

Agenda Item	14b
Report No	HC/22/18

THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL

Committee: Highland Council

Date: 28 June 2018

Report title: Redesign Review of Car Parking: Final Report

Report by: Inverness City Area Manager (Review Team Leader)

1. Purpose/Executive Summary

- 1.1 A peer review of car parking was requested by the Redesign Board, with the scope of the review agreed in November 2017. After much deliberation in Board workshops and in two formal Board meetings, the Board has agreed its final recommendations.
- 1.2 The recommendations from the review relate to a vision for car parking, a real shift to localism, a request that the Board's recommendations are included in a new car parking policy along with several specific process improvements. The Council is asked to agree these recommendations.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 Members are asked to note the process involved in the Board's review, and in particular the opportunity the review has provided to hear a range of Member views in ten Board workshops and two formal meetings. The review has taken longer than expected but this has allowed for extensive deliberation and the opportunity to find some common ground.
- 2.2 The Board recommends that the Council agrees:
- (i) The vision for parking as described in paragraph 5.1.
 - (ii) To devolve budget and decisions on car parking to local committees through the extended local control budget option by:
 - o including off-street car parking in the disaggregated Community Services budget;
 - o providing a local Car Parking Budget for each local committee;
 - o noting current powers in the Scheme of Delegation relating to disaggregated budgets would apply to car parking if devolved; and
 - o adding a new power for local / city committees as described in paragraph 5.10

- (iii) To enable local benefit from car parking opportunities, by re-investing any surplus income locally, i.e. income above the target set by Council in its budget setting process. This provides local choices on the disaggregated budget including improving or protecting other local Community Services provision or investing in other local priorities. Where a deficit occurs, local committees will decide where other service savings will be made, including an awareness of workforce implications. Local committees would monitor budget in year and investment/divestment decisions would be made by the local committee for the year ahead based on actual out-turns in the previous year.
- (iv) As part of the Council's budget setting process for 2019/20 and subsequent years, rather than setting any single corporate target for off-street car parking, the Council would set a revenue target for local committees instead.
- (v) To enable meaningful local engagement on local changes to car parking by:
 - o Introducing new ways of supporting Members to make local choices across on their disaggregated budget, with proposals from Community Services being agreed and implemented for influencing the disaggregated budget for April 2019.
 - o Engaging local Members and communities in changes to car parking using a defined process as set out at Appendix 4. The Ward Management and Policy teams in the Chief Executive's Office can support members and the Service with their engagement process.
- (vi) To support the shift to localism, proposals are developed by the Service to respond to the staff impacts expected around training, work load, priorities, staff roles and possibly structure.
- (vii) Dependent on the staff resourcing above, to implement the changes to align with budget setting for 2019/20, with local decisions on investment/divestment from 2020/21 and the first annual review after April 2021.
- (viii) A revised policy for car parking is considered at the EDI committee as soon as practicable (earliest opportunity August 2018) and that it includes the:
 - o vision for car parking developed and agreed through the Board, as set out at paragraph 5.1;
 - o extended local control budget model;
 - o engagement process as set out in Appendix 4; and
 - o additional Board recommendations as set in Appendix 5.
- (ix) That the revised car parking policy is given a higher profile in the Community Services Service Plan.
- (x) That other process improvements agreed by the Board, as set out in paragraphs 5.19 to 5.25, are noted at Council as operational issues and are largely delegated to officers in Community Services. These cover:
 - o Intelligence and opportunities around land for car parking
 - o Developing car parking data and financial management arrangements
 - o Processes to support investment in car parking infrastructure
 - o Marketing and promotion of car parking
 - o Work force issues
 - o Continually learning from good practice.

3. Background

3.1 As part of the Redesign Board's Review Programme, the Board commissioned a peer

review of car parking within the control of the Council. The Board agreed the [scope of the car parking review](#) in November 2017.

- 3.2 The original scope of the review was broad with objectives to:
1. Assist the Service set out a Vision for Car Parking – both off-street and on-street parking;
 2. Guide the Service in the component parts which should be contained within the Vision to achieve consistent traffic management;
 3. Appraise current financial management and business planning;
 4. Review current administrative processes;
 5. Consider the available information on the Council's parking estate and help the Service identify additional parking opportunities;
 6. Consider the views of stakeholders and staff;
 7. Look at the relationship between car parking and public transport, e-cars and cycling and help the Service identify any opportunities for changing behaviours;
 8. Consider the 10 options for service delivery (required of all peer reviews);
 9. Consider how car parking is viewed by visitors to the Highlands and assist the Service identify where enhancements can be made;
 10. Assist the Service in identifying opportunities for commercialism;
 11. Include recommended pricing strategies and business processes within the detailed options appraisal; and
 12. Recommend a preferred option; including direction for further business planning that also takes into account the Council's localism agenda.
- 3.3 This report sets out the final recommendations from the review as agreed by the Board on 12th June 2018. They take into account the earlier [decisions made by the Board on 1st May 2018](#). At that time 63 recommendations were agreed. Some have been superseded by more recent developments and discussions, so not all 63 require to be recommended to Council and some can be delegated to officers.

4. Review process

4.1 Review team

The review was undertaken by a peer review team comprising of: Staff - David Haas (Team Leader); Alasdair Bruce and Robbie Bain; Board members - Cllr Baxter and Paul MacPherson and non-Board member Cllr Boyd. Stuart Black has offered Director challenge and support. The host Head of Service is Tracey Urry and direct engagement was also made with Shane Manning (Principal Traffic Officer) and William Gilfillan.

4.2 Methods: information gathering

All peer reviews involve gathering a range of evidence from a variety of sources. The team gathered evidence from:

1. A desk-top review of existing information, reports and methods of delivery around car parking from within the Council and out with the Council (not limited to Scotland).
2. Identifying appropriate planning and transport policy links such as active travel and sustainable transport.
3. Meetings and workshops with staff and managers, from Community Services, Corporate Services, Development and Infrastructure and the Chief Executive's Office. This included reflection on current practice, service developments, a more in-depth review of current processes and potential future financial governance arrangements.
4. Information already gathered from our Citizens' Panel from previous surveys on car parking as part of previous budget consultation exercises.
5. Visits to see the service being delivered, including the visitor car park at Aonach Mòr, provision in Portree and Aviemore.
6. Discussions with other public bodies on their practice including the Peak District

National Park, Forestry Commission and the City of Aberdeen Council.

7. Deliberation within the Board on issues, opportunities and options. This included feedback from Members on views within their communities. This is described more fully below.

4.3 Method: Board deliberation

Normally peer reviews are concluded within a 12 week period and over 3 or 4 workshops and a formal Board meeting. However this review has taken longer to enable full deliberation at Board workshops. Workshops are used to enable discussion, the development and testing of ideas, thinking through scenarios and impacts and problem solving. In total the car parking review has been discussed in ten workshops and two formal Board meetings.

