
Report To:	Environment & Regeneration Committee	Date:	5 March 2015
Report By:	Corporate Director Environment, Regeneration & Resources	Report No:	ERC/ENV/IM/14.221
Contact Officer:	Robert Graham	Contact No:	01475 714827
Subject:	Greenock Town Centre Residents' Parking Permit Scheme Option Appraisal		

1.0 PURPOSE

1.1 This report advises the Committee of the options for a possible residents' parking permit scheme in Greenock town centre and recommends the most appropriate scheme for adoption by the Council.

2.0 SUMMARY

2.1 Inverclyde Council introduced its Greenock Town Centre Parking Strategy on 6 October 2014. When they were promoted, the Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) governing the Parking Strategy's waiting and loading restrictions attracted objections from residents who live in the town centre who argued their ability to park free for unlimited periods, close to their homes, had been denied them.

2.2 The subsequent Reporter's Report of the Public Hearing, called to hear these and other objections, recommended that the Strategy be implemented as intended, reviewed a year after implementation and the decision not to introduce a residents' permits scheme be reconsidered as part of that review.

2.3 A Decriminalised Parking Enforcement update report was submitted to the Environment and Regeneration Committee on 30 October 2014 subsequent to which Committee decided that a report should be submitted to the Environment and Regeneration Committee meeting of 5 March 2015 on options for the introduction of a residents' parking scheme for Greenock town centre.

2.4 Environmental and Commercial Services engaged Peter Brett Associates to undertake a study which has considered options for a residents' parking permit scheme. Options have been appraised, resulting in a single recommendation. The key activities completed during the study were a best practice review, an analysis of existing parking surveys, a public and stakeholder consultation exercise and option development, costing and appraisal.

2.5 Around 1,200 questionnaires were delivered to households in the town centre. 94 responses were received. The consultation exercise's conclusions were that there is dissatisfaction with the current parking situation and demand for a residents' parking permit scheme from residents living in and around the town centre. The majority of responding households (90%) said they were in favour of a residents' parking permit scheme and would like to apply for one permit (42% would like two) and around 30% said they would be willing to pay.

2.6 The development of the principles of the proposed scheme included consideration of the scheme's operating hours, allowable permit types, numbers of permits allowed per household, the accommodation of family carers and the scheme's geographical extent.

- 2.7 The geographical extent of the proposed scheme has been informed by parking analysis, public consultation and comments received at the Council's Customer Contact Centre. There was a clear consensus that consideration should be given to the scheme covering the existing Inner Greenock Parking Zone (IGPZ) plus extensions into the Kelly Street and Sir Michael Street/ Tobago Street/ King Street areas.
- 2.8 A spreadsheet model was developed to assess the financial impact of introducing a resident permit parking scheme in Greenock Town Centre. The model was set up to estimate the revenue and cost of 9 different options based on the boundary of the scheme and the location of parking proposed.
- 2.9 An option scoring exercise found that Option 9, an extension to the current IGPZ, with permits qualifying residents to park both on-street and off-street, was the preferred option to be taken forward. It scored particularly well in terms of:
- being simple and consistent, with the entire parking controlled area treated the same;
 - it provides residents with the option to use preferred on-street spaces and tackles parking pressure in the current IGPZ and surrounding streets; and
 - it creates a hierarchy of street usage throughout with residents encouraged to use on-street spaces and commuters to use car parks.
- 2.10 The extended boundary of the IGPZ is proposed to take in streets in the Kelly Street and Sir Michael Street/ Tobago Street/ King Street areas (see Appendix map) and to reinstate part of West Stewart Street, Station Avenue and the side roads next to Cathcart Buildings into the IGPZ.
- 2.11 To help prevent overspill of commuter parking beyond this boundary it is proposed to promote a TRO to convert the Bullring car park to long stay £1 a day operation and to return the Waterfront long stay car park to free operation, thus attracting commuters to town centre car parks rather than residential streets on the perimeter of the IGPZ.
- 2.12 The residents' parking permit scheme provides the opportunity to limit the use of the car park to the rear of Cathcart Buildings to residents only. Resident permits will allow the Council's Parking Attendants to enforce a residents' only policy in this car park.
- 2.13 Three pricing variants of Option 9 were prepared and the costs to the Council of each one compared. The public consultation suggested that 70% of residents are not keen to pay for a permit. However, if no charge is made for a permit it is likely that the scheme would become so attractive that more applications than were sustainable would result. The resultant attraction of so much more free residents' parking to the town centre than before is likely to affect the ability of the DPE scheme to continue to pay for itself. In addition, residents from outside Greenock town centre will see a free residents' parking permit scheme as a right and this will increase calls for more schemes in outlying towns and villages, whose costs will certainly escalate beyond the level that DPE income can accommodate.
- 2.14 *Variant 1 Typical Charge:* Proposed charges of £25 per annum for the first permit and £50 per annum for the second are comparable with other local authorities in Scotland and should ensure a good uptake of permits. These charges would result in the scheme breaking even, given the available level of accuracy of the assumptions regarding parking behaviour in future.
- 2.15 *Variant 2 Nominal Charge:* Using cheaper permit charges of £10 per annum for the first permit and £25 per annum for the second is likely to result in a greater uptake of permits but not enough to match the permit income of Variant 1. The subsequent loss of permit income results in an annual loss of income to the Council of £3,000.
- 2.16 *Variant 3 No Charge:* If parking permits were offered free of charge, it is likely that 100% of the residents who own a car would take up the offer of both available permits. This would result in a shortfall in car park and penalty charge revenues of around £10,900 which the Council would be required to fund.

