

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

CABINET

2ND JULY 2008

CONCESSIONARY PARKING FOR OVER 60s

Responsible Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Street Scene and Community Safety Portfolio Holder for Legal and HR
Responsible Head of Service	Head of Street Scene and Community
Non-Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report relates to a scrutiny request received from a member of the public on concessionary parking for over 60s.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet refers this matter to the Performance Management Board requesting Members of that Board to consider an officer report on concessionary parking for the over 60s once six months worth of the necessary data is available.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 An online scrutiny form was completed by Mr. Bateman, a member of the public and a representative from the Older People's Forum, on 20th March 2008 which provided the following information:

"Sir, We the members of the Older People's Forum would welcome a proper evaluation to be made of the 'savings' to be made by removing the 30 concession.

To count the cars displaying a permit on one day on one car park to estimate potential savings of 90/120K is quite frankly a nonsense.

Charles Bateman"

- 3.2 Mr. Bateman asked for the opportunity to expand on the online form he had completed and attached as **Appendix 1** is his letter and enclosures dated 7th April 2008.
- 3.3 The Scrutiny Steering Board considered the scrutiny request from Mr. Bateman at its meeting on 29th April 2008. Some Members of the

Board believed that due to the lack of reliable data available to carry out an in-depth scrutiny at the present time, an officer report should be requested when six months worth of data (March – August 2008) had been compiled to enable the Scrutiny Steering Board to consider the matter properly.

- 3.4 The Scrutiny Steering Board agreed to include this issue on its work programme and following the meeting Mr. Bateman sent the email below to Members of the Board on 1st May 2008:

“Dear Councillor,

Thank you for your understanding of our concerns. We will monitor car park revenue monthly and compare it to the revenue for the same month in the previous year. We will also monitor the number of £200 and £300 permits sold to persons over the age of 60. We believe that for this data to have any significance the data should be collected for at least 6 months. If, as we expect, increased revenue is less than that forecast, we will request another hearing by the scrutiny board. The car park income for March 2007 was £112k and for March 2008 was £103k, over one month this is not significant. However, it may be a reflection of resistance to increased charges.

Yours faithfully,
Charles Bateman.”

- 3.5 Due to the change in membership of the Scrutiny Steering Board following Annual Council, the Scrutiny Steering Board reconsidered all items on its work programme at its last meeting held on 22nd May 2008, including concessionary parking for the over 60s.
- 3.6 At that meeting, the Scrutiny Steering Board agreed that the Performance Management Board would be the appropriate Board to look at this particular issue and therefore it was recommended that this matter should be referred to the Performance Management Board by the Cabinet, hence this report.
- 3.7 It should be noted that Mr. Bateman is being kept up to date on the progress of this matter.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no financial implications directly relating to this report.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no legal implications directly relating to this report.

6. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES

- 6.1 This report does not directly relate to the Council’s Objectives.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT

7.1 There are no risk management issues directly relating to this report.

8. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS

8.1 There are no customer implications directly relating to this report. However, it should be pointed out that this issue has been raised by a local resident and customer of the Council and therefore Members are urged to give careful consideration to this request.

9. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are no implications directly relating to this report for the Council's Equalities and Diversity Policies. However, if this issue was considered further by the Performance Management Board, Members would need to consider such implications.

10. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are no Value for Money implications directly relating to this report.

11. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Procurement Issues – None.
Personnel Implications – None.
Governance/Performance Management – None
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime and Disorder Act 1998 – None
Policy – None
Environmental – None

12. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Portfolio Holders	Yes
Chief Executive	Yes
Executive Director - Partnerships and Projects	Yes
Executive Director - Services	Yes

Assistant Chief Executive	Yes
Head of Service	Yes
Head of Financial Services	No
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	Yes
Head of Organisational Development & HR	No
Corporate Procurement Team	No

13. WARDS AFFECTED

All Wards

14. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Letter and three enclosures from Mr. C. Bateman, representing the Older People’s Forum.

