay for permits. Charging for permits would also bear more heavily upon those residents on low incomes but who nevertheless need access to a vehicle. Moreover, it might well be considered unjust to expect residents of Residents' Parking Zones to pay for permits to support a County wide Special Parking Area. If such an initiative came to fruition, the County Council account would in my view be unlikely to show a surplus. Any deficit should, in my view, be made up in ways other than expecting one section of the community (i.e. residents' parking permit holders) to cover that deficit.
15. The County Council is inviting the City Council to meet part or all of the cost of residents' parking in Oxford as it used to do before the Highways Agency was handed back. At the current time there does not seem to be a need to inject any funding into the Special Parking Area account either by introducing a charge for residents' parking permits or by the City Council subsidising residents' parking because of the overall surplus on the parking account. It would, in my view, be difficult for the County Council to sustain an argument that more funding is needed unless it is to fund an extension of the Special Parking Area to the whole of the County. And it would be unjust to expect car owners in Residents' Parking Zones to provide that funding.

THIS REPORT HAS BEEN SEEN AND APPROVED BY:

Brian Johnson – Interim Legal and Democratic Services Business Manager

Sharon Cosgrove – Strategic Director, Physical Environment

Councillor Turner – Portfolio Holder, Strategic Planning, Housing and Economic Development

Councillor Hollingsworth - Leader

Background papers: Minutes of the City Council and its Highways and Traffic Committee in 1981, 1988 and 1991

Division(s): All

ITEM EX10

EXECUTIVE – 21 SEPTEMBER 2004

CHARGING FOR RESIDENTS' AND VISITORS' PARKING PERMITS

Report by Head of Transport

Introduction

1. This report reviews the existing Council policy and its operation with particular reference to the current position in Oxford where no charges are made for residents' parking permits. The issues in relation to bringing in charges in Oxford and elsewhere are explained. Recommendations are made to consult on the introduction of charges in Oxford and to adopt an updated policy on charging generally.

Background and Reasons for a Review

2. The County Council has a long standing policy to make a charge for residents' parking (see Annex 1) but it is not operating that policy consistently. In brief the existing policy is that the cost of establishing and operating residents' parking schemes is fully recovered by charging for residents' parking permits and/or subsidy from District Councils. Charges of £100 and £65 are made for residents' parking permits in Abingdon and Henley but no charges are made for residents' parking in Oxford and no subsidy is received from Oxford City Council to make up for loss of income as envisaged in the County Council's policy.
3. The implementation and operation of residents' parking and management measures in Oxford, as well as the enforcement of traffic regulations in the city, has changed significantly since the County Council's policy on residents' parking was drawn up. The existing residents' parking schemes in Oxford were introduced by the City Council quite some time ago when they had an agency for traffic management. The City Council had a policy of not charging for residents' parking permits and stood the cost of the administration of these from their budget. There were then no enforcement costs because this was undertaken by police traffic wardens, neither was there any income from enforcement.
4. The County Council now pays for enforcement costs within the decriminalised parking regime that started in 1997. An attempt was made to introduce a £50 charge for residents' parking in parallel with the order that brought in decriminalised parking enforcement. However the opposition to the charge was such that it made it difficult to confirm the decriminalised parking order and therefore the proposal to charge for residents' parking was dropped. I understand that the City Council agreed instead to make a budget provision to cover any loss on the residents' parking zones which would have continued their policy and been consistent with the County Council's policy. However I also understand that no payment has ever been made and the cost of operating the residents' parking in Oxford has always been met from revenue within the parking account. The practical effect of this has been to relieve the City Council of a cost they once bore and transfer that cost to the County Council contrary to its policy. There is no longer an agency agreement with the City Council for traffic management.
5. Residents' parking in Oxford operates at a net cost which is increasing. As more zones are introduced the costs will increase.
6. Parking control, including residents' parking schemes, is an integral part of the Oxford Transport Strategy. Is it also a key feature of Integrated Transport Schemes in other towns. It is important to have a consistent policy to apply when these schemes are implemented and that effective enforcement of them can be afforded.
7. The Environment Scrutiny Committee at its meeting in November 2003 requested the Executive to consider the introduction of charges for residents' parking permits in Oxford.