- 2.17 Officers recommend Option 9 Variant 2. However, charges will be reviewed annually. The scheme is small and permit income will not sustain one full time equivalent member of Council staff to administer it. The most cost effective solution is to vary the terms of the existing contract, already held by Imperial Civil Enforcement Solutions (ICES) for processing parking fines, to add the administration of the permit scheme to the contract.
- 2.18 The residents' parking permit scheme covers only Greenock town centre. Justification for schemes elsewhere has not yet been proven. Officers strongly recommend against taking up Option 9 Variant 3 (no charge) because of the impact this will have on requests for schemes elsewhere.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 The Committee is asked to agree to the suspension of Standing Orders so as to permit the reinstatement of part of West Stewart Street, Station Avenue and the side roads next to Cathcart Buildings into the Inner Greenock Parking Zone. Since the date of the decision of this Committee on 4 December 2014 to remove Terrace Road, Station Avenue, unnamed road serving numbers 51-57 Cathcart Buildings, unnamed road serving 59-67 Cathcart Buildings, West Stewart Street (from Jamaica Street to Kelly Street) and Jamaica Street (from West Stewart Street to Union Street) from the parking disc operation area there has been a material change of circumstances, namely the receipt by the Council of the report by Peter Brett Associates on a study which has considered options for a residents' parking permit scheme.

3.2 That the Committee approves the officers' recommendation to introduce a residents' parking permit scheme in Greenock town centre, in accordance with the principles at paragraph 3.3 below.

3.3 That the Committee remits to the Head of Environmental and Commercial Services to promote the TROs necessary to introduce such a residents' parking permit scheme and to engage Imperial Civil Enforcement Solutions to administer the scheme.

3.4	Operating Hours:	Monday to Friday 08:00 to 18:00 to match the operating hours of the Inner Greenock Parking Zone
	Resident Parking Permits:	Up to two permits permitted per household Permits would last for one year
	Permit Format:	Paper Permits displayed in the car windscreen
	Permit fee:	£10 per year for the first and £25 per year for the second permit per household, reviewed annually
	Geographical Extent:	On and off-street parking places within the Inner Greenock Parking Zone plus, by the promotion of TROs, extension into the Kelly Street and Sir Michael Street/Tobago Street/King Street areas, West Stewart Street from Jamaica Street to Kelly Street, Station Avenue and the unnamed side roads by Cathcart Buildings
	Administration	Vary the existing ICES contract to process Inverclyde Council's Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) to include the administration of the Permit Scheme

3.5 That the Committee remits to the Head of Environmental and Commercial Services to promote the TROs necessary to convert the Bullring car park into a £1 a day long stay car park, the long stay part of the Waterfront car park to free operation and to introduce a residents' only car park behind Cathcart Buildings.

