



Glasgow City Council

Economy, Housing, Transport and Regeneration City Policy Committee

**Report by George Gillespie, Executive Director
Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability**

Contact: Chris Paterson

Item 4

19th August 2025

Workplace Parking Licensing update

Purpose of Report:

To report on the work undertaken with respect to assessing the feasibility of a Workplace Parking Licensing (WPL) scheme in Glasgow.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that Committee:

- Note the contents of the report, including the engagement work undertaken on Workplace Parking Licensing to date;
- Note that no further work on a Workplace Parking Licensing scheme will be taken forward by the Council at this time; and
- Note that officers will continue to take forward work to explore potential road user charging options as agreed in the 2024/25 Council Budget, with progress to be reported via the Cross-Party Budget Political Oversight Group.

Ward No(s):

Citywide:

Local member(s) advised: Yes ☐ No ☐ consulted: Yes ☐ No ☐

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide Economy, Housing, Transport and Regeneration (EHTR) Committee Members with a summary of the outputs arising from the development of options for consideration of a Workplace Parking Licensing (WPL) Scheme for Glasgow.
- 1.2 As Elected Members may recall, the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019 introduced a discretionary power for local authorities to implement WPL schemes. Schemes require businesses and workplaces to hold a licence for parking places they provide to staff and visitors, with licence charges applied based on the number of parking places specified in the licence. The Act provides the legislative framework for WPL and confers powers on Scottish Ministers to make regulations in relation to certain elements of such schemes.
- 1.3 The intention of this provision is for Local Authorities to be empowered to create WPL schemes that reflect local circumstances, powers are not prescriptive, and Local Authorities can specify exemptions.
- 1.4 The WPL power was recognised within the [Glasgow Transport Strategy](#) with specific policies and actions developed around the power:

Policy 83: *Continue to develop a Workplace Parking Licensing scheme for the city to tackle long-stay parking and support policy 82 and support modal shift to sustainable modes for the journey to work. Any surplus revenue from such a scheme will be ringfenced to fund sustainable transport interventions from the Glasgow Transport Strategy and linked plans.*

Action 83.A: *Undertake a feasibility study about a Workplace Parking Licensing (WPL) scheme, continue to develop a business case and report back to Elected Members for a decision on whether to proceed with a scheme*

- 1.5 In addition, the [Glasgow Climate Plan](#) notes a similar action:

Action 33: *Undertake a feasibility study about a Workplace Parking Licensing (WPL) scheme, ring fenced to fund sustainable transport in the city.*

- 1.6 To investigate the feasibility of WPL in the context of Glasgow City, the Council procured technical and consultation support from experienced external transport consultants to develop options for a viable Workplace Parking Licensing scheme with associated impact assessments.

- 1.7 With the support of consultants, officers have developed a business case, in line with HM Treasury guidance and to fulfil Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance.
- 1.8 A significant amount of work has been undertaken to develop the framework for what would be the first scheme of its kind in Scotland. In order to aid development, the project has been 50% funded by Transport Scotland through the Air Quality Action Plan grant
- 1.9 This report summarises the work undertaken to date and the subsequent outputs and consultants' recommendations, which the EHTR committee is asked to note.
- 1.10 This piece of work represents the fulfilment of commitments made within the Glasgow Transport Strategy and the [Glasgow Climate Plan](#).
- 1.11 It should be noted that this piece of work is a standalone exploratory piece and does not impact upon the Council's committed programme of transport activity which includes:
- Residential Parking Zones
 - Low Emission Zone
 - Pavement Parking
 - Roads Maintenance
 - City Network and Liveable Neighborhood projects.

