

ITEM No ...6.....

REPORT TO: CITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE – 9 MARCH 2020

REPORT ON: PROPOSED EXTENSION OF RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEMES UPDATE

REPORT BY: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CITY DEVELOPMENT

REPORT NO: 81-2020

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 This report provides an update on work that has been undertaken with respect to the potential introduction of residents' parking schemes in three areas of the West End, Coldside and Maryfield wards and sets out the key challenges in delivering a successful scheme.

2 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 It is recommended that the Committee:

- a notes the consultation work that has taken place to date with community groups and that this consultation is ongoing;
- b agrees that in view of the significant financial challenges facing the Council, any new residents' parking schemes should have revenue costs met through payment of an appropriate annual charge to ensure full cost recovery;
- c remits the Executive Director of City Development to conclude consultation with relevant community groups, highlighting the issues raised in this report and seeking a formal response from those groups; and
- d remits the Executive Director of City Development to bring back a further report once feedback has been received from community groups.

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 The annual revenue cost required to cover maintenance, administration and enforcement of the schemes is estimated to be in the region £118,000. No budget exists for revenue costs at this time. A funding source requires to be identified to allow the delivery of any further residents' parking scheme.

3.2 Staffing resources with the appropriate expertise are not currently available within the Roads & Transportation Division and it is likely to be necessary to commission an external transport consultancy to undertake wider community engagement and support the introduction of any subsequent scheme. Should an external transport consultancy be engaged to support community engagement and full scheme development in advance of the introduction of a new scheme, £100,000 or more may be required to fund this. The use of consultants was the approach taken in the previous consultation on a potential West End Residents' Parking Scheme.

3.3 The potential income from the sale of permits in any new schemes is difficult to predict given the permit fee is not yet agreed and the likely number of permits sold each year is not known. Market research may be required to provide an informed estimate of income. In researching this approach, Council officers spoke with counterparts in other Councils to help ascertain anticipated take up of permits. Existing schemes in the City Centre, Menzieshill and Broughty Ferry currently have charges for the issue of residents' permits. In view of the significant financial challenges facing the Council, officers recommend that the annual cost of running any new scheme should be fully met by permit holders, through an annual charge that ensures all

operational costs are met. Once a pattern of uptake is established it may be possible to review permit fees to align with the future revenue costs of running the scheme.

- 3.4 Many Scottish towns and cities currently operate residents' parking schemes. By way of comparison the table below shows some of the fees charged by other Scottish local authorities for residents' parking permits. To enable a like for like comparison, the cost of permits in "outer zones" have been used where possible. It is noted that some local authorities charge a higher fee for any second permit issued to the same household.

Local Authority/City	Fee (first permit)	Fee (second permit)
Aberdeen	£60.00	£140.00
Edinburgh	£127.50	£162.00
Perth	£132.00	
Glasgow	£85.00	
Inverness	£58.00	

- 3.5 The capital cost of introducing the 3 proposed schemes is estimated to be in the region of £720,000. A breakdown is shown in Appendix 1. The capital costs have been calculated by extrapolating information from a bill of quantities supplied by Tayside Contracts for the provision of new road markings and traffic signs in selected sample streets. The figures shown cover the cost of creating approximately 1,800 permit bays across the 3 zones as well as an additional 500 bays marked as disabled, loading or limited wait (visitor) bays.
- 3.6 The capital resources within the Council are fully committed within the five year capital plan. Should the Residents' Parking Scheme progress, officers would be required to provide options around how it would be funded. This could result in current projects being delayed or removed from the capital plan.
- 3.7 Given the difficulty in accurately estimating the income generated from a residents' parking scheme, it is deemed inappropriate to use a prudential borrowing approach to fund the capital costs required to establish the scheme. Accordingly this option is not recommended by officers.
- 3.8 The estimated revenue costs associated with a residents' parking scheme are shown in Table 3 of Appendix 1. Revenue costs are associated with scheme administration, enforcement and maintenance with a small element of contingency costs.

4 BACKGROUND

- 4.1 In late 2008, Transport Consultancy Colin Buchanan produced a report for Dundee City Council that set out possible options for taking forward a residents' parking scheme on the periphery of the city centre. The final report found that there was demand for a scheme, with the West End of Dundee being identified as the area with the most to benefit.
- 4.2 It is noted that in 2012, extensive engagement was undertaken by council officers on proposals to introduce a residents' parking scheme in the West End. Every property within the zone as well as properties just outside the zone received a letter. Public drop-in sessions were organised and well attended by residents and businesses. The outcome of the consultation was a clear rejection of the Council's proposals. Nearly 1000 responses were received with 72% of respondents living within the proposed zone rejecting the proposals and 80% of respondents living just outside the zone stating their opposition. 62% of business responding rejected the proposals.

