

Parking Tariffs - Draft Business Case

Portfolio:	Communities and Housing
Outcome:	Increase in Parking Revenues
Project SRO:	Mark Glynn
Project Lead:	Adam Forbes

1. Executive Summary

This report proposes five options for increasing Parking revenue.

1. Amending the Town Centre tariff bands.
2. Amending the Town Centre charging period.
3. Harmonising tariffs across all Town Centre Car Parks.
4. Amending the District Centre car park tariff and tariff bands.
5. Extending the District Centre charging regime to car parks beside railway stations that are currently free of charge.

2. Case for Change

The first proposal (3.3a) increases revenues by adjusting the Town Centre tariff bands.

Stockport's Town Centre is growing with the Redrock complex and associated leisure outlets opening late 2017. This will attract new business to the town centre many of whom will travel by car.

This proposal recommends the deletion of the one hour tariff band. This option will remove the fiscal disincentive for staying over one hour by harmonising the cost of one and two hour stays at the existing two hour rate of £1.60

The second proposal (3.3b) increases revenues by adjusting the charging period in the Town Centre.

Town Centre car parks are currently chargeable between the hours of 8am and 6pm. This proposal increases the charging period by 2 hours to enable charges to be levied between the hours of 6am to 6pm.

The third proposal (3.3c) seeks to harmonise charges across all Town Centre council operated car parks.

Armoury, Churchgate, Hopes Carr and Stopford Lower (Sat only) have a cheaper charging regime to the remaining town centre car parks – this proposal intends to bring these car parks into the same charging regime that will be determined by the first two proposals.

The forth proposal (3.3d) affects the District Centres and models the option of adjusting the two hour charge to 50p and removing the one hour tariff band.

Stockport's district centre car parks are an important amenity providing shoppers, businesses and commuters with good quality, convenient parking facilities. There are predominantly two varieties of parking tariffs in Stockport's District Centres. Twenty pence per hour and a high turnover tariff (see 5.1d(2)).

This proposal outlines the case for increasing the two hour rate from 40p to 50p and the deletion of the one hour tariff band – this option will be applicable to all chargeable district centre car parks on all existing tariff types. (Appendix 2 details the affected locations)

The fifth proposal seeks to introduce a consistent charging mechanism at all Council Car Parks near railway stations and used by commuters.

There are several car parks near railway stations that provide free all day car parking to commuters, these are listed in 3.3c below. This is somewhat of an anomaly as many other car parks near stations e.g. Cheadle Hulme, Edgeley are chargeable.

This proposal aims to harmonise the charging regime at all Council operated car parks near stations.

3. Project / Programme Proposal

3.1 Project / Programme Vision

The proposals below seek to introduce a clear and consistent charging regimes across the Districts and Town Centre, increasing parking revenue to support the continued provision of affordable, convenient parking.

3.2 Scope

This report proposes introducing various adjustment in district centres and throughout the Town Centre. These adjustments affect tariffs, banding, charging periods and seek to harmonise approaches across the borough. A Parking Strategy report is assessing parking options in Stockport Town Centre and further options related to Parking in the Town Centre will be brought forward for consideration next year.

There are no staffing implications associated with these proposals.

3.3 Delivery Models

3.3a In the town centre (Merseyway) over 43% of visitors stay for less than 1 hour. This proposal introduces an initial two-hour time band across all town centre car parks whilst deleting the one-hour option. Removing the one-hour option removes the fiscal disincentive for longer stays, increases revenue and maintains the existing pricing with no overall increase in the hourly rate. See table in 3.3c below

3.3b It is proposed to increase the charging period to cover 12 hours between 6am and 6pm. This will have minimal impact on retailers or leisure facilities however it is anticipated to raise revenue from all day parking and those staying overnight.

3.3c Armoury, Churchgate, Hopes Carr and Lower Stopford (Sat only) have a reduced tariff of 50p per hour (NB Stopford is 50p ALL DAY on a Saturday.) with Sundays being free of charge (Armoury is 20p per hour on Sundays). This proposal recommends harmonising these rates with the prevailing town centre tariff.

Town Centre Proposed Changes

Stay Length	Existing Tariff (Mon – Sat)	Existing Tariff at Churchgate, Hopes Carr and Lower Stopford (Mon – Sat)	Proposed tariff (Mon – Sat)
1 hour	80p	50p	N/a
2 hours	£1.60	£1.00	£1.60
3 hours	£2.40	£1.50	£2.40
4 hours	£3.20	£2.00	£3.20

5 hours	£4.00	£2.50	£4.00
6 hours	£4.80	£3.00	£4.80
7 hours	£5.60	£3.50	£5.60
8 hours	£6.40	£4.00	£6.40
9 hours	£7.20	£4.50	£7.20
10 hours	£8.00	£5.00	£8.00
11 Hours	None	None	£8.80
12 hours	None	None	£9.60

Please note: Sunday tariffs and charging periods are unaffected by these proposals

3.3d In the district centres over 50% of visitors stay for one hour and 75% stay for less than two-hours. This proposal introduces an initial two-hour time band to simplify the tariff structure and remove the perceived fiscal barrier for visitors increasing their stay length. For example a two-hour stay would cost the same as a one-hour stay, this report proposes a two-hour stay is set at 50p – a 25% increase on the existing two-hour cost for all district centre car parks.

3.3e The car parks listed below are provided free of charge near railway stations. These are used by commuters, visitors and shoppers.

Area	Site	Spaces
Heald Green	Heald Green Pub	38
Bramhall	Bramley Close	85
Marple Bridge	Brabyns Brow Lower	71
Marple Bridge	Brabyns Brow Upper	90
Romiley	Guywood Lane (Part)	60

Customers may be more price sensitive at these locations and opt to relocate to nearby residential streets or alternative station car parks which are provided free of charge by TfGM however chargeable parking is well used at other locations near station in the borough notably Cheadle Hulme & Edgeley hence this risk is undefined.

Costs of around £0.049m would be incurred installing Pay & Display machines, updating signage and the required legal work to enable charges to be imposed at the above locations. It should also be noted that Brabyns Brow Upper (Middlers) car park is currently surfaced with compacted stone and may require additional capital expenditure should resurfacing be considered necessary.

4. Objectives and Benefits

As part of the saving proposals the primary objective of this business case is to increase parking revenues by £0.5m. It is proposed to achieve this by harmonising tariff structures to creating a clear and fair approach across the borough, removing the one hour charging option which potentially deters customers from staying longer in our town and district centres.

5. Initial Investment Return/Income Generation Analysis

5.1a Town Centre Tariff Band Amendment

Stay length (Hours)	Tariff (£)	Current Revenue* (£)	Proposed Tariff Structure (£)	Forecast Revenue (£)
1	0.80	£76,000	N/a	
2	1.60	£181,000	1.60	£333,000
3+	No change	No change	No change	No Change
		£257,000		£333,000

*Pay and Display Car Park Data from August 2017 i.e. not including Merseyway

NCP have advised that by deleting the 1 hour time band revenue from Merseyway Car Park will increase by £2,200 per month c £26kpa

$$(330,000 - 257,000) + 26,000 = £102,000 \text{ therefore Forecast increase in revenue} = \text{£102,000}$$

5.1b Amending the Town Centre charging period to 6am to 6pm

As the proposed additional charging period is currently free to park we have no available ticket data to analyse.

It is estimated that 30 cars per day paying £1.60 for this two hour period will accrue an additional £15,000 per annum.

Forecast increase in revenue = £15,000

5.1c Harmonising Town Centre Tariffs

Stay length (Hours)	Tariff (£)	Current Revenue (£) *	Proposed Tariff Structure (£)	Forecast Revenue (£)
1	0.50	£8000	N/a	
2	1.00	£19000	1.60	£56,000
3+	No change	No change	No change	No Change
		£27,000		£56,000

*Extrapolated from Armoury and Churchgate September 2017 data only. Hopes Carr and Lower Stopford data is unavailable, an estimate of £3000 has been added to the figure below account for Hopes Carr and Lower Stopford. It should be noted that Hopes Carr is earmarked for Housing in the next financial year and will cease to be a car park.