2 Background

- 2.1 Workplace Parking Licensing (WPL) is a pricing mechanism intended to help local authorities to directly manage road traffic demand growth and to support the promotion of sustainable transport. Indirectly, WPL is also intended to assist authorities in their management of traffic, through its potential to generate ring-fenced revenue streams that may only be used to improve local transport provision, such as by widening modal choice, reducing adverse impacts and providing community and environmental benefits.
- 2.2 WPL legislation was introduced in Scotland by the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019. This legislation, when enacted, effectively requires businesses to hold a licence for the workplace parking places they provide to staff and visitors. There are several, statutory national exemptions to the legislation, with others to be determined locally for individual WPL schemes.
- 2.3 In addition to offering Local Authorities a travel demand management tool, through the pricing mechanism and facilitating the management of workplace parking, WPL schemes have the potential to generate revenue and create a

new locally sourced and managed revenue stream. This revenue may only be used to fund local transport improvements and interventions that are consistent with that Authority's Local Transport Strategy, and could potentially support the on-going delivery of roads, maintenance and wider public transport and active travel improvements.

3 Experience from Nottingham

- 3.1 Nottingham City Council introduced WPL in 2012 and to date remains the only scheme of its nature in place in the UK. In 2022, the City Published the [WPL 10 Year Impact Report](#). The report provides detail on the scheme, the objectives, how proposals were initiated and crucially, performance statistics. These include the following:
- £90 million raised over ten years
 - Traffic congestion reduced by 47%
 - 17km of Nottingham tram track added from scheme proceeds
 - £120 million invested in the bus network and
 - £55 million invested in cycling and active travel facilities
- 3.2 In terms of public acceptability, there was some opposition to the development and implementation of the WPL scheme in Nottingham, as identified through the extended Public Consultation into the scheme and with issues aired at the Public Examination. This opposition included the local Chamber of Commerce and some individual businesses, challenging both the need for the scheme and ways of charging, including some with preferences for Road User Charging.
- 3.3 Notwithstanding this, the scheme was implemented and the funding raised was directed at addressing some of the city's transport problems, with investment in three key transport priorities in the city; the A453 road scheme, Nottingham railway station and the Nottingham Express Transit (NET) tram extensions.
- 3.4 Following the implementation of this WPL scheme, there appears to have been little concentrated opposition to the scheme and very little press coverage, with the WPL charges on liable businesses having effectively become an established part of doing business in Nottingham.

4 Engagement Work Undertaken to Date

- 4.1 In order to support the development of scheme options, there were two phases of stakeholder engagement. It should be noted that this engagement process was non-statutory and was intended to understand the concerns, priorities and thoughts of stakeholders. If a scheme were to be taken forward, there would need to be a period of statutory consultation in accordance with the legislation and guidance.

- 4.2 Transport Scotland advises that “under the 2019 Act, local authorities must consult “persons as the authority considers appropriate in relation to the proposal (including, in particular, persons that the authority has identified as likely to be affected by the proposal).” It is for the local authority to determine who the appropriate consultees may be”.
- 4.3 **Phase 1** involved information sharing and high-level discussion sessions with groups of stakeholders, introducing the concept of WPL, how it would operate and what outcomes might be expected to arise from the licensing scheme.
- 4.4 **Phase 2** held more detailed sessions with many of the same stakeholders, discussing updates on the scheme development and receiving feedback on options for a potential scheme. The stakeholders included GCC departments, neighbouring Local Authorities, the health and education sectors, retail businesses, public transport operators and local businesses (via the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce).
- 4.5 It should be noted that Glasgow Chamber of Commerce and their members have stated their explicit opposition to the scheme. Despite this, the Chamber have continued to engage constructively and have provided valuable business insights and contributions to the study. Concerns from stakeholder groups can be summarised as follows:

- **Treatment of fleet vehicles in a potential scheme** - reflecting the nature of the freight and emergency services sectors’ work in terms of resource usage both in terms of time and location.
- **Shared parking spaces between sectors and different staff members** - Both the health and higher education groups highlighted examples of different types of users (such as employees, students and contractors using the same spaces).
- **Spending of revenue generated on schemes that cross local authority boundaries** - Neighbouring local authorities raised concerns around displacement of car parking to streets in neighbouring council areas and whether WPL revenue could be spent outside of the GCC area to mitigate this.
- **Governance and management of the WPL scheme at different locations** - The Shopping Centre group noted how their current parking provision is not defined by staff and customers, making it challenging to determine who and where to pass on the license charge if employers chose to do so. The higher education group noted that they offer a ‘daily ballot’ system, meaning that parking use by an individual is not the same annually, an aspect further exacerbated by term timetables of higher education sites.