4.4 Discussion in workshops has also attracted non-Board members to attend, particularly where they have had views on how changes to car parking would impact on their Wards. The key points made in workshops and the decisions made in formal Board meetings are provided in **Appendix 1**. Key themes from these discussions are:

- The need for greater transparency and fairness in car park charging across the region;
- The need to make the most of our car parks as assets;
- Maximising the opportunities for improving traffic management and active travel;
- Realising economic gain especially from tourism;
- Re-investing car parking income locally to support other local Council services and jobs (also to avoid further service reductions and job losses and understanding workforce implications of choices made) and communicating these choices well. This fits with the Council's approach to workforce planning and operating more commercially;
- Enabling localism – with more decision-making powers devolved to local committees, listening locally and the need for meaningful public engagement on Council decisions.

4.5 It is fair to say that the review had some unexpected turns:

- It had to be re-focused to take into account the budget decisions made by the Council in February 2018. While the Board heard a range of views for and against the roll out of car parking charges this year, it clarified that the Board had no power to change the budget decision on the overall income target agreed at Council.
- It had to seek Board approval in two stages, firstly to confirm the Board's intentions around: the vision for car parking; the appetite for localism; the extent of new opportunities; and the improvements needed on current processes (financial and business planning, pricing, administration and engagement). This was required before further work could be progressed, particularly around developing options for localism. The report considered at that time '[Parking with Purpose](#)' is available. It was agreed that further work was required before the Board could make its recommendations to Council.

4.6 Localism options

With a focus on how the car parking review can support localism agreed from the first stage of the review, the team provided discussion papers for the Board on:

- [A draft approach for considering local changes to car parking](#) – setting out the process to be followed for internal and external engagement on changes to car parking, including impact assessment;
- [Finance and governance proposals](#);

- [Three financial options](#): the current model, limited local budget control and extended local budget control.

4.7 On balance the strongest support in the Board was for the third option: extended local budget control along with the proposed approach to considering local changes to car parking. The final recommendations made below, support the preferred 3rd financial option: extended local budget control. This would apply to off-street car parking income.¹

5. Recommendations from the Board

5.1 Vision

The Council is asked to agree the vision that parking should:

- Contribute significantly to good traffic management.
- Be a key component of the Council's strategy for integrated transport and active travel.
- Promote growth in the local economy, especially around tourism.
- Provide opportunities that meet the aspirations of users.
- Allow key decisions to be taken locally.
- Ensure that good local data is available to decision-makers.
- Be based on transparent rules which are applied consistently and fairly across Highland.
- Ensure that parking revenue contributes to local infrastructure improvement, (including expansion of the parking estate and sustainable travel) and any other local priorities as agreed by the local committee.
- Ensure that pricing strategies are adopted which differentiate the market (e.g. residents, visitors and shoppers) and support behavioural change.
- Be delivered in a cost-effective way.

5.2 Localism

The Council has several commitments in its Programme to develop localism and strengthen local democracy and this is in keeping with national policy on community empowerment. The car parking review can support the Council's ambitions on localism in a number of ways:

- Devolving more decision-making powers to local committees;
- Enabling local benefit from car parking opportunities, including the re-investment of off-street car parking income locally and potentially new car parking provision, especially to improve local facilities and the tourist experience; and
- Enabling meaningful engagement with communities on local changes to car parking and local choices on how the Council spends its money locally.

5.3 Devolving more decision-making to local committees

¹ Income derived from off-street parking is discretionary but must still be reported to central government. On-street parking income is not currently in scope as its use is tightly controlled by statute and with less scope to use for non-car parking activities. Income from enforcement activity would not be included in the disaggregated budget at this time as it is unpredictable income and it supports the costs of enforcement activity which is managed centrally and deployed across areas.

Currently car parking budget decisions are made centrally and normally reported through the EDI Committee. The income is used corporately to manage the overall community services budget. **Appendix 2** shows the income expected in 2018/19 from off street car parking which is pooled and used in this way. There is no local committee input (other than reviewing objections to Traffic Regulation Orders), less transparency on how car parking income is used and limited opportunities for meaningful community engagement. In essence as a Council we have not explained how much we spend on managing car parking and what we do with money received from car parking. There would be advantages in a more explicit link between income and benefit to each community.

5.4 It is recommended that this is achieved by devolving decisions and changes to car parking as part of the Community Services disaggregated budget. This will allow local committees to make decisions for their locality and within the wider context of their disaggregated budget. The current disaggregated budget for 2018/19 is attached at **Appendix 3**. Including car parking would enable the extended local control budget model favoured by the Board. It means:

- Off-street car park revenue and expenditure is fully included in the Community Services disaggregated budget.
- Decisions on tariffs to be applied and lists of car parks for inclusion would be made by local committees.
- A revenue target for car parking would be set by Council for each area to account for existing corporate saving/income targets as part of the budget setting process.
- Surplus revenues would be retained by local committees for expenditure against relevant local priorities.
- Any deficits would need to be met from reductions in other disaggregated budget lines, subject to statutory requirements on services and on workforce planning. Workforce implications will be clarified whenever service reductions are being considered.
- Both surpluses and deficits would be applied to the following year's budget, based on actual out-turns and not income assumptions.
- It is likely that future increased corporate income targets might be applied against the car park estate within the local area and may include any new car parks.

5.5 Members favoured this model because it provides:

- Extended local budgetary control and local budget planning.
- Improved opportunities for local benefit.
- Improved scope for meaningful engagement.
- Local accountability for surpluses and deficits.
- Opportunities to explain the benefits of car park tariffs.
- Stable corporate budget planning.
- Scope to build on current practice, emphasising the disaggregated budget.
- Scope for future development of this model to full local responsibility for the budget, income and savings, including a review of the apportionment of the Community Services disaggregated budget.

5.6 There are risks associated with this approach, as detailed in paragraphs 6.5 to 6.10 below, but the Board has seen these are more acceptable than the risks associated with the other two options of:

- The current model; and
- Limited local budget control (which means deficits in one Committee area being met by surpluses in another).

- 5.7 The Board has also considered amendments to the Scheme of Delegation which would be needed for this shift to local decision-making.
- 5.8 Currently the Scheme for local committees makes only one reference to car parking and that is in relation to promoting Road Traffic Orders, where there are statutory objections (power 2.23 and 2.24)².
- 5.9 The following general powers relate to the disaggregated budget and community engagement and these would apply to car parking if this becomes part of the disaggregated budget:
- To agree local priorities within area operational budgets for Community Services, taking account of statutory requirements and Council policy and priorities (2.12 and 2.13).
 - To agree variations within local budgets between individual functional areas to meet local priorities as specified below (2.13 and 2.14).
 - To agree whether and to what extent non-statutory functions are delivered locally, and how these are funded within local budgets (2.14 and 2.15).
 - From the resources that are agreed to be delegated to the Local Committee, for the Local Committee to agree which resources are to be allocated through participatory budgeting and the methods to use (2.11 and 2.12).
 - To agree any local community engagement, including the work of Ward Forums in relation to Council business in the locality (1.10 and 1.11).