4.0 BACKGROUND

- 4.1 Inverclyde Council introduced its Greenock Town Centre Parking Strategy on 6 October 2014 at the same time as its Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Scheme. Until then Inverclyde Council had not charged for any on-street or off-street parking.
- 4.2 When they were promoted and when more recent variations were proposed, the TROs governing the Parking Strategy's waiting and loading restrictions attracted objections from residents who live in the town centre and feel their ability to park free for unlimited periods in on and off-street parking spaces has been denied.
- 4.3 The Reporter's Report of the Public Hearing, called to hear these and other objections, recommended that the Strategy be implemented as intended, reviewed a year after implementation and a residents' parking permit scheme be reconsidered as part of that review.
- 4.4 Since the Strategy's introduction, pressure for parking spaces in some areas bordering the town centre has been seen to increase. Officers were aware of such a possibility and have been pursuing the creation of additional long stay town centre car parks to alleviate this pressure. However, in light of the above residents' objections, Members have requested that a residents' parking permit scheme be brought forward for consideration now.

5.0 STUDY

- 5.1 Consultants Peter Brett Associates were commissioned to undertake an options appraisal for a residents' parking permit scheme for Greenock town centre.
- 5.2 This study has considered options for a residents' parking permit scheme, with costs. Options have been appraised and narrowed down to a single recommendation. The key activities completed during the study were:
 - best practice review;
 - analysis of existing data from parking surveys undertaken before the restrictions were introduced;
 - public and stakeholder consultation;
 - option development;
 - option costing and revenue forecasting; and
 - option appraisal.

6.0 CONSULTATION

- 6.1 Consultation was undertaken in the form of a questionnaire delivered to all the addresses within the IGPZ and the areas outside where pressure for parking spaces has been seen to increase since the introduction of the Strategy. In addition, the questionnaire was made available online. A total of 94 responses were received giving a return rate of 7.8%. While overall this is disappointing, car ownership within the consultation area is low, with only 32% of households having access to a car, so the 94 responses equates to around 24% of households with access to a car.
- 6.2 The consultation feedback allowed conclusions to be drawn about how different elements of a residents' parking permit scheme should be treated, its geographical extent and what the likely demand for permits would be. The key conclusions were:
 - There is a genuine dissatisfaction with the current parking situation and demand for a residents parking permit scheme from residents living within and outside the current IGPZ;
 - The majority of respondents would like a residents' parking permit scheme and at least one resident parking permit (over 90%). Around 42% of these would like a second (or third) permit; and
 - 29% of respondents living within the IGPZ and 31% living outside it said they would be willing to pay for a residents' parking permit.

7.0 SCHEME PRINCIPLES

- 7.1 *Operating Hours:* The scheme would operate five days (Monday to Friday) 08:00 to 18:00 to match the IGPZ's TROs. Enforcement will only be undertaken during these hours.
- 7.2 *Residential Parking Permits:* Up to two residential permits would be permitted per home and would be issued dependent on proof of address and ownership of vehicle. Permits would last for one year from the time of issue.
- 7.3 *Visitor Permits:* Visitor permits are not recommended as these would be open to abuse and the consultation showed little demand for them. In addition, their administration would put an unacceptable burden on the Customer Contact Centre.
- 7.4 *Business Permits:* No business permits would be issued as discouraging business parking is a key objective of the Parking Strategy.
- 7.5 *Blue Badge Holders:* Blue badge holders would be permitted to park on yellow line restrictions under the national regulations and concessions for legitimate badge holders. They can also park in standard parking spaces without charge or limit of time.
- 7.6 *Provision for carers:* The Council has received requests for help with parking from carers who live outside the IGPZ but who care for a family member who lives inside the IGPZ. The increase in the on-street parking maximum stay from 30 minutes to 2 hours, proposed in the latest variation TRO being promoted for the IGPZ, is considered sufficient for carer visits without the need to issue permits.
- 7.7 *Tradespeople and Medical Practitioners:* Tradespeople and Medical Practitioners would receive no special dispensations.
- 7.8 *Permit Format:* Permits would be paper permits and displayed in car windscreens, these keep the scheme simple and transparent.
- 7.9 *Geographical Extent:* The geographical extent of the residents' parking permit scheme has been informed by parking analysis, public consultation and comments received at the Council's Customer Contact Centre. There was a clear consensus that consideration should be given to the scheme covering the existing IGPZ plus extensions into residential areas beyond.
- 7.10 Based on observed parking pressure, observed resident parking behaviour and expressed demand for permits, the extent that the IGPZ is proposed to be extended to cover is (see Appendix):
- King Street;
 - Smith Street;
 - Sir Michael Place;
 - Sir Michael Street;
 - Tobago Street;
 - West Stewart Street (between Kelly Street and Patrick Street);
 - Kelly Street (between West Stewart Street / Houston Street and Union Street);
 - Ann Street;
 - Buccleugh Street; and
 - Crown Street.

