

2014/15 to 2017/18 MTFP Proposal Document

FP Ref: 55

Proposal Name:	Resident Permit Charges Full Cost Recovery																											
Service:	Parking Services																											
Lead Officer:	Oliver Woodhams & Steve Deakin																											
Stakeholders and Partners:	<p>This proposal only currently affects those residents of Somerset County Council residing in an area of high parking demand where controlled resident parking has been introduced at their request. However, in the event that new schemes are introduced, we would seek to recover full costs</p> <p>The current numbers of households affected by this proposal is approximately 2,200. Of this number about 500 households are further affected due to the presence of a 2nd vehicle. For existing schemes that have already introduced resident parking permits, section 46a of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 enables a change in price with no statutory consultation required. Nonetheless, consultation has been undertaken with residents of existing schemes to ascertain views - details of the consultation results are set out in the Appendix to this proposal.</p> <p>Further statutory consultation will be required for new schemes prior to implementation. Such statutory consultation provides an opportunity for any objections (which must be dealt with) to be considered before implementation.</p>																											
Proposal Recommended:	<p>Increase in the charge for resident parking permits over the years 2014/2015, 2015/2016 and 2016/2017 to ensure the full costs of schemes are recovered, harmonising current charges in different districts as follows:</p> <p><i>Current Charges:</i></p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Taunton Deane</th> <th>South Somerset</th> <th>West Somerset</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>First vehicle - £35</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>per vehicle</td> <td>£35 per vehicle</td> <td>£8 per vehicle (all</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Second vehicle -</td> <td>(all vehicles)</td> <td>vehicles)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>£50 per vehicle</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Proposed charges (all Districts):</i></p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2014/15</th> <th>2015/16</th> <th>2016/17</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>First Vehicle</td> <td>£40</td> <td>£50</td> <td>£60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Second Vehicle</td> <td>£70</td> <td>£90</td> <td>£100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Other than the price of the permit no other changes are proposed within this MTFP proposal. Related proposed amendments to change the criteria for eligibility, method of application and various sundry permit schemes will be subject to a separate decision. Residents will still be required to confirm their eligibility. Charges will be reviewed every 3 years (or more frequently as required) to ensure costs are in line with revenue.</p>	Taunton Deane	South Somerset	West Somerset	First vehicle - £35			per vehicle	£35 per vehicle	£8 per vehicle (all	Second vehicle -	(all vehicles)	vehicles)	£50 per vehicle				2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	First Vehicle	£40	£50	£60	Second Vehicle	£70	£90	£100
Taunton Deane	South Somerset	West Somerset																										
First vehicle - £35																												
per vehicle	£35 per vehicle	£8 per vehicle (all																										
Second vehicle -	(all vehicles)	vehicles)																										
£50 per vehicle																												
	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17																									
First Vehicle	£40	£50	£60																									
Second Vehicle	£70	£90	£100																									

Assumptions:	It is assumed that the current numbers of resident zones and the consequent purchase of resident permits will remain, or increase slightly as new schemes come on board. It is considered unlikely that there will be requests for controlled zones to be removed. Permit levels are likely to remain at current levels as residents maintain ownership of vehicles.												
Options Considered:	<p>A number of charging variations have been considered, with the objective of recovering the full cost of running and enforcing residents' parking schemes. The cost per permit of running a typical scheme has been calculated as follows (annual costs are shown, rounded to the nearest pound):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="544 622 1382 815"> <tr> <td>Costs of enforcing permit area</td> <td>£53.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Permit processing costs</td> <td>£7.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maintenance of signs and lines</td> <td>£7.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other contract costs and overheads</td> <td>£14.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Income from enforcement activity (penalty charge notices)</td> <td>-£15.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Net running cost of scheme per permit issued</td> <td>£66.00</td> </tr> </table> <p>In addition to the ongoing running costs above, there are also set up costs associated with schemes which were originally included within the calculation. Charges originally proposed prior to the consultation period have been reduced to reflect the views of residents, who felt overall that the charges originally proposed were a little too high.</p> <p>It is apparent from feedback from residents of the Minehead area of West Somerset the existing scheme arrangements may need to be reviewed, particularly as all areas are shared use, with no resident permit parking areas. The review would delay the implementation of the new permit rates for this area and implementation plans will be revised to take this into account.</p>	Costs of enforcing permit area	£53.00	Permit processing costs	£7.00	Maintenance of signs and lines	£7.00	Other contract costs and overheads	£14.00	Income from enforcement activity (penalty charge notices)	-£15.00	Net running cost of scheme per permit issued	£66.00
Costs of enforcing permit area	£53.00												
Permit processing costs	£7.00												
Maintenance of signs and lines	£7.00												
Other contract costs and overheads	£14.00												
Income from enforcement activity (penalty charge notices)	-£15.00												
Net running cost of scheme per permit issued	£66.00												
Responsibilities	<p>Parking Services Manager to arrange Notice of Variation and liaise with Parking Contractor to implement new pricing structure.</p> <p>Strategic Manager – Traded Services (in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport) to review the level of charges in the light of any future changes to the number of schemes.</p>												