Legal issues to be Considered

8. The Council has an existing policy which creates a presumption in favour of making charges for residents' parking permits in Oxford (and in any other locations in the future). Any proposal to introduce charges for residents' parking will need to be drawn up with care to ensure compliance with the relevant legislation and guidance on charging for permits.
9. The Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984 contains the powers to designate on-street parking spaces for permit holders and to charge for the use of those spaces. Our legal advice is clear, that the grounds for action under the RTRA must be not to raise revenue but to make appropriate traffic management and/or parking provision. In determining charges to be made we should not have regard to the way in which any resulting surplus which may result should be spent.
10. With regard to Oxford, the Council also should take account of DfT Circular 1/95, Guidance on Decriminalised Parking Enforcement outside London. The key paragraphs are 4.1 and 4.9 (attached as Annex 2). The tenor of these is that the local authority's safety and traffic management objectives are fundamental to setting any charges but subject to this the aim should be to make decriminalised parking enforcement at least self-financing. However, the Guidance does not make the aim of being self-financing a limit on the income raised – provided the charges are justified on valid safety and traffic management grounds, income can legitimately exceed expenditure.
11. A judgement on a judicial review of a proposal to introduce a controlled parking zone in London with charges for residents' permits also provides useful pointers to what needs to be considered and recorded in making a decision to introduce charges. The key points are:
 - (a) The purpose of the RTRA Act is not to raise revenue (as above)
 - (b) The right to occupy a vacant space in a residents' parking place has a value in the sense that the expenditure on lines and signs and enforcement is required to keep the spaces free for residents. It was not unreasonable or unlawful for the local authority to take account of this.
 - (c) The extent to which the setting of a permit charge should take account of income from enforcement and perhaps the income from pay and display spaces in the zone must be for the local authority to determine, remembering always that the 1984 Act is not to be used to raise revenues.
 - (d) It was not a material consideration to set charges by reference to what other authorities charged.
 - (e) The decision in this case was to quash the controlled parking zone order because consultation and consideration of objections were so flawed as to be prejudicial.
12. The fact that most authorities with on-street parking schemes charge for residents' permits must mean that this is a widely accepted principle. In a sample of 54 non-London authorities researched for information on charges for residents' permits only 8 made no charge and 2 of these are reviewing their scheme with a view to introducing charges. A further 2 authorities have a free first permit but charge for second and subsequent permits. There is a wide range of zone-based differential charges and charges for permits additional to the first or second permit. (See Annex 3) Although we should not set charges by reference to other authorities, the charges do provide a test of reasonableness for our charges.

The Case for Charges for Residents' Permits

13. The Council has an existing policy on the introduction of residents' parking schemes which is based on traffic management reasons, and provides for the cost of implementing and operating them to be recovered. This existing policy would apply to any new residents' parking proposals and permit charges, although the policy could do with updating to include reasons other than road safety and nuisance for residents - to allow, for example, for

consideration of restraint by pricing in seating charges. A draft amended policy is attached as Annex 4.

14. In Oxford the comprehensive network of residents' parking zones is a fundamental part of the Oxford Transport Strategy, designed to reduce unnecessary car use in the city by deterring commuter parking and address nuisance caused to residents by not being able to park near their homes. The provision of the facility is therefore consistent with the terms of the established policy, although the policy's stipulation that the provision should be self-financing is not currently met. An income is gained from enforcement but does not meet the costs of operating the zones.
15. Enforcement of parking regulations in the Oxford Special Parking Area is aimed at meeting both safety and traffic management objectives. The Penalty Charge of £40 was set with deterrence in mind, but at a level which at the discounted rate of £20 equated with the national fixed penalty charge. It is set at the lowest rate of those permitted but still provides effective enforcement. The cost of enforcement exceeds the income from penalty charges.
16. On-street pay-and-display parking in central Oxford is designed to provide short term parking and remove long term on-street parking from the city centre in support of the overall parking policy for the city. The pricing of pay-and-display is geared to ensure a consistent charge for on-and off-street car parks in the city centre and encourage the use of Park and Ride for longer term parking thus serving an express traffic management purpose.
17. The current overall surplus on the parking account in Oxford is a by-product of parking measures (including charges) that have a positive traffic management and road safety justification. Irrespective of the existence of that surplus I consider that the introduction of charges should be seen as reasonable, given: the relevant Guidance; the Council's established policy; that residents' permits are recognised as having a value; and that the residents' parking zone element of the parking arrangements run at a loss. A case could also be made for using permit charges as a restraint mechanism in zones where the parking orders do not include a limit on the number of permits per household.