- 4.3 The proposals put to residents had been informed by the detailed report produced by Colin Buchanan (transport consultancy). The primary reason for rejection was the proposed permit fee of £80.00 which was deemed to be excessive. Comparison was made by many survey respondents to the permit fee applicable to the Menzieshill Residents' Parking Scheme that was introduced in the early 2000s. It is noted that the cost of implementing the Menzieshill scheme was funded from capital budgets available at that time.
- 4.4 In March 2018, City Development committee approved the preparation of the three Traffic Regulation Orders in areas of central Dundee that lie adjacent to the existing controlled parking zone in Dundee city centre (Article IV of the minute of meeting of this Committee of 12 March 2018, Report 99-2018 refers). The committee further agreed that before preparing the three Traffic Regulation Orders, officers would be instructed to undertake a consultation exercise on the proposals in the report with the communities in the affected areas, including with community councils and residents and tenants groups and to then report findings back to the City Development Committee. The follow up report was to include a range of financial options and, in particular, not to be limited to a "cost neutral to the Council" option.

5 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- 5.1 Consultative meetings were organised by the Communities Officers and took place in summer/autumn 2019 between Roads & Transportation officers and representatives from the West End, Coldside and Maryfield communities. The focus of discussion was on establishing initial views on a residents' parking scheme and discussing the most appropriate ways to engage with the wider community in each locality. Further engagement is planned for spring 2020, culminating in the opportunity for community groups, including school parent councils to respond formally to the Council. To date, feedback from members of the public and community representatives has been mixed and while support is evident, opposition to the generality of the proposals has also been expressed. There will be a further opportunity for all members of the public to provide their views on any scheme when public consultation is undertaken as part of the Traffic Regulation Order process. Meetings have been held/organised as follows, and a number of City Council elected members have been present at each meeting: :

Locality	Date	Attendees
West End	3 July 2019	Members of the West End Community Council.
Maryfield	29 July 2019	Members of the Stobswell Forum and the City Centre and Harbour Community Council.
Coldside	9 August 2019	Members of the Coldside Forum.
Coldside	26 September 2019	Public meeting organised by Coldside Forum
Maryfield	12 November 2019	Meeting of the City Centre and Harbour community council.
West End	7 March 2020	
West End	12 March 2020	
Maryfield	To be arranged	

- 5.2 During the consultation, the advantages and disadvantage of a residents' parking scheme were discussed, drawing on experience of other towns and cities where schemes are in place and previous engagement undertaken in Dundee (2012). The table below shows some of the main themes and concerns that have come out from the engagement to date:

Advantages to Residents
Gives residents with permits an increased chance of finding a parking space in the near vicinity of their home. Residents returning to their properties by car during the working day should find it easier to park near their home – e.g. to unload shopping or children.
Residents (including non-car owners) may experience less congestion and fewer parked cars on their streets and therefore cleaner air and safer streets.
Perception that cars left on street are more secure if parked within sight of home.
Opportunity for some West End residents to use Council car parks without further charge – if these are included in any scheme.

Disadvantages to Residents
The cost of permits falls on the resident in the controlled zone rather than the commuter who is perceived to be the cause of the problem. Perception that the wrong person is being penalised.
Displacement of vehicles to adjacent (non-controlled) areas. Any scheme will have a boundary zone and residents on the “wrong side” of the zone may consider that the problem has simply moved to their street.
Visitors arriving by car will have a reduced opportunity to park near their destination – e.g. visiting a family member living within the zone may become more difficult during the working day.
Purchase of permit does not guarantee a parking space – particularly so in streets where demand for parking outstrips number of permit holder bays.
Properties with private car parks (e.g. a block of flats with private parking) may see increased levels of abuse by non-residents as commuters seek out places where they can continue to park without payment.
Due to bay lengths requiring to be formally marked out, the overall number of vehicles that will be accommodated in any street is likely to be reduced.
Tradespeople will have reduced opportunity for parking vehicles near the homes they are servicing.
Residents with off-street parking are unlikely to purchase permits but from time to time may need to make use of on-street parking – which will not be possible without a permit.
Annual requirement to reapply for a permit or when vehicle is changed.

Issues for DCC to Consider
Additional cost of staff resources to enable effective enforcement.
The potential to introduce of a cap on the number of permits that can be issued to a single address.
More permits may be sold than bays available leading to feelings of discontent amongst residents who believe that they have paid for something that has not been delivered by the Council.

Layout/widths of historic roads does not allow for significant on-street parking to be created. Proposals may require Council to retrofit a scheme to roads that do not comply with current design standards.

Complex administration of scheme and requirement to establish and promote rules – e.g. company cars, work vans, limit of the number of permits per household.

B&Bs, accommodation providers and other businesses may complain to Council that their offer would be disadvantaged if they had no off-street parking to offer guests/customers.

Potential for increased number of front gardens being given over to parking as residents seek to avoid parking permit fees.