Forecast Increase in Revenue = £32,000

5.1d District Centre Tariff Analysis

Stay length (Hours)	20p per hour tariff (£)	Current Revenue *	Proposed tariff structure (£)	Forecast Revenue
1	0.20	£178,673	N/a	£0

2	0.40	£75,593	0.50	£541, 172
3	0.60	£22,441	0.60	£22,441
4	0.80	£5,518	0.80	£5,518
5	1.00	£23,712	1.00	£23,712
6	1.20	£5,466	1.20	£5,466
7	1.40	£3,460	1.40	£3,460
8	1.60	£2,962	1.60	£2,962
9	1.80	£5,938	1.80	£5,938
10	2.00	£10,237	2.00	£10,237
		£334,000		£620,906

5.1d(2) High Turnover Tariff Analysis

Stay length (Hours)	Tariff (£)	Current Generation*	Proposed tariff structure (£)	Forecast Revenue Generation
1	0.20	£25,382	N/a	-
2	0.40	£183,753	0.50	£293,146
3	1.50	£13,444	1.50	£13,444
4+	5.00	£3,420	5.00	£3,420
		£226,000		£310,010

*Extrapolated from August 2017 data

Current Revenue : 334,000+226,000 = £560,000
Forecast Revenue: 621,000+310,000 = £931,000
Forecast Increase in Revenue 931,000-560,000 = £371,000

5.1e Introducing parking charges to all Car Parks near railway stations

Area	Site(s)	Chargeable Spaces	Hours per Annum*	Potential revenue assuming tariff proposed in 5.1d is in effect. (50p for two hours)
Bramhall	Bramley Close Car Park	85	198900	£74,000
Heald Green	Area adjoining Premier Inn Car park	35	65520	£24,000
Marple Bridge	Brabyns Brow Lower	71	166140	£61,000
	Brabyns Brow Upper	90	210600	£77,000
Romiley	Guywood Lane	60	140400	£52,000

*Assumes 75% occupancy

Forecast Increase in Parking Revenue: £288,000

5.1f Summary Data

A factor has been applied to the forecast savings to recognise that consumer behaviour is elastic.

Proposal	One off costs (Lines, signs, legal orders, Pay & Display machines etc.) (£)	Forecast Revenue Increase (£)	Adjusted forecast to consider for change in customer behaviour (£)
----------	---	-------------------------------	--

a	2,000	102,000	64,000
b	Included in a above	15,000	9,500
c	Included in a above	32,000	20,000
d	3,000	362,000	226,500
e	44,000	288,000	180,000
	£49,000		£500,000

Consolidated forecast Increase in Parking Revenue: +£500,000

6. Key Timescales

Milestone Description	Date Expected	Output at Milestone
Amend Tariffs inc Legal Notices	Approx. 8 week lead time	Revised Tariff in operation
Install Pay and Display equipment and update signs and lines where necessary	Approx. 12 week lead time	Fees can be levied at new sites

7. Consultation and Engagement

To amend or introduce off street car parking tariffs it is required to advertise the proposed change(s) in advance. This statutory procedure offered residents, businesses and visitors the opportunity to comment on the proposal for consideration by the Council.

Outside of the statutory process the Council canvassed opinion from local business forums, the Town Centre Business Improvement District Board and through the Council's Scrutiny process

The statutory notice detailing these proposals was published in the Stockport Express on the 8TH NOVEMBER 2017 through a full page notice. One official response was received during the statutory consultation period. This objection was from the Friends of Romiley Station and set out concerns that to introduce tariffs at Romiley station would have an adverse effect on local trade, potential to deter public transport use, concerns around increased levels of congestion in the vicinity and comments around the consultation process.

Additional responses and comments were received via other channels. These are summarised below and included in Appendices 3

1 question to committee

24 emailed responses from Romiley residents – These mainly relate to the 2 hour 50p district centre proposal.

3 responses from Town Centre Business Groups – re Town Centre proposal

1 response from a local Councillor re charging at Heald Green station car park

1 response from a local Councillor re charging in Marple Bridge car parks

1 response from Conservative Group – Across all proposals

A 288 name petition received opposing the introduction of charges at Romiley Station car Park

A 36 name petition received from Town Centre businesses regarding proposed changes to Town Centre Tariff structure.

Summary

Generally most comments were opposed to changes in tariffs, with particular concerns regarding:

- Impact on local traders and businesses
- Displacement on to residential streets
- Consultation could have been better publicised

The Cabinet has considered these responses and concerns raised and resolved to;

- Arrange for officers to meet with the groups and individuals who have contacted the council to review detailed proposals and alternatives before implementation, assessing potential alternatives which will generate similar levels of income
- Review tariffs annually to assess income levels, car park usage, and displacement onto residential streets

8. Interdependencies, Constraints and Risk

Risk Description	Risk Owner	Broad Risk Response	H/M/L
Fall in visitor numbers		With higher minimum parking charges there is a risk that visitor numbers will fall. Recent tariff increases in Cheadle and Bramhall have had little noticeable effect on visitor numbers, hence demand is considered relatively inelastic. Nevertheless income forecast have been prudently reduced by a factor to mitigate this risk.	L
Vehicle displacement		Motorists may consider parking on nearby residential streets rather than pay for parking. Should this parking become problematic then additional parking restriction could be considered to eliminate issues. This is considered less of a problem in the Town	M

		Centre as many parking controls already exist to limit problematic parking	
--	--	---	--

APPENDIX 1

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Title:	Date: 13/10/2017
	Stage: Final
	Lead Officer: Mark Glynn

Stage 1: Do you need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)?

None required

Stage 2: What do you know?

Stage 2a: Further Data and Consultation

Stage 3: Results and Measures

Stage 4: Decision Stage

Appendix 2

Car Park	Location	Postcode	Existing Tariff	Total Spaces	Notes
----------	----------	----------	-----------------	--------------	-------

Parking Tariffs – Town Centre •Introduce minimum 2 hour tariff of £1.60 •Harmonise prices of all car parks (All become class A) •Increase hours of charging from 6am to 6pm	Town Centre	Armoury St.	SK3 9DR	Class B	61	
	Town Centre	Banbury St.	SK1 3AX	Class B	10	To be closed and redeveloped 2018
	Town Centre	Churchgate	SK1 2LX	Class B	69	
	Town Centre	Heaton Lane (Multi -Storey)	SK1 1RS	Class A	710	
	Town Centre	Hopes Carr	SK1 1YS	Class B	37	To be closed and redeveloped 2018
	Town Centre	Knightsbridge	SK1 2DW	Class A	22	
	Town Centre	Merseyway	SK1 1PT	Class A	815	
	Town Centre	Newbridge La.	SK1 2ND	Class A	206	
	Town Centre	Redrock (opening Summer 2017)		Class A	340	
	Town Centre	Ritz Cinema	SK1 3AD	Class A	87	
	Town Centre	Stopford House (Lower Level)	SK1 3SH	Class B	138	Saturday Only
		Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff			
	Class A	80p per hours	£1.60 for two hours, 80p per additional hour thereafter			
	Class B	50p per hour	£1.60 for two hours, 80p per additional hour thereafter			

Parking Tariffs – District Centres •Introduce tariffs at all car parks near stations (Marple Bridge, Bramhall, Heald Green & Romiley)	Car Park	Location	Postcode	Existing Tariff	Total Spaces	Notes
	Bramhall	Bramley Close	SK7 2DT	Free	90	
	Heald Green	Finney Lane	SK8 3QH	Free	38	Used by Premier Inn patrons. Also very close to airport.
	Marple Bridge	Brabyns Brow	SK6 7DA	Free	76	
	Marple Bridge	Midders	SK6 7DA	Free	79	Some capital works required to improve surface and lining
	Romiley	Guywood Lane (Romiley Station)	SK6 4BN	60 spaces are free, remainder are chargeable at district rate (20p per hour)	83	
	Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff				
	Free	50p for two hours, 60p for three hours, 20p per additional hour thereafter				

