

Introducing Car Park Charging on the SCC Countryside Estate

Date of Investment Panel	23 rd January 2018	Reference <i>To be completed by administrator</i>
Project Manager	Name:	Sam Cunningham
	Tel:	07817 820371
Type of Project	Invest to Save Project	
Sponsor Name	Lisa Creaye-Griffin	
Service	Place Development: Countryside	
Consulted Head of Service	Lesley Harding Place Development Service	
Strategic Finance Manager/ Finance Manager	Tony Orzieri	
Procurement		
Cabinet Paper		
Procurement reference	SGM	

Version	11/1/18

Business Case

1.1 Issue, problem or opportunity to be addressed

This paper sets out the proposed approach to introducing car parking charges at the five busiest sites on Surrey County Council's Countryside Estate. This would mean introducing charges at 15 out of the over 30 car parks across the Estate.

SWT and SCC have been working together to introduce more income-generating activity across the SCC Countryside Estate ('the Estate') to help meet the SCC savings target of zero contribution toward the cost of managing the Estate by the end of March 2021. The current contribution from SCC Public funding is £575,000 (FY2017/18). This new source of income will make a notable contribution towards the savings target. It is essential that the Estate becomes self-funding in order to maintain visitor access and experience, and to ensure the landscape is conserved and enhanced for future generations.

This business case presents car park charging as an income-generating activity that will contribute net revenue of between £1.2m and £3.3m over 15 years to the Countryside Estate, helping the Estate to become self-funding. As detailed later in this report, the preferred option will generate a net revenue over 15 years of £3.0m

Income generated by car park charging is increasingly being used nationally by countryside landowners (such as the National Trust and Forestry Commission) to contribute to the ongoing costs of providing high quality access to countryside sites and of maintaining the quality of sites for wildlife.

Experience gained at Newlands Corner has been used in the preparation of this business case. For example, the final infrastructure and service contract prices agreed at Newlands have informed the cost estimates in this business case.

There are over 30 car parks across the Estate. They range from formalised car parks with the capacity for 190 cars to informal car parks with limited space for only a few vehicles. A number of the popular sites have car parks with better capacity that are suitable for car park charging. It is proposed that car park charging is introduced to the following five sites:

1. Chobham Common (6 car parks)
2. Whitmoor Common (2 car parks)
3. Norbury Park (3 car parks)
4. Ockham and Wisley Common (3 car parks)
5. Rodborough Common (1 car park)

These sites have been identified because the number of visits at each site is sufficient to generate an income that will more than outweigh the revenue costs associated with running car park charging. The number of visits to each site is supported by vehicle counter data that also indicates visitor patterns. The vehicle counter data is attached as Appendix 2.

The Pay and Conserve consultation on the proposals to introduce countryside car parking ran for a six week period between September and November 2017. The aim of the

consultation was to give residents an opportunity to comment on the possibility of car park charging and to gather information on how the sites are used. The survey aimed to understand more about how people currently use the sites, what they felt about paying to park, including how a scheme might operate. The results of the survey have been analysed and have been considered in the development of this business case.

On 29th November 2017 a report was taken to the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee asking them to consider the output from the consultation, comment on the proposed options and provide a view on the preferred option. The committee supported the preferred option as set out in this paper.

1.2 Aims and objectives

The objectives for the introduction of car park charging are:

1. To provide a financially sustainable model for the management of the SCC Countryside Estate that will provide further savings for SCC and enable the continued and sustainable management of key sites within the Countryside Estate for the benefit of people and wildlife.
ECONOMIC PROSPERITY, RESIDENTS' EXPERIENCE, WELLBEING
2. To yield a good and relatively low risk return on investment and provide a secure long-term income stream that will enable the SCC Countryside Estate to move closer to financial self-sufficiency over time.
ECONOMIC PROSPERITY
3. To provide infrastructure improvements, such as better surfacing on paths and offer more information relating to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) and the opportunities for access and enjoyment by the public.
WELLBEING, RESIDENTS' EXPERIENCE.

SWT will operate the car parking scheme to help meet the SCC savings target of zero contribution toward the cost of managing the Estate by the end of March 2021. Car park charging could start in summer 2018, assuming SCC capital funding is obtained and other conditions are in place by April 2018.

1.3. Scope

The following items are included in the scope of this project:

1. Car park meters and associated Pay and Display signage at car parks where the number of visits is sufficient to generate an income that will outweigh the revenue costs associated with running car park charging.

2. Improvements at the sites including surfacing, white lines, noticeboards and cycle parking with additional measures such as posts to manage displacement issues.
3. A cash-free system where parking is paid for by card, mobile phone collection, e.g. RingGo, and through an annual parking pass. This will reduce infrastructure costs and reduce operational costs, e.g. cash collection, vandalism repairs.
4. Ongoing service contracts for the operation of car park charging in multiple car parks.

