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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 works commissioned since April 2016 as well as works that are yet to be 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 Government requirements (cited in Statutory Guidance) that the civil enforcement of parking controls by local authorities should not be subsidised by the taxpayer. In addition, income generation derived from off street parking also forms part of the 2017/18 budget and opportunities to achieve this need to be investigated.

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

* Changes in permit, fee and charge prices to customers
* Increases in public parking provision
* Policy changes to the way that parking enforcement is provided in order to reduce the disparity between income and expenditure.

1.3.3 This work will involve studies to investigate the feasibility of proposals for the MWP and, if these are approved, the implementation of those proposals. These typically will include changes in policy that would entail minimal practical changes to signs, permits and 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. It is intended to ensure that TRDC complies with Government requirements (cited 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 and TRDC will continue not to comply with Government requirements (cited in Statutory Guidance) that the civil enforcement of parking controls by local authorities should not be subsidised by the taxpayer.

1.5.2 Future budget targets will not be met.

# Business Case

Why should this project be undertaken?

* The purpose of the suite of proposed works that have been (or are to be) included in this project is to bring TRDC into compliance with Government requirements (cited in Statutory Guidance) that the civil enforcement of parking controls by local authorities should not be subsidised by the taxpayer. In addition, to generating an income from off street parking.
* 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) in order to meet the objective to resolve a current disparity between parking enforcement income and expenditure.
* Some works resulting from the recommendations of the MWP were approved and implemented from April 2016 and some recommendations are still under development.
* This PID was requested at the meeting of the MWP of the 4 January 2017 to seek funding for all the activities of the MWP, in addition to £10,000 already allocated for this purpose from other budgets.

How will project success be measured?

* The success of the MWP recommendations is measured by the extent to which the combined proposals achieve the requirement levied on the MWP to resolve the disparity of £180,000 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.
* Off street parking income rise to meet budget targets for 2017/18

## Project Definition

## Outputs and Outcomes

Outputs

* Studies exploring options proposed by the MWP, such as:
	1. Increased fees and charges for parking permits, car parks and other controls'
	2. Increased availability of on- and off- street parking spaces directed towards the market for paid parking
	3. Reorganisation and reallocation of current parking options in town centres
* 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 suite of proposals 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:1. Implementing changes to traffic order signing and lining:
 | Up to around £50,000 (e.g. TRO changes at estimated £5,000 for each iteration; most costly infrastructure is new P&D machines at up to £7,000 installed per parking place) |
| External contractors; fees; consultancy:Studies:Counts and other works towards future investigations into income maximisation.  | Potential for 3 further studies (new tech; new locations for commuters) at around £5000 eachAround £30,000 for counts, surveys and consultant fees to establish potential for investments.Around £30,000 to implement outcomes of any investigations as above. |
| Any other attributable costs | None. |

2.1.1 The **total estimated project cos**t is around £80,000 capital and £45,000 revenue. This figure is very much a ballpark estimate based on 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.

Has the project been agreed by the Head of ICT?

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

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 |