- **Impact on shift workers** - The Shopping Centre, Emergency Services, and Higher Education groups raised concerns around the unsociable timings of shift workers, and how the current provision of public transport services would not support their work patterns.
- **Existing provision of public transport** - Related to the impact on shift workers, concern was highlighted about existing levels of public transport reliability and accessibility. Many groups noted that the public transport network should be improved prior to the implementation of WPL and, specifically, the Higher Education and Glasgow Bus Alliance groups noted that there should be a strategy in place setting out what the revenue is going to be spent on.
- **Ensuring the scheme is simple, understandable and communicated well** - The scheme should be easy to understand and it be communicated that it will support a transition to more sustainable travel behaviour for the city in the long term.

4.6 The views and feedback collected during both phases of the stakeholder engagement exercise have been used to both develop potential options for WPL in Glasgow and to inform an understanding of aspects that would need to be considered and impacts that would need to be mitigated, should a scheme be taken forward.

4.7 All stakeholder feedback has been documented and is contained within the Strategic Business Case (SBC).

5 Option Development

5.1 The Strategic Case sets out the case for change, i.e. the rationale for developing the scheme, which can be summarised as follows:

- A reliance on car journeys for commuting to work
- High levels of congestion and traffic
- Unreliable or perceived poor-quality public transport (lack of direct public transport routes, aged vehicles, journey time variability)
- Increases in journeys to school by car
- Transport-related environmental impacts
- Unsustainable traffic growth
- Oversupply of public and private parking

5.2 The Strategic Case also sets out the option generation and sifting process. The options were generated in response to a series of Transport Planning Objectives (TPOs) (see table in Appendix A) and an assessment of the problems and opportunities generated as a result of:

- Policies and objectives set out in the Glasgow Transport Strategy

- Engagement with key stakeholders and partners
 - Professional judgement - flowing from a structured decision-making process by the study team (comprising GCC's appointed consultants and a number of Council officers)
- 5.3 From an initial longlist of options, the Preliminary Appraisal process produced a shortlist of two main options for the licensed area, or geographical extent of the WPL scheme, as follows:
- Option 1: Extended City Centre, including the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) area with phased expansions linked to future expansions of CPZs; and
 - Option 2: WPL introduced across the full GCC area.
- 5.4 Both options were then tested against several criteria including price point, level of exemptions and supporting interventions. The results of the economic and financial appraisal are provided in **Appendix A**.
- 5.5 Option 2, in which the licensed area extends across the Glasgow City Council administrative area, was found to offer the greatest net benefit and, were a scheme to be taken to delivery, would offer the most significant support for local transport improvements and interventions.
- 5.6 Option 2 can be summarised as follows:
- **Licensed area: GCC boundary**
 - **License charge:**
 - £500 per space (2025 prices)
 - Annually indexed to RPI
 - Phased introduction using an interim low charge period for the first year – this could be at cost or an amount lower than what will become standard
 - **Exemptions and discounts (in addition to statutory exemptions):**
 - Occasional business visitors
 - Fleet and display vehicles
 - Vehicles primarily used to deliver or collect goods
 - Motorbikes and mopeds
 - Locations with low numbers of spaces (to be defined in Detailed Appraisal)
 - Emergency service vehicles
 - Non-healthcare services provided at NHS premises
 - **Annual Projected Revenue: £8.2m - **Figure does not include one off development or implementation costs but does include £1m per annum operating costs***