Enclosure 1 – Report to Cabinet on 9th January 2008 on Concessions Policy for Users of Council Services.

Enclosure 2 – Letter to Mr. Bateman dated 31st January 2008 from the Council’s Chief Executive

Enclosure 3 – Concessionary Fares Savings Calculations compiled by the Council’s Transport and Engineering Officer following a Freedom of Information Request in January 2008 from Mr. Bateman.

15. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

CONTACT OFFICER

Name: Della McCarthy, Committee Services Officer

E Mail: d.mccarthy@bromsgrove.gov.uk

Tel: (01527) 881407

75 Old Birmingham Road
Bromsgrove
B60 1DF

7th April 2008

Dear Ms. McCarthy

Scrutiny Request

The Older People's Forum request that the Steering Board carry out a scrutiny on the following justifications for removing the concessionary parking for the over 60's.

1. Concessions Policy for users of Council Services (Cabinet 9th Jan. 2008)
 - a. Page 138 – Para. 5.1
 - b. Page 136 – Para. 3.6
2. Letter from Kevin Dicks dated 31st Jan. 2008 (copy attached)
3. Concessionary fares savings calculations document.

We wish to make it clear that the request for scrutiny to be carried out is on the 'justifications' and not policy itself.

If the Board wish to put any questions to us we will be pleased to answer them, either written or verbal.

Yours sincerely,

(Original Signed)

Charles Bateman (Older People's Forum)

Copy to - Carole Tipping (Secretary OPF)

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**CABINET****9TH JANUARY 2008****CONCESSIONS POLICY FOR USERS OF COUNCIL SERVICES**

Responsible Portfolio Holder	Margaret Sherrey
Responsible Head of Service	Michael Bell / Jayne Pickering / John Godwin

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Council currently provide a reduction in cost for certain services for residents in particular circumstances. This report is considering the application of a standard concession to all services.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That members consider option 3 for future application of concessions across relevant services as being the most equitable.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Council currently provide a range of discounted services for residents who fall into certain users groups. This primarily refers to the over 60's, Students, people on Income Support or Job Seekers Allowance, the disabled and carers of disabled people.
- 3.2 However different departments apply differing criteria to discounting of services and apply them to different user groups, thus producing an inconsistent approach.
- 3.3 At its meeting in November 2006 Cabinet agreed, in relation to the provision of a free Pest Control Service that the definition of vulnerable was 'where the main householder is in receipt of one of the following, Income Support, Housing Benefit or Council Tax benefit.'
- 3.4 It further agreed that this definition is used in the future as a Council definition for determining any service concession.
- 3.5 Cabinet also agreed that any concession be considered on a service by service basis until such time as a comprehensive concessions policy is developed.

3.6 The following are some of the concessions currently provided by this Council:

- Parking Passes for residents over the age of 60 at a discount of approximately 95%
- An extra hours parking for blue disabled badge holders.
- A free pest control service for 'vulnerable' people as defined above.
- A discount of 50% for Dolphin Centre Services for Students, those on Income Support or Job Seekers Allowance and the over 60's. Disabled users are provided with free access to Dolphin Centres services for off peak usage.

	Parking	Dolphin Centre	Rodent Control
Vulnerable People	0%	50%	100%
Students	0%	50%	0%
Disabled	Extra time allowed	100%	0%
Over 60's	95%	50%	0%

3.7 This list demonstrates the inconsistency between different services, but also shows that the same groups are being provided with concessions but to a different degree. However it also demonstrates that it will be difficult to standardize concessions across all services.

3.8 It is therefore proposed that concessions continue to be delivered along departmental lines but with some modification to the reductions given in order to make them more equitable.

3.9 The two areas that are most obviously inconsistent are the over 60's group and the disabled group and a number of options for resolution of this inconsistency exist.

