

**Manchester City Council
Report for Resolution**

Report to: Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee –
5 September 2018
Executive – 12 September 2018

Subject: Proposals for a Resident Parking Policy

Report of: Operational Director of Highways

Summary

The purpose of this paper is to consider a new resident parking policy for Manchester. The policy, once approved, will enable the council to move forward in designing, costing and ultimately implementing a sustainable model for residents' parking schemes across the city.

It will be necessary to come back to a future meeting with detailed proposals including costs, how schemes will be funded and a proposed charging regime once further work on testing existing and potential new schemes against the policy principles has been undertaken.

Recommendations

1. Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider and comment upon the content of this report.
 2. Executive is asked to:
 - a. Approve the resident parking policy and principles set out in the report.
 - b. Note that a report will be brought back to a future Executive setting out proposals for funding and a charging regime for Resident Parking Zones across the city.
-

Wards Affected: All

Contact Officers:

Name: David Smith
Position: City Wide Highways Manager
Tel: 07983 430588
Email: d.smith4@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Kevin Gillham
Position: Head of City Wide Highways

Tel: 07775 791002

Email: k.gillham@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Steve Robinson

Position: Director of Operations (Highways)

Tel: 07989 148203

Email: steve.robinson@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection): None

1.0 Introduction / Background

- 1.1 Residents' parking schemes were first introduced in the city almost 20 years ago. Since then a number of these schemes have been introduced to tackle the impact that commuter and other non-residential parking has on residential areas. These schemes have been introduced in many different areas, all with their own unique set of issues and problems. As such, whilst all schemes are similar in the way they operate, they are all, to some extent bespoke with individual characteristics defining the way they are managed and administered.
- 1.2 Alongside the implementation of resident parking schemes, Manchester has invested significantly in long term solutions to help reduce the impact of commuter parking and reliance on the motor vehicle. Investment has been made in areas such as cycling, public transport and walking to help make it easier and more convenient for residents, commuters and visitors to access the many attractors of the city without a vehicle. These investments include:
 - Oxford Road Corridor (Improving Cycling & Public Transport).
 - Wilmslow Road Cycle Scheme.
 - Metrolink Airport Line.
 - Cross City Phases (Opening Ardwick / University Quarter to the city centre).
 - Initiatives with TfGM including encouraging car sharing to access a place of work and the health benefits of both walking and cycling to work.
 - The planned Manchester to Chorlton Cycleway (Cycle City Ambition Grant).
- 1.3 The growth of the city's economy and increased levels of car ownership and use continues to put pressure on the availability of parking for residents, particularly, but not exclusively, in the area surrounding the city centre. The impact of the Airport, of events at the city's major sports and entertainment venues and areas with a particularly vibrant evening economy also puts pressure on the availability of parking in surrounding residential areas.
- 1.4 The number of Residential Parking Zones (RPZs) has therefore increased over time and there is a strong demand for more schemes to be introduced. However, existing schemes are operating at a loss and with increasing pressures on budgets we cannot continue to subsidise these costs going forward, as such there is a need for a consistent policy framework to be adopted to develop a sustainable way forward that meets the needs of a growing city. This paper therefore contains a set of key principles that all future residential parking zones will be expected to adhere to but also enables some flexibility in order to allow specific local circumstances to be taken into account. This document sets out a draft framework and is intended to support the further extension of RPZs to more parts of the city in the future.

2.0 Proposed Principles for Resident Parking Schemes

- 2.1 Resident parking schemes need to contribute to making the city an even more attractive place to live, work and visit. In this regard, it is important that the benefits to residents of being able to easily park a car close to their property or have a parking facility for those delivering to or carrying out work at a property, is balanced with other demands on scarce road space. These different demands vary across the city and, whilst there is a need for a common approach to many aspects of residents' parking schemes, there is also a need to be able to respond to local differences in a sensitive and appropriate way in scheme design.
- 2.2 In the future there is a need to ensure that new and existing residents' parking schemes accord to an agreed set of principles. The following key principles aim to ensure that there is a broad consistency of approach:
- a) The operation of resident parking schemes needs to be self-financing. The City Council should not commit future revenue support to such schemes.
 - b) There should be broad consistency across schemes so that the design of schemes aimed at tackling similar problems should not differ e.g. in the case of schemes designed to tackle parking around hospital sites.
 - c) Schemes should be introduced in an equitable way so that there is appropriate financial support for residents who would be disproportionately affected by the impact of a charging scheme.
 - d) There needs to be clear evidence of majority support in the area concerned for the introduction of a scheme as well as clearly established evidence of need.
 - e) Enforcement of resident parking schemes should be fit for purpose. (A review of scheme enforcement is to take place looking at ways to increase / improve enforcement).
 - f) Schemes need to be appropriate and proportionate to the parking issues being faced by residents in any given area.
 - g) Any visitors' permits made available as part of scheme design need to be linked to a specific vehicle and not be transferable.
 - h) It will be important to consider the 'knock-on' implications for adjoining areas in terms of displacement as part of any assessment.
- 2.3 The application of these principles will lead to the need to take some specific decisions regarding the design of new and the operation of existing schemes. Any new scheme will need to be considered against these principles. There will also need to be a review of the operation of existing schemes on a similar basis. Adoption of the principles – in particular principle (a) - would also require the introduction of charges to cover the scheme operating costs which would need to include charging for Resident Parking Permits. The basis of any charging would only be to cover running costs for schemes and not to generate a return.

