

## LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES

## CABINET

## APPENDIX 1

**DATE:** 19 JANUARY 2009

**REPORT OF:** CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAFFIC,  
TRANSPORT & PARKING

**LEAD OFFICER:** ANDREW DARVILL – ASSISTANT  
DIRECTOR FOR ENVIRONMENT

**SUBJECT:** FEES AND CHARGES 2009/10 – PARKING CHARGES AND  
PAYMENT FACILITIES

**WARDS:** ALL

**KEY DECISION?:** YES

**IF YES, IN FORWARD PLAN?:** YES

### For general release

#### 1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 This report deals with the issues of parking charges and other parking related proposals.

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.2 The report makes proposals to build on the Council's emission based Controlled Parking Permit (CPZ) scheme, extending it to other forms of parking charges.

It also addresses the need to realign the CPZ banding arrangements to take account of forthcoming changes to the national (DVLA) banding structure.

Easier access to parking services is proposed using 'on-line' methods for residents/public to interact with the Council.

#### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 No increase is applied to the basic cost of a CPZ permit (see paragraph 3.8).
- 2.2 To address the inconsistency in the basic charge for a CPZ permit between the areas detailed in paragraph 3.10.
- 2.3 CPZ banding arrangements are realigned to fit the forthcoming DVLA banding changes (see paragraphs 3.11 – 3.13 and Appendix A).
- 2.4 Car Park operating hours/locations be amended as detailed in this report. (see paragraphs 3.29 – 3.33)
- 2.5 Voucher Parking arrangements be withdrawn. (see paragraphs 3.34 – 3.36)
- 2.6 New arrangements for provision of parking services be adopted. (see paragraphs 3.37 – 3.39)
- 2.7 To seek the views of the public on an emission based charging structure for 'on' and 'off' street parking based on three tariffs (low, mid and high emissions). (see paragraphs 3.14 – 3.18)

### **3. DETAIL**

#### **Background**

- 3.1 The Council is the primary provider of parking provision in the borough and is responsible for the operation of 'on' and 'off' street car parking, operating Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) and the enforcement of parking controls.
- 3.2 It is usual to undertake a review of parking charges on an annual basis and this may result in making adjustments to the tariffs and/or operating arrangements.
- 3.3 In April 2007 the Council introduced an arrangement where the cost of a CPZ permit was dependent on the CO<sub>2</sub> emission of the vehicle.
- 3.4 The adoption of CO<sub>2</sub> linked CPZ parking permits was innovative and attracted considerable interest. While aimed at encouraging the use of lower CO<sub>2</sub> emitting vehicles and also raising awareness of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions there was a concern expressed by some and echoed by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee that the scheme only applied to a discrete group of residents, those seeking to buy a CPZ permit.
- 3.5 Following the CPZ scheme introduced by this authority in 2007 a number of other authorities have followed along similar lines. These include LB Islington, LB Camden, LB Tower Hamlets, LB Waltham Forest, LB Haringey, LB Kensington & Chelsea and City of York.
- 3.6 The proposals contained in this report build on the views of Overview & Scrutiny in relation to making emission based car parking charges more widespread within the Borough.
- 3.7 The last increase to general 'on' and 'off' street parking charges was in February 2007.

#### **Controlled Parking Zones**

- 3.8 Over the past two years consultations have taken place on various Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) and residents are likely to have based their views on the current charging arrangements it is not proposed to alter the basic permit costs for residents.
- 3.9 Therefore, apart from the changes to the 'Vehicle Banding', that need to be altered to match those of the DVLA the scheme will be unaltered.
- 3.10 There is a discrepancy between the basic cost of a CPZ permit in Vicarage Road and Ferry Road (zones M1 and Z2) and those in the Hampton Court area (zone H). Each of the zones operate 7 days a week and have similar hours yet the Vicarage Road/Ferry Road have a permit cost of £75 while for the others it is £100. In order to address this discrepancy the cost for all the permits should be brought into line at £100.