•Increase the existing 20p per hour fee across all district centre car parks to 50p for 2 hours	Bramhall	Bramhall Precinct	SK7 1AL	Class C Higher	81	
	Bramhall	Bramley Close	SK7 2DT	Free	90	
Class C Higher = 40p 2hrs, £1.50 3hrs, £5 over 3 hrs	Bramhall	Meadway East	SK7 1JZ	Class C Standard	139	
	Bramhall	Meadway West	SK7 1JR	Class C Standard	99	
Class C Standard = 20p per hour	Cheadle	Church Street	SK8 1PX	Class C Higher	52	
	Cheadle	Mary Street	SK8 1AH	Class C Higher	33	
	Cheadle	Massie Street East	SK8 1BN	Class C Higher	191	
	Cheadle	Massie Street West	SK8 1BP	Class C Higher	108	
	Cheadle Hulme	Mellor Road	SK8 5AZ	Class C Standard	65	
	Cheadle Hulme	Station Approach	SK8 7AA	Class C Standard	66	
	Edgeley	Bakewell Street	SK3 9HA	Class C Standard	11	
	Edgeley	Bulkeley Street	SK3 9AJ	Class C Standard	22	
	Edgeley	Caroline Street	SK3 9DJ	Class C Standard	73	
	Edgeley	James Street East & West	SK3 9AT	Class C Standard	46	
	Edgeley	York Street	SK3 9AD	Class C Standard	26	
	Hazel Grove	Beech Avenue	SK7 4QR	Class C Standard	31	
	Hazel Grove	Brook Street	SK7 4QW	Class C Standard	39	
	Hazel Grove	Commercial Road East	SK7 4AA	Class C Standard	30	
	Hazel Grove	Commercial Road West	SK7 4BG	Class C Standard	21	
	Hazel Grove	Davenport Road	SK7 4EZ	Class C Standard	29	
	Hazel Grove	Spring Vale	SK7 4PP	Class C Standard	29	
	Heald Green	Finney Lane	SK8 3QH	Free	38	
	Heaton Moor	Kings Drive	SK4 4DU	Class C Standard	32	
	Marple	Chadwick Street	SK6 6BY	Class C Standard	95	
	Marple	Derby Way	SK6 7AW	Class C Standard	53	
	Marple	Hollins Lane	SK6 6AW	Class C Standard	35	
	Marple	Memorial Park	SK6 6BD	Class C Standard	63	
	Marple	Springfield Avenue	SK6 7AL	Class C Standard	9	
	Marple	Townley Terrace	SK6 6BL	Class C Standard	30	
	Marple Bridge	Brabyns Brow	SK6 7DA	Free	76	
	Marple Bridge	Longhurst Lane	SK6 5AA	Class C Higher	14	
	Marple Bridge	Midders	SK6 7DA	Free	79	
	Marple Bridge	Town Street	SK6 5AA	Class C Higher	11	
	Romiley	Dye Lane	SK6 3AN	Class C Standard	15	
	Romiley	Guywood Lane (Romiley Station)	SK6 4BN	Class C Standard	83	
	Romiley	Romiley Precinct	SK6 4DN	Class C Standard	96	
		Current Tariff	Proposed Tariff			
	Class C Higher	40p 2hrs, £1.50 3hrs, £5 over 3 hrs	50p for two hours, £1.50 3hrs, £5 over 3 hrs			
	Class C Standard	20p per hour	50p for two hours, 60p for three hours then 20p per additional hour thereafter			

Appendix 3 - Responses received

Question to committee re Romiley

Please find below a question for the next Council Meeting from Mr Johnnullah Seraj of Meadow Walk, Bredbury

“Could the council please explain the rationale behind the unilateral decision behind increasing parking charges, in particular at local rail stations, also why there was no consultation with Friends of Romiley Station, a stakeholder in Romiley Station that campaigns for better access to public transport and better infrastructure surrounding rail transport. Can the council also put forward proposals to combat the increased congestion that the increase in parking charges will incur, and whether this was a consideration with the proposal to increase and impose parking charges at Romiley station? Also, has the council considered support to local residents whose access to their own properties and interests will be greatly reduced as commuters avoid the parking charges by parking on nearby residential roads where there are currently no restrictions on parking or duration to commuters, and will the council be prepared to do this, and give firm assurances and guarantees that this will be at no cost to the residents of the locale in Romiley?”

Response to Council Question

The Council has a savings requirement of approximately £60m over the next five years due to the balance of expected income and rising cost pressures. Savings can found through a mixture of reductions in expenditure items and increases revenue streams. One of the proposals put forward has been to increase car park revenues across the borough. This is the first borough wide increase in over 10 years

It is proposed to harmonise tariff structures to creating a clear and fair approach across the borough. Many car parks beside railway stations already levy a charge and have done for many years. Many customers already use and pay for parking at stations across Stockport, whilst there are a number that remain free.

Around a quarter of the spaces at Romiley Station Car Park are currently chargeable, this charge is currently 20p an hour – and is proposed to increase to a minimum of 50p for two hours however the all day rate will remain unchanged at £2. These spaces are heavily used and we do not expect to see a reduction in the use of the car park.

It is proposed to impose a charge on the remaining three quarters of spaces in this car park at the new rate.

As previously noted we do not expect a significant change in customer behaviour as a result of imposing a charge, nevertheless in the event that access to drives are blocked the Council’s civil enforcement team can be on called to take robust action to prevent illegal parking.

Some local streets have previously opted to have Resident Parking Schemes (RPS) introduced. Residents benefiting from such a scheme are entitled to purchase permits at a cost of 60p per week (£31 per year) – should any area fulfil the criteria for such a scheme and providing there is a majority in favour new RPS can be considered.

The statutory consultation has been open to everyone including the Friends of Romiley Station. It remains open until 30th November 2017 and all comments should be sent to p&h@stockport.gov.uk quoting ZLA PLA005.946

One official response received during statutory consultation period.

STATUTORY NOTICE PUBLISHED ON 8TH NOVEMBER 2017

REFERENCE ZLA PLA005.946

I write in my capacity as chair elect of the Friends of Romiley Station to formally object to the proposals set out within the Statutory Notice published in the Stockport Express on 8th November 2017 which as you will see below are to be considered at the meeting of the Council's Cabinet on 19th December 2017. That Notice gives effect to proposals set out within a document dated 13th October 2017 published by the Council headed "*Parking Tariffs - Draft Business Case*" which is aimed at increasing parking revenues. The document, within paragraph 7 headed "*Consultation and Engagement*" states as follows:

"To amend or introduce off street car parking tariffs it is required to advertise the proposed change(s) in advance. This statutory procedure offers residents, businesses and visitor the opportunity to comment on the proposal for consideration by the Council.

Outside of the statutory process it is the Councils intention to canvass opinion from local businesses."

The document also makes many financial and other assumptions which are not supported by reasoned argument or financial calculations.

Upon seeing the Statutory Notice I emailed the address provided therein (p&h@stockport.gov.uk) to highlight that the Statutory Notice set out proposals to increase car parking charges throughout the Borough of Stockport, impose a minimum charging period of 2 hours and to introduce charges for a number of hitherto free car parks that serve railway stations in Bramhall, Marple, Heald Green and Romiley.

It is the latter that causes the greatest concern.

I expressed the view that the notice clearly seeks to implement the draft proposals set out within the document "*Parking Tariffs - Draft Business Case*" referred to above.

I further went on to state that from my observations of a Council webcast of the Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee on 2nd November 2017 there was nothing to suggest that the proposals had been approved or were to be put through the statutory process.

Indeed, I suggested that given the content of the document "*Parking Tariffs - Draft Business Case*" it would be premature to do so, as to the best of my knowledge there has been no canvassing of local opinion or the obtaining of any formal Council approval.

Accordingly, I requested that I be advised as to which Council committee had approved the document and authorised the publication of the Statutory Notice.

I also pointed out that the Statutory Notice made no reference to the lodging of formal objections, something which "*Parking Tariffs - Draft Business Case*" does make reference to.

I received a response to my email from Adam Forbes the Council's Parking, Patrols and Waste Manager.

Mr Forbes states in his response:

"You are correct in noting that no approval has been provided to implement any changes to car parking tariffs.

The car parking proposals have been advertised in advance of Decembers (sic) Cabinet meeting. All objections and comments received will be submitted to Cabinet for consideration prior to a decision being taken as to whether the proposals will or will not be implemented. This statutory procedure offers residents, businesses and visitors the opportunity to comment on the proposal for consideration by the Council.

Should you wish to comment on the proposals please email p&h@stockport.gov.uk quoting ZLA PLA005.946"

By way of a reply I stated that if what Mr Forbes says is correct then why did the published Statutory Notice not state the true situation and invite comments/objections etc. I also asked the question as to under whose authority the Statutory Notice was published given the sizeable charge no doubt made for a full page advert in the Stockport Express (and the need to republish the Statutory Notice should the proposals not be approved as currently advertised). The placing of the Statutory Notice gives the clear impression that the changes as proposed are effectively a done deal.

I further asked as to what steps were being taken to undertake the canvassing of opinion from local groups/organisations/individuals. Certainly, the Friends of Romiley Station who are a major stakeholder at the station have never been contacted or consulted with a request for their views. Also, to the best of my knowledge no other local groups in Romiley have been canvassed for their views either.

So given that the Cabinet meets on 19th December 2017 are the Council not leaving insufficient time to carry out the canvass, receive responses and publish them within the supporting paperwork in time for the Cabinet meeting?

That said I now move on to set out below by way of bullet points why the proposals should not be implemented as set out within "*Parking Tariffs - Draft Business Case*" and the Statutory Notice.