- 2.4 For information, Appendix 1 provides details of the charges for resident, visitor and business permits in a number of other local authority areas outside London.

3.0 Where Should Schemes be Considered?

- 3.1 There is demand for new residential parking schemes in different parts of the city. Development work has already been undertaken on a number of these and the following schemes have been identified as a priority for implementation using developer related Section 106 funding contributions:
1. Rusholme
 2. North Manchester General Hospital
 3. Hathersage Road Area
 4. St George's (partially funded)
- 3.2 A further 8 locations have been identified across Manchester as sites in need of some form of residential parking scheme. These sites have been made known to the Council through working with elected members, the local neighbourhood teams and residents.
- 3.3 The additional sites / potential scheme locations will require assessment against the principles detailed in item 5.0 above, to determine which schemes adhere to the principles and, as such, which should be considered for implementation. This will enable 'eligible' schemes to be costed. Note that an appropriate funding stream will need to be agreed prior to schemes being progressed and that proposals for resourcing will need to be the subject of a future report to Executive.
- 3.4 As part of the legal process any such schemes will need to be fully consulted on and responses properly considered and addressed before any orders can be made and the scheme implemented.
- 3.5 The delivery programme for those funded schemes in 6.1 above can be confirmed once revenue funding is agreed. Some of the schemes have time limits on the s.106 funding, and St Georges will require further funding approval before more work can begin.

4.0 Revenue Funding

- 4.1 The current Council revenue subsidy for existing residents' parking is estimated at around £225,000 pa. This level of revenue support is not sustainable and would clearly increase significantly if further schemes were implemented without a clear plan for meeting future revenue costs. As outlined above, a core principle of future schemes is that there should be no Council revenue subsidy hence appropriate charging schemes would need to be introduced so that all schemes are able to cover their revenue costs. As already indicated, this would need to include charging for Resident Permits which is not currently the case in the city (other than in the city centre scheme).

4.2 The revenue costs for schemes are associated with maintenance of the scheme covering both physical maintenance of signs and lines, maintenance of appropriate back office systems and the costs of enforcing the schemes. Further work will be required, should members agree the principles, to calculate the costs and likely charges for permits and a proposed charging scheme would need to be brought back to Executive for approval.

4.3 In the following sections the rationale for some of the key principles is explained further. Other design issues are also identified.

5.0 Discounts

5.1 Any charging scheme should be fair and equitable with appropriate discounts being made available for particular people depending on their individual circumstances. Examples of people who could qualify for discounts include those in receipt of Council tax benefit and this may include a limit on the discount e.g. only one Resident Permit per household. As an incentive to encourage use of cleaner vehicles, discounts could potentially also apply to residents with less polluting vehicles. Only one discount would be applied per permit.

6.0 Visitor Permits

6.1 Resident parking schemes need to make provision for visitors to be able to park in the area affected. There are a number of potential ways in which visitor permits can be managed. The existing regime involves the issuing of visitor permits for a set annual charge. There will be no change to this and all future schemes will include a charge for all visitor permits.

6.2 There is anecdotal evidence that visitor permits for existing schemes are on occasion transferred and that they are being abused by people who are parking each day in the relevant zone and walking to work, attending events or parking while away for an extended period. There are alternatives which involve the issuing of vouchers for a specific vehicle that are not transferable or to make permits available to people digitally for a range of durations.

6.3 As highlighted within (5.0 Principles for Resident Parking Schemes) any visitor permits made available as part of scheme design need to be linked to a specific vehicle and not be transferable.

6.4 It is accepted that some residents will be in a position where they have multiple visitors at any one time and that these visitors may have travelled in individual vehicles. Due to this, within each proposed scheme there will be locations where 'limited waiting' and possibly 'pay and display' will be available.