- 5.10 To enable the shift to localism the Board recommends the Scheme is amended to include a specific power in relation to car parking, as it is for the other disaggregated functions as follows:

For local/City Committee

To approve any changes to local Parking Services including introducing and varying charges, commissioning new car park provision, increasing or reducing the local service, all in accordance with the Council's Parking Policy; approach to engagement and the disaggregated budget for car parking. (New power 2.19 for local committees and 2.27 for the City of Inverness Area Committee).

5.11 Enabling local financial benefit from car parking opportunities

The extended local control budget model recommended by the Board means local choices around off-street car parking income. This means if car park charges are rolled out to more of the existing 228 off-street car parks, reinvesting the surplus income locally. This income could be significant as currently charges are applied in only 18 of these 228 car parks.

Options for re-investment could include:

- Improving or protecting other local Community Service provision e.g. roads repairs, winter maintenance, environmental and amenity works, public toilets or village officer type activity; and/or.
- new car parking provision, especially to improve local facilities and the tourist experience (corporate support may also be available for this, including from external funds).

This will require a local Car Parking Budget to be drawn up for each local committee.

- 5.12 The model enables the Council to set the off-street car park income level corporately when it sets its budget. Any surplus above this income level will be available for local

² The numbering relates to both the Scheme for Local Committees and for the City of Inverness Area Committee.

decision-making. We can expect further budget reductions so the Council may decide to increase the income level to avoid reducing services and preventing job losses. Local Committees can choose to vary the tariffs locally. Over-achieving the income level set by Council means more to invest locally, but under-achieving will mean reducing other services within the disaggregated Community Services budget. Modelling to enable accurate income assumptions along with improved budget monitoring in year will be required, but to manage this risk well, investment decisions by local committee for the year ahead would be made on actual out-turns in the previous year.

5.13 Enabling meaningful local engagement including on budget choices

The extended local control budget model recommended by the Board empowers local committees. Disaggregated Community Services budgets were agreed by the Council in March 2016. While local committees have been able to agree priorities for some areas of service, they have tended to do this for specific service areas at different times of the year. They have not yet been able to consider choices across the range of disaggregated budgets and services. By including off-street car parking as a disaggregated budget and service, Members will have to be supported differently by staff so that they have the right information to understand the options they have, the impacts of different choices and for discussions on these matters to be held at the right time and in the right forums. Proposals from the Service to confirm these new arrangements (and those below) are needed. These should consider any impacts expected around training, work load, priorities, staff roles and possibly structure.

5.14 As the model enables more decisions to be made by local committees, it brings more opportunity for those decisions to be informed also by local community views. There should be a defined process for this to happen. The approach for considering local changes to car parking is set out in **Appendix 4**. This includes the internal and external engagement process that is to be followed and the impact assessment done before decisions are made at Committee as well as the action following any Committee decision. This allows local members to:

- be fully involved in any changes proposed,
- be aware of the implications of the choices they can make, including workforce implications; and
- choose the right methods for engagement. The Ward Management and Policy teams in the Chief Executive's Office can support members and the Service with their engagement process.

The implications for Community Services staff should be included in the Service proposals highlighted above.

5.15 Implementation timescale

The Board recommends the timescale for implementing any changes as set out below.

- a. Adopt the engagement process at Appendix 4 as soon as possible in 2018/19.
- b. The Council's budget setting for 2019/20 includes the corporate target for car parking income which is to be met locally (by February 2019).
- c. Following the Council's budget setting, Local Committees to decide car parking arrangements for 2019/20 – this means acting on the process defined for making local decisions (Appendix 4 and as described in paragraphs 5.13 and 5.14 above) and in the context of choices about the overall disaggregated budget.
- d. Quarterly monitoring by local committee during the year on car park income and expenditure from April 2019, with scope to make in-year adjustments if necessary (e.g. tariff changes).
- e. In May 2020 when out-turns for 2019/20 are available, the local Committee

decides how to re-invest any surplus locally or if a deficit has occurred it agrees which other disaggregated community services expenditure to reduce for 2020/21.

- f. Review of the new process after a year of implementation, i.e. after April 2021.

5.16 Car parking policy

To support the redesign review and other changes sought by the Service, the Board agreed on 1st May for a revised policy for the management of car parking across the Highlands to be prepared. The Board also agreed the revised policy should have a higher profile in the Community Services Service Plan. The Service requires the policy to address issues wider than the terms of the redesign review and to include e.g. blue badges, permit parking, Traffic Regulation Orders, and enforcement.

- 5.17 The Board has agreed that any revised policy should include the review team's work, so including the vision and localism changes agreed by the Board in June, plus other relevant changes agreed by the Board on 1st May 2018. These are listed in Appendix 5.

- 5.18 It is recommend that Council agrees:

- A revised policy for car parking is considered at the EDI committee as soon as practicable (earliest opportunity August 2018) and that it includes the:
 - vision for car parking developed and agreed through the Board as set out at paragraph 5.1;
 - extended local control budget model;
 - engagement process as set out in Appendix 4; and
 - further Board recommendations as set in Appendix 5.
- That the revised car parking policy is given a higher profile in the Community Services Service Plan.

5.19 Other recommended process improvements

Several other types of process improvement were agreed by the Board at its meeting on 1.5.18. They are listed below for Members to note. Unless otherwise stated most are operational improvements that can be delegated to officers (in Community Services) to take forward. These are reported to Council as actions agreed by the Board to be taken forward by the Service. Where any further governance is required this is noted below and would be followed at the appropriate time.

5.20 Intelligence and opportunities around land for car parking

- Resource the development of a database to show all land currently under the management of the Council used for car parking together with details of other land used for car parking which is not within the control of the Council where practicable (this can build on the data included in the Council's asset map)
- In line with existing policies, identify additional land which could be used for car parking where there is an established need e.g. vacant land, including land adjacent to Housing, and land currently earmarked for other uses. This could include land identified with partners which could have dual use
- Identify sites currently used for car parking and audit the income and use against the potential for them to be sold or developed as a site for Housing or commercial use. Also consider sites to be sold or developed for other use which could be used for car parking instead.

5.21 Developing car parking data and financial management arrangements

- Improve available data used to assess parking needs.
- Prepare a business case to ensure that the best solution is found for revenue

collection and recovery of data on car park usage

- Develop an information analysis tool-set inclusive of modelling and enhanced data collection processes.
- Ensure an appropriate coding structure is in place to record detailed income & expenditure to support analysis
- Recognise the distinct nature of parking income and the restrictions on what any surpluses can be spent on.

5.22 Processes to support investment in car parking infrastructure

- Quantify the costs to bring priority car parks to a standard suitable for introducing charging.
- Link potential income to the upgrade costs required using the revised modelling formula.
- Agree a car park maintenance programme in conjunction with Local committees as part of cyclical roads maintenance.
- Develop an investment programme through appropriate governance based on car park use and importance to the local community.

5.23 Marketing and promotion of car parking

- Simplify and expand public access to parking services
- Develop website content to better promote the council's car parking strategy
- Improve car park management technology including information and signage and the potential use of Apps linked to advertising for the Council and other businesses.