Impact:	Strategic Impact	Continuation of Civil Parking Enforcement without financial support and achievement of linked County Plan and Business Plan objectives for controlling congestion to promote economic growth.
	Service Impact External Users	Service provision to residents unaffected (apart from cost of service).

Impact contd:	Service Impact Internal Users	None. Day to day administration of service is outsourced.
	Impact Assessment Key Impacts:	Low impact on residents on low incomes. A phased increase will allow residents on low incomes to mitigate or plan for the impact of increased charges. The new charges are more equitable as they eliminate arbitrary charging differences which currently exist between schemes in different parts of the county.
	Other Implications as necessary	None

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	Requirement to publish Notice of Variation within local press and locations affected and full cost recovery basis for proposed charges ensures we are compliant with Traffic Management Act legislation. This proposal is considered to be a low statutory / legal risk.
	Dependencies	Assumption number of permits will remain, or increase slightly. This will be kept under review to ensure income from charges is broadly equivalent to the cost of existing and any new schemes.
	Constraints	None.
	Capacity	No capacity issues. Administration of permit scheme is outsourced. Parking contractor has resource available to place signs at each location.

Financial Implications:		2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Net Revenue:	On-going Savings	(£27,000)	(£41,000)	(£32,000)	
	One-Off Savings				
	On-going Pressures				
	One-Off Pressures				
Capital:	Capital Costs				
	Capital Income				
	Capital Receipts				
Impact of Delay:	Revenue Impact				
	Capital Impact				
Staffing Implications:		2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Revenue	FTEs				
Capital	FTEs				
Redundancy Implications	FTE – Voluntary				
	FTE – Compulsory				

Appendix 1: Summary of Consultation results

Background

As part of the review of charges relating to resident parking charges, consultation has been undertaken across the County.

All residents who currently hold either an annual resident permit for their vehicle or have purchased resident visitor permits were invited to complete the consultation.

The consultation available on the Council's website ran for the period 5th December 2013 to 10th January 2014.

Paper copies of the questionnaire were available for those participants who requested them.

The consultation was based on a proposal which sought to raise resident's parking permit charges to £70 for first vehicles, and £150 for second vehicles.

Consultation process & response levels

Prior to completing the questionnaire respondents were encouraged to read a supporting document. This provided background information to the proposals. Both the questionnaire and supporting document are available on request.

A covering letter inviting parties to complete the consultation was sent to the following:

- 2,280 resident permit holders
- 123 residents who have purchased scratch cards only
- Compass Disability for distribution to their contact list and Facebook page
- Somerset Association of Local Councils
- District Councils
- Somerset County Council's businesses e alert
- Companies employing Carer's in Somerset
- Somerset Chamber of Commerce
- Yeovil Chamber of Commerce
- Bridgwater Chamber of Commerce
- Federation of Small businesses
- Federation of Master Builders
- National Federation of Builders
- National Landlords Association
- Landlords for Landlords
- Taunton Town Centre Company

Over all groups, 423 responses were received, 284 of whom identified themselves as existing resident's permit holders. From these figures it can be surmised that 88% of existing resident permit holders did not respond to the consultation.