5.3 During the community engagement process other transport related issues emerged as follows:

- concerns expressed about vehicle traffic that may seek to avoid Dundee's low emission zone and the impact this may have on the streets on the boundary of any future zone;
- city centre parking costs and a call for Dundee City Council to review parking charges that would lead to fewer drivers seeking to avoid high parking tariffs; and
- a desire for Park and Ride sites to be established on the periphery of the city to attract longer distance commuters.

5.4 An area of particular concern is the issue of displacement that should be expected as an unintended consequence of a residents' parking zone being introduced. Residents of streets immediately outwith the zone may see an increased volume of traffic and parking as commuters and residents who live close to the boundary seek out uncontrolled streets where they can park without restriction. This may contribute to new complaints from householders who consider that the introduction of the residents' parking scheme has created problems where few problems were being experienced previously. An extensive zone that results in a lengthy walk to primary workplaces (e.g. city centre office and retail, university campus) is one option that might be used to counter this type of behaviour but it will not be able to eliminate it.

5.5 Given the financial and staffing resource required to introduce each scheme, it may be challenging to launch the three schemes simultaneously should funding be identified. It is proposed that any new schemes would therefore be introduced incrementally on a ward by ward basis. This approach would allow council officers to monitor the impact of the scheme in the first area selected and gather feedback before commencing engagement and scheme roll out in the other two areas.

6 NEXT STEPS

6.1 The Transport (Scotland) Bill 2018 completed its passage through the Scottish Parliament and received Royal Assent on 15 November 2019. The new Act will include provisions to prohibit the parking of vehicles on pavements and prohibit double parking. The new legislation is expected to reduce the number of on-street parking bays that can be created as part of any future scheme – particularly on narrow streets. Pavement parking, where either two wheels or all four wheels are positioned on the pavement is common practice in most cities across Scotland and is regularly observed in Dundee. The new Act will prohibit this type of parking and remove the option for the Council to designate residents parking areas that straddle the carriageway and footway. This is likely to significantly reduce the availability of parking in narrower streets even where on-street parking is currently accepted practice. It would be difficult for the Council to formalise any marked parking areas that either encouraged or impelled driving on the footway.

- 6.2 Any new scheme will require additional parking enforcement resources over an expanded area. The revenue cost estimates assume that the additional enforcement costs (i.e. the salaries of extra Parking Attendants) are not met from additional revenue generated by the issue of Parking Charge Notices (PCNs) in the new zones.
- 6.3 The Council has been amending parking pricing policies in recent budgets. It is hoped that the introduction of a tiered approach to parking, with lower charges on the periphery of the City Centre, will help disincentivise “park and stride” behaviour that has been identified by many residents. In April 2019, the reduction of all day car parking charges at Dudhope Castle Car Park saw a large increase in the number of commuters using the car park. Although difficult to ascertain, it is thought that a reasonable proportion of these cars had previously been parked on residential streets.
- 6.4 Dundee’s Low Emission Zone, once fully implemented, could, in future years, change the parking behaviour of a small cohort of commuters. Some consultees have highlighted that a Low Emission Zone may exacerbate commuter parking on the periphery of the city centre. The Council operates at least two multi-storey car parks and a number of surface level car parks that may lie outside the potential Low Emission Zone and these will continue to provide options for commuter parking.

7 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 This report has been subject to an assessment of any impacts on Equality and Diversity, Fairness and Poverty, Environment and Corporate Risk.
- 7.2 This will be considered further as a detailed response is developed to this issue.

8 CONSULTATIONS

- 8.1 The Council Management Team were consulted in the preparation of this report.

9 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 9.1 None.

Author: John Berry

Robin Presswood
Executive Director of City Development

Dundee City Council
Dundee House
Dundee

RGP/JB/KAS

14 February 2020

APPENDIX 1**Table 1: Capital Costs – Signing And Lining Of Residents’ Parking Scheme (Non-recurring)**

Ward Area	Indicative Capital Costs	Number of Permit Bays
Coldside	£140,000	350
Maryfield	£110,000	280
West End	£470,000	1,170
Total	£720,000	1,800

Table 2: Consultancy, Engagement and Scheme Development Costs (Non-recurring)

To undertake further research into scheme and provide effective community engagement. Assuming scheme is approved develop scheme rules, application processes and website/payment systems.	£100,000+
---	-----------

Table 3: Revenue Costs (Without Capital Loan Repayments) (Recurring)

Renewal of road marking and signage	£20,000
Management of scheme – appeals, queries, rules administration (1 FTE of Parking Officer)	£34,000
Permit Administration – issuing 1800 permits annually (0.5 FTE of Customer Services Officer)	£15,000
Enforcement on-street (1.5 FTE of Parking Attendants)	£44,000
Contingencies	£5,000
Total Revenue Costs (annual) – without capital loan	£118,000