5.24 Workforce issues (NB processes are in place to engage with staff, Trade Unions and Corporate Resources Committee on workforce planning and any changes arising).

- Undertake a LEAN Review in 2019/20 into car parking service delivery arrangements and related Services.
- Ensure that the Parking Service is fully integrated into the mainstream administration of Roads & Community Works and links in with others in the transport planning sector.
- Further integrate Parking Services to provide a one-stop shop for consumers.
- Ensure workforce planning considers resourcing implications as the parking strategy rolls out and enforcement activity increases.

5.25 Continual learning from good practice

- Continue to learn from other initiatives undertaken by local authorities with similar parking issues.

6. Implications

6.1 Resource implications

There are resource implications detailed in the report for shifting to the extended local control budget model and for staff support needed to make this model work. Proposals to respond to staff impacts (training, work load, priorities, staff roles and possibly structure) are requested from the Service. Staffing issues could also arise from re-investing surplus income locally and from choices to reduce other service in the disaggregated budget. These local workforce implications would be clarified to support Members when they make these local choices.

6.2 Legal implications

Proposed changes to the Scheme of Delegation are set out in the report.

- 6.3 Community (Equality, Poverty and Rural) implications
The process set out at Appendix 4 enables community impacts to be assessed and taken into account before Members make decisions at local committees on changes to local car parking.
- 6.4 Climate Change/Carbon Clever implications
The revised policy will act to help integrate parking services with other community transport partners and act to enhance active travel. There are also opportunities to include electric vehicle charging points in Council car parks and as another source of local income from car parks.
- 6.5 Risk implications
There are risks associated with the shift to localism. This involves a change in how decisions are made in the Council, where budget responsibility lies and how we involve communities better. This brings different expectations of both Members and staff supporting them.
- 6.6 Ways of managing these risks are detailed in the report. Reputational risk can be managed by introducing a standard process of engagement with Members and communities prior to local committee decisions being made (Appendix 4).
- 6.7 Financial risk can be managed by:
- devolving off-street car parking budgets so that they sit within the disaggregated Community Services budget (and with Members supported differently by staff to enable real choice across the disaggregated budget);
 - setting local income targets as part of the budget setting process agreed by the Council;
 - quarterly monitoring of car parking income and expenditure at local committees;
 - surplus income being re-invested and deficits being managed in the new financial year after out-turns are reported for the previous year; and
 - Members being supported to understand the impacts of the decision they make, including workforce impacts.
- 6.8 In appraising three options for decision-making and budgetary control for car parking, the Board did acknowledge the pros and cons of the extended local control budget option they favoured. The pros of that option are set out in paragraph 5.5 above. The cons were described as: no scope for future deficit transfers across areas; locking in existing deficit transfers; lacking transparency in current apportionment of budgets across areas (historically based budgets) which could hamper meaningful community engagement; reduced flexibility to improve assets/facilities as surplus revenue raised in one area will not be available for expenditure elsewhere; surplus car park revenue being required to meet one-off deficit on other disaggregated budget lines; and an additional layer of complexity of reporting and management.
- 6.9 However the pros were seen to outweigh the cons and were more acceptable than the cons associated with the other options, i.e. the current approach for car parking decision-making and the limited local budget control option.
- 6.10 A review period is built into the changes a year after implementation (April 2021).
- 6.11 Gaelic implications
The only Gaelic implications relate to signage and other forms of communication around car parking and the Council has policies in place which will be adhered to.

Designation: Inverness City Area Manager

Date: 12 June 2018

Authors:

- David Haas, Chief Executives Office
- Alasdair Bruce, Corporate Resources
- Robbie Bain, Chief Executives Office
- Carron McDiarmid, Chief Executive's Office

Redesign Board Deliberation on the Peer Review of Car Parking

15.8.17 Workshop: Board agrees to include a peer review of car parking in its review programme. Cllr Baxter, Cllr Boyd and Paul MacPherson agreed to participate in the review team.

19.9.17 Workshop: A proposal was made from the Service to re-consider whether a redesign review was required as the Service was developing proposals for a car parking charging model for roll out across the Council. The Board confirmed it wanted a redesign peer review to proceed.

14.11.17 Workshop: The proposed [scope of the car parking review](#) was agreed. It was supported by the team members on the Board present; Cllr Boyd and Paul MacPherson. Discussion included the appetite for charging, the need for appropriate enforcement and the links with traffic management.

5.12.17 Workshop: Board members involved provided a verbal up-date of progress with the review. Three meetings had taken place and information on price modelling had been provided. Cllr M Smith raised the benefits of using Ringo for paying for parking and had some proposals on charging in Easter Ross (*the team leader has been asked to contact Cllr Smith to discuss*). Investment to improve car parks on a spend-to-save basis was raised and there is Trade Union interest in any staff redeployment opportunities that might arise. The scope for seasonal charging was raised and links are being made by the team to tourism opportunities. The scope for issuing more parking permits for residential use in towns was also raised. Review proposals will come to a workshop in January.

16.1.18 Workshop: The work of the review team was presented by David Haas and supported by Cllr Boyd and Paul MacPherson as team members. David described how the team had been working to identify key priorities and developing objectives for the review. Their work included ensuring the right fit with Council priorities including localism, traffic management and active travel, building on current strengths and finding out about practice elsewhere in the UK. He highlighted the need for clarity on car parking policy, appraising the financial model, transparency in budget management and the importance of communicating what car parking fees are used for. He confirmed the Council had over 200 car parks with charges applied in 18 and different degrees of management over them all. The review was enabling challenge on whether all current car parks were best used for that purpose or if there were better alternatives (e.g. housing development) but that local context was important. From stakeholders the team had access to previous Citizen Panel responses and there was a sense that tourists expect to pay to park. There were clear opportunities emerging for commercialism and the team would look at pricing strategies, appreciating that different car parks have different markets, as well as digital opportunities to make it easy to pay and link to other forms of transport. In discussion Members raised the following challenges and suggestions:

- How to make the most of the tourist experience, including:
 - Scope for overnight parking charges linked to tourism

- Investing in car parks where people will pay e.g. for munro climbers who'd prefer to park safely and pay £2-£3 a day – these would pay back quickly.
- Interpretation boards at sites of interest and for these to ask for donations.
- Links to better public toilet provision with scope for charging.
- Other commercial opportunities e.g. car parking at airports
- Using digital tools including number plate recognition for payment to keep administration/collection costs down
- Scope for redeployment if we expand the car parking and any associated services
- Charging for more than 18/200 car parks with greater consistency in approach to charging
- Whether there is scope to charge more for non-domestic rates for supermarkets with charging car parks
- Supporting the localism agenda for re-investing income raised by new charges. This would include:
 - Being clear about the links between what we charge and what it supports — so identifying the benefits of charging and a policy around that to enable investment in the area
 - Charges could pay for road maintenance locally or other priorities of Members e.g. village officers
 - Awareness of local impacts of charging and that one size does not fit all
 - The need for the right arrangements for enforcement

The team were thanked for their work to date. Having listened to Members' views they will return for a further discussion at the additional workshop on 30th January (3-4pm). Workshop later cancelled.