Determination of the Level of Charge for a Residents' Permit

18. Applying the principle of the Council's existing policy – the recovery of the costs of operating the residents' parking zones - raises the question of whether a charge in Oxford should be based on the gross cost before taking account of income from enforcement, or on the net cost after allowing for this. Taking everything into consideration it is suggested that the net cost of operating all the existing and future zones is used as the basis of the permit charge and that one permit charge applies across Oxford. Taking into consideration that higher enforcement levels may be needed in some zones, that additional zones planned will increase the net deficit over the current level, and a risk that enforcement income does not match the income from the central area zones, it is calculated that an annual charge of £40 a permit would be justified.
19. Nine of the existing Oxford residents' parking zones have a limit of two permits per household. For traffic restraint reasons it is recommended that in zones where there is a higher or no limit on permits per household the first two permits should be charged at £40, a third at £80, and a fourth or more permits at £120. This would be in keeping with traffic policies for the city.
20. The match day only residents parking scheme around the Kassam Stadium should be treated differently to the other zones in Oxford. There are some exceptional costs in the signing of these zones (the signs need to be regularly updated to show the date of the next event). Taking account of the cost of administration in issuing a permit, the numbers of days a year the scheme is in operation, and these exceptional enforcement costs, a charge of £10 a year is suggested. The zones around the stadium are still covered by an experimental traffic order, no charges should be made until the orders are confirmed as permanent.
21. For any future residents' parking zones in other towns the charge for a permit would be set to take account of the costs particular to that scheme. The revised policy would allow

implementation costs to be included in the calculation if this was considered to be justifiable. It may be that in towns where an Integrated Strategy is being pursued, the implementation costs are met as part of the strategy.

Visitors' Parking Permits

22. All the residents' parking in Oxfordshire has so far included provision of visitor parking permits. Not all authorities give visitors' permits: a sizeable proportion of authorities researched do not make provision for these. There is no generally applied policy in Oxfordshire on whether we do or do not always provide for visitor parking and it is probably best to leave each zone to be considered on its own merits. But a decision is needed on whether to charge for visitor permits in existing zones and in future zones where provided for.
23. An argument against charging is a social one: that it would penalise elderly and infirm residents who find it difficult to get out and rely on visitors for care and social contact. However, medical carers can get 'Carers Permits' and some short term non-permit parking is available in most zones, which other visitors could use.
24. One reason for charging is that visitor permits have a market value and a charge may be a deterrent to residents obtaining them to sell on.
25. Charges of forty pence and thirty pence a day are made for visitor permits in the Abingdon and Henley schemes, so a precedent for charging is set in Oxfordshire. It is recommended that the charging policy includes a charge for visitor parking permits. In Oxford, there is an entitlement to a maximum of fifty days a year per individual, issued in packs of 5x5 day visits, an arrangement written into the parking orders. A charge of sixty pence a day is recommended, which would mean a payment of fifteen pounds to obtain one allocation of visitors' permits. The permits are limited to use within a calendar year, a credit would be given for any unused permits when buying new ones for the following year.

Benefits to Service Levels

26. While permits remain free any refinements and improvements to the existing level of service for permit holders that would involve additional administration costs would increase the loss on residents' parking zones, none have been introduced for this reason. The introduction of charges would enable some helpful additional services to be provided. Examples are:
 - Sending out reminders that permits need to be renewed.
 - Introducing a new style of visitor permit that could be valid for any 24 hours instead of a calendar day so allowing overnight visitors to use one permit instead of two.
 - Introducing a temporary residents permit capable of being issued to residents using hire cars for a period (e.g. because their car is being repaired) or by intermittent or short term residents (e.g. working overseas for periods or doing a research project in Oxford).
 - Allow bona fide residents who are permitted to use business vehicles not registered to them for their personal use to have a resident's permit.
 - Introducing long term visitor permits for social/non-medical carers that would be valid for 13 weeks.