Summary of responses relating to resident permits

a. Category	Number of Responses	% of Responses
Resident	402	95%
Business	7	2%
Other	14	3%
Total	423	100%

b. 284 respondents hold a resident parking permit

c. Number of vehicles at respondents property

Zero	21
One	220
Two	135
Three	31
More	15

d. Off road spaces at respondents property

Zero	244
One	83
Two	53
Three	12
More	16

e. To what extent should parking be included within the Councils financial planning?

To a large extent	49	12%
To some extent	133	32%
To a little extent	95	23%
Not at all	143	34%

f. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the approach that those who cause parking pressures should cover our costs

Strongly agree	115	28%
Slightly agree	110	27%
Neither agree or disagree	71	17%
Slightly disagree	42	10%
Strongly disagree	72	18%

g. What do you think about the proposed costs for resident parking permits?

Overall Averaged Response A little too high

g. What do you think about the proposed costs for resident visitor parking permits?

Much too high	189	47%
A little too high	51	13%
About right	136	34%
A little too low	18	4%
Much too low	8	2%

h. If you currently have a resident parking permit how would the proposed changes affect you?

It would not make a significant difference to me	105	32%
It would make me consider not purchasing a permit	89	27%
It would definitely make me not purchase a permit	34	10%
Not sure	97	30%

Selected comments / themes emerging from comments:

- Modern life means more cars, extended families with adult children
- Our cars are necessary as the bus service is too expensive and inadequate
- House conversions are a problem
- Only residents should be able to park
- There is too much enforcement
- There is insufficient enforcement
- The cost of permits is too high
- Why should there be a charge for permits?
- Reduce the level to be consistent rather than increase all
- The proposals for charges are too high, we are not living in London
- There is acknowledgment of abuse of current annual visitor permits.
- Council Tax should be used or increased to cover the cost
- Why should we pay to park outside our house?
- Proposed charges are outrageous
- These changes will make family support for children unaffordable
- Putting up the prices will have an effect on house prices
- Stop selling more permits than spaces
- We have to have 2 cars
- Extra controls are needed into the evening and Sundays
- Disabled drivers should not get free permits
- The scheme discriminates against those who live in cheaper housing areas
- Cars associated with the school run are a problem
- Residents should not be used as a “cash machine”
- The proposed charges are extortionate and unacceptable
- Motorcycles should not be exempt as they take up road space
- Sundays should be included
- Parking controls in the evening should be introduced
- Residents should be able to use the car parks for free if there road is full
- Standardizing the rates across the County is not appropriate as Taunton and Yeovil are different
- Residents should have one free permit per property
- These increase will make me think about moving
- There is no justification as to how the charges have been calculated
- Wasn't the service outsourced to a private company to save money
- Charges should vary according to demand

Impact Assessment Form and Action Table			
(Expand the boxes as appropriate, please see guidance to assist with completion)			
Why are you completing the Impact Assessment?			
Proposed New Policy or Service	Change to Policy or Service	MTFP or Paper	Service Review or SCC Change Programme Service Review
Existing service	Increase of existing charge	✓	
Title are you completing the Impact Assessment on (which policy, service, MTFP reference, cluster etc)?		Increase of Resident Permit Parking Charges MTFP Ref 55	
Risk Rating			
Section 1 – Description of what is being impact assessed			
Impact on residents affected by the proposed increase to resident's parking charges for resident parking permits.			
Section 2A – People or communities that are targeted or could be affected (for Equalities - taking particular note of the Protected Characteristic listed in action table)			
Residents on low incomes or holders of disabled drivers blue badge			
Section 2B – People who are delivering the policy or service			
This proposal will have no direct impact on people delivering the service. There may be some transitional impacts on workload and work environment if significant enquiries are raised with staff in a forceful manner; however this is considered to be unlikely and low impact in a service which is used to dealing with disgruntled customers.			
Implications of MTFP 2012/13 for staff in relation to Equality and Diversity will be dealt with corporately by the HR Policy Manager in association with the HR Group Managers.			
Section 3 – Evidence and data used for the assessment (Attach documents where appropriate)			
Approximately 1,700 households across the County are holders of resident permits who would be affected by the proposed increases. The majority of permit holders are situated within the centre of Taunton with smaller numbers in central Yeovil and Minehead. The number of households who would benefit from the improved clarity in the policy is unknown as the existence of a disabled drivers badge is not recorded by parking services. These stakeholders and others, including Compass Disability will be consulted on the proposals and feedback from the consultation exercise will shape the final proposal and decision.			
Section 4 – Conclusions drawn about the impact of the proposed change or new service/policy (Please use prompt sheet for help with what to consider):			
Key issues to be fed into relevant Action Table			
Equality			
Low impact. Holders of disabled drivers blue badges who are the registered keeper are unaffected by this change as they receive the first badge free of charge. The proposals are an improvement as the vehicle only needs to be registered at the property. Therefore households where the blue badge holder is not the keeper will benefit. Additional clarity is also provided regarding the 2 nd vehicle. The proposal is to allow the 2 nd permit to be purchased at the first permit price. In cases where an			