13.3.8 Workshop: David Haas, team leader, made a presentation with suggestions for refocusing the review of car parking following budget decisions made on car parking charges at Council in February 2018. David shared data on the areas where car parking costs were incurred and where car parking charges are applied. This showed where there was a mismatch between income and expenditure and it highlighted where further information on financial data was needed. He confirmed that the scope for the car parking review to support localism still existed, with surplus income generated ring-fenced to the locality and made available to invest locally and as agreed by the local committee. Being open about how charges are reinvested would improve transparency on charging to the public. Experience in 2018/19 would test the modelling on projected income and on impact. He highlighted areas where there was growing demand for car parking e.g. Skye and for other opportunities to support tourism. He confirmed that some research had shown that where charges had been introduced at the right level, footfall had increased to towns as car parking spaces were re-used as people realised the value of them.

Member comments included: the interest the Commercial Board has in camper van parking provision; the scope for drilling into the income and expenditure associated with individual sites; collecting payments in remote areas; and the proportion of funding that might be retained locally.

Those concerned about new car parking charges queried whether: Ward Discretionary Grant could be used to offset car parking income and the potential displacement of car parking to supermarkets where no charge is levied. They felt in Caithness that the poor condition of car parks made it difficult for some to justify the new charges being applied to them. Others wanted to know what form the planned consultation would take and expressed their opposition to introducing charges; noting the Council decision had been made.

Others were concerned about current inequity and felt it was not fair to charge in some places and not others. The review in progress offered scope to improve localism and enable charging to be defensible and beneficial to the public. Political leadership was needed.

The Director present confirmed that the scope for community wardens enforcing charges was limited because they provide services to tenants (HRA funded) but that the new enforcement plan includes recruiting 4 new officers. He confirmed the consultation plan was being devised and he offered to speak to local Members.

25.4.18 Workshop: David Haas, team leader for the peer review presented the [slides circulated](#) earlier to Board Members on the redesign proposals. A full discussion with contributions from 18 Board and non-Board members followed. Two further Members unable to attend had sent comments in by e-mail. The Chair read the email from Cllr Wilson. The discussion reflected diversity of opinion and it was acknowledged that the budget decision in February had been taken separately to the peer review which was still underway.

The team was asked to reflect on the points below.

- Stakeholders should include local businesses.
- Clarity is needed on the timeline – for policy and proposals being implemented.
- Clarity on the % that can be kept locally – 50/50 suggested but this needs further deliberation.
- Surplus generated to stay locally should be available to use on local priorities and not be confined to community services activities.
- Local committees given opportunity to consider how to bring in Member views from each Ward on car parking proposals – especially where committees cover large geographies
- Draw out how Lochaber Area Committee has used its powers locally to vary rates and time periods for car parking - £300k to £600k was being raised in Fort William now.
- Consider lobbying approach to Govt. and its agencies on scope for levying tax on larger commercial car parks and for that to be retained locally.
- Whether the Highland Rover ticket could be available for local residents too.
- Helping residents with parking where charges are to be introduced e.g. residents living above town centre shops.

- How to respond to staff concerns about paying for parking – Fort William staff had raised this issue with Trade Unions. Some commented that free parking can be seen as a perk.

In conclusion, the current inequity with charging in only some areas was acknowledged. Some Members highlighted that those charging are subsidising costs incurred for car parking elsewhere and the status quo was not acceptable. Some Members present are opposed to introducing car parking charges in their Wards mainly because they feel there would be adverse local impacts. It was acknowledged that the policy proposed enables local context to be considered, local decisions to be made and for public engagement. This would include understanding impacts, re-investing surpluses generated locally (with surplus to be defined) and bearing deficits locally.

The Chair asked that the review team prepare their recommendations for a report to a formal Redesign Board to be arranged for the following week. If possible the recommendations from the Board could be presented to the Council in May.

1.5.18 Formal Board meeting: Report prepared titled '[Parking with Purpose](#)' which included 63 recommendations for the car parking review. Prior to discussion, the Chair advised that it was now intended that this review would be taken in two stages on the basis that Members could raise issues in relation to any of the current 60+ recommendations within the circulated report at this meeting, with further work done on the proposals which would then be continued through the Board in workshop(s) before coming back to a further formal meeting of the Board and submission of final recommendations to the Council. Ideally this would be the Council meeting at the end of June.

During discussion, Members raised the following issues:-

- in relation to Chapter 6 (Stakeholder & Staff Views), and specifically the proposal to agree a Communications Plan as part of the process to be followed when applying the revised policy and to include consultation with local bodies, it would help to also include consultation with Community Councils;
- in regard to Chapter 5 (Council's Parking Estate – Identifying Additional Parking Opportunities), and specifically the development of a database to show all land currently under the control/ownership of the Council used for car parking, this should include fuller and more detailed information on the car parks missing from the list and those of uncertain status. Also, in terms of the identification of sites currently used for car parking, there should be consideration also given to the use of vacant land where possible;
- there was a concern in relation to the reputational risk to the Council arising from the lack of consultation with certain communities over the decisions made at the Council meeting when the budget was set and in this respect it was highlighted that in future consultation before implementation was key;
- an apology was offered by Mr A MacKinnon to Mr G MacKenzie (and accepted) in relation to comments which had been made in a Board workshop about Mr MacKenzie's previous involvement in discussion on this issue at the Council meeting in February;

- a breakdown of the capital costs of implementation of proposals in each area, along with associated information on the staffing/operational running costs and income targets, would be helpful;
- there were concerns about the potential impact on small car parks across the Highlands;
- in regard to Chapter 7 (Parking Revenue and Commercialism Opportunities), and specifically consideration of the expansion of lorry parks, mobile homes and coach parking facilities with the application of a charge for use, it was suggested that this should include reference to working in conjunction with partners;
- in relation to Chapter 9 (Recommended Pricing Strategies and Business Processes, and specifically the recommendation for improvement of car park management technology, it was suggested that this should also include reference to information and signage;
- there was a need for further and more detailed information on rates associated with individual car parks and this should be provided for a future Board Workshop;
- in response to a query as to what was planned for future consultation exercises, it was noted that there would be full involvement of Local Committees in each case and that a consistent template would be used across the Highland area in this regard which could be adjusted to local circumstances if necessary;
- opportunities for discussion of future proposals at a Ward level should also be considered;
- feedback from communities in areas where car parking charges had already been implemented would be helpful;
- further detail on the criteria to be used in terms of the inclusion of car parks in future was needed; and
- in relation to Chapter 2 (Car Parking Vision) and specifically the rolling out of benefits from the new policy across the Highlands and utilising Local Committees and Community Partnerships in this respect, it was suggested that reference should instead be made to rolling out the new policy (with no reference to benefits). It was noted that this linked to Chapter 8 (Delivering on Localism) and specifically the identification of a Communication Plan which engaged communities effectively and highlighted benefits whilst also accounting for any concerns.