#### **CPZ Banding arrangements**

- 3.11 The Chancellor of the Exchequer announced in his March 2008 budget that he would introduce new policies intended to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. One of which was to introduce a new banding structure for vehicles. The new bands, to be introduced in April 2009, would be greater in number but each band would have a smaller range of CO<sub>2</sub> emission.

When making the announcement the Chancellor said that the new banding system would be applied retrospectively to all cars registered after 1 March 2001.

- 3.12 To avoid the potential for confusion over operating the CPZ scheme under a different banding arrangement to the DVLA structure it is proposed to realign the CPZ tariffs to the new DVLA bands from April 2009. Details of the realigned bandings are shown in Appendix A.
- 3.13 It is not proposed to alter the current CPZ arrangement for pre 2001 cars which is based on engine size.

### **On and Off Street Parking Charges**

- 3.14 The Council encourages motorists to switch to vehicles that have low CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, therefore, a proposal has been developed to introduce a three tier payment system for all 'on' and 'off' street parking based on the CO<sub>2</sub> emission of the vehicle.
- 3.15 Under this proposal the Council would further encourage motorists to use low CO<sub>2</sub> emission vehicles by reducing the cost of parking for vehicles with a CO<sub>2</sub> emission not exceeding 120 g/km and not changing the current level of parking charges for vehicles with a CO<sub>2</sub> emission above 120 g/km but not exceeding 180g/km (or with an engine size at or below 1800cc). A vehicle with a CO<sub>2</sub> emission above 180 g/km would incur an increase on the current parking charge.
- 3.16 It is proposed that the differentials (from the current tariffs) are a reduction of 25% for the very low (not exceeding 120g/km) emission vehicles and an increase of 25% for vehicles above 180 g/km. Charges need to be 'rounded' to the nearest 5p to avoid the need to use very low denominations of coinage.
- 3.17 To operate the CO<sub>2</sub> emission based tariff there will need to be a means of easily identifying which cars fall into the lower and mid range tariffs. Parking equipment technology is now sufficiently advanced to allow registration of a vehicle either via a mobile telephone, and then pay for their parking using the mobile phone, or by pre-registering their vehicle with the Council and using a 'smart card' at the 'Pay and Display' meter. For unregistered vehicles the parking charge would need to be the higher (+25%) tariff.
- 3.18 By using mobile phones or smart cards to pay for parking variable tariffs can be used as explained below.

### **Mobile Telephone Parking**

- 3.19 At the Cabinet meeting of 8 Oct 2007 it was agreed to start the process of tendering for the provision of a service to allow the payment of parking charges via a mobile telephone.
- 3.20 Tenders have now been received, evaluated and the Cabinet Member for Traffic, Transport and Parking has made a Cabinet Member Decision to appoint Cobalt Ltd as the provider of a mobile telephone parking system.
- 3.21 Anyone wishing to use the system will need to follow a simple registration of their vehicle and the system will allow for checking which of the DVLA bands a vehicle falls into (or the size of the engine). Once motorists have registered their vehicles they will be able to easily pay for parking by '*keying in*' a few basic details, such as the car park reference number and the period of time they wish to park. They will then be charged the appropriate tariff according to their vehicle banding.
- 3.22 Registration, of a vehicle, which is expected to take less than 5 mins, can be done from anywhere that has a mobile phone signal. This allows motorists wishing to visit the borough to do so in advance. Registration is only required once and will be valid for any other district that operates the same system.
- 3.23 There is a small, (approx. 20p), charge that will be payable by the motorist for each transaction although there is the convenience of not having to have cash or a credit/debit card. Payment by phone also allows the motorist to 'top up' their parking if they find that they will not be back in time to move their vehicle and the company will also provide a text reminder service (the text will cost approx. 10p paid by the motorist) should the motorist opt for this option.
- 3.24 Mobile telephone parking has been successful in many other local authorities both home and abroad and those that use it usually find it to be extremely customer focused and beneficial. Other authorities have indicated that within the first two years of operation the payment by 'mobile phone parking' increased to 25% of the parking transactions.