exclusive mobility vehicle is registered at the property, it is suggested this does not count towards the allocation. Low income residents will be affected by the price increase, although for households with one vehicle the total cost of the permit will remain a very small proportion of the total cost of motoring. A phased increase will allow residents on low incomes to mitigate the impact of increased charges. The new charges are more equitable as they eliminate arbitrary charging differences which currently exist between schemes.

Feedback received during the consultation from residents has resulted in a number of objections to holders of disabled driver badges receiving free permits.

Health and Safety

None.

Sustainability

None

Community Safety

None

Privacy

New additional personal data relating to applications for dispensations will be collected and held. The data will be similar to that currently held which is held securely on behalf of the Council. The data remains the property of the Council at all times. This new data will be held in accordance with required legislation and policies.

Section 5 – After consideration please state your final recommendations based on the findings from the impact assessment. Also include any examples of good practice and positive steps taken.

No changes to proposals recommended. Harmonising charges will eliminate current variations which are inequitable.

Section 6 - How will the assessment, consultation and outcomes be published and communicated? E.g. reflected in final strategy, published. What steps are in place to review the Impact Assessment

Consultation to be discussed at cross party parking working group. Outcome of informal consultation to be published on the Council website. Impact Assessment will be reviewed in the light of consultation results, and re-submitted prior to the decision on this proposal.

Completed by:	Steve Deakin, Parking Services Manager
----------------------	--

Date	22 nd November 2013
-------------	--------------------------------

Signed off by:	Paula Hewitt and Michele Cusack
-----------------------	---------------------------------

Date	14/1/2014
-------------	-----------

Compliance sign off Date	December 2013
---------------------------------	---------------

To be reviewed by: (officer name)	Oliver Woodhams
--	-----------------

Review date:	Following publication of necessary Traffic Regulation Order
---------------------	---

Version	2	Date	14 January 2013
----------------	---	-------------	-----------------

Equality Impact Assessment Issues and Action Table					
Identified issue drawn from your conclusions	Actions needed – can you mitigate the impacts? If you can how will you mitigate the impacts?	Who is responsible for the actions?	When will the action be completed?	How will it be monitored?	What is the expected outcome from the action?
Age					
As permit relates to an ability to drive, only a very small number of residents below the age of 18 are likely to be affected.	None	n/a	n/a	Not monitored as application for a permit is not reliant upon age.	n/a
Disability					
Not affected as holders of blue badge will receive a first permit without charge	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Gender Reassignment					
Not affected.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Marriage and Civil Partnership					
Not affected.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Pregnancy and Maternity					
Not affected.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Race (including ethnicity or national origin, colour, nationality and Gypsies and Travellers)					
Not affected.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Religion and Belief					
Not affected.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Sex					
Not affected.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Sexual Orientation					
Not affected.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other (including caring responsibilities, rurality, low income, Military Status etc)					
People on low incomes may be affected by these proposals, however impact is low. The phased introduction allows those on low incomes to take mitigating actions to ensure charges remain affordable. The proposals will only affect urban areas where car ownership is less essential for access to services and work, and the cost of permits is a small proportion of the overall costs of car ownership.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Health and Safety, Sustainability, Community Safety Impact Assessment Issues and Action Table					
Areas of increased risk drawn from your conclusions	Actions needed – can you mitigate the impacts/risk? If you can how will you mitigate the impacts?	Who is responsible for the actions?	When will the action be completed?	How will it be monitored?	What is the expected outcome from the action?
Health and Safety Issues and Action Table					
None					
Sustainability Issues and Action Table					
None					
Community Safety Issues and Action Table					
None					
Privacy Issues and Action Table					
None					