The Board **NOTED** the findings as detailed in the report and attached appendices.

The Board also **AGREED**:

1. the following changes to the current recommendations in the report:
 - a. Recommendation 2/06 – link this to rec 8.06 and 6.01 and remove reference to ‘the benefits’;
 - b. Rec. 5/01 – include land we use for car parking but do not own;
 - c. Rec 5/02 – include land identified with partners which could have dual use;
 - d. Rec. 5/03 – include sites to be sold or developed for other use which could be used for car parking instead

- e. Rec. 6/01 – link to rec 2.6 and 8.6
 - f. Rec 7/07 – include and working with partners
 - g. Rec 9/07 – include information and signage
 - h. Include a recommendation that the final and agreed proposals should be reviewed after a period of one year.
2. that the team would proceed with work to draft:
- a. a revised policy using the findings from the review;
 - b. revisions to the scheme of delegation setting out the decisions to be made at local and City Committees and those to be made at strategic Committee;
 - c. the options on the formula for retaining income locally and regionally;
 - d. the template for local committees to use to help with their decision-making;
 - e. and the timescale proposed for implementation.

This work would come back to a Workshop for consideration and prior to a formal meeting of the Board where it would agree its recommendations for Council, ideally for the Council meeting in June 2018.

3. That the Board should look at the operating model for car parking. This should include consideration of rates treatment, so further information is to be provided on current rates charged and the likelihood of those being reviewed where charges are introduced.

The [minute from the Board meeting](#) was provided to Council on 10th May for noting.

15.5.18 Workshop: the review team leader, David Haas presented three reports.

- a. The list of the review recommendations agreed at the Board Meeting on 1st May was circulated for information. This will be presented differently in the final report for the Board taking into account the need to streamline them and to separate those which need Member approval and those that can be taken forward operationally.
- b. Proposals on financial and governance arrangements. There was a general view that the proposals were going in the right direction but with more work needed on targets and surplus levels. Discussion points included:
 - The importance of including all relevant costs attached to individual car parks.
 - The need for enforcement to ensure people pay where required.
 - There is scope for some areas to benefit from the approach proposed given opportunity to re-invest income locally and if there is local flexibility and impacts are considered (e.g. Caithness and Mallaig).

- On setting the income target, questions were raised about who sets that and whether it is one rate for the Council or if there is scope for local income targets to be set. Should we accept the current income target and work on the basis of the surplus being retained locally or could all income raised locally be kept locally?
- Income targets set need to be reviewed annually. The Depute Chief Executive/Director of Finance confirmed that income targets will carry risk where you can't control demand and people's choices can be fickle. While surplus can be retained locally a deficit would call on reserves and we need a range of options to deal with a deficit occurring. The Director of Community Services reminded the Board of the position in Fort William recently where assumptions needed to be re-visited. The Convenor said choices in Aviemore were surprising with the Council car park often full where charges are made and nearby non-paying car parks were not.
- Concerns about whether the income targets set for 2018/19 are achievable. Some feel they are not achievable because assumptions about capacity and use are inaccurate and that there had been errors on the budget backing sheet presented to Council.

Although it was acknowledged that the budget decision was separate to the redesign review, the Leader explained the position that the budget decision for 2018/19 had 3 elements: increasing current charges, new permit arrangements and new charges in some other car parks. On the latter there did appear to be errors in the detail but the Leader was seeking clarity from the Head of Corporate Governance on whether the Council decision was about the savings/income target overall to be met or whether it was also for the detail on how it would be met and from specific locations listed in the budget backing sheet. If it was for the savings/income target overall then there would be scope to look at new places and to change it. It was also noted that the Redesign Board cannot over turn a Council decision that would need a Council decision. If savings/income was not achieved it would need to be found from somewhere else.

The Board noted that the redesign of car parking would not proceed until it is ready and Members have deliberated it sufficiently.

It was agreed that an extra workshop was needed prior to the June workshop for further discussion on the options for a devolved car parking management budget which would look at the figures for the income target and amount to retain locally. It should be mindful of all factors across the disaggregated budgets so that charges can be considered more holistically as part of local decisions on the Community Services budget. This way Members can have choices on what charges can be used for or to off-set costs on other services.

- c. Draft approach for considering local changes to car parking. Discussion points included:

- Communities want to be involved so the new approach should apply to the areas proposed for this year and not wait until next year. Local petitions showed public opinion on introducing new charges in 2018/19.
- The engagement approach was welcomed but had not been used for the areas identified to have charges this year.
- Engagement is important because communities don't want to be presented with a fait accompli. Also the approach proposed would allow for very local circumstances to be considered that could influence our approach to charging e.g. in Mallaig cars have to be parked because you can't take vehicles to some islands so we might want a different charging regime for those cars than for others.

It was agreed that the additional workshop would also give time to consider a flow chart version of the approach presented.

28.5.18 Workshop:

Matter arising noted from the action note from the workshop on 15th May:

The Chair fed back that following advice from the Head of Corporate Governance the Council budget decision on car parking did stand in terms of the overall income target to be achieved. There could be flexibility on how some elements of the target could be raised locally.

A paper setting out the financial options for car parking redesign had been circulated previously and was presented by the review team leader. It set out 3 options for discussion at the workshop, including the team's assessment of the pros and cons for each option. The options included were:

- Option 1: the current model;
- Option 2: Limited Local Budget Control; and
- Option 3: Extended Local Budget Control.

In discussion the points raised by Members and responses included:

- Clarifying that it would be the Council that sets the corporate income target for car parks.
- Under option 3 any additional income raised (above the target) is used as the local Committee decides and as part of the wider disaggregation of Community Services budgets.
- Devolving control to local committees means Members locally decide and there could be scope to take option 3 further and disaggregate more budgets and decisions.
- Acknowledging that income assumptions are assumptions and that the final out-turn figures must be used for decisions – so decisions are made on the previous year's income.
- There could well be difficult local choices to make given the Council's budget situation but that these decisions were best made locally – the local

Committee would make decisions about where charges would occur and what level to set the tariffs and in the context of the income target set by Council and the income can be used to protect local Council services.