### **Richmond Smart Card**

- 3.25 While many motorists will find the mobile telephone method of payment to be appropriate for their needs some may prefer to use a 'Richmond Smart Card'.
- 3.26 The 'Smart Card' would be similar in size to a credit/debit card and will contain the details (registration and DVLA banding) of the vehicle. It will also have the ability to 'hold money' in a similar way to the London wide 'oyster card'. Anyone using the Smart Card would then simply present it to the card reader on the ticket machine and after indicating how long they wished to park for would be issued with a ticket that had the vehicle registration number printed on it and payment would be at the appropriate level.
- 3.27 A card would be obtained by a telephone or on-line application or via the post. Once issued the card could be 'topped up' either on-line or

via a card reader/writer (these could be located at suitable locations across the borough), again in a similar manner to the 'oyster card'.

- 3.28 There would be a small charge to the motorist (likely to be about £2.50) when obtaining the card to cover its cost and the administration.

### **Car Parking operating hours**

- 3.29 Over the years there has been little change to the operating hours of the borough car parks.
- 3.30 Now the decision has been made to shut the Civic Centre cash office it is proposed to remove the 'half hour' free parking in front of York House, since its primary purpose was to enable convenient cash payments.
- 3.31 The car park at Taylor Close, Hampton Hill currently has half the number of bays free and half are 'Pay and Display'. It is proposed to make all spaces 'Pay and Display'.
- 3.32 In reviewing the operating hours it is noted that many organisations such as the National Trust, English Heritage now charge for parking on their land when visitors come to make use of the facilities.
- 3.33 It is proposed to introduce charging for parking in the car park at the riverside in Ham. The operating hours would be 10.00am to 5.00pm seven days a week thus allowing visitors to the area to benefit from free parking in the early morning and in the evening. The car park would also benefit from being regularly patrolled which in turn helps to monitor the car park both for safety and to alert the Council to any matters that need attention (e.g. litter, vandalism, etc).

### **Voucher Parking Arrangements**

- 3.34 Some years ago an arrangement was put in place where motorists could purchase 'vouchers' from nearby shops which could then be displayed in the vehicle and the date/time shown via a 'scratch off' panel.
- 3.35 Although it provides an alternative method of payment the scheme is expensive for the Council with printing and administrative costs now amounting for approximately 25% of the income received. Furthermore the scheme can be confusing for motorists leading to poor 'customer service'.
- 3.36 With increased methods of payment, mobile phone and smart card, as well as all meters now being able to take credit and debit cards it is proposed to remove the option of 'Voucher Parking'

### **Provision of Parking Services**

- 3.37 Currently the Council provides day to day parking service via the Parking Shop in Holly Road, Twickenham. The shop provides an opportunity for the public to purchase permits and pay Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs). It also provides a point of contact to seek advice on parking matters.

- 3.38 A drawback with the Parking Shop is that it only opens during office hours Monday to Saturday. Furthermore some current processes require the public to visit the shop. Residents have often requested a more convenient way (i.e. on-line) method of obtaining their permits.
- 3.39 It is proposed to close the Parking Shop in Twickenham investing resources into improving 'customer care' by ensuring residents can obtain their permits on-line and provide advice either over the telephone or in person at the Civic Centre. Payment of PCNs will need to be made via the internet, telephone or posted to the Parking Services team at the Civic centre.

#### **4. CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 The Council undertook a comprehensive survey of residents attitudes to an emission based parking payment approach when introducing the CPZ permit scheme. There was support for linking permit charges to the emission of a vehicle, although some residents and Overview and Scrutiny Committee expressed a view that such an approach should be wider than the CPZ scheme. The proposals in this report are considered to be in line with the views and findings of the earlier consultation and follow the same principles (the CPZ permit scheme) as the previous consultation. Furthermore it reflects the approach of the government with the emission based Vehicle Excise Duty arrangements that have been in place for some years.
- 4.2 Nevertheless before deciding on the emission based 'on' and 'off' street parking charges it is proposed to invite views before a Cabinet decision is made about implementation.
- 4.3 When publicising the proposals and seeking views use would be made of posters (outlining the proposals) placed around the borough, writing to key stakeholder (including local business) groups and ensuring that there is coverage in the local media.
- 4.4 Views expressed would be collated and a summary contained in any further Cabinet report.