To enable the extension into Kelly Street the length of West Stewart Street from Jamaica Street to Kelly Street will require reinstating into the IGPZ. Similarly, to enable the use of resident permits on Station Avenue and the side streets next to Cathcart Buildings, controls must be reinstated here also.

- 7.11 The residents' parking permit scheme covers only Greenock town centre. Justification for schemes elsewhere has not yet been proven.

7.12 *Permit Fee:* For the purposes of the following option appraisal, the costs of permits were assumed to be £25 per annum for the first permit per household and £50 per annum for the second. Permit fees will be reviewed annually. The public consultation suggested that residents are not keen to pay for a permit but these charges are comparable with, or cheaper than, other local authorities in Scotland and should ensure a good uptake of permits. Raising permit costs any higher than this may have an adverse impact on uptake and therefore not provide a satisfactory solution to residents who feel aggrieved at not being able to park at a convenient time and location. The differential between first and second permit charge is designed to suppress demand for the second permit, to limit the impact of the scheme on the availability of parking spaces to the general public, yet still make it affordable.

7.13 The table below shows a selection of typical resident parking permit charges from other Scottish local authorities.

Area	Cost per permit Annual unless otherwise stated
East Ayrshire	£25
Dumfries and Galloway	£25
Aberdeenshire	£30.00 per annum per permit covering parking and administration. £40.00 per annum from 1 April 2015 £50.00 per annum from 1 April 2016 £60.00 per annum from 1 April 2017
Dundee	Menziesshill Zone -£5.00 per annum Broughty Ferry Zone - £50.00 per annum City Centre Zone -£70.00 per annum
Aberdeen City	First permit £70 for 12 months (£37 for 6 months/ £21 for 3 months) and for second permit £120 for 12 months (£63 for 6 months / £36 for 3 months)
South Ayrshire (Ayr)	£50
South Lanarkshire	Permits are free of charge for all areas, though for multiple permits it varies by zone.
Clackmannanshire	£20
Falkirk	£60
Renfrewshire (Paisley)	Free
Borders	£25 (£60 for a specific car park)
Glasgow	£135 - £250 depending on location

8.0 OPTION APPRAISAL

8.1 A spreadsheet model was developed to assess the financial impact of introducing a residents' permit parking scheme in Greenock Town Centre. The model was set up to estimate the revenue and cost of 9 different options based on the size of the scheme boundary and the location of the parking proposed. The 9 options considered in the model are summarised in the table below.

Option	Size of scheme boundary	Parking location
Option 1	Within the IGPZ only	On street
Option 2	Within the IGPZ only	Off street
Option 3	Within the IGPZ only	On and off street
Option 4	Potential extensions to the IGPZ only	On street
Option 5	Potential extensions to the IGPZ only	Off street
Option 6	Potential extensions to the IGPZ only	On and off street
Option 7	IGPZ and potential extensions to it	On street
Option 8	IGPZ and potential extensions to it	Off street
Option 9	IGPZ and potential extensions to it	On and off street

8.2 The consultation exercise identified that there is a genuine demand for residents' parking permits both within and just outside the current IGPZ and therefore only Options 7 to 9 were taken forward for further consideration within the model. Options 1 to 6 were dropped as they do not deal with parking problems both within and outside the current IGPZ.

8.3 In order to inform the decision making process, Options 7, 8 and 9 were scored in terms of their costs and revenues and their contribution to four strategic priorities:

- Simplicity and consistency;
- Creating a hierarchy of street usage (residents use on-street locations and commuters use the car parks);
- Encourage turnover of spaces near commercial premises; and
- Meet residents' expressed preferences (on-street parking within and outwith IGPZ).