☐ Lack of consultation with local communities, organisations, interested parties and individuals affected by the proposals

☐ The adverse effect upon local district centres by way of a reduction in trade as drivers vote with their feet and seek alternative shopping areas where short term parking is free (such as in parts of Tameside and High Peak)

☐ The discouragement of using public transport (for onward travel) from those railway stations affected by the proposals when it is clearly stated Transport for Greater Manchester policy that car parking at commuter station in Greater Manchester should be free of charge (Bredbury, Strines, Woodley and Rose Hill stations for example)

☐ The impact upon local residents as more car drivers choose to park on side streets in the vicinity of those railway stations where it is proposed to introduce charges

☐ The additional cost to commuters in travelling to work which would adversely affect existing commuters but would positively discourage those potential commuters thinking of moving into the areas affected.

☐ The increase in road congestion as those affect decide to either drive to those stations where parking remains free or simply decide to drive to their place of work

☐ There is already a poor level of public transport in many areas of Stockport (further reduced with the withdrawal of many services at the end of October 2017)

I very much hope that the views expressed above will be made known to all members of the Cabinet (and any other Council Committee considering this matter) and that the proposals regarding car parking charges will not be implemented.

24 emailed comments – from Romiley – mainly relating to 2hour 50p proposal

I would like to object to the proposed increase in parking fees in Romiley.

We are a recently opened shop in Romiley and one of the main reasons we chose Romiley was the level of car parking fees for short visits for our customers. If these proposals go ahead we will lose custom as will most of the other shops in the village which will result with the demise of some resulting in a domino effect.

I implore you to reconsider and not undo all the good that is happening in Romiley recently.

Regards

Dear sir.

I wish to voice my objection to the proposed increase to parking charges in Romiley from 20p to 50p.

I believe that the detrimental effect this will have on local businesses has not been considered.

There are many close local shops in other areas that have free car parking (example Woodley) and I believe we will see people choose to shop there instead of locally.

The council has also not considered the many elderly residents of Romiley who heavily rely on shops such as Sainsbury's to get their essential food and daily needs. Increasing the minimum charge will only serve to alienate a already vulnerable group in the community.

Also the many struggling families and chronically ill members of our lovely community who may rely on benefits will severely struggle to pay this charge. Especially when there are other free options.

Romiley has become a thriving community, we now have the wonderful Market and food on Friday events which bring in a incredible amount of business to the village.

Increasing the cost will not only hinder the positivity of these events, but will also drive business away.

I live on Guywood Lane we have trouble now with people parking in front of our house as they don't want to pay the fee are you going to do something about residents parking!!

I implore you to reconsider this decision.

Thank you

We are business owners based in Romiley Precinct. We learned of this consultation late yesterday (29 November) on our return from holiday and this is our first opportunity to respond. I would point out that the only reason we have found out about the consultation is because we are members of Romiley Traders Association - there are 7 members of said Association. So in theory, there are approximately 80 high street businesses in Romiley who are unaware of these proposals which, in our view, is not a genuine consultation. The period of time allocated for informed response to the email that has been distributed is appallingly short and it would suggest that this consultation is just paying lip service to the requirement for consultation. Additionally, you sent out your email on 23 November with an incorrect attachment. It was resent on 24 November with a 30 November deadline. You were

unavailable on 30 November - we tried to speak with you but you were in meetings throughout the day. There is little point offering a telephone number for contact if you are then beyond reach. With regards to the proposal to abolish the one hour stay for 20p, we believe this will have a negative affect of local businesses. As shopkeepers we understand that people "pop into the village". They don't park up and spend 2 hours strolling around (particularly during the winter months). We get plenty of complaints about the 20p charge, this increase is simply another nail in the retailers coffin. By implementing this change you will decrease footfall in all of the districts - Stockport centre is already a shadow of its former self. We would like the opportunity to attend the meeting when this issue is to be discussed and would ask that you send information about the location, date and time in order that we can notify all interested parties in this district. Thank you for your attention.

I wish to voice my objection to the proposed increase to parking charges in Romiley from 20p to 50p. Although the increase in charge may seem small to those in the council, it will discourage the use of local businesses. Many who park in the car park are elderly and use the local shops and services to meet their needs, this group are often on a small fixed income and this charge is another cost they can ill afford. Locally Woodley offers free parking and the introduction this increased charge will likely discourage the use of Romiley in favour of those areas with free parking. Work within the community to increase local shopping with regular markets and food nights will also be put at risk by these measures.

I believe that this increase in parking charge will also result in inconvenience for residents nearby Romiley centre as people trying to avoid the charge will likely park on the residential streets nearby, likely causing obstructions and putting pedestrians at risk.

I feel this increased charge should be reconsidered to help maintain and encourage the use of local businesses. Thriving local businesses attract visitors and keep the community alive.

I wish to voice my objection to the proposed increase to parking charges in Romiley from 20p to 50p.

I believe that the detrimental effect this will have on local businesses has not been considered.

There are many close local shops in other areas that have free car parking (example Woodley) and I believe we will see people chose to shop there instead of locally.

The council has also not considered the many elderly residents of Romiley who heavily rely on shops such as Sainsbury's to get their essential food and daily needs. Increasing the minimum charge will only serve to alienate a already vulnerable group in the community.

Also the many struggling families and chronically ill members of our lovely community who may rely on benefits will severely struggle to pay this charge. Especially when there are other free options.

Romiley has become a thriving community, we now have the wonderful Market and food on Friday events which bring in a incredible amount of business to the village.

Increasing the cost will not only hinder the positivity of these events, but will also drive business away.

I implore you to reconsider this decision.

Thank you

I wish to register my displeasure with the proposed increase in parking charges in Romiley car parks. This increase will make more people parking on our side streets and with a primary school in the centre of the village this would be very dangerous. Romiley has a high proportion of elderly residents who depend on their car to get out and about and have a limited income and would be unable to afford the increase Regards

As a shop owner in Romiley I have to say that the proposed increase in parking fees is ridiculous. As part of the local traders association we work hard and on a voluntary basis with events like our Food on Friday and monthly market to bring people into the village. An increase in parking fees would have a huge effect on the positive work we do. I look forward to hearing your views.

I wish to voice my objection to the proposed increase to parking charges in Romiley from 20p to 50p, and also similar proposals at Romiley train station.

I believe that the detrimental effect this will have on local businesses has not been considered where many people will choose to shop elsewhere, either at larger supermarkets, or areas where there is free car parking (e.g. Woodley).

Romiley also has an older, elderly generation who heavily rely on their local shops to get their essentials. Increasing the minimum charge will alienate many local residents, and commuters.

Romiley is a thriving community, with well supported local events, and markets, bringing much needed business to the village. Increasing the cost is likely to drive business away.

Also, as people will naturally consider parking elsewhere, has any thought been given to residents who live on the side streets. As a resident on Beechwood Ave, near the precinct car park, I am concerned that these already busy streets will be difficult to negotiate for the people who live there. Oak avenue, lyme grove and birch ave would be in a similar position.

Please reconsider this decision.

I wish to voice my objection to the proposed increase to parking charges in Romiley from 20p to 50p.

I believe that the detrimental effect this will have on local businesses has not been considered.

There are many close local shops in other areas that have free car parking (example Woodley) and I believe we will see people choose to shop there instead of locally.

The council has also not considered the many elderly residents of Romiley who heavily rely on shops such as Sainsbury's to get their essential food and daily needs. Increasing the minimum charge will only serve to alienate a already vulnerable group in the community.

Also the many struggling families and chronically ill members of our lovely community who may rely on benefits will severely struggle to pay this charge. Especially when there are other free options.

Romiley has become a thriving community, we now have the wonderful Market and food on Friday events which bring in a incredible amount of business to the village.

Increasing the cost will not only hinder the positivity of these events, but will also drive business away.

This will also encourage people to seek street parking where local residents have enough issues already trying to park outside their own homes.

I implore you to reconsider this decision.

Agree with all the comments made below from another local resident. And to add: Romiley, Bredbury and Woodley is so congested at the moment that to get anywhere outside of the area takes an hour +. We should be encouraging people to stay local!

I have no idea who or what you represent but have been told that you are part of a consultation process regarding proposed increases in the minimum car park charge. Apparently this consultation ends at midnight today. Why is it that no one commenting on the Romiley facebook pages has heard or seen anything in print from SMBC. Why have Romiley councillors not communicated with the electorate. SMBC is acting in its usual dictatorial fashion and continually acts against the wishes of large sectors of the electorate. Having lived in the

borough all my life I have never known a period of such gross incompetence and sheer stupidity by the administration. I actually re located my business to Trafford 15 years ago because they offered far more in the way of support and had lower rates. I fully expect the charges to be imposed no matter what local people think or do.