- 5.7 GCC liabilities have been reflected with regard to sites with parking provision, including depots, office locations, community centres and schools. Work undertaken suggests the total staff parking provision is in the region of 4,000 spaces, or approximately 18% of the city-wide total of 22,000. GCC would have responsibility for financial commitments related to these spaces which is estimated at **£2.02m**.
- 5.8 Whilst consultants' initial recommendations did not include the exemption of schools and education staff, the annual projected revenue has been considered to reflect this. Should education services be exempted, the reduction in revenue has been estimated at £1.37m and the annual projected revenue related to WPL would be in the region of **£6.83m**.
- 5.9 Were a Workplace Parking Licensing Scheme to be progressed, Option 2 – GCC Boundary – would offer the greatest number of benefits for the following reasons:
- The larger licensed area presents a more impactful intervention, in which the increased geographic scope presents greater opportunity to manage traffic demand growth and achieve wider community and environment benefits, at similar development, implementation and operating costs to the limited license area (Option 1).
 - The larger licensed area presents greater opportunity to reinvest in a more transformational programme of sustainable transport measures, required to address the problems identified in the Strategic Case and to fulfil the aspirations of the Glasgow Transport Strategy, by generating significantly greater revenue than the limited license area (Option 1). This is a key reason why Option 2 scores higher than Option 1 against the TPOs and STAG Criteria.
 - The £500 pa (in 2025 prices) license charge would still generate significant revenue for reinvestment in the transport network in support of the Glasgow Transport Strategy while limiting the impact on businesses. Annually indexing the license charge to RPI inflation protects future revenue surpluses, preventing the value of the license charge reducing in real terms during the lifetime of the scheme and maintaining the financial support available to the transport network and delivery of the Glasgow Transport Strategy.
 - The phased introduction of the scheme via an interim low charge period in the first year addresses some of the concerns raised by stakeholders about the administrative cost and burden of managing their parking within the scheme, and allows GCC to work with employers over this

interim period to get systems and processes in place, and support businesses to manage their parking and work with their employees, prior to the full cost of the license charges coming into effect.

- The exemptions and discounts proposed seek to address many of the concerns raised during the engagement process regarding the impact on occasional visitors and special use vehicles, whilst maintaining the simplicity of the scheme in terms of understanding and operation. Exempting non-healthcare services at qualifying NHS premises provides a consistent approach at these locations and limits the administrative burden on NHS trusts.

5.10 This process also identified a number of essential supporting measures to help in the implementation of the licensing scheme and mitigate some of the direct and indirect impacts of implementation. The importance of these measures was identified through the stakeholder engagement programme that was used to understand the concerns of the business and wider stakeholder groups.

5.11 Part of this mitigation could come in the form of supporting measures funded by the WPL revenues, in part to aid compliance and support for the scheme, but also to relieve any administrative burden on businesses and other employers and reduce any adverse impacts arising on local communities if businesses and commuters change their behaviours in respect of workplace parking provision and use. Based on a review of practice and proposals elsewhere and the stakeholder discussions, these supporting measures could include:

- Measures to deter or address displaced parking if businesses significantly reduce their workplace parking provision below normal use and/or they pass on their WPL liability to employers who then chose to forego their workplace parking place. This could include interventions such as activities to supplement GCC's programme of controlled parking zones, resident parking schemes and associated road marking.
- Support for businesses to manage, enforce and improve their parking provision, including advice on the equitable allocation of spaces and/or licenses (such as allocating by need, lack of alternative transport provision, role or shift pattern, for example), barrier or other secure car park entries, and support strategies and policies that allow the employer to develop objectives and supporting measures in their management of parking supply as part of wider employee rewards packages. Any support provided by GCC would likely have to be paid for by revenue raised from the scheme.
- Support for businesses to develop robust and effective travel plans to help employees travel to work using public transport and active travel,

allowing businesses to more easily manage (and potentially reduce in the future) their employee parking provision (and therefore their liability). As with the above, any support provided by GCC would likely have to be paid for by revenue raised from the scheme.

