Consultation

1. Did you take part in any consultation exercise preceding the Bill and, if so, did you comment on the financial assumptions made?

South Lanarkshire responded to the Transport Scotland’s March 2017 consultation “Improving Parking in Scotland” and attended the two subsequent stakeholder group workshops.

South Lanarkshire also responded to their September 2017 consultation on LEZs.

Neither of the consultations provided any financial assumptions.

2. If applicable, do you believe your comments on the financial assumptions have been accurately reflected in the FM?

In response to the consultation on parking, and at the workshops, South Lanarkshire made it clear that there would undoubtedly be a financial burden upon the Council for implementation and enforcement of the parking ban. It is felt that this has not been accurately reflected in the Financial Memorandum, which assumes that for those local authorities already undertaking decriminalised parking enforcement cost will be at a minimum.

3. Did you have sufficient time to contribute to the consultation exercise?

While it would appear that the response times were reasonable, as is normally the case, the need for Council committee, or senior management, approval means that long lead-in periods are required and more time would have been advantageous.

Costs

4. If the Bill has any financial implications for your organisation, do you believe that they have been accurately reflected in the FM? If not, please provide details.

5. Do you consider that the estimated costs and savings set out in the FM are reasonable and accurate?

6. If applicable, are you content that your organisation can meet any financial costs that it might incur as a result of the Bill? If not, how do you think these costs should be met?
7. **Does the FM accurately reflect the margins of uncertainty associated with the Bill’s estimated costs and with the timescales over which they would be expected to arise?**

In response to questions 4. to 7. inclusive South Lanarkshire believe that there are clearly a number of assumptions and uncertainty within the Financial Memorandum so it is difficult, if not impossible at this time, to gauge its accuracy. Without having a better understanding of the potential implications of aspects of the Bill it is not, at this time, possible to say whether, or how, the Council will meet additional financial costs.

It is noted, however, that in the case of LEZs the Financial Memorandum acknowledges that the financial management required to deliver LEZs will require a joint / partnership effort between the Scottish Government and local authorities. Therefore no single body will be responsible for the entire financial outlay and management necessary to deliver LEZs.

Notwithstanding this there will be a, as yet unquantifiable, financial outlay required for implementation and enforcement should the Council promote any LEZs, however, this would also generate income from the issue of penalty charge notices.

Similarly there will be a financial outlay required to install the necessary signing and lining if any streets are exempted from the pavement parking ban. Once again, however, there will be some income generated from the issue of penalty charge notices for contravention of the ban. The Financial Memorandum states that the City of Edinburgh Council anticipates nine exemptions to the ban and Aberdeenshire Council ten but we consider these figures to be surprisingly low and would expect there to be considerably more across South Lanarkshire. The suggested average cost per local authority of £25,000 to undertake the necessary assessments also appears low. As outlined above if additional resources are required to enforce the ban there will be financial implications associated with this.

The Financial Memorandum seems to indicate that Council’s will be funded in relation to any additional financial burden a new Act imposes on them, but the details of how this works in practice has yet to be established.

Some of the costs associated with Bus Service Improvement Services and franchising currently arise and may not be a burden, however, as outlined in the Financial Memorandum, for the Council to provide and run bus services would have significant implications. This function is currently undertaken by SPT on behalf of the Council.

It is considered that the Financial Memorandum reflects the margins of uncertainty associated with the Bill’s estimated costs and timescales. At this time it is not considered that there are any apparent costs associated with the Bill that have not been considered in the Financial Memorandum, or any future cost not yet identified.

### Wider Issues

8. **Do you believe that the FM reasonably captures any costs associated with the Bill? If not, which other costs might be incurred and by whom?**

9. **Do you believe that there may be future costs associated with the Bill, for example through subordinate legislation? If so, is it possible to quantify these costs?**
In response to questions 8. and 9. it is not apparent, at this time, that there are any apparent costs associated with the Bill that have not been considered in the Financial Memorandum, or any future cost not yet identified