Dear Sir, I have heard rumours, which I am really hoping are untrue, that the council intends to increase the parking charges in Romiley from the present 20p minimum to 50p. If this is the case then please can you explain the council's thinking behind this? Does the council really want the shops and businesses to lose customers? I really fear that this will happen. I live in the Bredbury Green part of Romiley and there is now only the one Post Office in our local area and to have to pay a minimum of 50p just to go and post a parcel or get cash from the machine seems most unfair to say the least. The parking in Woodley is free so why should we Romiley residents have to pay an increased charge? I would be very interested to hear the council's views regarding this.

I wish to voice my objection to the proposed increase to parking charges in Romiley from 20p to 50p. I believe that the detrimental effect this will have on local businesses has not been considered. There are many close local shops in other areas that have free car parking (example Woodley) and I believe we will see people chose to shop there instead of locally.

The council has also not considered the many elderly residents of Romiley who heavily rely on shops such as Sainsbury's to get their essential food and daily needs. Increasing the minimum charge will only serve to alienate a already vulnerable group in the community. Also the many struggling families and chronically ill members of our lovely community who may rely on benefits will severely struggle to pay this charge. Especially when there are other free options. Romiley has become a thriving community, we now have the wonderful Market and food on Friday events which bring in a incredible amount of business to the village. Increasing the cost will not only hinder the positivity of these events, but will also drive business away. I implore you to reconsider this decision. Thank you

I am emailing you regarding the new proposed change of charges for parking in our local car parks. I am a frequent visitor to Romiley and I am totally opposed against the idea of increasing the charge for the one hour from 20p to 50p.

I believe that the detrimental effect this will have on local businesses has not been considered.

There are many close local shops in other areas that have free car parking (example Woodley) and I believe we will see people chose to shop there instead of locally.

Romiley has become a thriving community, we now have the wonderful Market and food on Friday events which bring in a incredible amount of business to the village.

Increasing the cost will not only hinder the positivity of these events, but will also drive business away.

I implore you to reconsider this decision.

I wish to voice my objection to the proposed increase to parking charges in Romiley from 20p to 50p.

I believe that the detrimental effect this will have on local businesses has not been considered.

There are many close local shops in other areas that have free car parking (example Woodley) and I believe we will see people chose to shop there instead of locally.

The council has also not considered the many elderly residents of Romiley who heavily rely on shops such as Sainsbury's to get their essential food and daily needs. Increasing the minimum charge will only serve to alienate a already vulnerable group in the community.

Also the many struggling families and chronically ill members of our lovely community who may rely on benefits will severely struggle to pay this charge. Especially when there are other free options.

Romiley has become a thriving community, we now have the wonderful Market and food on Friday events which bring in a incredible amount of business to the village.

Increasing the cost will not only hinder the positivity of these events, but will also drive business away.

I implore you to reconsider this decision.

I must urge you to seriously consider your decision to increase parking charges in Romiley.

There is already issues of people parking on residential streets to avoid parking charges. By increasing the charges this will only compound the issue.

If the council is serious about supporting local business then they should really really re-think this increase in parking charge.

I am writing to you to express my objection to the proposed parking charge increase at the public car park, behind the forum, in Romiley.

The reason for my objection is that this will deter patrons from visiting the local shops and could therefore have a detrimental affect on local businesses. Romiley is a thriving, vibrant and busy village. I believe this is in part due to reasonable parking changes. Any increase is a potential threat to the local community.

I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and offer a counter proposal that all parking charges in council car parks are actually scrapped and not increased.

I wish to voice my objection to the proposed increase to parking charges in Romiley from 20p to 50p.

I believe that this will have a detrimental effect on local businesses , There are many close local shops in other areas that have free car parking (example Woodley) and I believe we will see people chose to shop there instead of locally.

The council has also not considered the fact that residents will shop at larger centres like Morrisons / Aldi that don't charge to park , and the small local businesses will suffer !

Romiley has become a thriving community, we now have the wonderful Market and food on Friday events which bring in a incredible amount of business to the village. People will think twice if they have to pay .

50 p just to send a letter ? Pop in the post office or local shop ? Is very unfair

Increasing the cost will not only hinder the positivity of these events, but will also drive business away.

I implore you to reconsider this decision.

Thank you

I wish to voice my objection to the proposed increase to parking charges in Romiley from 20p to 50p.

I believe that the detrimental effect this will have on local businesses has not been considered.

There are many close local shops in other areas that have free car parking (example Woodley, Marple Bridge) and I believe we will see people chose to shop there instead of locally.

The council has also not considered the many elderly residents of Romiley who heavily rely on shops such as Sainsbury's to get their essential food and daily needs. Increasing the minimum charge will only serve to alienate a already vulnerable group in the community.

Also the many struggling families and chronically ill members of our lovely community who may rely on benefits will severely struggle to pay this charge. Especially when there are other free options.

Romiley has become a thriving community, we now have the wonderful Market and food on Friday events which bring in a incredible amount of business to the village.
Increasing the cost will not only hinder the positivity of these events, but will also drive business away.
I implore you to reconsider this decision.

I wish to voice my objection to the proposed increase to parking charges in Romiley from 20p to 50p. I believe that the detrimental effect this will have on local businesses has not been considered. There are many close local shops in other areas that have free car parking (example Woodley) and I believe we will see people chose to shop there instead of locally. The council has also not considered the many elderly residents of Romiley who heavily rely on shops such as Sainsbury's to get their essential food and daily needs. Increasing the minimum charge will only serve to alienate a already vulnerable group in the community. Also the many struggling families and chronically ill members of our lovely community who may rely on benefits will severely struggle to pay this charge. Especially when there are other free options. Romiley has become a thriving community, we now have the wonderful Market and food on Friday events which bring in a incredible amount of business to the village. Increasing the cost will not only hinder the positivity of these events, but will also drive business away. I implore you to reconsider this decision.
Thank you

I wish to voice my objection to the proposed increase to parking charges in Romiley from 20p to 50p.
I believe that the detrimental effect this will have on local businesses has not been considered.
There are many close local shops in other areas that have free car parking (example Woodley) and I believe we will see people chose to shop there instead of locally.
The council has also not considered the many elderly residents of Romiley who heavily rely on shops such as Sainsbury's to get their essential food and daily needs. Increasing the minimum charge will only serve to alienate a already vulnerable group in the community.
Also the many struggling families and chronically ill members of our lovely community who may rely on benefits will severely struggle to pay this charge. Especially when there are other free options.
Romiley has become a thriving community, we now have the wonderful Market and food on Friday events which bring in a incredible amount of business to the village.
Increasing the cost will not only hinder the positivity of these events, but will also drive business away.
I implore you to reconsider this decision.

I wish to voice my objection to the proposed increase to parking charges in Romiley from 20p to 50p.
I believe that the detrimental effect this will have on local businesses has not been considered.
There are many close local shops in other areas that have free car parking (for example Woodley) and I believe we will see people chose to shop there instead of locally.
The council has also not considered the many elderly residents of Romiley who heavily rely on shops such as Sainsbury's to get their essential food and daily needs. Increasing the minimum charge will only serve to alienate a already vulnerable group in the community.
Also the many struggling families and chronically ill members of our lovely community who may rely on benefits will severely struggle to pay this charge. Especially when there are other free options.
Romiley has become a thriving community, we now have the wonderful Market and food on Friday events which bring in a incredible amount of business to the village.
Increasing the cost will not only hinder the positivity of these events, but will also drive business away.

There will also be increased parking on already busy side roads around the which is already being threatened by the impact of the removal of the free parking at Romiley rail station car park. Diverting the traffic to the surrounding side roads increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
I implore you to reconsider this decision.

Re Consultation on car parking fees in Romiley.

1. I have been advised only 10 minutes ago, on my village Facebook page that there is a consultation regarding the car parking fees in Romiley. Please can you tell me how this consultation has been advertised ? Also, for how long was it advertised ?
2. It would appear that our right to have a say on this matter expires at midnight tonight, which gives me and no doubt, many other interested parties, very little time to formulate an objection, if that is our wish.
3. Personally, I would like to state my extreme opposition to any increase in car parking fees.
4. Our small shops and businesses in Romiley all work very hard to attract people into the village for shopping and leisure activities, and I know that a lot of these businesses disagree with parking charges per se.
5. I suggest, that an increase in these fees, will have a detrimental effect on the footfall in the village and people will shop further afield ie Woodley, where the car park is free or Marple, where Asda run a free car park in the town centre.

I look forward to hearing from you with regard to all the above points.