8.4 The table below shows the scores for each option

Option No.	Extent	Parking Provision	Simplicity and consistency	Creating a hierarchy of street usage (residents use on-street locations and commuters use the car parks)	Meet residents expressed preferences (on-street parking within and outwith IGPZ)	Encourage turnover of spaces near commercial premises	Objectives Score	Deliverability	Affordability	Value for Money Score	Weighted Score	Rank
7	ICPZ and potential extensions to it	On street	4	5	4	3	16	4	3	7	112	2
8	ICPZ and potential extensions to it	Off street	4	2	2	5	13	4	4	8	104	3
9	ICPZ and potential extensions to it	On and off street	5	4	5	4	18	4	3	7	126	1

- 8.5 The option scoring exercise found that Scenario 9, a small extension to the current IGPZ with permits qualifying residents to park on-street and off-street, was the preferred option to be taken forward. It scores particularly well in terms of:
- Being simple and consistent, with the entire parking controlled area treated the same;
 - Provides residents with option to use preferred on-street spaces and tackles parking pressure in current IGPZ and surrounding streets; and
 - Creates a hierarchy of street usage throughout with residents encouraged to use on-street spaces and commuters to use car parks.

9.0 PRICING VARIANTS

- 9.1 Rather than assume permit fees of £25 and £50 only, three pricing variants of Option 9 have been prepared and the costs to the Council of each one compared. The public consultation suggested that 70% of residents are not keen to pay for a permit. However, charging eases the Council of the burden of subsidising the scheme and has the effect of suppressing demand such that the majority of spaces are available to shoppers and business clients (as per the Greenock town centre parking strategy) and residents who genuinely need a permit will still find them affordable.
- 9.2 *Variant 1 Typical Charge:* Using a pricing structure for permits, where prices are set at £25 per annum for the first permit issued to each house and £50 per annum for the second. With the loss of income to the Council predicted to be in the region of £19,700 per year (assuming an 80% uptake of permits) but an increase in income from the conversion of the Bullring car park predicted to be around £15,000 (see para 9.5), then the scheme is seen to break even. All figures recognise the uncertainty inherent in the level of accuracy of the assumptions made regarding parking behaviour in future.
- 9.3 *Variant 2 Nominal Charge:* Using cheaper permit charges of £10 per annum for the first permit and £25 per annum for the second, the loss of income to the Council is still predicted to be in the region of £19,700 per year less the increase in revenue of £15,000 from the Bullring car park (assuming an 80% uptake of permits). However, permit income is less than Variant 1, despite the increase in uptake, giving an annual loss of income to the Council of £3,000.
- 9.4 *Variant 3 No Charge:* If parking permits were offered free of charge, it is likely that 100% of the residents who own a car would take up the offer of both available permits. This would result in a shortfall in car park and fine revenues of around £10,900 which the Council would be required to fund. In addition, if no charge is made for a permit it is likely that the scheme would become so attractive that more applications than were sustainable would result. The resultant attraction of so much more free residential parking to the town centre than before is likely to affect the ability of the DPE scheme to continue to pay for itself. In addition, residents from outside Greenock town centre will see a free resident parking permit scheme as a right and this will increase calls for more schemes in outlying towns and villages, whose costs will certainly escalate beyond the level that DPE income can accommodate.
- 9.5 *Car Parks:* Extending the controlled zone boundary is likely to displace commuter parking. The overspill of this commuter parking into areas beyond the proposed extension of the controlled zone boundary will be minimised by promoting a TRO to convert the Bullring into £1 a day parking and returning the Waterfront long stay car park to free operation. Neither car park is being used to its full potential and these changes are considered necessary to rectify this situation. The Bullring is on average only a third full and the revenue from the Waterfront long stay car park is only 34% of its estimated contribution quoted in the Decriminalised Parking Enforcement scheme's business case. The introduction of two other proposed long stay car parks in Greenock town centre also has the potential to release more parking pressure from residential streets.

- 9.6 The table below shows the financial impact on the Council of each of the proposed residents' parking permit scheme pricing variants and the proposed alterations to car parks.

Option 9	Annual Total Income from Permit Fees	Annual Total Income Lost from fines and parking charges	Annual Total Cost of administration	Car park income	Annual Revenue Change (approx.)
Variant 1 Typical charge (first £25 pa Second £50 pa)	£(5,800)	£19,700	£1,100	£(15,000)	0
Variant 2 Nominal charge (first £10 pa Second £25 pa)	£(3,000)	£19,700	£1,300	£(15,000)	£3,000
Variant 3 Free of charge	0	£24,500	£1,400	£(15,000)	£10,900

- 9.7 Officers recommend Option 9 Variant 2 as the residents' parking permit scheme to be taken forward. Officers strongly recommend against taking up Option 9 Variant 3 (no charge) because of the likelihood that the scheme would become so attractive that more permit applications than were sustainable would result. The resultant attraction of so much more free residential parking to the town centre than before is likely to affect the ability of the DPE scheme to continue to pay for itself. In addition, residents from outside Greenock town centre will see a free resident parking permit scheme as a right and this will increase calls for more schemes in outlying towns and villages, whose costs will certainly escalate beyond the level that DPE income can accommodate.

