Overview of Responses and Recommendations

Budget Proposals 16/17 Phase Two: Car Parks		Mark Edwards – Head of Highways & Transport	24 March 2016 Version 2 (Executive/Council)	
Proposal:	In addition to the proposed increase in parking charges in Phase One, Phase Two proposed: Parking charges at car parks in Newbury will now apply seven days a week; there will be no separate Sunday charge. The evening / overnight charge at car parks in Newbury will increase from £1.00 to £2.00, seven days a week. An increase in West Berkshire residents parking permit charges from £25 to £30 and £50 to £70 respectively. An increase in visitors parking permits from 50p to £1.00 per day. New parking charges will apply at the following car parks: Pangbourne Station Road Pangbourne River Meadow Thatcham Kingsland Thatcham Station Theale Main Theale West			
Total income 15/16:	£2,925,190	Expected income 16/17:	£3,566,190 (£641,000 or 22% increase)	
Initial expected income 16/17 (incl. Phase One and Two)	£3,566,190 (£641,000 or 22% increase)	Final recommendation to Executive/Council:	To proceed with this proposal	
No. of responses:	In total, 48 responses were received, 46 of which included comments. Of those who responded: • 43 were individuals • Three were groups/organisations • Two were Town/Parish Councils Three responses were from non-users of the service.			
Key issues raised:	Of the 46 responses received, which included comments, 27 related to the proposed price increases at car parks, with nine concerned that shoppers may go elsewhere or be deterred from visiting. 12 responses related to the proposed increases to daily tariffs in Newbury that were the subject of the Phase One consultation and which the council has already resolved to introduce. There were five responses opposed to the Sunday charging proposal, with two concerned that this would affect			

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Summary Report and Verbatim Responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our <u>Consultation Portal</u>.

Overview of Responses and Recommendations

Budget Proposals 16/17 Phase Two: Car Parks		Mark Edwards – Head of Highways & Transport	24 March 2016 Version 2 (Executive/Council)	
	churchgoers. Eight were concerned that the elderly or those on tight budgets would be affected and two opposed the increase in resident/visitor permits. Six responses were in support of the proposals.			
Equality issues:	No issues were raised during the consultation, that weren't already included in the EqIA stage one.			
Suggestions for reducing the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response		
	Don't introduce the parking charge increases.	12 responses related to the proposed increases to daily tariffs in Newbury, that were the subject of the Phase One consultation, and which the council has already resolved to introduce. Unfortunately in these times of economic austerity the council has little option but to increase parking charges. A benchmarking exercise was undertaken in a number of car parks across 28 neighbouring & adjoining and similar social & economic loc authorities. This indicated that WBC offers competitive parking prices in comparison to a large number of them. Out of Newbury charges have been unchanged for 6 years and residents permits & visitor permits have been unchanged for some 13 years.		
	Provide periods of free parking.	The council can't afford to offer periods of free parking. The charges proposed, for up to one hour for car parks outside of Newbury, are only an extra 20p. There are on-street charge options that are very competitive and some that are free of charge.		
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response		
	Increase outer Newbury charges to £1, £1.50, £2, £2.50 and £3 where we are proposing 70p, £1.20, £1.60, £2 and £2.50.	This is an alternative pricing option, but it would be unpopular for the majority of users of car parks outside of Newbury. It is considered that the pricing schedule proposed is the fairer option.		

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Summary Report and Verbatim Responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our <u>Consultation Portal</u>.

Overview of Responses and Recommendations

Budget Proposals 16/17 Phase Two: Car Parks		Mark Edwards – Head of Highways & Transport	24 March 2016 Version 2 (Executive/Council)
	Increase long stay charge to £6 instead of £5.50.	The proposed increase from £5.40 to £5.50 is modest because long stay parkers tend to be employees. It would be possible to increase the charge to £6.00, but this is not recommended. The proposed evening charge of £2.00 lasts from 6pm until 8am the next day. There are not large numbers of cars that remain all night so essentially the proposal is to increase the evening charge from the current £1.00 that has remained unchanged since April 2008. There is therefore little to be gained from trying to separate the evening charge from the overnight charge. We could charge more, but believe we have proposed an appropriate and fair set of parking charges. Unfortunately, in these times of economic austerity the council has little option but to increase parking charges.	
	£1 for evening, £2 for overnight.		
	Charge even more.		
	Keep charges low.		
	Raise the £1.20 charge to £1.50 and round up higher charges to the nearest 50p or £.	This is an alternative pricing option, but it would be unpopular for the majority of users of car parks outside of Newbury car parks. It is considered that the pricing schedule proposed is the fairer option.	
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	No suggestions were received.		
Officer conclusion:	Feedback from the consultation process has not resulted in any issue being raised which would prevent the council from proceeding with the proposal. The feedback has also not generated any viable counter-proposal which would mitigate the proposal.		

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Summary Report and Verbatim Responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our <u>Consultation Portal</u>.