Most of these possibilities would need to have rules developed for eligibility and for the use of them which would have to be subject to separate consultation and consideration.

27. There would also be the possibility of increasing enforcement in zones where there is evidence that this is necessary.

Process and Timing of the Introduction of Charges

28. To introduce charges for residents parking in Oxford requires an amendment to the traffic and parking orders for the existing residents' parking zones. Formal consultation on the draft amending orders would be necessary. Before this stage however it is recommended that a non-statutory public consultation should be undertaken on the principles of the proposed for charges. If the Executive decides to proceed this consultation would take place during the autumn, with the outcome brought to a later meeting of the Executive, probably in December 2004.
29. Should a decision be made to introduce charges following this initial consultation and subsequent formal consultation on the individual orders, the timing of the introduction of charges for the majority of zones would be at the first renewal date of permits following the implementation of the amending orders. The minimum time from a decision by the Executive to consult on the introduction of charges to being in a position to collect the first charges would be 44 weeks.
30. There is an issue of timing for the new parking zones being introduced and consulted on at the moment. Orders for three zones have been approved but have not yet been made (North Oxford, Summertown, Headington Central). A further three zones have been through informal consultation and are progressing to formal consultation (Headington North-East, Headington Quarry, Girdlestone Road). Should the Executive agree to consult on introducing charges, the least complicated arrangement would be to include these six zones in the non-statutory consultation. This would leave the implementation of the parking measures in these new zones to progress to their conclusion without any reference in the orders to charging. Subsequent amendment to any made orders along with those for all the currently existing zones would then be needed to introduce permit charges.
31. The timing of the introduction of charges is likely to give North Oxford and Summertown zones two years of free permits but only a year for Headington Central. In the interests of equity of treatment it is suggested that the introduction of charges is timed to allow 2 years of free permits for each of these zones.

Financial Implications

32. The costs and charges in respect of all on-street parking operations (including pay-and-display and residents' parking) fall within the two specific ring-fenced accounts kept under Section 55 of the RTRA – one for the Oxford Special Parking Area and one for the remainder of the County. The current costs of operating the residents' parking places within the City are met from the former and are estimated to amount to approximately £150,000 (net of enforcement income.) If a further 10 planned zones are added the net cost is forecast to rise to £400,000 taking into account the possible risks mentioned in paragraph 18. Introduction of charges for residents' and visitor permits in line with the above, based on the current numbers of permits issued, would be expected to produce a credit of some £500,000 to the parking account to offset the above costs.

Conclusions

33. The Council has the powers and a case to make for the introduction of charging for residents' and visitor permits in Oxford. An updated policy is suggested for any charging for permits in residents' parking arrangements (Annex 4.) RTRA Orders will be necessary to introduce any charges in Oxford and thus implementation will entail full consultation on the principle of charging and the level of charges. Consideration of objections and representations on the individual traffic and parking orders would, under present arrangements, be a matter for the Transport Implementation Committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS

34. The Executive is RECOMMENDED to:

(a) subject to (b) below, agree:

(1) the principles for the applying of charges for residents' and visitors' parking permits as set out in Paragraphs 18-25 of the report; and

(2) the updated policy for charging for residents' parking set out in Annex 4;

(b) authorise consultation on the proposals for introduction of charges for residents' and visitors' permits in Oxford, the outcome to be reported to the Executive at a later meeting.

DAVID MCKIBBIN
Head of Transport

Contact Officer: Richard Dix, Tel: Oxford 01865 815663
Background Papers: None

25 August 2004

014/04 CHARGES FOR RESIDENTS' PARKING PERMITS

(Agenda Item 10)

The Executive considered a report (EX10) which reviewed existing County Council policy on residents' parking and its operation and examined the legal, financial and other practical issues in relation to bringing in such charges in Oxford and elsewhere.

Mr Hannigan considered the proposals to be illegal in so far as the scheme was more than self-financing and surplus was already realised as a result of operation of the Special Parking Areas.

City Councillor Rundle was opposed to the concept of charging particularly in areas covered by Residential Parking Zones but welcomed consultation on the proposals. He hoped that other ways could be found to offset the costs of enforcing and administering the zones which would not jeopardise the achievements of HAMATS.