5.12 A number of feasible operational delivery models exist to deliver all or part of the above functions. The consultants' provisional recommendations for a scheme model, were a WPL scheme to be progressed, is for a scheme to be operated in-house by GCC in collaboration with the Workplace Parking Levy team at Nottingham City Council (NCC) on a knowledge sharing basis. This arrangement would ensure lessons can be learned from current best practice within the UK while retaining GCC oversight. The justification for the consultants' recommendation can be summarised as follows:

- GCC retains control and oversight of the scheme.
- Implementation timescales are quicker than procuring to a third party, and procurements costs are lower, allowing the scheme to be developed and implemented quickly and efficiently.
- GCC already has a parking enforcement team that, subject to resources, could feasibly take on many of the operational roles and responsibilities.
- The involvement of NCC officers ensures that some of the key learnings in developing the UK's only currently implemented WPL scheme can be utilised. NCC officers can offer expert insight and advice during further scheme development and ensure smooth scheme implementation and operation. In principle, NCC may also be able to offer access to their existing systems and processes, proven in an operational WPL scheme, through sub-contracted or licensed-based approach without the need to develop bespoke systems from scratch. The involvement of and collaboration with NCC could be tapered down once the scheme is in place and operating successfully, further reducing costs.

6 Implementation Programme

- 6.1 Were a scheme to be taken to delivery, timescales are likely to be in the order of two to four years. Estimated implementation timescales suggest that commencement of the scheme could be active 2.5 years from OBC approval and a decision by Elected Members to proceed.
- 6.2 Estimated timescales could be significantly impacted if an examination of the proposal is initiated by Scottish Ministers or a Local Authority. It is estimated that this could potentially add between 1 and 3 years to the programme, depending on the requirement for hearings or inquiries.
- 6.3 It is noted that there is no precedent in implementing a WPL scheme in Scotland and the legislative framework for WPL therefore remains untested. This may introduce the potential for further delays to implementation.

7 Revenue Expenditure

- 7.1 The Transport Act is clear in that revenue can only be spent on measures contained within the Local Transport Strategy. In terms of Glasgow, this could take the form of investing in public transport infrastructure, noting GCC priorities for Bus Priority Corridors; our support for the Strathclyde Regional Bus Strategy (SRBS) and the ongoing development of Clyde Metro. Where appropriate, this can also include further parking interventions which align with modal shift priorities.
- 7.2 Engagement suggests that targeting money at key public transport solutions would lead to greater support of WPL in general as revenue raised would be visible through public transport improvements. This correlates with experience in Nottingham.

8 Risks

- 8.1 A key aspect of the scheme is the management of risk and the various uncertainties that exist. Within these risks, there are a number of legal considerations and uncertainties where it is recommended that GCC should seek legal advice prior to proceeding with any scheme. These can be summarised as:
- **The treatment of commuters using public car parks supported by their employers** – it appears to be unclear in the guidance and legislation whether GCC could license spaces in public car parks used by commuters where there is no formal arrangement between the car park operator and the employer, and what the process for identifying and enforcing these would be.
 - **Use of revenues** – the legislation and guidance states that revenues generated by the scheme must be used to facilitate the achievement of policies in the local transport strategy. GCC may need to seek legal advice regarding whether a particular investment or revenue support falls within the scope of the provision set out in the legislation.
 - **Period the scheme is in operation** – the legislation and guidance require local authorities to specify arrangements for the periodic review of the scheme. Furthermore, the legislation and guidance state that local authorities should set out the period in which the scheme is to remain in force, or that it is to remain in force indefinitely. It is recommended that legal advice should be sought by GCC regarding the definition of ‘periodic review’ and how best to comply with this requirement, and

whether and how to define a scheme with a fixed or indefinite operational period.

- **Enforcement and compliance** – GCC may wish to seek legal advice on how best to develop and implement an enforcement and compliance regime. The current Nottingham WPL scheme has seen very high compliance, through a collaborative approach between NCC and businesses, and there is therefore little precedent in enforcing a WPL scheme where high levels of non-compliance are occurring. The 2019 Act makes provision for offences in relation to WPL license applications, with it being an offence to provide false or misleading information in respect of a workplace parking license.
- **Potential for the scheme being called for examination** – the legislation and guidance includes the provision for an examination of the scheme if requested by Scottish Ministers or a Local Authority. This includes the possibility that GCC decides to initiate an examination of its own scheme. This would have the potential of adding significantly to the timescales and costs for implementation, and may require amendments to the scheme proposals or withdrawal of the scheme entirely.