Yours sincerely

I wish to voice my objection to the proposed increase to parking charges in Romiley from 20p to 50p. I believe that the detrimental effect this will have on local businesses has not been considered. There are many close local shops in other areas that have free car parking (example Woodley) and I believe we will see people chose to shop there instead of locally. The council has also not considered the many elderly residents of Romiley who heavily rely on shops such as Sainsbury's to get their essential food and daily needs. Increasing the minimum charge will only serve to alienate a already vulnerable group in the community. Also the many struggling families and chronically ill members of our lovely community who may rely on benefits will severely struggle to pay this charge. Especially when there are other free options. Romiley has become a thriving community, we now have the wonderful Market and food on Friday events which bring in a incredible amount of business to the village. Increasing the cost will not only hinder the positivity of these events, but will also drive business away. I implore you to reconsider this decision.
Thank you,

Stockport Town Centre

RE: Response to TC Car Parking Proposal on behalf of BID Board

We would like to thank you for taking the time to present the SMBC Stockport Town Centre Car Parking Strategy proposals at the recent BID Board Meeting.

Whilst we appreciate that car parking is always going to be a contentious issue in the town centre, we are keen to offer our feedback to ensure the objectives of the proposal can be fully met to ensure continued support of the growing town centre economy.

Our primary concern is the suggestion of a 2-hour minimum parking tariff. Whilst we recognise the intention to encourage people to stay longer for only a small surcharge, thereby increasing dwell times and generating

revenue, this is punitive to those who 'pop-in' to the town centre for various reasons. These short-stay, convenience visitors constitute a high proportion of lunch time traffic, as well as the 'click-and-collect' shoppers that we would be at risk of losing to other larger retail destinations.

We would therefore strongly recommend the inclusion of a free period or an additional low-charge tariff for a 10-15-minute stay for example, so that this audience is not deterred from visiting. This would have the benefit of increasing the number of visits on a short-stay basis as well as encouraging dwell times for longer stays. It is a very viable option that would also serve to optimise income generation and we hope you will be able to take it into serious consideration.

Should this strategy not be effective, perhaps a pay-as-you-use / pay-on-exit structure may be worth exploring. We would also recommend that regardless of the strategy that is approved, a more regular monitoring and review process be implemented. It is important that this is not based on anecdotal evidence alone but uses relevant data on the number of visits and lengths of stay. An annual review would not allow the council to react quickly should the changes have a negative impact on visitor numbers.

Perhaps it would be useful to discuss how the data collected by the BID as part of the Totally Stockport Place Dashboard, together with that from Merseyway, NCP and other Town Centre stakeholders, could be shared for this purpose to ensure spaces are fully utilised and revenue enhanced as well as exploring how the growth of car park usage is progressing under the new plans.

However, we would also like to feedback on the many positive areas of the proposal put forward. For example, the harmonisation of town centre charging, the review of payment and management technologies, and improved wayfinding signage, which is much needed to reduce displacement across the town centre. We feel that dual signage that references the car park name and what you'll find there, not just one or the other, would be particularly beneficial.

We would very much welcome further improvement in car parking standards, particularly the redevelopment of the Heaton Lane car park which has seen a surge in uptake during and following the redevelopment of the A6 and Redrock. We are also eager to hear further suggestions regarding the delivery of additional spaces in the South-East zone, Exchange Street and Edgeley in particular, where the station overspill and wider office occupation is having a significant impact on residential areas. Perhaps additional multi-storey parking off King Street West to alleviate the on-street parking in Shaw Heath would be one option.

In summary, the Town Centre economy is still evolving and an appropriate car parking strategy to increase visitors at low cost, easy accessibility and good wayfinding is essential. We hope you will take our feedback and recommendations into consideration to continue making Stockport a great destination for all.

Yours Sincerely,

Caroline Patten

For and on behalf of the BID Board

Car Parking is always going to be a contentious issue in the Town Centre. But the Town Centre has come a long way in the last 2 years and commercial office space occupation has increased from which in part, Heaton Lane car park income has benefitted.

The retail and evening economy of Stockport Town Centre are still emerging and fragile and nothing should be put in place as a car parking strategy that could hinder the growth that is still yet to come. Whilst there are moves to limit the opportunity for vehicles to access the Town Centre, that is fine if you've arrived by public transport and the areas to move around the Town Centre are safe and secure in the dark winter afternoons or evenings. However this is not the case and the pedestrian routes within the internal areas of the Town Centre are not well lit or fully covered by CCTV. So people will not visit and go elsewhere.

The parking areas should be accessible and there should be improved wayfinding to access them, perhaps dual reference them with their name and what you'll find there, not just one or the other.

The car park fee structure should be on a pay as you use basis, not a set fee for a minimum period as is being proposed. All car parks should have a payment structure that is pay on exit, not pay up front for a ticket for 2 hours or more. The payment system should be for both card (contactless) and cash and provide a receipt.

Regular monitoring of the car park split by hourly intervals should be put in place and shared with Town Centre stakeholders such as the BID and Merseyway etc. so they have an understanding how the growth of car park usage is progressing over time. If a particular car park isn't full on a regular basis then a re-structure its tariff should be considered and this published online or through an App to provide visitor friendly solutions that mean these spaces are cheaper than others to ensure every opportunity is made to allow car parks to be fully utilised and revenue enhanced. Also continue to review parking charges, if a car park isn't being fully utilised usually this will be due to it being too expensive and users are therefore parking elsewhere.

Do not allow valuable Town Centre car parking spaces to be utilised for airport car parking as is being proposed. The airport is more than capable of providing this and it will remove capacity for shoppers and leisure users to visit the Town Centre.

We would welcome additional car parking at Exchange Street to benefit the wider office occupational customer base as opposed to it just being based at the Station, perhaps also consider working with the station operator to provide additional multi storey car parking off King Street West to alleviate the on-street car parking in Shaw Heath.

In summary please don't create a punitive charging policy that destroys all the good work that goes into trying to make the Town Centre a destination to visit, whether its for an hour at lunchtime for convenience shopping or for 3 hours at a weekend. The Town Centre needs every support to help it grow and car parking at low cost with easy accessibility and good wayfinding is one of those elements.

Many thanks for your update to the BID Board yesterday evening.

I would like to raise one concern:

While we would indeed like to increase the visitor dwell time, there are a number of people who do 'pop in' to the town for whatever reason. By increasing the minimum period to 2 hours across town centre locations, I fear that these shoppers will be put off and take their business to an alternative place. While £1.60 is not a lot of money in the grand scheme of things, it is a waste of £1.28 if making a flying visit. Could you consider a free period - say 10-15 minutes but make it mandatory for all vehicles to display tickets? After 10 minutes all vehicles would be required to display a valid, paid for ticket. Or 10 minutes = 20p and £1.60 there after?

Thank you for your presentation at the BID meeting.

My comments are two fold:

1. I have concerns about a minimum time of 2 hours for £1.60. I am not convinced that this will encourage dwell time. Rather I think it will discourage people from coming into the town centre. Can we for example have first 20 mins 20p (suit those nipping in) then rising incrementally to £1.60 for two hours – then encouraging stay longer than 2 hours by having small rise for an extra hour? Depends what the aim is – but if to encourage visits and dwell

time, current proposal will not. Also if we increase use by public (at reduced rates) then query whether SMBC revenue would be the same or better

2. Review – important that this is not on anecdotal evidence alone but uses data – what data is going to be used is crucial – will you have data on number of visits and length of stay and from Place Dashboard too? Also you need to be able to react quickly if the charges are having a negative impact so review every month

Regards

Heald Green

Trains from Heald Green to Manchester are the only method of public transport into Manchester that residents can take. It was only by chance (enquiries with the Officer to have parking bays re-painted) that I found out that the 38 free parking bays in the Premier car park managed by SMBC for many many years were shortly to incur a cost. As you can imagine this came as a distasteful shock as neither me nor my two colleagues had been informed of this decision. Commuters were not informed of the proposed changes in parking regulations, so as you can understand they are very upset at the lack of public consultation.

British Rail at Heald Green only offer 8 parking spaces plus 2 disabled spaces, and as many commuters live at least ¾ mile from the station, hopefully you can understand the necessity for them to use their own transport to the station.

The service from Heald Green to Manchester runs every 20 minutes, showing how popular and used this service is.

Marple

I think it might help if I add why this is so important in Marple Bridge. We recently completed a major survey and study of the car parking there which serves a number of functions and is not just about rail users car parking. There are seven parking faculties around the station, all for different purposes. My action plan to improve parking was agreed with all residents and businesses, given to and agreed with Council officers, some 12 months ago, and the first stages agreed at Area Committee in the proper manner. This has already included an increase in tariff on one type of parking there so we are not NIMBYS. Where we differ from your current stance is that we understand the problem because we have analysed it and taken views from some 250 residents and businesses.

