


Report of : Strategic Director, Physical Environment

To : Executive Board

Date : 13th March 2006

Item No:

CHARGING FOR RESIDENTS' PARKING PERMITS


 **Purpose of report :** To decide how to take forward a Motion agreed by Council concerning consultation on a proposal by the County Council to charge for residents' parking permits.

 **decision :** No 

Portfolio Holder : Councillor Turner (Portfolio Holder, Strategic Planning, Housing and Economic Development)


 **utiny Responsibility :** Environment


Ward(s) affected : All

 **ort Approved by :** Jeremy Thomas (Head of Legal and Democratic Services); Councillor Turner as Portfolio Holder

 **Policy Framework :** None

 **ommendation(s) :** The Executive Board is recommended:-

 To consider whether it wishes to make representations to the County Council and to write to County Councillors who represent City Electoral Divisions in accordance with the Motion adopted by Council;

(b) Depending upon its decision on (a) above, to authorise officers to respond  hally to the traffic authority as and when Traffic Regulation Orders are advertised for public comment.



Introduction

1. At its meeting on 13th February 2006 Council adopted the Motion that forms Appendix 1 to this report. The Motion contains recommendations for the Executive Board to consider, namely:-

- To request the County Council to carry out genuine consultation on whether or not there should be a charge for residents' parking permits.
- To remind the County Council of this Council's objections to charging for residents' parking permits.
- To write to County Councillors representing City Electoral Divisions explaining to them why charging for residents' parking permits is objected to.

Background

2. The Executive Board considered a report on this subject in February 2005. Its decisions form Appendix 2 to this report.
3. The Board is reminded that in 1995/96 the City Council, as Agent Highway Authority, and with the County Council's consent advertised a proposal to charge for residents' parking permits. The charge then proposed was £50 per permit. The charge was felt to be needed in order to offset any deficit in anticipated revenue on the proposed local authority enforcement of waiting and parking controls. In fact there is no deficit. The February 2005 report dealt, among other things, with the on-street parking account.
4. In the light of the very many petitions and letters of objection to the charging proposal the City Council decided 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's current position is that there should be no charge for residents' parking permits. However, before the Highways Agency Agreement was terminated, the Council was introducing limits on the number of residents' parking permits per dwelling.

Reasons for Residents' Parking Schemes

5. As explained in the report to the Executive Board in February 2005, residents' parking schemes were never intended to be an end in themselves. Rather, the purpose of such schemes was and is to prevent the transfer of non-residential parking to residential areas from areas or employers where parking is restricted, and thereby encourage the use of other modes of transport, in particular park and ride and public transport. It is not generally the residents in Residents' Parking Zones that create parking problems in residential areas and it might be considered unjust to expect residents to pay for permits given the wider policy objectives. Charging for permits would also bear more heavily upon those residents on low incomes but who nevertheless need access to a vehicle.

County Council Proposal

6. Appendix 3A to this report contains the decision of the County Council's Cabinet on 6th December 2005 on residents' parking charges. Appendix 3B is the press release issued after the Cabinet reached its decision.

Conclusion and Recommendations

7. The Board is being asked how it wishes to respond to the Motion adopted by Council on 13th February 2006. The traffic authority's timetable provides for advertisement of the charging proposals in April.

In reaching its decision the Board is asked to note that area committees have within their powers and duties "to act as consultee on traffic management and highway authority functions".

The Board is being recommended:-

- (a) To consider whether it wishes to make representations to the County Council and to write to County Councillors who represent City Electoral Divisions in accordance with the Motion adopted by Council;
- (b) Depending upon its decision on (a) above, to authorise officers to respond formally to the traffic authority as and when Traffic Regulation Orders are advertised for public comment.

Name and contact details of author:-

William Reed
Democratic Services Manager
Town Hall Oxford OX1 4YS
Tel: 01865 252230 e-mail: wreed@oxford.gov.uk

Background papers: None