#### **5 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 At the heart of the proposal is the fact that the level of parking charge is related to the CO<sub>2</sub> emission of the vehicle and the figure in paragraph 5.9 is based on a similar spread of cars in each DVLA band as currently seen in the boroughs CPZ areas. Unlike CPZ parking the make up of vehicles using the car parks/on street parking bays will include non residents as well as residents. Therefore the ownership in each band may vary from the CPZ data, furthermore with more 'incentives' to own less polluting cars and the production of cleaner engines from manufacturers there is every likelihood that more and more motorists will own lower CO<sub>2</sub> emitting vehicles and therefore take advantage of the lower charges.
- 5.2 There will be some implementation cost which will include new Pay & Display meters in the Ham car park and Taylor Close along with new

tariff boards. This is estimated to be approximately £15K.

- 5.3 Costs will be incurred in undertaking an awareness/consultation to gather the views of the general public, it is anticipated that this will be in the order of £20K.
- 5.4 Implementation costs associated with an emissions based charging approach have not been included in this report but would be included in any future report following the expression of views from the public.
- 5.5 During the current financial year there appears to be a significant shortfall in parking demand leading to a reduction in income from parking. Any additional income from these proposals will help to address this deficit but given the level of uncertainty of income and the fact that there is a current projected shortfall in the current financial year it is considered prudent not to include any income growth in the Councils budget for the financial year 2009/10.
- 5.6 With respect to demand other 'external' factors influence parking levels including provision of alternative modes of transport (buses, trains, etc), weather conditions, 'economic climate', etc. The proposals, however, in this report are new and as such there is no direct comparison to determine how parking income might change.
- 5.7 The proposals could result in additional parking income and this has been estimated to be in the region of £800K if demand is the same (as at the end of 07/08) and 70% of motorists eligible for the discount and price freeze register. Of this estimate of £800K about 40% is likely to come from 'on street' parking (i.e. £320K).
- 5.8 In reviewing the charges consideration has been made with respect to the current temporary lowering of VAT from 17.5% to 15%. Given the need to ensure tariffs are set at a level that is practical to collect (i.e. P&D machines will not accept coinage below 5p) it is proposed only to continue (started 1 Dec 2008) offering a VAT reduction on parking season tickets. It should also be noted that VAT is only applicable to off street parking.

## 6 POLICY IMPLICATIONS/CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 Parking charges are reviewed on an annual basis in line with the Council's corporate charging policy. Reports are only presented to Cabinet when changes to charges are recommended.

When setting the level of charges consideration needs to be given to the following:-

- Whether there are any statutory or legal requirements that may affect the setting of fees;
- Any service/community plan objectives directly related to fees;
- Current market conditions, i.e. competitor and/or comparator prices;
- Impact of charges on user groups.

- 6.2 The proposals support the Council's policy on allocating kerb-side space with on-street policies aimed at prioritising spaces for residents,

residents' visitors, business needs (operational, customers and other visitors) and commuters.