9 Impact Assessments

9.1 In order to appropriately develop the proposed scheme as recommended by consultants and the corresponding business case, a series of Impact Assessments were undertaken which helped inform option development, appraisal and suitability. Impact Assessments undertaken for the specific purpose of the WPL project are as follows:

- Equality Impact Assessment
- Environmental Impact Assessment
- Child Rights and Wellbeing Assessment
- Business and Regulatory Impact Assessment
- Data Protection Impact Assessment

9.2 Generally, all assessments were supportive of the proposed WPL intervention, however identified impacts did include the potential for greater financial impact for certain groups of employees where the charge was passed on by employers. Key Points from each assessment are included within the table below:

Equality Impact Assessment	There are no significant adverse impacts on members of the Protected Characteristic groups.
-----------------------------------	---

	<p>The revenue generated to reinvest into transport services has the potential to positively benefit members of the Protected Characteristic groups, especially where investment is focused on improving accessibility to employment and services, such as education, training, healthcare, retail and leisure facilities.</p> <p>The license charge, where passed on to employees by the employer, is likely to have a greater financial impact on some groups that are not fully captured by the Protected Characteristics, including: those experiencing socio-economic disadvantage in areas where car use is high; those without public transport alternatives; and shift workers, who may pay the charge but, as they travel out of normal hours, would not see the benefits of reduced congestion or an enhanced public transport system.</p>
Environmental Impact Assessment	<p>Likely to have indirect positive impacts on some land uses but may also result in adverse effects associated with parking displacement.</p> <p>Benefits from investment unlikely to apply equally across the study area.</p> <p>It may be expected the scheme will lead to a positive beneficial health impact. However, the degree to which adverse environmental effects may be reduced is uncertain, as are the benefits that may derive from investment of WPL revenue in transport infrastructure</p> <p>A positive impact on air quality within the city. The extent of overall improvement to air quality from the WPL scheme is uncertain and will be dependent on the type of public transport/active travel schemes invested in.</p> <p>The larger scheme option is likely to have a more positive impact on the environment and climate factors</p>
Child Rights and Wellbeing Assessment	<p>The revenue generated to reinvest into transport services has the potential to positively benefit the rights of children and young people by providing a safer, more affordable and more reliable transport network.</p> <p>Younger adults are more likely to work part-time and travel for education, resulting in travelling hours</p>

	<p>outside of typical commuting patterns, and are more likely to rely on public transport and active modes. They are also less likely to drive to work, and therefore less likely to be negatively impacted directly by the cost of the license charge if passed on by employers</p> <p>The rights of disabled children, those from low income and deprived socio-economic backgrounds, and those living in rural areas of the region would be expected to benefit from the reinvestment of WPL revenues into transport services.</p> <p>It is considered that WPL and its associated investment would enhance the ability to access safe, convenient and cost-effective transport for children and young people, and therefore improve their ability to access services, such as education, training opportunities, healthcare services and facilities, and local retail hubs.</p>
Business and Regulatory Impact Assessment	<p>Likely to have a small impact on businesses, and negligible impact on consumers, and regulators.</p> <p>Where businesses choose to absorb the full license charge, the scale of financial impact is likely to vary dependent on business size and turnover. At the city level, the scheme's annual revenue estimates are small in the context of Glasgow's total output (GVA).</p> <p>Where businesses pass on some or all of the license charge to their employees, an impact on staff retention and recruitment may be seen. Other possible impacts include additional time spent on management of parking spaces and collection of payments from employees.</p> <p>It may be expected that the scheme will lead to some positive impacts for businesses, including the reduction in traffic congestion and reduced impacts on business operations; the release of parking spaces for other business priorities; and a healthier, more productive workforce if employees switch to other modes.</p>
Data Protection Impact Assessment	<p>There is no requirement for personal data processing and the data processing that is required was determined to be of a low risk to individuals.</p>

	GCC will be required to collect and hold data from employers relating to workplace parking places, associated license payments and information on exemptions. As it is employers who are liable for the license payments, GCC will not be required to collect individual employee data.
--	---