- Some Members were keen to press on with option 3 because of local pressures, especially around Mallaig where traffic management issues arose especially in the tourist season. Local communities were now looking to take on the ownership of Council car parks to raise charges and improve traffic management themselves.
- Option 3 was seen as the fairest option, not just for local choices to be made and better equity across the region, but also because the more income that is raised by extending car parking charges, the lower the overall corporate target can be.
- There is a fear of charging in new places, but the experience of Fort William shows that charges can be accepted and especially if the link can be made with how the income will be used and that is possible through option 3. In Caithness there has been no charging by the Council and that can't continue, especially when local communities show they can generate income from car parking that support amenity improvements. The Latheron Wheel beach was a good example of this, where Ward Discretionary Funding had been awarded through participatory budgeting to support a community group to provide parking. The honesty box installed for the car park had raised £1500 in less than year, demonstrating that people were willing to pay. Maybe explaining car parking charges as an environmental levy, where income is used for local maintenance could help promote it. Also some shopkeepers complain to Members about people parking all day which could block access to potential shoppers.
- Some concern was expressed at the abuse some Members had received on social media about car parking but others said localism meant taking local praise and lock flack. Others said it's best to ignore abuse received by social media and with better engagement with the public on this matter this should be easier to handle.
- Parking fine income is not proposed for disaggregation at this time.
- Keen to explore how option 3 can help with new provision for camper vans. There should be scope to charge more because of their size, as ferried do, and this can be part of the local discussion on setting tariffs and developing new sites.
- Option 3 seemed to offer more scope to engage with partners locally.
- It is important for Members to have an open mind about car parking locally and to consider the evidence around opportunities and impacts before taking stand points.
- It was confirmed that the Council set an income target for rolling out car parking charges for 2018/19 of £210k, however this income would be needed to also cover the costs of the roll out (e.g. installation of charging

machines) so that the income available in the first year to off-set savings elsewhere was £67k.

In conclusion, and consensually, option 3 was preferred by the Board to proceed as a team's recommendation.

It was agreed that a formal Board meeting should be set to enable the Board to take its recommendations to Council for the June meeting. One further workshop would be planned to ensure all Member queries had been considered.

8.6.18 Workshop (extract from draft action note)

David Haas, Team Leader, presented the draft report circulated in advance. Points raised in the discussion included:

- Trade Union concerns about the earlier Board recommendations into workplace charging for parking. The Board shared this concern. As this was previously agreed at a formal Board meeting, Members would be invited to withdraw this at the next Board meeting.
- Support for the approach to engaging Members and communities locally.
- Concern about the proposals working for the Ross and Cromarty Committee given its size and having to find a solution there and involving Wards would help.
- Local decisions mean local members being accountable for those decisions local, some will be easy and some will be harder to make. If those decisions are not taken locally then they will have to be taken centrally.
- Members need to step up and take responsibility for local decisions.
- Localism also means taking community views into account.
- How to make disaggregated budgets work by including car parking – we know this needs more work and we need to find a solution.
- We won't be able to make the shift with our small teams, we need to look at the resourcing to do it.
- Recent Member visits to Orkney showed how car parking charges can be applied sensitively for residents and visitors, using seasonal tariffs and different rates including free first hour parking.
- Differentiating the market is important. Off-street permits for residents could be a way of doing this.
- Future budget settlements are expected to get harder and income from car parking is needed. Members have to face the hard decisions.
- The need for fairness in charging and not just relying on some areas to meet the budget gap.
- The rest of Scotland charges for parking.
- Charging for car parking affects motorists and not the poorest in our communities.
- The review has involved a huge amount of work and lengthy discussion in the Board. In hindsight it would have been better to have done this work before making some car parking decisions. The proposals offer a way to move forward.
- The proposals offer new opportunities locally – to raise income and to engage better.

- Seeking clarity on whether proposed charges can stop. Confirming that the proposals set out the engagement process to use but the Board cannot undo a Council decision.
- We could spend years challenging fairness of allocations across the region but that would not help close our budget gap.
- The potential benefits here are not just about income, but about dealing with congestion and environmental destruction. If we are to be an international destination we have to sort this out. Community engagement opportunities exist too. There will be wider income opportunities from getting this right.
- Confirmation the disaggregation referred to off-street car parking only.
- Confirmation that the earlier request to explore other models of car parking service delivery should not be pursued at this time. As this was raised at a formal Board meeting, Members would be invited to withdraw this at the next Board meeting.

Reference was made to the emails sent in to the workshop from those absent, from Cllr m Smith, Cllr I Cockburn and Cllr P Siggers.

Source: workshop action notes and minutes of the formal Board.

12th June 2018 2nd Formal Board Meeting

The Minute from the Board meeting on 12th June 2018 will be circulated separately to Council for its meeting on 28th June 2018.

Community Services Parking Budget for off-street car parks 2018/19

	Core Parking Service	Badenoch & Strathspey	Caithness	Inverness	Lochaber	Nairn	Ross & Cromarty	Skye	Sutherland	TOTAL
Parking Revenue	360,000	40,000	0	1,751,200	222,500	0	0	56,100	0	2,429,800
Roll Out to new sites (budget saving 18/19)	- 143,000				64,000	32,000	86,000	15,000	12,500	66,500
Off-street tariff review (budget saving 18/19)				438,000	543,000			29,000		1,010,000
New Services & Uplifts (budget saving 18/19)	330,000									330,000
Less: Expenditure	- 900,700	-1,100	-13,500	-474,800	-95,500	13,800	-44,500	18,500	-13,300	- 1,575,700
Net Parking Revenue	- 353,700	38,900	-13,500	1,714,400	734,000	18,200	41,500	81,600	-800	2,260,600

Appendix 3

COMMUNITY SERVICES - SUMMARY
REAL CASH BUDGETS ONLY

DISAGGREGATED AREA BUDGETS 2018/19

	Badenoch & Strathspey	Caithness	Inverness	Lochaber	Nairn	Ross & Cromarty	Skye	Sutherland	Total
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY									
No of Employees (including seasonals)	30	60	126.69	50	23	108	42	84.41	524.1
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Labour	716,600	1,500,865	3,021,110	1,269,600	557,000	2,641,150	1,028,200	1,986,450	12,720,975
Plant	293,500	877,100	1,096,880	554,400	243,200	1,347,900	697,900	949,965	6,060,845
Winter maintenance	184,400	153,600	284,600	57,000	41,900	302,400	296,000	335,500	1,655,400
Roads maintenance	77,100	68,500	89,800	72,600	62,900	191,600	62,100	180,100	804,700
Public conveniences	33,100	47,400	72,200	75,500	21,400	212,961	71,400	56,500	590,461
Burials	13,300	16,800	40,000	11,300	16,800	37,100	17,500	8,700	161,500
Grounds maintenance	19,600	17,000	83,700	40,000	14,000	33,800	20,000	6,000	234,100
Play areas maintenance	3,000	6,500	8,300	7,000	2,000	24,300	2,000	3,800	56,900
Street cleansing	-	3,000	20,000	22,000	-	12,200	200	11,000	68,400
Roads capital works	486,263	785,013	1,132,321	858,888	297,107	1,522,992	807,202	1,040,215	6,930,001
TOTAL	1,826,863	3,475,778	5,848,911	2,968,288	1,256,307	6,326,403	3,002,502	4,578,230	29,283,282

Recommended approach to considering local changes to car parking

Prior to Any Decision Being Made

Local Members should meet to consider the key issues around car parking proposals prior to reaching any local committee decision. This could be done in a Ward Business Meeting, or where committees cover more than one Ward in a local Member workshop. Ward Managers can help to set up the right forum for Members and Community Services staff to attend.