- 6.3 The report supports the priority of the Council to take positive steps to tackle Climate Change by reducing carbon emissions. However, by concentrating on the key 'greenhouse gas' (CO<sub>2</sub>) there is every likelihood that the levels of other pollutants will also fall. The Council also has a priority to reduce other types of air pollution in the Borough. The requirement to do this originated in the EU Daughter Directives on Air Quality, which have then been adopted into UK law, becoming the Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland 2000, and sets out the air quality objectives. An assessment of air quality in the Borough in 2000 identified the air quality improvements needed to comply with the objectives. Following a public consultation, the Council made an Air Quality Management Order on 21<sup>st</sup> December 2000. This designated the whole Borough as a single Air Quality Management Area. Following further consultation, the Council (Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning) approved an Air Quality Action Plan in November 2002, with the aim of improving air quality, to comply with the objectives. Pollution monitoring results, for objective deadline of 2005, indicated that many areas across the Borough still did not meet these objectives and therefore there remains a need for further work to be done to improve the air quality. Since then, air pollution monitoring has continued and the latest results show that the Borough is still exceeding the limits. In addition, modelling predictions for the revised Government deadline of 2010 indicate that exceedences will still be continuing then, if intervention action is not taken in time to improve the air quality in the Borough.
- 6.4 The proposals are consistent with the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy and Air Quality Strategy and also with the GLA's new duties to combat CO<sub>2</sub> emissions under the GLA act 2007.
- 6.5 There are many other pollutants that are considered damaging to the environment and people's health (as addressed in the Council's Air Quality Action Plan). A switch of vehicle to one of the cleanest ones would result in lower pollution emissions, especially if it is electric or hybrid. Accordingly it is considered reasonable to anticipate that a consequence of this policy will be to assist in improving the local air quality and so help meet the Council's obligation to do so.

## **7 RISK ASSESSMENT**

- 7.1 A risk is a failure of the 'new technology' (mobile telephone parking/Smart Card) to deal adequately with the variable tariffs. To mitigate this the manufacturers of the equipment/system will be asked to set up a working demonstration of the arrangements which can be tested by prior to any public launch.
- 7.2 If people eligible to register for a discount in parking charge or price freeze are not able to do so in time and could therefore be unfairly penalised. To mitigate this it is proposed to have a minimum of six weeks between the making of the traffic orders to implement the changes and actually introducing the new tariffs.

- 7.3 Risks associated with the legal aspects of the proposals are dealt with under section 9.

## **8. EQUALITY IMPACT/CONSIDERATIONS**

- 8.1 An initial assessment has been undertaken and this highlighted that the overall proposals may benefit those that have a particular concern for personal safety in so far as mobile phone parking and the Richmond Card would enable motorists to park without having to have cash/credit/debit cards to hand. Furthermore with mobile telephone parking payment could be made without leaving the vehicle.
- 8.2 Motorists who are disabled, and have a 'blue badge' will still be able to park free or charge.
- 8.3 To help ensure that all 'equality' concerns are considered when considering an emission based parking charge scheme it has been recommended that views on the proposals are sought and then considered at a later Cabinet meeting.

## **9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1.1 The Council introduces and maintains charges for on and off-street parking under the provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as amended, and Road Traffic Act 1991. All schemes are subject to statutory consultation processes, which are duly followed by the Council. Road Traffic Regulation orders will be required in order to implement the decisions recommended.
- 9.1.2 Because of the nature of the proposed changes in respect of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, preliminary discussions took place with Leading Counsel prior to Cabinet approval for consultation. In his view, there is no reason in principle why the proposed changes should not, as a matter of law, be implemented. This included consideration of both the legislation and human rights considerations. Consideration has also been given as to whether there are any issues under the Human Rights Act 1998 and European law, and the view taken is that these charges will not have an effect on the rights of property or freedom of movement and would be justifiable.

### **9.2 Powers under Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984**

- 9.2.1 Leading Counsel has confirmed that section 32 (off street parking) and section 45 (on street parking) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 do permit differential charging relating to vehicular emissions. In his view regard can be had to environmental considerations.
- 9.2.2 Section 122 (1) Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 states that it shall be the duty of every local authority upon whom functions are conferred by or under the Act (so far as practicable having regard to the matters specified in s122 (2)) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. S122 (2) specifies a number of such matters including (b) the effect on the amenities of any locality (bb) the strategy prepared under s80 Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy) and (d) any

other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant.