1.4. Deliverables

The project would deliver the following outputs and benefits:

Outputs

1. Car park charging infrastructure in 15 car parks at 5 sites on the SCC Countryside Estate:
 - Chobham Common (6 car parks)
 - Whitmoor Common (2 car parks)
 - Norbury Park (3 car parks)
 - Ockham and Wisley Common (3 car parks)
 - Rodborough Common (1 car park)

Where there is more than 1 car park at a site, it will be necessary to charge in all of the car parks to ensure that visitors do not relocate to another car park to avoid charges.

Benefits

1. Net revenue of £3.0m over 15 years to the Countryside Estate (Option 5), making a notable contribution towards making the Estate self-financing (zero-contribution from direct SCC public funding) by the end of FY 2020/21. The preferred option provides a payback period of 3 years and the IRR is 51% (Section 1.7).
2. Concentration of resources on car parks that serve the most people and therefore have the potential to generate an income, resulting in higher quality infrastructure for visitors, including car park surfaces and signs that encourage visitors to explore the countryside from the car parks provided.
3. Positive interaction with the public through prominent visibility of a warden who will proactively explain the need and benefits associated with the introduction of car park charging. The role will be present on site during peak hours to talk to people and undertake such tasks as site maintenance, 'soft' enforcement and replace tickets.

1.5 Options considered

<p>Option 1 No change If no charges were made for car parking there would be no income generated to cover the cost of running the Countryside Estate.</p>	<p>The consequence of this option are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Car parks would continue to be free to use and available to all to access the sites. There would be no issue with displacement parking. b) As funding reduces, money would not be available to maintain car parks and the sites. This could lead to the closure of the car parks or the removal of other access facilities at the most popular sites on the Countryside Estate, resulting in falling visitor satisfaction and additional risks associated with the maintenance of car park surfaces and safe use of car parks and trails. c) This could lead to more insurance claims if the condition of the car parks deteriorates. d) This approach would mean there would be no funding available to invest in protecting and enhancing the countryside
<p>Option 2 Introduce a voluntary donation in the busiest car parks. Income would be collected via mobile phone payment, such as RingGo or similar, (i.e. no Pay & Display machine). Soft enforcement would be in place with messages encouraging visitors to make a donation of a suggested amount.</p>	<p>The consequence of this option are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Car parks would be open to all, with an option for making a contribution. There would be no issue with displacement parking. b) Compliance, based on work by the National Trust, would be likely to be approximately 25%. Potentially this could be lower as this is County Council land, rather than land owned by a popular charity. It should be noted that Dartmoor National Park calculated that they received on average 15p per car via their voluntary donations and are now introducing a mandatory charge. c) Income from car park charging would make a minimal contribution to the Estate becoming self-funding and is projected to result in a funding shortfall, resulting in reduction in levels of maintenance in car parks and at sites. This could lead to closure of car parks and other impacts as set out in option 1 above. d) This approach would mean that there would be no funding available to invest in protecting and enhancing the countryside
<p>Option 3 Introduce car parking charges on the five busiest sites using cash and card collection Income would be collected via a mix of Pay and Display machines, accepting cash and cards, mobile phone payment, e.g. RingGo. The smaller and least used car parks would offer card or phone payment only. An annual permit would be available for use at all 5 sites.</p>	<p>The consequences of this option are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Funding would be generated to support the ongoing maintenance and management of the countryside estate and enable the County Council to continue to improve the biodiversity, landscape and amenity value of the estate for future generations. b) The introduction of car park charges may deter some people from visiting the sites and displacement parking would need to be monitored and could be a problem in residential areas around the car parks. c) The costs of cash collection are significant and there are risks associated with having cash on sites. They are located in isolated rural areas, and could be subject to theft and vandalism which could result in periods of time where meters are not operational and therefore income is lost. The National Trust in Surrey have found that up to 50% of their cash-based meters are vandalised every year. They are now moving to a non-cash based system. <p>Income from this option will contribute a net revenue of £1.2 million over 15 years with a 6 year project payback period and IRR at 21%</p>

<p>Option 4 Introduce car parking charges across the five busiest sites using meter less payment methods only. Income will be collected via mobile phone payment and an annual parking pass scheme only (i.e. no Pay & Display machine).</p>	<p>The consequences of this option are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Funding would be generated to support the ongoing maintenance and management of the countryside estate and enable the County Council to continue to improve the biodiversity, landscape and amenity value of the estate for future generations. b) The introduction of car park charges may deter some people from visiting the sites and displacement parking would need to be monitored and could be a problem in residential areas around the car parks. c) Capital investment costs would be minimised as no meters would be required, with the focus being on clear signage. d) Annual costs would be minimised because this option removes the need for cash collection from the sites and a banking service. All transactions are based on mobile based payment and annual parking pass scheme using an online facility. e) No cash meters will reduce theft and vandalism, a common issue for isolated rural car parks. <p>Income from this option will contribute a net revenue of £3.3 million over 15 years with a 2 year project payback period and IRR at 87%</p>
<p>Option 5 Introduce car park charging at the five busiest car parks using non-cash parking machine (card only) and other non-cash payment methods, e.g. mobile phone payment and annual pass. Income will be collected via a mix of Pay and Display (Card only) machines, a pay by phone option and use of an annual parking permit.</p>	<p>The consequences of this option are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Funding would be generated to support the ongoing maintenance and management of the countryside estate and enable the County Council to continue to improve the biodiversity, landscape and amenity value of the estate for future generations. b) The introduction of car park charges may deter some people from visiting the sites and displacement parking would need to be monitored and could be a problem in residential areas around the car parks. c) The operational costs are lower than option 3, due to the fact that cash collection is not required. d) The fact that meters will not contain cash removes the risk of theft and significantly reduces the risk of vandalism. <p>Income from this option will contribute a net revenue of £3.0 million over 15 years with a 3 year project payback period and IRR at 51 %</p>