2014/15 to 2017/18 MTFP Proposal Document

FP Ref: 56

Proposal Name:	Parking Dispensations/Suspensions								
Service:	Parking Services								
Lead Officer:	Oliver Woodhams & Steve Deakin								
Stakeholders and Partners:	<p>This proposal will primarily affect businesses with a need to park vehicles in contravention of parking controls – for example, building firms carrying out work on properties within residents parking zones.</p> <p>As charges for dispensations/suspensions are not currently within the Relevant Traffic Regulation Order it will be necessary for a new or amending order to be drafted. This will require statutory consultation. Informal consultation has been undertaken with business representatives who are likely to be affected.</p> <p>Details of the consultation results are shown below in Appendix 1.</p>								
Proposal Recommended:	<p>Introduce a charge for parking dispensations/suspensions to cover the costs of providing this service.</p> <p>Proposed charges:</p> <table style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>Daily Dispensation/Suspension</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Weekly Dispensation/Suspension</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Monthly Dispensation/Suspension</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Administration Charge (per application)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£10</td> </tr> </table> <p>Currently around 300 dispensations/suspension requests to park in contravention of current controls are issued each month, for no charge. This service is provided by our parking contractor who makes a charge to the County Council for the work they undertake.</p> <p>Charges will be introduced alongside a full policy covering eligibility, method of application and various related sundry permit schemes (e.g. carers (healthcare) permits, landlords permits) – consultation on this policy will be carried out alongside the informal consultation on proposed charges, however the final policy will be subject to a separate decision.</p> <p>Charges will be reviewed every 3 years (or more frequently as required) to ensure costs are in line with revenue.</p>	Daily Dispensation/Suspension	£10	Weekly Dispensation/Suspension	£30	Monthly Dispensation/Suspension	£100	Administration Charge (per application)	£10
Daily Dispensation/Suspension	£10								
Weekly Dispensation/Suspension	£30								
Monthly Dispensation/Suspension	£100								
Administration Charge (per application)	£10								
Assumptions:	It is assumed that the current numbers of dispensations issued will reduce once a charge is introduced. A reduction of 40% has been modelled and this will be kept under review.								

Options Considered:	A number of charging variations have been considered and the proposed charges above have been reviewed in the light of consultation with affected businesses and discussion with a Cross Party Parking Working Group of members.
Responsibilities	<p>Parking Services Manager to arrange amending Traffic Regulation Order and liaise with Parking Contractor to implement new pricing structure.</p> <p>Strategic Manager – Traded Services (in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport) to review the level of charges to ensure charges are in line with costs.</p>

Impact:	Strategic Impact	Continuation of Civil Parking Enforcement without financial support and achievement of linked County Plan and Business Plan objectives for controlling congestion to promote economic growth.
	Service Impact External Users	Service provision to users of the dispensation service will be unaffected (apart from cost of service).
	Service Impact Internal Users	None. Day to day administration of service is outsourced.
	Impact Assessment Key Impacts:	No impacts on protected characteristics identified.
	Other Implications as necessary	Any other implications identified during statutory TRO consultation will be highlighted to decision makers via a revised proposal document.

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	Requirement to publish new Traffic Regulation Order within local press and locations affected. This will enable anybody to object. All objections must be considered with objectors advised of the reason why we are have proceeded despite the objection. Full cost recovery basis for proposed charges ensures we are compliant with Traffic Management Act legislation. Low Risk.
	Dependencies	None.
	Constraints	None.
	Capacity	No capacity issues. Administration of dispensation scheme is outsourced. Parking contractor has resource available to administrate charging arrangements.