7.0 Carers Permits

7.1 People who live in a RPZ area and require care can apply for a transferable free carers permit which can be used by those who are visiting to provide care.

Usually one carer permit is allowed which is issued to the person in receipt of care to issue to their care givers at their discretion. This is a physical permit to display in the windscreen so that it is flexible for users.

8.0 Business Permits

- 8.1 It is proposed to introduce an annual charge for business permits and for business visitor permits. This will help to meet the wider costs of administering any scheme and ensure it is self-financing.
- 8.2 The number of business permits available along with the number of business visitor permits available will need to be further assessed to ensure that the needs of the wider community are considered.

9.0 Blue Badge Holders

- 9.1 Blue Badge holders can park in areas where RPZs are in place by displaying their blue badge. There is no intention to change this current practice. However, there is a recommendation to provide additional Disabled Person Parking Bays within both new and existing schemes as Blue Badge Holders have reported that standard sized bays are not adequate for their needs and they require the larger designated Disabled Person Parking Bays.

10.0 Future Schemes (Funding)

- 10.1 In some circumstances, the capital cost of future schemes could, as has been the case in the past, be met through developer related funding (Section 106 payments) where in the opinion of the Council as local planning authority such permits are required to mitigate any harm generated by the proposed development . However not all areas where schemes are required are likely to see developments that are able make such a contribution to the cost because there is no harm in terms of planning consideration. Further in other cases there may be calls on S106 funding required to mitigate other deficiencies in the proposed development such as the need for affordable housing or open space. Future potential sources of capital funding will therefore need to be investigated for the additional RPZ schemes which are deemed to be 'eligible' having been tested against the policy principles.
- 10.2 There is an option to consider funding the proposed schemes without developer related (S106) funding through the use of city council reserves, which would be subject to the Council's capital approval processes and form part of a future report to Executive. This would be a one off request for funding with the on-going revenue costs of managing each scheme being funded through the charging principles detailed in item 5.0 above.
- 10.3 If further potential schemes emerge at a later time, then their capital costs will need to be raised from sources other than MCC funding reserves.

11.0 Existing Schemes

- 11.1 Some existing resident parking schemes have been in force for many years (see appendix No2). With the exception of the schemes in the heart of the city centre which operate differently and the Etihad scheme which only operates on a given number of days per year and has a set of unique circumstances, it is proposed that, as part of the adoption of the new policy, the same principles should apply to existing schemes as to new ones.
- 11.2 The proposal to consider existing schemes against the principles is important, otherwise it would lead to inequitable situations arising with charged and non-charged schemes existing in close proximity and with no obvious reason. The intention would therefore be to carry out a thorough review of the operation of existing schemes against the policy principles detailed in item 5.0 above. It is recommended that the Etihad scheme is included in the review to consider how the scheme can better align with the principles overall.
- 11.3 A review of the existing resident parking schemes - of which there are 11 including the city centre - could take between 6-12 months to carry out depending on the level of resources made available to carry out the task. Should significant revisions be required to bring an existing scheme up to the agreed new principles (which is likely), then this would require changes to the Traffic Regulation Orders taking a further 12 months to implement.
- 11.4 Such a review together with the works required to implement the revisions to the schemes' operation, is likely to have a capital cost which would be subject to the Council's capital approval processes and form part of a future report to Executive. Firm costs will not be known until the initial review is completed and a schedule of works is identified and agreed. This could include the capital costs involved in making the necessary changes to each scheme including the required changes to the associated Traffic Regulation Orders, scheme design and physical layout on site. Again, a funding source will need to be identified and contained within proposals for consideration at a future Executive meeting.

12.0 Financial Consequences

- 12.1 Revenue - There are no revenue implications arising directly from the report. The report sets out the current cost to the Council of £225k pa for supporting residents parking schemes and the commitment to report back to a future Executive on the proposals for charging for and funding the running costs of future schemes.
- 12.2 Capital - there are no capital implications arising directly from this report. There is a potential need to identify capital funding for future schemes which will include a mixture of the use of S106 receipts and the consideration of the use of Council Reserves. Approval of any capital funding will be through the Council's capital approval processes and form part of a future report to Executive.

13.0 Conclusion

- 13.1 The Council is fully committed to tackling the impact that commuter and other non-residential parking has on residential areas. The draft policy document contained in this report sets out the principles for how this may be achieved without a revenue subsidy from the Council. As noted, the policy provides a clear framework to enable further work to be undertaken on the location, costs, resourcing and charging regime for future and existing schemes across the city.

14.0 Recommendations

- 14.1 Recommendations are set out at the beginning of the report.