- 9.2.3 S122 (2) (bb) itself lends some support to what the Council is proposing to do through differential charging. While the National Air Quality Strategy prepared under s80 Environmental Act 1995 is not specifically concerned with CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, it aims to improve local air quality by reduction of other pollutants. The differential charges the Council is proposing will also have the effect of contributing to the improvement of local air quality. Further, other initiatives by both central government and regional government (the GLA) have laid increasing emphasis on the need to take action in respect of both air quality and greenhouse gases. These are also matters the Council can, and should, have regard to under s122 (2) (d). The on-line guide to greener living has a specific section ([www.direct.gov.uk/environmentandgreenerliving](http://www.direct.gov.uk/environmentandgreenerliving)) on “Greener cars and driving” and includes the following, “The type of car you own, the way you drive it and the fuel you can use have a big impact on the emissions it produces. Personal car travel produces 13% of the UK’s total greenhouse gas emissions and it contributes to local air pollution and congestion”.
- 9.2.4 Even before the addition of s122 (2) (bb) the unanimous view of the House of Lords in R v London Boroughs Transport Committee ex p. Freight Transport Association Ltd (1991) was that “one policy and one object of the Act of 1984 are to protect the environment of Greater London”.
- 9.2.5 Further, section 45 (2) (b) and section 32 of the 1984 Act, which states “the authority...may make such charge in connection with the issue or use of the permit, of such amount and payable in such manner, as the authority by whom the designation order was made may by order prescribe” is a function governed by s144 (1) (a) Greater London Authority Act 1999. This section provides that in exercising any function a London borough council is to have regard to the Transport Strategy. This refers to the Mayor’s Transport Strategy (MTS) published under s142. The MTS contains a number of references to the importance of improving air quality and reducing emissions, e.g. para 2.4 describes one of the MTS’s objectives as the promotion of London as a green city through addressing traffic congestion, improving air quality and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.
- 9.2.6 Cabinet’s attention is also drawn to the well being powers under the Local Government Act 2000. These are wide powers given to local authorities to do anything which they consider is likely to achieve the objectives listed in s2 and which includes the promotion or improvement of the economic, social and environmental well-being of their area. There are limits to these powers. Subsections (1) and (2) of s3 of the Local Government Act 2000 do not enable a local authority (1) to do anything which they are unable to do by virtue of any prohibition, restriction or limitation on their powers which is contained in any enactment (whenever passed or made); or (2) to raise money (whether by precepts, borrowing or otherwise). Subsection (5) of s3 of the Local Government Act 2000 also requires a local authority to have regard to any guidance for the time being issued by the Secretary of State about the exercise of that power. Subsection (3) of s2 of the Local Government Act 2000 provides that a local authority must have regard

to their Community Strategy when exercising powers for the promotion or improvement of the economic, social and environmental well-being of their area. The Community Strategy of the Council incorporates, "Priority 2: The greenest borough in London" which includes, "our vision is to set a regional and national example by making Richmond upon Thames the greenest borough in London. In particular, we will set the standard for reducing domestic and business energy consumption, and also transport emissions" and it incorporates aims or provisions to:

- "Tackle climate change through an integrated approach with our partners in the local business, housing, transport, public, voluntary and community sectors";
- "promote sustainable forms of transport and to reduce the levels of air pollution and other environmental impacts resulting from road transport";
- "promote sustainable forms of transport and to reduce the levels of air pollution and other environmental impacts resulting from road transport";
- "Aim for 63% of all travel in the borough to be non-car based by 2011"; and
- "Support the introduction of the London Low Emission Zone".

### **9.3 Revenue Raising**

9.3.1 Counsel was also asked to specifically consider the issue of whether any revenue raised from this policy could be interpreted as a 'Local Tax'.

9.3.2 Counsel considered *R v Camden LBC ex p.Cran* (1996) where it was said that the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 is not a revenue raising Act. However, the intention in bringing in these additional measures is not to raise revenue but to reduce CO2 emissions. Any surplus can only be spent on the purposes set out in 9.5.2 below.

### **9.4 Existing Consultation**

9.4.1 Extensive consultation took place regarding CO2 emissions proposals on parking permits including "Attitudes to Climate Change" "Traffic and Transport Issues" and "Attitudes to Parking Permit Proposals". The consensus was that there was support for steps to address CO2 emissions and parking charges related to CO2 emissions. It is therefore felt that there is a mandate for harmonisation between existing legislation and government policy regarding the existing proposals on parking charges in the Borough.