Financial Implications:		2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Net Revenue:	On-going Savings	(£35,000)	0	0	0
	One-Off Savings				
	On-going Pressures				
	One-Off Pressures				
Capital:	Capital Costs				
	Capital Income				
	Capital Receipts				
Impact of Delay:	Revenue Impact				
	Capital Impact				

Staffing Implications:		2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Revenue	FTEs				
Capital	FTEs				
Redundancy Implications	FTE – Voluntary				
	FTE – Compulsory				

Appendix 1: Summary of Consultation results

Background

As part of the review of charges for parking dispensations and suspensions consultation has been undertaken across the County.

All residents who currently hold either an annual resident permit for their vehicle or have purchased resident visitor permits were invited to complete the consultation along with business groups who maybe affected by the introduction of these charges.

The consultation available on the Council's website ran for the period 5th December 2013 to 10th January 2014.

Paper copies of the questionnaire were available for those participants who requested these.

Questionnaire

Prior to completing the questionnaire respondents were encouraged to read a supporting document. This provided background information to the proposals.

A covering letter inviting parties to complete the consultation was sent to the following groups:

- 2,280 resident permit holders
- 123 residents who have purchased scratch cards only
- Compass Disability for distribution to their contact list and Facebook page
- Somerset Association of Local Councils
- District Councils
- Somerset County Council's businesses e alert
- Companies employing Carer's in Somerset
- Somerset Chamber of Commerce
- Yeovil Chamber of Commerce
- Bridgwater Chamber of Commerce
- Federation of Small businesses
- Federation of Master Builders
- National Federation of Builders
- National Landlords Association
- Landlords for Landlords
- Taunton Town Centre Company

Summary of consultation responses relating to parking dispensation and suspension charges

a. Category	Number of Responses	% of Responses
Resident	402	95%
Business	7	2%
Other	14	3%
Total	423	100%

b. To what extent should parking be included within the Councils financial planning?

To a large extent	49	12%
To some extent	133	32%
To a little extent	95	23%
Not at all	143	34%

c. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the approach that those who cause parking pressures should cover our costs

Strongly agree	115	28%
Slightly agree	110	27%
Neither agree or disagree	71	17%
Slightly disagree	42	10%
Strongly disagree	72	18%

d. What do you think about the proposed costs for dispensations and suspensions

Much too high	129	33%
A little too high	94	24%
About right	140	35%
A little too low	14	4%
Much too low	19	5%

Comment Themes

No specific comments have been identified regarding the dispensation and suspension charges. The comments provide a general view that, as residents have to pay for their permit "others" should pay also pay to park.

Impact Assessment Form and Action Table			
(Expand the boxes as appropriate, please see guidance to assist with completion)			
Why are you completing the Impact Assessment?			
Proposed New Policy or Service	Change to Policy or Service	MTFP or Paper	Service Review or SCC Change Programme Service Review
Existing service	Increase of existing charge	✓	
Title are you completing the Impact Assessment on (which policy, service, MTFP reference, cluster etc)?		Introduction of charges for parking dispensations MTFP Ref 56	
Risk Rating			
Section 1 – Description of what is being impact assessed			
A proposal to introduce charges for parking dispensations. Parking dispensations are given to businesses with a legitimate need to park in contravention of a parking restriction (e.g. building firms carrying out work on a property in a resident's parking zone).			
Section 2A – People or communities that are targeted or could be affected (for Equalities - taking particular note of the Protected Characteristic listed in action table)			
Businesses, rather than people or communities, are affected by this proposal. There may be a secondary impact on residents who live in a controlled parking area where businesses pass on the cost of a dispensation permit to the customer.			
Section 2B – People who are delivering the policy or service			
This proposal will have no direct impact on people delivering the service. There may be some transitional impacts on workload and work environment if significant objections are raised with staff in a forceful manner; however this is considered to be unlikely and low impact in a service which is used to dealing with disgruntled customers.			
Implications of MTFP 2012/13 for staff in relation to Equality and Diversity will be dealt with corporately by the HR Policy Manager in association with the HR Group Managers.			
Section 3 – Evidence and data used for the assessment (Attach documents where appropriate)			
Stakeholders will be consulted on the proposals and feedback from the consultation exercise will shape the final proposal and decision.			
Section 4 – Conclusions drawn about the impact of the proposed change or new service/policy (Please use prompt sheet for help with what to consider):			
Key issues to be fed into relevant Action Table			
Equality			
No impact. Introduction of charge will not affect any protected characteristic group over another.			