I gave you a flavour of the issues last night, which the proposals will, as they stand exacerbate. The retailers and businesses in Marple Bridge need good cheap accessible short stay parking close by, or the village will die. This is not about people being lazy using cars. If you know Brabyn's Brow, it deters all but the fittest. Yet the Brabyn's Brow car park has a conflict between this short facility and the long stay bays filled up by rail users. There is also Brabyn's Park, nominated for one of the best parks in Britain and about to be killed by these proposals because they will result in the car park there being full of fee-avoiding rail users by about 7.30 every day, thus preventing dog users visiting, to say nothing of parents walking toddlers and sports facility users.

Then there are the parents who help us by avoiding drop off at the two primary schools nearby, both with huge traffic problems, one of which is on our 20 priority list for traffic engineering because it's so bad. These parents will be pushed into outside school drop offs instead of walking that last 300 yards having parked safely. There is more associated with the Doctors' and dentist's surgeries etc but that should give you a flavour.

Response from the Conservative Group

Conservative Group response to the Parking Tariffs Business Case – Increase in Parking Revenues

The Conservative Group have serious concerns regarding the proposals for parking tariffs, seeking increased revenue as part of the Place Directorate Reform and Growth proposals. We understand the motivations for this review and the challenges faced by Cabinet and Officers seeking to deliver a balanced budget, but have a number of concerns.

We don't believe that the full impact of the changes proposed is reflected in the business case, there is an absence of evidence based modelling for the new tariffs, unsubstantiated assumptions, no consideration of alternatives, and there has been minimal consultation. Additionally, the business case repeatedly refers to "harmonisation" across the Borough and fails to take into account local knowledge, local geography and differing local circumstances that are highly relevant for these proposals and the impacts they will have on our local residents.

Consultation

Consultation on the introduction and changes in parking tariff has been minimal. The only public engagement has been a statutory notice placed in the Stockport Express. The Stockport Express is a local newspaper with a circulation of just 10,000 (fewer than the number of people in just one of the wards affected by the changes). The Conservative Group don't consider this to be adequate public consultation and believe it is highly unlikely that this statutory notice reached many residents likely to be affected by the changes.

The business case also states that, outside the statutory process, the Council intends "to canvass opinion from local businesses". It gives no indication how this will be done, who will be included, how feedback will be recorded and what weight will be given to feedback.

Whilst there is no requirement on the Council to consult residents (outside the statutory obligations), the Conservative Group would support a proper consultation with residents on these changes which could have been done easily and at a minimal cost by including the proposals on the Have Your Say pages of the Council website where other budget consultations are listed and through taking the proposals to the Area Committees affected by the changes and particularly by the introduction of new charges in the districts. Such consultation would have helped uncover local issues at an early stage.

The proposals went to Communities and Housing Scrutiny Committee at the end of October. However, the Conservative Group would argue that the business case should also have gone to

Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee due to the potential impact on the local economies, business and footfall in district centres in the context of the need to revitalise and regenerate our shopping districts. The Town Centre Car Parking Strategy went to Economy & Regeneration Scrutiny Committee and, at that meeting, members raised concerns about district centre car parks and displacement. As the Inclusive Growth and Reform Programme: Update (3rd October) stated that the District Centre Parking Tariffs and Town Centre Parking Tariffs were two parts of the same proposal, it would have made sense for both these complimentary items to have gone to Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny.

Elected members in wards affected by these changes have not been consulted and it is our contention that they could and should have been informed to allow a proper grown up debate with our residents. Again this could have been done through Area Committees.

Town and District Centres

Stockport Council has spent millions in Council taxpayers' money on developing the Town Centre to attract more residents to use it. The report proposes a doubling of the charge for a one hour stay hitting 43% of all users in the town centre and 75% of all district centre users. The proposals include plans that will result in some district centre users having a 150% increase for parking less than 1 hour.

The Conservative Group disagree with the deletion of the 1 hour free band, this provides an incentive for people to come into our town and district centres. We completely disagree with the logic that deleting the one hour band "removes the fiscal disincentive to stay longer". In fact, deleting the one hour band simply introduces a new "fiscal disincentive" for residents to come into our town and district shopping centres at all!

Why would residents travel into Stockport Town Centre and pay £1.60 for an hours parking when you can park for free at Handforth Dean in Cheshire East or at the Trafford Centre in Trafford and arguably still experience a better shopping offer?

We should not be deterring residents from coming in, but encouraging them. In the case of the Town Centre, the new developments are still at an early stage of opening and the public should be encouraged in with a "try before you buy" attitude in support of the new offer rather than immediately penalising and hitting shoppers with more charges.

The second proposal of a 6am start time will not in our view generate any significant benefit to the Council.

Currently if you use the Town centre in the evening you can leave your vehicle in a car park and take a taxi home. Returning to work the next day adding a ticket to your car for the days parking.

The current proposal stops this option. The result will be less use of the night time facilities or residents possibly choosing to drive home unsafely.

Occupiers of the Councils hotel at the Exchange and the Travel Lodge may use Council car parks as a much cheaper alternative to the NCP. The current 8am tariff allows them to do so. The 6am tariff will be an issue for hotel customers who may choose an out of town alternative hotel which does not

have these restrictions. Who would choose to get out of bed before 6am to replace their car parking ticket?!

There is no evidence that 30 cars per day will pay £1.60 before 8am and generate £15,000 of revenue.

Changing enforcement officers work patterns to monitor the car parks from 6am will be in our view an unacceptable request of our employees. We do not support the reports assumption that there would be no staffing implications.

Was an alternative of raising the 6pm cut off for charging to 7pm in place of the original proposal looked at, which would have been better suited to likely customer behaviour and parking patterns?

District Centres

We do not support the fourth proposal on district centres to remove the one hour band and raise the charge for two hours. As with the Town Centre, we are penalising the short stay shopper and driving them to use other neighbouring authorities very competitive retail offers where parking is free. We should be supporting the regeneration of our district centres and encouraging shoppers in. Increasing the minimum stay payable to two hours stops the short stay shopping trip and disproportionately increases costs to residents by up to 150% over the current one hour price. We also suggest that if implemented this proposal will have a considerable impact on revenues. The business case for this proposal is misleading when it quotes a 25% increase as that would only apply to the 2 hour ticket cost increase. For those only staying an hour and now having to purchase a two hour ticket the increase is 150%.

The Conservative Group strongly support our local and district centres and the communities they support and would like to see these centres thrive, with a healthy footfall and easy access to community resources and facilities. The introduction of new or increased charges simply serves as a disincentive to residents to use their district centres and unfairly penalises those trying to access vital local services. The Conservative Group are also concerned at the potential adverse effect for local businesses.

The Conservative Group do not support the fifth proposal and strongly oppose introducing new charges at Council car parks near railway stations. The business case in our view wrongly assumes that the car park usage is all railway commuters and this is simply not the case. This is where consultation with local Councillors and residents would have uncovered the specific local issues and impacts of these proposals.

Bramley Close, Bramhall

The report states that users may opt to use residential streets or other free car parks provided by TfGM “although the risk is undefined”. Local Councillors believe this statement to be inaccurate as there is evidence to the contrary. In 2007, the then Liberal Democrat administration added car

parking charges to the car park at Bramley Road, Bramhall. This resulted in utter chaos and a great deal of misery for the residents of the Little Australia estate who were forced to endure indiscriminate and inconsiderate parking for a period of three weeks before the Council withdrew the charges due to pressure from both the public and Conservative Councillors for the ward. We would suggest that should these charges be introduced the same result will be occur.

The report assumes that this car park is only or predominantly used by rail commuters. This is not the case. The car park at Bramley Close, Bramhall is very well used by visitors to and patients of the Health Centre which has 7 Doctors, 2 nurses, and a team including community district nurses, community midwives, health visitors and podiatrists and has over 12,000 registered patients. The car park is also used by families with children accessing the sea scouts, the scout hut and tutoring and educational facilities. Those accessing health and wellbeing classes at the scout hut also patronise the car park. Customers of the very well-used Bramhall Library which also supports a number of valuable groups and organisations who meet there also use this car park. Alongside this, local district centre visitors use the car park and there is some limited usage by commuters. The Conservative Group do not wish to see those accessing primary care health facilities, community resources and organisations, health and wellbeing facilities, educational facilities and those intending to contribute to the local economy through district shopping penalised for doing so or displaced onto local streets. In particular, we are concerned about the increased barrier to accessing healthcare and the impact on those 12,000+ patients of the health centre being subject to charges for convenient parking which has historically been free. We do not support charging users of the health centre and the library for use of this car park.

We also consider the £39,780 income to be extremely over optimistic in its assumptions. Likewise we believe the assertion that demand at these car parks is likely to be relatively inelastic is incorrect.

