

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

CABINET

3rd November 2010

CAR PARKING – PAY ON FOOT

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Michael Webb
Relevant Head of Service	Guy Revans
Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- 1.1 This report proposes the re-introduction of the incremented tariff on the Council pay on foot car parks.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

That Cabinet recommend to Full Council that:

- 2.1 That the incremented tariff is reintroduced as soon as possible.**
- 2.2 That the anticipated losses from the initial introduction and the proposed reintroduction of the incremented tariff are met from balances for 2010/2011.**

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Council has converted two car parks to the pay on foot system. During the introduction of this system a new type of tariff was trialled which broke the hourly fee into 10 minute segments and allowed customers to pay to the nearest available fee. This tariff was discontinued due to the lower than anticipated revenue generated by the scheme.
- 3.2 The use of incremented tariffs is unusual, and is seen as customer friendly. A driver who is one minute over an hourly fee of 70p would normally be required to pay £1.40. Using the incremented tariff the fee would be 90p.
- 3.3 Using the incremented tariff would allow the Council to publicise the fact that the Council treats its parking customers differently by using a customer friendly system with a customer friendly tariff. It should be noted that officers are not aware of any other operator using such a tariff.

4. KEY ISSUES

- 4.1 The incremental tariff has shown that there is a significant detriment to the Council finances and has not generated the income as initially anticipated. To introduce the original incremental tariff would result in a further reduction

to income generated in a period when revenue from car parking is substantially below the target set for 2010/11.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The incremented tariff was introduced when the new system went live on March 2010. This tariff initially cost up to £3k per week in lost revenue to the service.
- 5.2 The tariff operated for a number of weeks before it was removed. This has allowed officers to predict the effects of reintroducing the incremented tariff. Based on the current spend and revenue patterns, including the reintroduction of the incremented tariffs, the Council will be faced with a further £60k shortfall in income in addition to the £180k predicted on the car parking service.
- 5.3 This shortfall is primarily composed of the failure to attain the expected increase in revenue from pay on foot, the loss from the incremented tariff, and the increase in VAT from 2011.
- 5.4 It is proposed that the £60k shortfall to fund the incremental tariff is met from balances as officers are unable to identify other areas of savings that could meet this shortfall.
- 5.5 Officers will prepare options for 2011/2012 and report back to Members as part of the medium term financial plan review.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The provision of the incremented tariff is discretionary and does not require any changes to the parking Order to implement.

7. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 None.

8. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES

- 8.1 The town centre is one of the Council objectives. The provision of affordable, safe, and well maintained car parking supports the economy in the town centre.

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

CABINET

3rd November 2010

9. RISK MANAGEMENT INCLUDING HEALTH & SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS

9.1 None.

10. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The customers will pay less when using the Council pay on foot car parks. Although not directly comparable, this does reflect the incremented tariffs for overpayments on pay and display car parks.

11. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

11.1 None.

12. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS, PROCUREMENT AND ASSET MANAGEMENT

12.1 None.

13. CLIMATE CHANGE, CARBON IMPLICATIONS AND BIODIVERSITY

13.1 None.

14. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

14.1 None.

15. GOVERNANCE/PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

15.1 None.

16. COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS INCLUDING SECTION 17 OF CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998

16.1 This will reduce levels of aggression between Council staff and customers.

17. HEALTH INEQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

17.1 None.

18. LESSONS LEARNT

18.1 None.

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

CABINET

3rd November 2010

19. COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

19.1 During the six month review of the new system, there were 36 comments out of 402 questionnaires stating that the removal of the tariffs was unfair and that they should be reintroduced. This was the second most popular comment made with long queues at the paystations being the most common.

20. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Portfolio Holder	Yes
Chief Executive	Yes
Executive Director (S151 Officer)	Yes
Executive Director – Leisure, Cultural, Environmental and Community Services	Yes
Executive Director – Planning & Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services	Yes
Director of Policy, Performance and Partnerships	Yes
Head of Service	Yes
Head of Resources	Yes
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	Yes
Corporate Procurement Team	Yes

21. WARDS AFFECTED

All.

22. APPENDICES

None.

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

CABINET

3rd November 2010

23. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

24. KEY

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Steve Martin
E Mail: steve.martin@bromsgrove.gov.uk
Tel: 01527 881493