Health and Safety
Positive impact. Demand for dispensations is likely to drop following the introduction of a charge as businesses opt to park in safer locations.
Sustainability
Positive impact. Affected businesses are likely to rationalise vehicle usage.
Community Safety
Any potential increase in anti-social behaviour caused by neighbourhood disputes if the driver of the vehicle refuses to purchase a dispensation will be reduced. Civil Parking Enforcement provides for a quick and efficient financial penalty. These tend to discourage drivers and encourage compliance. Liasion with the police will also be undertaken if necessary.
Privacy
New additional personal data relating to applications for dispensations will be collected and held. The data will be similar to that currently held which is held securely on behalf of the Council. The data remains the property of the Council at all times. This new data will be held in accordance with required legislation and policies.
Section 5 – After consideration please state your final recommendations based on the findings from the impact assessment. Also include any examples of good practice and positive steps taken.
No changes to proposals recommended. Impact is negligible.
Section 6 - How will the assessment, consultation and outcomes be published and communicated? E.g. reflected in final strategy, published. What steps are in place to review the Impact Assessment
Consultation to discussed at cross party parking working group. Outcome of informal consultation to be published on the Council website. The assessment and any identified impacts (following consultation) will be given due consideration within them decision making process for the Medium Term Financial Plan and published with papers for Scrutiny and Cabinet. The service will consider the feedback from the consultation when implementing and changes that are agreed as part of the Medioum Term Financial Plan.
General Comments –
<p>The assessment has considered where appropriate potential impacts on the following sustainability issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of energy, water, minerals and materials • Waste generation / sustainable waste management • Pollution to air, land and water • Factors that contribute to Climate Change • Protection of and access to the natural environment • Travel choices that do not rely on the car • A strong, diverse and sustainable local economy • Meet local needs locally • Provision of appropriate and sustainable housing <p>Other sustainability impacts such as health, safety and equality are considered within other areas of the overall impact assessment.</p>

Completed by:	Steve Deakin, Parking Services Manager		
Date	22 nd November 2013		
Signed off by:	Paula Hewitt and Michele Cusack		
Date	16/1/2014		
Compliance sign off Date	December 2013		
To be reviewed by: (officer name)	Oliver Woodhams		
Review date:	Following publication of necessary Traffic Regulation Order		
Version	2	Date	14 th January 2014

Equality Impact Assessment Issues and Action Table					
Identified issue drawn from your conclusions	Actions needed – can you mitigate the impacts? If you can how will you mitigate the impacts?	Who is responsible for the actions?	When will the action be completed?	How will it be monitored?	What is the expected outcome from the action?
Age					
No issue identified.	None	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Disability					
No issue identified. Carers of people with Disabilities will be eligible to partake in a separate scheme for resident's parking areas.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Gender Reassignment					
No issue identified.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Marriage and Civil Partnership					
No issue identified.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Pregnancy and Maternity					
No issue identified. Health visitors / Midwives visiting new parents will be eligible to partake in a separate scheme for resident's parking areas.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Race (including ethnicity or national origin, colour, nationality and Gypsies and Travellers)					
No issue identified.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Religion and Belief					
No issue identified.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Sex					
No issue identified.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Sexual Orientation					
No issue identified.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other (including caring responsibilities, rurality, low income, Military Status etc)					
People on low incomes may be affected by these proposals, however impact is considered to be negligible – any charges passed on by businesses will be a very small proportion of the cost of the overall service provided by (for example) a building firm. Separate arrangements will exist for businesses providing care services to households within resident's parking schemes.	None.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Health and Safety, Sustainability, Community Safety Impact Assessment Issues and Action Table					
Areas of increased risk drawn from your conclusions	Actions needed – can you mitigate the impacts/risk? If you can how will you mitigate the impacts?	Who is responsible for the actions?	When will the action be completed?	How will it be monitored?	What is the expected outcome from the action?
Health and Safety Issues and Action Table					
None					
Sustainability Issues and Action Table					
None					
Community Safety Issues and Action Table					
None					
Privacy Issues and Action Table					
None					