10 Next Steps

- 10.1 As part of the Glasgow Transport Strategy and as reiterated in the 2024 budget statement, Glasgow City Council is committed to investigating powers available to support its management of travel demand. The Council remains committed to its objectives of reducing car use and tackling congestion, and to exploring opportunities to raise revenues to support sustainable transport interventions which can encourage modal shift.
- 10.2 WPL is one such opportunity, and the work undertaken to date has illustrated the outline of a potential scheme in Glasgow. However, this exercise has also identified a number of risks and a range of strong themes across feedback from stakeholders. From the engagement undertaken, it is clear that there is limited commercial and public appetite for a WPL scheme in Glasgow at this time.
- 10.3 Further, while a WPL scheme has the potential to encourage modal shift and generate relatively modest revenues to support sustainable transport interventions, it is considered that alternative options such as initiatives utilising local road user charging powers may prove more impactful in achieving these aims. For example, the 2022-27 Council Strategic Plan commits the Council to explore an at-city-boundary congestion charge, while the Council Budget 2025/26 reiterates this commitment and further commits to the investigation of tolling of the Clyde Tunnel.
- 10.4 As such, while the Council does not intend to progress a WPL scheme at this time, officers will now direct resources to the exploration of alternative potential initiatives utilising local road user charging powers. Transport Scotland has recently committed to undertaking a regulatory check of existing Transport (Scotland) Act 2001 powers for discretionary local road user charging schemes to allow local authorities and/or regional transport partnerships the option to implement these.
- 10.5 No timeline for the regulatory review has yet been set, and while it is clear that the exploration, development and implementation of any such scheme would likely take several years, the Council will engage closely with the national regulatory review as part of its ongoing work in this area. Progress on this workstream will be reported at appropriate junctures to the Cross-Party Budget Political Oversight Group, and an update report will be brought to this committee at a future date.

11 Policy and Resource Implications

Resource Implications:

Financial: Were GCC to proceed, estimated development and implementation costs are in the region of £2.4 million. An additional £1 million would be required each year to operate the scheme. Estimated revenue is between £11 million and £15 million per annum dependant upon level of charge set.

Legal: WPL legislation is untested in Scotland. This may result in legal challenges and or the scheme to be called in for examination by Scottish Ministers

Personnel: Were a scheme to be introduced in Glasgow there would be requirement for additional personnel to manage and operate the scheme. Potentially the parking teams would require to be strengthened to ensure appropriate resources in place.

Procurement: Were a scheme to be taken forward, this report recommends procurement of the Nottingham WPL team which has a consultancy arm.

Council Strategic Plan: Grand Challenge 1: Mission 3
Grand Challenge 2: Mission 1 and 3.
Grand Challenge 3: Mission 1 and 2.

Equality and Socio-Economic Impacts:

Does the proposal support the Council's Equality Outcomes 2021-25? Please specify. WPL provides the Council the ability to directly invest in transport improvements across the city which will positively benefit all groups, particularly those from SIMD areas who have no access to a private vehicle, where reinvestment is focused on improving accessibility to employment and services, such as education, training, healthcare, retail and leisure facilities.

<i>What are the potential equality impacts as a result of this report?</i>	Equality Impact Assessments (EQIAs) has been developed as part of this workstream. No significant adverse impacts on members of the Protected Characteristic groups were found.
--	---

<i>Please highlight if the policy/proposal will help address socio-economic disadvantage.</i>	The scheme does not allow GCC to level the charge against individuals but rather the workplace themselves. It is for the employer to decide whether to absorb the cost or pass through to their staff. It should be noted that all revenues raised through the scheme must be spent on measures contained within the GTS. As such, transport improvements can be provided as a direct outcome which will help address socio economic disadvantage and transport poverty.
---	--

Climate Impacts:

<i>Does the proposal support any Climate Plan actions? Please specify:</i>	GCC has committed to a goal of achieving net zero carbon emissions in Glasgow by 2030 in its collaborative Climate Plan. WPL can be used as a demand management tool to dissuade car travel but importantly, help fund transport improvements
--	---