9.4.2 The Traffic Management Act 2004 amends section 55 (4) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and it provided further guidance on financial provisions related to parking charge income. It states that the income should be used:

- a. to make good any payment used for parking places,
- b. for the provision of or maintenance of off street parking (whether in the open or not) and
- c. where off street parking provision is unnecessary or undesirable:
  - i. To meet costs of provision of or operation of public

- passenger transport services, or
- ii. For highway or road improvement projects within the borough, or
- iii. Meeting costs incurred by the authority in respect of the maintenance of roads maintained at the public expense by them, or
- iv. For the purposes of environmental improvement in the local authority's area, or
- v. Any other purposes for which the authority may lawfully incur expenditure.

Such legally binding requirements comply with recent changes to Government funding allocations following the Government's pledge to divert it to 'areas of greatest need' as set out in the Pre-Budget Report of 2008.

9.4.3 Government programmes related to Climate Change are "unlikely to secure cuts in road transport emissions to comply with existing legally binding targets to reduce greenhouse emissions by 1/5<sup>th</sup> by 2020", whilst the Government believes that we should be aiming to increase "methods to cut transport emissions" as stated in The Committee on Climate Change's Inaugural Report "*Building a low-carbon economy - the UK's contribution to tackling climate change*" (published on 1st December 2008) (see [www.theccc.org.uk/reports](http://www.theccc.org.uk/reports)). The Report also suggests the "wide-spread adoption of 'smarter choices' and policies to increase bus and rail travel by 50%".

9.4.4 The "*Government response to the King Review of low carbon cars*" issued by the Department of Transport (published on 26 November 2008) also addresses carbon dioxide emissions from vehicles and it includes Recommendation 21, which "welcomes local authorities introducing measures that incentivise consumers to choose lower emission vehicles where they are appropriately designed and are introduced with the objective of reducing CO<sub>2</sub>" (see [www.dft.gov.uk/about/strategy/king/respokingreview.pdf](http://www.dft.gov.uk/about/strategy/king/respokingreview.pdf)), so that it will "not encourage people to drive more".

## 10. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

10.1 The proposals are in line with the council approach to reduce 'carbon emission' in so far as they encourage the ownership of vehicles that have low CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

10.2 The proposals are also ones that should reduce overall pollution from traffic (both in this borough and further a field) which in turn would contribute to cleaner air. As lower CO<sub>2</sub> emission vehicles are usually more efficient there would be less consumption of the finite resources of the earth.

10.3 Although it is accepted that the reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will be small compared to the total emissions of the Borough this should not prevent a policy such as outlined in the report being adopted.

10.4 There may be secondary benefits from a high profile policy as this can help to encourage residents and visitors to be more environmentally aware in other aspects of energy consumption.

**11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:**

Cabinet report 'Parking Permit Report' January 2007.

**12. CONTACTS**

Cllr David Trigg Cabinet Member for Traffic, Transport and Parking.  
[cllr.dtrigg@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:cllr.dtrigg@richmond.gov.uk)

Trevor Pugh, Director for Environment, 020 8891 7907  
[t.pugh@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:t.pugh@richmond.gov.uk)

Andrew Darvill, Assistant Director for Environment  
[a.darvill@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:a.darvill@richmond.gov.uk)

DVLA Banding 2001 - 2009	CO <sub>2</sub> (g/km)		DVLA banding from April 2009	CO <sub>2</sub> (g/km)
A	Up to 100		A	Up to 100
B	101 - 120		B	101 – 110
			C	111 – 120
C	121 - 150		D	121 – 130
			E	131 – 140
			F	141 – 150
D	151 - 165		G	151 – 160
E	166 - 185		H	161 – 170
			I	171 – 180
F	186 - 225		J	181 – 200
			K	201 – 225
G	More than 226		L	226 – 255
			M	Over 255