- 9.8 *Residents Only Car Park:* The implementation of the residents' parking permit scheme provides the opportunity to limit the use of the car park to the rear of Cathcart Buildings to residents only, which until now has been available to all. Residents and Members have requested a residents' only car park here for some time but the control mechanism to provide it has until now been lacking. Resident permits will allow the Council's Parking Attendants to enforce the residents' only policy with no extra expense on additional infrastructure like barriers or the administration of keys. Officers recommend that the car park to the rear of Cathcart Buildings be included in a TRO to introduce residents' only parking.

10.0 ADMINISTRATION

- 10.1 *Scheme Administration:* The scheme is small and will not sustain one full time equivalent member of trained Council staff to administer the Residents' Parking Permit Scheme. The most cost effective solution would be to add the service to the contract already held by ICES. With this in mind, ICES were asked at the introduction of Decriminalised Parking Enforcement to prepare for the possibility of administering a future Residents' Parking Permit Scheme. ICES will handle and record all applications for permits and check the validity of applicant's addresses and car ownership details annually. They will take the permit fee on behalf of the Council and issue by post a uniquely numbered permit, showing the vehicle registration number, to each applicant for attaching to their car windscreen.
- 10.2 *Parking Attendants:* Parking Attendants will enforce the scheme and check for fraudulent permits. It has been assumed that, given the proposed small expansion to the extent of the inner parking zone, there will be no requirement to increase the number of parking attendants. The analysis of the locations where PCNs are issued shows that they are already currently patrolling the majority of streets within Greenock town centre necessary to cover the proposed scheme.

11.0 IMPLICATIONS

11.1 Finance

One off Costs

Cost Centre	Budget Heading	Budget Years	Proposed Spend this Report	Virement From	Other Comments
	Parking capital budget	15/16	£5,000		New signs and lines to extend zone and for resident only car park
	Parking capital budget	15/16	£5,000		New signs and transfer of equipment from Waterfront to Bullring car park

Annually Recurring Costs/ (Savings)

Cost Centre	Budget Heading	With Effect from	Annual Net Impact	Virement From (If Applicable)	Other Comments
02506	Parking Revenue	15/16	£3,000		Assumes 90% take up of nominal charge Option 9 Variant 2

11.2 Legal

TROs for (i) the introduction of a Residents' Parking Scheme in the Inner Greenock Controlled Parking Zone; (ii) the inclusion of the Sir Michael Street/Tobago Street/ King Street and Kelly Street areas, West Stewart Street from Jamaica Street to Kelly Street, Station Avenue and the unnamed side roads by Cathcart Buildings in the Inner Greenock Controlled Parking Zone and the proposed Residents' Parking Scheme; (iii) the consequential removal of Sir Michael Street/Tobago Street/ King Street and Kelly Street areas, West Stewart Street from Jamaica Street to Kelly Street, Station Avenue and the unnamed side roads by Cathcart Buildings from the Outer Greenock Parking Zone; (iv) the conversion of the Bullring car park to £1.00 per day and the Waterfront long stay car park to free operation and (v) the introduction of a residents' only car park behind Cathcart Buildings, will all be promoted in accordance with the terms of the Local Authorities' Traffic Order (Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 1999.

11.3 Human Resources

No implications.

11.4 Equalities

Residents of Greenock town centre, without private off-street parking spaces, are now able to park close to their homes in much the same way as residents from outside the town centre.

11.5 Repopulation

No implications.

12.0 CONSULTATIONS

12.1 The Head of Legal and Property Services has been consulted on the contents of this report.

12.2 The Chief Financial Officer has been consulted on the contents of this report.

13.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

13.1 None.

Appendix

Proposed Inner Greenock Parking Zone expansion into the streets marked in dark blue for the proposed residents' parking permit scheme