3.10 Changes also need to take into account that the fact that 'objective justification' can be a reason to apply a specific concession in particular circumstances.

Option 1

	Parking	Dolphin Centre	Rodent Control
Vulnerable People	0%	50%	100%
Students	0%	50%	0%
Disabled	0%	50%	0%
Over 60's	0%	50%	0%

In this option the concession for parking for those over 60 is removed as is the extra time allowance for disabled parkers. This provides a completely equitable system across all services except for pest control for the vulnerable. However there is 'objective justification' for this concession

Option 2

	Parking	Dolphin Centre	Rodent Control
Vulnerable People	97%	50%	100%
Students	0%	50%	0%
Disabled	Extra time allowed	50%	0%
Over 60's	0%	50%	0%

In this option the concession for parking for those over 60 is removed, but extra time for disabled parkers is retained, disabled users of the Dolphin centre have the concession brought in line with others within the target group by a reduction in concession of 50% and 'vulnerable people' have a concession for parking based on the existing concession for rodent control minus an administration fee. There is 'objective justification' for each of these changes and for retaining the pest control discount for the vulnerable group.

Option 3

	Parking	Dolphin Centre	Rodent Control
Vulnerable People	0%	50%	100%
Students	0%	50%	0%
Disabled	Extra time allowed	100%	0%
Over 60's	0%	50%	0%

In this option the concession for parking for those over 60 is removed, but extra time for disabled parkers is retained and the 100% discount for disabled users at the Dolphin centre retained. There is again 'objective justification' for retaining the pest control discount and the current discount for disabled users at the Dolphin Centre..

4. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Option 1: Increased income of £93,000 in year 1. There is likely to be an additional income from removing the extra time concession for disabled users of car parks but this is difficult to quantify. Higher increases in future years once existing passes have run out.

Option 2: Increased income of £90,000 in year 1 for parking however there is likely to be an offset of this income because of the granting of an additional concession to vulnerable people. This has the potential to be in excess of £90,000. It is difficult to predict the impact on Dolphin centre usage and income increases but this is likely to be small because the concession applies to off peak services.

Option 3: Increased income of £90,000 in year 1 for parking. Higher increase in future years similar to Option 2. No change to usage of the Dolphin Centre

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There is currently a Discrimination Law review which is likely to result in a single Equalities Act. This would mean that current legislation under age discrimination which currently only applies to employment and training will be extended to the provision of goods, facilities and services. Consequently concessions based on age could be classed as unlawful discrimination under the new legislation.

6. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES

6.1 Improvement in the equality of access to services would support the Councils aim of Customer First and Equality.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT

7.1 The main risks associated with the details included in this report are:

- Resistance from user groups affected by the changes
- Negative press coverage to changes

7.2 These risks are being managed as follows:

- Resistance from user groups affected by the changes

Risk Register:
Key Objective Ref No:
Key Objective

- Negative press coverage to changes

Risk Register:
Key Objective Ref No:
Key Objective:

7.3 Currently the risk identified in the bullet point in 7.1 and 7.2 are not addressed by any risk register and will be added to the Street Scene and Waste Management risk register as follows:

Ensure sufficient advanced warning through press releases.
Regular press releases in period approaching change.

8. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 Press releases and information bulletins will be prepared in advance of the change. Detailed discussion will be had with CSC to update Resource Level Agreement. Stock responses will be prepared for staff answering queries.

9. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 This report aims to provide consistent access to services for users, with concessions based on equality and diversity. It uses the principle of 'objective justification' for varying the charges for some services. However members need to be aware that when charges were introduced for disabled users of car parks there was considerable resistance to this change. This resulted in additional time being granted to disabled users when purchasing a parking ticket. There is 'objective justification' for doing this hence the retention of this extra concession within the recommendation.

10. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Please include the following table and spell out any particular implications in the relevant box. If there are no implications under a particular heading, please state 'None':-

Procurement Issues:	None
Personnel Implications:	None
Governance/Performance Management:	None
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime and Disorder Act 1998:	None
Policy:	
Environmental:	None

11. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Please include the following table and indicate 'Yes' or 'No' as appropriate. Delete the words in italics.

Portfolio Holder	Yes
Chief Executive	Yes
Corporate Director (Services)	Yes

Assistant Chief Executive	
Head of Service	Yes
Head of Financial Services	Yes
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	Yes
Head of Organisational Development & HR	No
Corporate Procurement Team	No

12. **APPENDICES**

None

13. **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Executive Cabinet Report, Review of Pest Control Services: Update
November 2006

CONTACT OFFICER

Name: Michael Bell
E Mail: m.bell@bromsgrove.gov.uk
Tel: (01527) 881703

Our Ref:
 Please ask for: Michael Bell
 Telephone: 01527 881703
 e-mail: m.bell@bromsgrove.gov.uk



Bromsgrove
 District Council

www.bromsgrove.gov.uk

Mr C Bateman

Street Scene and Waste Management

The Council House, Burcot Lane, Bromsgrove,
 Worcestershire B60 1AA.

Main Switchboard: (01527) 873232

Textphone: (01527) 881291

Fax: (01527) 574127

DX: 17279 Bromsgrove

e-mail: busdepotsupport@bromsgrove.gov.uk

31st January 2008

Dear Mr Bateman

Concessionary Parking Queries

Further to your most recent letter concerning removal of the concessionary parking passes I can answer your queries as follows.

The administrative cost for the existing permits is £30. This covers the physical costs of the permit, staff time involved in issuing and monitoring the permits by the Parking Manager.

The car parks are monitored on a regular basis however a specific survey was carried out by the Parking Manager on the 28th June 2007 between 9 am and 3 pm on Recreation Road South to confirm anecdotal information. Seven surveys were carried out throughout the day.

During the survey 354 vehicles were displaying a concessionary pass and 846 were not displaying any form of pass, we did not count the number of vacant spaces because this is changing too frequently to be of any statistical value.

The revenue is estimated on the expected number of ticket sales based on historical data from previous and current years.

The estimates of resistance to any change are based on the experience of the managers involved and data from previous years ticket sales. We use trends from existing data to predict the sales but this does vary we therefore build in a degree of flexibility with these figures.

I hope this provides the information you require, however I do challenge your initial comment that predicted savings are 'speculative'. We use the experience of long serving managers to arrive at our estimates taking into account existing ticket sales and, build in a degree of resistance based again on experience. I am sure you will be able to arrive at a different conclusion if you simply use statistics to produce an alternative view, but I would be very skeptical about an exercise that does not include the experience of working in the parking environment and the many variables that we try to take into account with our calculations.

Yours Sincerely

Kevin Dicks
 Chief Executive



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



BUILDING PRIDE

Concessionary fares savings calculations

These figures are approximations only and should be viewed in that context. They were also calculated some months ago.

According to our latest survey work, the number of permits in use during the day on each car park ranges from 19% to 31%.

Therefore the total revenue less VAT for the car park is only 81% or 69% of the total we expect to achieve (£1080000).

Therefore the total which would be achieved if every permit holder paid for their parking would range from £1333333 to £1565000.

This represents a range of £253k to £485k in lost revenue as a result of issuing the permits.

Because permits have a twelve month lifespan, only half of the additional income will be achieved during the first 12 months. Therefore the savings would be in the range from £127k to £243k.

Taking the worst case figure we can factor in some resistance by ex-permit holders to having to pay charges, so we can times £127k by 0.8 which gives £102.

However, it is likely that this may be too high which is why we put in a figure of £90k.

In year two, the full £127k will be achieved. Again, there is likely to be some resistance by ex-permit holders having to pay charges, but not so many. Therefore we can times £127k by 0.9 which gives £114k. Rounding this up gives £120k for year 2.