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# 1 Introduction

## Purpose of the document

The Project Initiation Document (Lite) consolidates information required regarding the fundamental aspects of the project and is the basis against which the project is evaluated and prioritised.

* Why is this project important
* What will the project do, what outcomes will be delivered, what are the success factors and risks
* How much will it cost, what resources are required

*\*\* This document is a “lite” version of the full Project Initiation Document (PID) required when initiating the project fully. The full PID contains additional information.*

* *How will the project be implemented, how will it be managed*
* *When will the project be implemented*
* *Who will be involved and who will be impacted*

## Executive Summary

1.2.1 This project includes Phase 2 of works due to be commissioned as determined by the Parking Member Working Party (or “MWP”) to bring the Parking Account into balance. Further works to be included relate to investigation of potential additional revenue generation.

1.2.2. The purpose of each of the sub-schemes of this project, each one either investigating or implementing an approved recommendation by the MWP, is solely to increase revenue in order to achieve this.

1.2.3 Each project agreed to date has been determined by the MWP based on its internal decision making as ratified by the relevant Committee and does not necessarily include a full feasibility, options and detailed assessment of the likely outcomes of each proposed scheme, as the remit of this MWP is solely financial.

## Project Objectives

1.3.1 The purpose of the project is to bring TRDC into compliance with statutory requirements that the civil enforcement of parking controls by local authorities should not be subsidised by the taxpayer.

1.3.2 This will be achieved by implementing works resulting from the recommendations of the MWP and relevant Committees including:

* Review of Business permit prices, types and availability to business customers and their employees
* Increases in public parking provision through conversion of superfluous parking prohibition to create new space.
* Other car parks (including the Aquadrome and other leisure car parks)

1.3.3 This work will involve studies to investigate the feasibility of proposals for the MWP If these are approved, the implementation of those proposals. These typically will include decisions that would require practical changes to parking infrastructure (including signs, permits, machines and other works associated with traffic orders).

1.3.4 Some more complex and costly changes are under investigation that would include, for example, new parking schemes and changes to technology used to charge parking fees (to reduce collection and banking costs).

## Current issues and priorities

1.4.1 This project is not intended to realise policy objectives but as part of a programme of measures to ensure that TRDC complies with legal requirements set out in Statutory Guidance, in addition to addressing future budget targets.

## Implications of project not being complete

1.5.1 The MWP will not meet its objectives so TRDC will continue not to comply with legal requirements set out in Statutory Guidance.

1.5.2 Future budget targets will not be met.

# Business Case

Why should this project be undertaken?

* The purpose of the programme of proposed works that have been (or are to be) included in this project is to bring TRDC into compliance with legal requirements set out in Statutory Guidance that the civil enforcement of parking controls by local authorities should not be subsidised by the taxpayer.
* TRDC is the statutory authority for onj-street parking controls and is empowered by the RTRA 1984 to manage off-street car parks for various purposes.
* While this project is intended to implement the decisions taken by the various committees towards decreasing the deficit, it will create significant improvements parking turnover in short-stay car parks (benefitting local retailers and people shopping locally), better managing long-stay and medium-stay parking availability (to benefit every road user group but particularly those requiring long-stay parking that is not otherwise available).
* This project will enhance the experience of all drivers (and passengers) wishing to park in local car parks for retail access, which encompasses the majority of the local population because local retail offers in each district settlement cater primarily for local needs.
* The primary cost associated with this project, that of parking payment machines, will directly affect the attractiveness of local parking and its ability to benefit different user groups by enabling easier payment, that potentially delivers cost savings to individual drivers through technology that allows them to pay for only the time they park.
* The District Council determined that a working party (the “Member Working Party” or “MWP”) would make recommendations to the relevant committee (for Sustainable Development, Planning and Transport). Some initial increases in charges resulting from the recommendations of the MWP were approved and implemented in 2016 and three further ‘phase 1’ projects have been developed and are programmed to be delivered in 2017/18, including:
* Provision of extra parking bays for visitors
* Introduction of short-stay off-street parking charges in Rickmansworth
* Trial of dedicated visitor parking bays in The Ferry Car park, Chorleywood
* Each of these projects is currently deliverable within short timescales. However, this PID supports decisions and proposals by the MWP since April 2017 to seek funding for all the activities of the MWP. This includes some outstanding Phase 1 projects that were not funded in 2017/18, as well as the listed Phase 2 projects; and several other projects not listed above could be delivered as part of Phase 2, including new parking efficiency project in other district car parks and on local streets.

How will project success be measured?