Councillor Power expressed his opposition to charging which in his view was a form of stealth tax.

Councillor Brighthouse referred to charging as a tax on those people who did not have integral parking facilities on their properties, of which there were in her division, and pointed out that the need for introduction of parking controls in the first place arose largely from the use of hospital facilities in Oxford by people from the whole sub-region.

The Chairman then suspended proceedings due to the disruptive behaviour of a member of the public and resumed the meeting when the member of the public had left.

RESOLVED: to:

(a) subject to (b) below, agree:

- (1) the principles for the applying of charges for residents' and visitors' parking permits as set out in paragraphs 19-25 of the report EX10; and
- (2) the updated policy for charging for residents' parking set out in Annex 4 of the report EX10 but with the addition of:

'6. In cases where the District Council did not wish a charge to be levied upon residents for participation in a residents' parking scheme, the District Council would be expected to meet all costs.'

- (b) noting that the City Council's policy had been to make no charges for residents' parking in Oxford and that, since the County Council had taken over responsibility for parking control, an anomaly had resulted in the County with the costs of zones in the City falling on all the County residents (including those already paying in their own residents' parking areas), to:
- (1) affirm that the Executive was minded to bring Oxford into line with the updated policy in accordance with (a)(2) above; and
 - (2) ask officers to clarify with the City Council whether it would be prepared to meet the cost of the residents' parking schemes in Oxford or part of them and report back to the Executive on progress in November.

Department for Transport Circular 1/95
Guidance on Decriminalised Parking Enforcement outside London

Overall financial objectives of decriminalised parking enforcement

4.1. Each local authority operating the new system of decriminalised parking enforcement should ensure that it is run efficiently and economically. Each authority should also aim to make the new system overall at least self-financing as soon as practicable. In assessing its performance against this objective, a local authority may take into account costs and revenues from its off-streets parking operations. However, the attainment of this objective should not be at the expense of the safety and traffic management objectives of decriminalised parking enforcement, or be achieved by setting unreasonable levels of penalty and other charges.

On-street parking charges

4.9. The setting of on-street permitted parking charges is primarily a matter for individual local authorities exercising their responsibilities in accordance with the provisions of the RTA 1984, rather than for the Secretary of State. However, the Secretary of State recommends that charges should be set at levels which are consistent with the aim of ensuring that the new system of decriminalised parking enforcement becomes at least self-financing in each local authority area and with securing the local authority's safety and traffic management objectives. Local authorities should avoid using parking charges as a means of raising additional revenue or as a means of local taxation.

ON-STREET CAR PARKING 2003/04 - ACTUAL INCOME / EXPENDITURE - AS AT END MAR 2004

	OXFORD CITY Pay & Display	OXFORD CITY SPA (excl Residents' Parking Zones	OXFORD CITY Residents' Parking Zones	ABINGDON	HENLEY	WALLINGFORD	TOTAL	OXFORD CITY TOTAL
<u>EXPENDITURE</u>	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
PURCHASE EQUIP	25,322	48,851	24,426				98,599	98,599
MGT CONTRACT	314,199	693,198	310,178	63,197	75,444		1,456,216	1,317,575
STAFF COSTS	32,996	115,485	16,498				164,979	164,979
PARKING SHOP	21,796	15,200	51,100				88,096	88,096
OTHER	90,376	59,205	13,290	984	1,460		165,315	162,871
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	484,689	931,939	415,492	64,181	76,904	0	1,973,205	1,832,120
<u>INCOME</u>								
PAY & DISPLAY	-1,462,716			-37,390	-32,711	-2,927	-1,535,744	-1,462,716
ENFORCEMENT	-262,794	-649,398	-313,550	-15,840	-42,309		-1,283,891	-1,225,742
RES PERMITS				-8,255	-9,332		-17,587	0
TOTAL INCOME	-1,725,510	-649,398	-313,550	-61,485	-84,352	-2,927	-2,837,222	-2,688,458
NET INCOME	-1,240,821	282,541	101,942	APPROX 2,696	-7,448	-2,927	-864,017	-856,338

15.5

APPENDIX 4