In addition to the proposed introduction of Bramley Close the other three District Centre car parks will be affected by these proposals. The Village centre car park has only just had its charging bands increased for long stay parking by Conservative Councillors. The one hour ticket facility available in all three centre car parks has driven footfall into the Bramhall Village centre. The proposed change back to a two hour minimum stay ticket is totally at odds with the long and hard fought concession obtained by ward councillors. The proposal to remove it and increase charges by 150% would not be supported by residents or elected members.

Romiley

The proposal is to introduce charges at the Guywood lane car park close to the station which is currently free. This introduces charges at the upper level, the lower level is already chargeable and is used for short term parking by shoppers in the village. The upper car park is up a steep hill and is tucked away from normal village use adjacent to the train platform.

There is already a significant parking problem in Romiley. Many of the roads surrounding the Station are now double yellow lined and the area off Church Lane has been designated a Residents Parking Zone due to the number of vehicles parking all day in the local streets by commuters.

The effect of introducing charging for this car park will be to further clog up the surrounding streets which are already full due to the proximity of the village. Conservative Councillors believe that introducing charges will cause a significant number of cars to be displaced onto local streets. Any displacement is likely to significantly adversely affect the local health centre and its patients. The roads immediately around the health centre will be used by commuter traffic that has been pushed out of this car park. Patients using the health centre are likely to be displaced by commuters arriving early in the morning, before the health centre opens, and leaving cars there all day, leading to patients having difficulty accessing health care services. Patients may need to park considerably further away throughout the day since commuters will stay on local roads all day, meaning there are no spaces becoming available during the day. The health centre doesn't open until 8.30am, the station car park is full by 8am, meaning that if commuter cars are displaced to health centre car parking areas all the spaces currently used by patients are likely to be taken by the time the health centre opens for the full working day. Even if patients were able to park in the charged car park this would be unacceptable, as patients would effectively be being charged to access health care services due to displacement where previously parking was free.

The Conservative Group want to see regeneration and a strong and thriving local business and shopping centre in Romiley. Introducing paid parking not only deters residents from visiting their local centre at all, but makes the experience less pleasant by introducing more competition for free parking spaces and having to navigate roads congested by displaced parked vehicles.

Charging for the upper Station car park will make it an empty desert and street parking will be severely impacted. The Conservative Group do not support this proposal which will simply cause daily grief to local residents.

Romiley Traders are incensed at the proposal to remove the one hour band at 20p for the District Centre. The move to a 2 hour slot at double the price is a sure fire way to reduce footfall and trade.

Again the income stream anticipated seems optimistic and the likely level of displacement underestimated.

Marple

The current proposal is to apply charges to both Brabyns Brow and Middlers Car Park. We consider that considerable harm will be done because to avoid these charges cars will be dispersed onto the adjacent residential roads which already take overflow parking when the two car parks are completely full. Whilst currently the car parks do provide commuter parking they also provide much needed parking for access to the local parks.

The projected revenue of £75,348 is ambitious even when taking an assumption of 75% occupancy.

Other costs associated with the introduction of new charges

The proposal omits any detail on the additional costs of operating the car parks in terms of enforcement and revenue collection against unsubstantiated revenue receipts.

Only one-off costs have been included for the installation of pay and display machines, lines, legal work and signs. What provision is made for the ongoing maintenance and repair of the pay and display machines? What provision is being made for enforcement, introduction of additional traffic regulations orders and yellow paint should displacement onto nearby streets be significant? The Conservative Group believe that there may be additional ongoing costs which have not been reflected in the proposal. These mostly arise should the displacement be higher than anticipated.

Displacement, disincentive and income projection

It is our assertion that vehicle displacement has not been fully considered. Local Councillors know their wards well and a number have past history of the introduction of parking charges and how this has led to considerable vehicle displacement, inconsiderate parking and real inconvenience and frustration for residents.

The projections for income show how vehicle displacement and the disincentive to visit district centre car parks has not been adequately considered in the proposals. For example, in the district centres the income for the two hour band appears to be arrived at by an assumption that all current one hour visits will remain at the same level and this is added to the current level of two hour visits (20p 1 hr band income currently £178, 673 = 893,365 uses, 40p 2hr band current income £75,593=188,982.5 uses. Total 1 & 2 hr uses = 1,082,347 uses. Compared to anticipated income from a 50p 2 hr band = 1,082,344 uses). This doesn't take any account of not only the likely displacement but also the introduction of a financial disincentive to come into the district centre and park at all! The Conservative Group would argue that it is unlikely that the number of short stay 1 hour visits (now paying for a longer stay) will remain at the same level and these are in fact the visitors likely to be the most easily deterred by increased costs. Later in the report it is stated that "A factor has been applied to the forecast savings to recognise that consumer behaviour is elastic" and the projected income is reduced by 25%. This is a blunt application with no rationale supplied as to why this figure has been chosen, particularly given officers previously state in the report that the risk of displacement is "undefined" and that there is a complete lack of data about how many vehicles may use car parks at particular locations and at newly chargeable periods. Why 25%? The Conservative Group would like to see better and more robust quantification of the likely displacement and of the likely levels of usage at newly chargeable locations and periods.

Alternatives

The business case does not appear to have looked at alternatives for raising additional income which could have preserved the free car parking in places where this is useful to the local residents and communities. For example, did officers look at tariffs and times charged at other district centres car

parks in these localities which are already chargeable? Could other work have been done to look at adjusting chargeable periods?

Investment and Innovation

The business case does not include any detail on investment into the car park network. The replacement of aging machine stock would allow the introduction of more flexible time periods for charging. The addition of automatic number plate recognition cameras into the major car parks could be revenue generating and free enforcement officers time to be redeployed to other locations.

There is an ambition to phase out new petrol and diesel cars in the UK by 2040. This will increase the requirement for electric vehicle charging points within the Borough and maybe a revenue stream.

Conclusion

The Conservative Group does not support the proposals for changes to parking tariffs as currently outlined in the business case. The proposals do not contain robust evidence based modelling of the new tariffs detailing the effects on usage and impact on income. There are unsubstantiated assumptions made and we consider these to be serious flaws which will possibly result in poorly informed decisions.

The Conservative Group entirely disagree with the logic that sees the deletion of the one hour band and a more costly start point of two hours band as the “removal of a fiscal disincentive” to stay longer. We believe that starting at a higher two hour band simply introduces a new disincentive to visit at all. This is simply off putting to people in the first instance, nobody sees a higher charge as an incentive to choose that car park or to stay longer. We believe that short stay visitors account for a large proportion of visits and significant income and that these customers are likely to have the most elasticity of demand and be most easily put off visiting at all by higher charges. This will impact adversely on income. We should be supporting the economies and regeneration of our town and district centres by encouraging people in not driving them to competing out of town shopping offers which provide all day free parking on site!

The Conservative Group are concerned at the impact on local business and footfall in the areas affected.

We do not believe that the specific local circumstances have been taken into account for the car parks near stations which make a strong argument for them continuing to be provided free of charge. These car parks also serve thousands of patients of health centres and residents accessing important community, education and wellbeing facilities and they should in no way be penalised or discouraged from doing so. We are concerned at the introduction of new barriers to accessing such facilities charging would constitute. In addition to this, there has been little or no consideration of the consequences for residents of the neighbouring local streets who are likely to have to put up with displaced vehicles parking all day long and the frustration and inconvenience this can cause.

The Conservative Group believe the level of displacement has been underestimated and the income projections not satisfactorily justified.

The consultation on this proposal has been limited to a statutory notice with a very limited reach and some informal approaches to a few businesses. In addition the proposals went C&H Scrutiny Committee. Although the Council is not obliged to undertake wider consultation, given the potential impact on local people, residents, commuters, shoppers, business and local economies we would have wished to see more consultation. This could have been done at low cost through the Council's website budget consultation pages, area committees, talking with ward councillors and including the business case on the agenda for Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee.

The Conservative Group do not support the current parking tariff proposals and propose they are dropped or paused to allow elected members time for further discussion with officers and the Portfolio Holder. We would also suggest that Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee as well as Housing and Communities Scrutiny Committee is afforded the opportunity to review any final proposals.

Petitions

1. A petition was received relating to Romiley Station Car Park. This petition stated "We the undersigned call on Stockport Council to reverse the plans to charge for railway parking at Romiley Station and protect our residential streets".

There were 288 names on this petition

2. A second petition was received from Town Centre retailers. This petition stated "This is a petition to Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council to delay the following proposed car parking tariff proposal while the businesses in Town Centre, which it will ultimately affect, are engaged and have the opportunity to have input to proposed parking charges"

There were 36 names on this petition