* The success of the MWP recommendations is measured by:

1. The extent to which the combined proposals achieve the requirement levied on the MWP to resolve the disparity between income and expenditure for parking enforcement activities carried out by the District Council. The current and projected extent of the disparity is reported regularly at meetings of the MWP and is contained in all relevant reports to the SDPT committee. It is also reported to HM Government in a statutory annual return on the state of the Parking Account.
2. Parking income increase to meet budget targets for 2017/18 and 2018/19.
3. Customer feedback on effectiveness and useability of new machines.

## Project Definition

## Outputs and Outcomes

Outputs

* Studies exploring options proposed by the MWP, such as:
* New parking payment options across the district for existing charged locations
* Extra Visitor bays at appropriate locations across the District.
* Improvements to support local business parking
* New charges at existing car parks outside Rickmansworth
* Changes to parking control mechanisms and options for users that arise from these studies.

Outcomes

* Increased revenue to close the disparity between income and expenditure on the Parking Account.
* Increased revenue to close the Council budget gap

Benefits

* The intended initial benefit is that the Parking Account should be balanced. Subsequently this account should be in profit. .
* Monitoring of the financial success of this phase 2 programme takes place as set out in section 1.

# Project Costs

## One off project costs

Include summary of all expected project costs – total project budget required to complete all activities.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Expected costs** |
| Project management: | None, as this is subsumed into normal business under parking enforcement and traffic engineering. |
| All other staffing/resourcing costs (inc ICT resources required): | Communications support in marketing changes (minimal cost).  No ICT impact (service managed by external contractor). |
| Overheads; buildings; Equipment (inc hardware & software: |  |
| Implementing changes to traffic order signing and lining: | From around £78,000 (lowest possible cost, phase 2 only, cheapest machines) to around £660,000 (best likely cost for phase 2), to include TRO changes at estimated £5,000 for each iteration, new signage and publicity; most costly infrastructure is new P&D machines for which there are various costed options.  There is more detail available but on current estimates this is likely to cost from £7,000 to around £80,000 per parking place, depending on the system installed at each parking place.  The variance in these estimates arises from the type of payment mechanism used. The figure stated reflects the likely cost to introduce ‘pay on foot’ parking in each of the current car parks in Rickmansworth. |
| External contractors; fees; consultancy:  Studies: Counts and other works towards future investigations into income maximisation. | Around £30,000 to collect data to enable implementation of outcomes of any investigations as above. |
| Any other attributable costs | None. |

2.1.1 The **total estimated project cos**t is a maximum of £660,000 capital and £30,000 revenue costs (not including revenue on-costs which would be deducted from any projected revenue). This figure is very much an initial estimate based on current figures for the possible amount of infrastructure that could be required.

## Financial viability

2.2.1 Approved and implemented proposals to date have shown a 94:1 rate of return because the proposals primarily comprise changes to policy, at minimal cost to implement. The main costs attributed to this project are in the development of details to inform these policy changes.

## Resources and skills

2.3.1 The resources required are primarily financial. The skill-sets required are already available as part of everyday business, in the traffic engineering and parking enforcement services; or would be procured through framework agreements available to the Council. Any significant ongoing costs are likely to be borne through the parking enforcement contract which is held and managed by an external contractor. The Council has determined that it will not increase enforcement resources to that contractor.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes |  |
| No | Y |

Has the project been agreed by the Head of ICT?

2.3.2 The project has been agreed by Management Board.

## Equalities

Is this project responding to an Equality Impact Assessment?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes |  |
| No | Y |

If yes, please provide brief details of the EIA… \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Has an Equality Impact Assessment been undertaken for this project?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes |  |
| No | Y |

If yes, what are the outcomes and how do these link to the project?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

## Risks

Initial Risk Log

Likelihood and Probability Key

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Likelihood** | A |  |  |  |  | 1 | **Impact** | **Likelihood** |
| B |  |  |  |  |  | **V = Catastrophic** | **A = ≥98%** |
| C |  |  | 2 |  |  | **IV = Critical** | **B = 75% - 97%** |
| D |  |  |  |  |  | **III = Significant** | **C = 50% - 74%** |
| E |  |  |  |  |  | **II = Marginal** | **D = 25% - 49%** |
| F |  |  |  |  |  | **I = Negligible** | **E = 3% - 24%** |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V |  | **F = ≤2%** |
| **Impact** | | | | | |  |  |

| Risk | Level of Risk | | Required actions | Owner |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Impact | Likeli-hood |
| 1. Funding would be unavailable for works already commissioned. | V | A |  | MWP |
| 2. The MWP would be unable to progress towards meeting its objectives and the TRDC would remain in contravention of statutory guidance | III | C |  | MWP |
| 3. Income targets are not met | III | C |  | MWP |