Key issues for Members to consider will be:

- **Preparing for discussions** – it is important that Members and staff come to the discussion with an open mind, willing to think through scenarios and choices and to work constructively together to identify next steps.
- **Identification of existing car parks and potential sites for new car parks**
 - For existing car parks staff will provide a street plan. All car parking should be identified, along with a description of current parking controls. It should differentiate any car parking provision associated with Common Good Funds. This provides an opportunity for checking all correct information is used.
 - For potential sites for new car parking, any options should be identified by staff with Member views also sought.
- **Identification of the budget associated with each car park** – staff would prepare this and draw on the proposed individual budget associated with each car park location and any target for car parking income set for the local committee by Council. Members may have questions for staff to clarify.
- **Discuss the proposals from staff** - for revising the current parking arrangements. This provides an opportunity for Members to seek clarity on the proposals and to share ideas on other potential proposals.
- **Data Analysis** - review the information provided by staff on the income modelling used, including assumptions around car park usage and different tariff options.
- Consider if the **reasons for the proposals are clear**. These should include the potential benefits e.g. improved traffic management, supporting active travel, how the surplus income raised could be used locally. Options for re-investment of the surplus income include local priorities for and protection of a range of Community Services, across the Disaggregated Budget lines.
- If at this stage Members do not support the proposals, they will need support from Community Services staff to consider:

- how else income could be generated to support Community Services locally; and
- which spending could reduce within the disaggregated budget to counter the shortfall in car parking income.
- This will require further discussions on service impacts and workforce planning. Staff will clearly specify which services are in scope for reduction and which are not, i.e. some services may not be reduced because minimum statutory requirements will have to be met. The potential impact on staff, especially any job reductions, will be spelt out, along with the process to follow when changes are expected to the workforce. This will also involve advice on statutory processes as well as Council policy on managing changes to the workforce and workforce planning, including consultation with staff and Trade Unions.
- **Community Engagement** – This is fundamental. It will involve Community Services staff briefing Members on any existing data gathered from earlier engagement and discussion about any new engagement to take place. This will involve a discussion which can be supported by the Ward Management and Policy Team to identify:
 - who the stakeholders are (including community councils and local businesses).
 - the purpose of engaging with them, which should be honest about the Council's funding position, the choices to be made and how engaging others should help make better local choices.
 - the key messages about the proposals and where feedback is needed e.g.
 - what the proposals are
 - why they are proposed
 - the benefits of them - and if there are choices around this (e.g. choices on re-investing surplus income)
 - specific views sought e.g. charging hours, charging seasons, tariff ranges, tariff types (e.g. residents, visitors, shoppers)
 - whether there are other ideas/options
 - what would happen if the proposals cannot be taken forward - and if there are choices around this (e.g. choices on service reduction and workforce implications)

- views on impacts of the proposals
 - the most appropriate methods to use. This might include survey work, focus groups, on-line engagement, participatory budgeting or other approaches.
 - the timing around engagement - to fit with e.g. committee meeting timetable.
 - which staff and Members will take part.
- **Understanding impacts** – Local Members may have a view on potential impacts of the changes proposed on those affected by the potential changes to car parks. Views on impacts can be gathered from the engagement above. We have statutory duties to consider and assess the potential impact changes may have on:
 - protected groups as defined by the Equality Act,
 - potential socio-economic impact as per the Fairer Scotland Duty. In addition the Council's practice is also to consider and assess the:
 - potential impacts upon rural communities and
 - potential impacts on staffing.

These considerations, where possible, should be made at an early stage and should take account of what evidence there is and identify how these may be incorporated into any engagement or consultation. Impacts may be positive or negative but where negative, mitigating actions or changes to the proposal should be considered in order to minimise any negative impacts identified. Corporate guidance and support is available from the policy team and service representatives.

- A **communications plan** should be prepared. This will support the engagement above. It should also provide clarity on the local budget and an explanation as what the additional income could be used for (all within the new car parking policy), and what else would need to reduce if car parking income is not changed. This should help make the options transparent for communities.
- **Amending proposals and confirming proposals** - when analysis and engagement has concluded Members should feel they have enough evidence to be ready for final proposals to be prepared by the Service for a Committee meeting. Ideally this approach should enable consensus but that may not always be possible. Debate on the proposals would take place at Committee before a decision is made.

- **Preparation of the Committee report** – this will include the proposals for change, the reasons for them and how engagement has influenced them. It should specify the impacts identified and what, if any, mitigation is possible if they are negative. Positive impacts should also be reported. A template report to ensure consistency can be provided to the Service to ensure consistency across all local committees.

Action following the Committee decision – in addition to implementing the changes agreed at the local committee, Members should be supported to communicate the change to the public doing this effectively should be identified.

Appendix 5

Additional Items to include in the revised parking policy and guidance

The Redesign Board agreed that that a revised policy would be prepared and that the policy would have a higher profile with the Community Services Service Plan. (Recommendation 10.1 in the report agreed by the Board 1.5.18).

The policy that must reflect the work of the review team as agreed by the Board and listed below. This is in addition to the following changes agreed by the Board and recommended to Council:

- the car parking vision;
- the extended local control budget model; and
- the internal and external engagement process to be used before making any changes to car parking.

Original reference 2/02	The Council should encourage operators to offer end-to-end journeys rather than separate buses, trains and planes.
5/08	Consider establishing Quality Park and Ride Schemes in conjunction with other transport providers.
2/03	Ensure car parking arrangements across the Highlands are integrated with development plans.
2/04	Draw on the experience of other mixed rural and urban Regions to understand how to predict future changes in behaviour; in particular the impact of the change to electric vehicles
2/05	Ensure integration of car park provision and charging regimes to encourage growth and investment in our tourist based economy
2/06	Roll out the new policy across the Highlands utilising local committees and community partnerships (Recommendation 6/01 and 8/06 in relation to communications refers).
2/07	Work with national government and partner agencies such as Hi Trans and HIE to meet the challenges and maximise the opportunities of changes in behaviour.
2/08	There is a need to promote the local and community benefits of effective traffic management for residents, visitors and the local economy.
4/01	Develop the present model in support of transport planning.

4/03	Incorporate the Service's policy work to date into the new policy on car park management.
------	---

6/01	Agree a Communications Plan as part of the process to be followed when applying the revised policy to include consultation with local bodies, including business representatives and community councils, utilising local committees and community partnerships. (Recommendation 8/06 in relation to communications refers).
6/03	Build in feedback on use of car parks into future survey work and link to improvement in wellbeing, including the use of active travel options.
6/04	Link survey work into the benefits that income generated from car parks could bring.

7/01	Consider a 'Highland Rover' ticket aimed at the tourist market.
7/02	Offer combined ticketing (Highland Rover) in conjunction with car hire companies.
7/03	Consider "seasonal parking tickets" with attractive pricing options. The benefit is that the money is paid up front regardless of the level of use.
7/05	Evaluate the opportunities to provide car park management services to owners of other public sector or privately managed car parks.
7/06	Ensure appropriate minimum standards are maintained, maximising the number of spaces available within car parks.

9/08	Simplify and expand public access to parking services.
9/13	Ensure effective communication in all future developments.