<i>What are the potential climate impacts as a result of this proposal?</i>	WPL has the potential to provide a positive impact on the climate through enabling and encouraging alternative and more sustainable modes of within the city, as well as reduce emissions.
---	--

<i>Will the proposal contribute to Glasgow's net zero carbon target?</i>	WPL has the potential to contribute to Glasgow's net zero carbon target by using revenue raised to invest in sustainable modes of travel
--	--

Privacy and Data Protection Impacts:	Were WPL to be enacted it is not envisaged that personal data will require to be collected. Workplace and Business information will however be required to operate and manage the scheme. The data processing that is required is therefore determined to be of a low risk to individuals.
---	--

12 Recommendations

12.1 It is recommended that Committee:

- Note the contents of the report, including the engagement work undertaken on Workplace Parking Licensing to date;
- Note that no further work on a Workplace Parking Licensing scheme will be taken forward by the Council at this time; and
- Note that officers will continue to take forward work to explore potential road user charging options as agreed in the 2024/25 Council Budget, with progress to be reported via the Cross-Party Budget Political Oversight Group and a future update report to this Committee.

Appendix A

Options 1 and 2: Economic and Financial Appraisal

From an initial longlist of options, the Preliminary Appraisal process produced a shortlist of two main options for the licensed area, or geographical extent of the WPL scheme, as follows:

- Option 1: Extended City Centre, including the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) area with phased expansions linked to future expansions of CPZs; and
- Option 2: WPL introduced across the full GCC area.

Both options were then subject to a Detailed Options Appraisal, including the consideration of price point, level of exemptions and supporting interventions.

The results of the socio-economic appraisal are set out below.

Criteria	Option 1	Option 2
WPL Transport Planning Objectives		
TPO 1 – To reduce congestion	✓✓	✓✓✓
TPO 2 – To increase use of sustainable modes and encourage modal shift away from cars	✓✓	✓✓✓
TPO 3 – To reduce carbon emissions	✓✓	✓✓✓
TPO 4 – To generate revenue funding	✓✓	✓✓✓
TPO 5 – To deliver a cost effective, adaptable and acceptable transport system	✓✓	✓✓✓
STAG Criteria		
Environment	✓	✓✓
Climate change	✓	✓✓
Health, safety and wellbeing	✓	✓✓
Economy	✓	✓✓
Equality and accessibility	✓✓	✓✓✓
Deliverability and Value for Money		

Feasibility	Minor to moderate consideration	Minor to moderate consideration
Affordability	Minor consideration	Minor consideration
Public acceptability	Major consideration	Major consideration
Net Present Value (2023 prices, 10-year appraisal period) (£500 pa license)	£3.89m	£72.64m
Net Present Value (2023 prices, 10-year appraisal period) (£650 pa license)	£9.06m	£97.86m
Benefit cost ratio	n/a	n/a

The Financial Case sets out the estimated costs and revenues for the scheme, which are summarised below in terms of scheme costs, revenue and GCC liability:

Cost Element	2025/2026 prices
Option 1 – Extended City Centre and CPZ area	
Development costs	£1.58m
Implementation costs	£0.71m
Operating costs	£0.67m – £1.14m pa
Option 2 – GCC boundary	
Development costs	£1.65m
Implementation costs	£0.75m
Operating costs	£0.75m – £1.21m pa

Alongside costs, an initial review of potential revenue and importantly GCC liability was undertaken:

	Option 1 – Extended City Centre and CPZ area	OPTION 2 – GCC Boundary
--	--	-------------------------

Revenue per annum		
£500 pa	£2.19m	£11.22m
£650 pa	£2.85m	£14.59m
GCC liability per annum		
£500 pa	£0.07m	£2.02m
£650 pa	£0.09m	£2.62m
Net Revenue (Rev minus liability) *This does not account for development and implementation costs however estimated operating costs of £1m have been included		
£500 pa	£2.12m	£8.2m
£650 pa	£2.76m	£11.97m