Summary Table of options 3-5

	Option 3: cash, card & phone ¹	Option 4: phone only ¹	Option 5: card & phone ¹
	£000s	£000s	£000s
Capital investment required in year 1 ²	332	190	332
Total revenue ³	6,717	6,717	6,717
Expenditure (including debt repayments)	5,548	3,456	3,705
Net revenue³	1,169	3,261	3,012
Average per annum net revenue	78	217	201
Project NPV at 5.5% ⁵	545	1,801	1,628
Project IRR ⁶	21%	87%	51%
Project payback period ⁷	6 years	2 years	3 years

Notes

¹Each option also includes the option to purchase an annual parking permit and includes assumptions on visitor numbers made before the consultation exercise

²Capital investment includes all costs associated with security, meters, signage and measures to mitigate displacement.

³Total revenue and net revenue figures are over 15 years.

⁴Expenditure for options 3 and 5 includes assumptions around levels of vandalism per annum, based on experience from other rural sites.

⁵ NPV – the net of expected income and expenditure over the 15 year life of the project, expressed at today's value.

⁶ IRR – a measurement used to compare the attractiveness of different investment options.

⁷ Payback period is the notional period over which the initial capital cost is recovered through net cashflows.

1.6 Preferred option and reasons

In order to assess the options to develop a preferred option the following criteria were considered:

- The Contribution to the financial sustainability of the countryside – the extent to which the option could support the vision to protect and enhance the countryside for current and future generations
- Public acceptability – the extent to which the option was likely to be acceptable to the public, based on the feedback from the Pay and Conserve consultation and experience from elsewhere

Financial Return

Option 1 does not generate any income and, whilst in the medium term there may be other opportunities to generate income from other sources, the ability to generate sufficient income to offset funding reductions is limited. As such, this option would not support the financial sustainability of the countryside estate. Similarly with option 2, whilst some income may be

generated, evidence from elsewhere suggests this is likely to be very low and is unlikely to make any meaningful contribution to the financial sustainability of the countryside estate.

Options 3, 4 and 5 all provide a positive business case, with net revenue making a positive contribution to the maintenance of the carparks and the wider estate. Option 4 (phone & permit only) is the most financially advantageous. A cashless system with no meters on site will require a lower capital investment and incur lower annual running costs. The second most viable is option 5, which also includes an option to pay by card, resulting in higher capital and running costs. The capital costs associated with option 3 are similar to those of option 5 but the running costs associated with option 3 are significantly higher due to the costs of cash collection and the risk of being subject to a high level of vandalism, theft and loss of income that results from having cash at the sites. As a result, the level of income generated for investment in maintaining the Surrey countryside is projected to be significantly lower with option 3 than either option 4 or 5.

Public Acceptability

The results of the consultation show us that options 1 and 2 would clearly be the most preferable, as both would mean that people would not need to pay for parking. However, this would result in deterioration in the quality of the estate and in safe access to the estate, such as the closure of car parks, which would result in much lower amenity value and impacts on biodiversity and landscape value. A number of respondents to the consultation recognised the need for funding to pay for the countryside and emphasised the importance of the money raised being ring-fenced for protection and enhancement of the countryside.

Of the options that include charges (options 3, 4 and 5) option 3 the cash system, would be the most acceptable to the public as the consultation showed that 59% preferred to pay by cash. The next most popular payment option was by card at 46%. The consultation results showed that the least preferred payment option was the pay by phone only option.

Preferred Option

Taking account of the assessments above, option 5 (card & phone payment plus annual permit) offers a system that balances financial return and public acceptability. Whilst in purely financial terms, option 4 would be preferable, the consultation made it clear that many people would not be happy with a scheme where payment by phone or annual permit were the only options. As such, option 5 offers the additional option to pay using a card (around 95% of adults in the UK have a debit or credit card), but removes the very significant risks and costs associated with a scheme that includes cash payments.

The proposed scheme will have the following features:

- **Enforcement** – enforcement will be carried out as an extension to existing enforcement activity run by the County Council. This arrangement provides flexibility in order to provide the client with the level and type of enforcement deemed appropriate for the sites.
- **Introduction** – the introduction of the charging will be combined with information for visitors, both to provide early warning of the charges and how the system will work and to provide information for visitors about how the income is being retained to be spent in Surrey's countryside. Wardens will be present during the early phase to answer questions and provide support. Information boards at the sites will provide more information on nearby walks and points of interest.

- **Mitigation** – measures to mitigate the impacts of displacement parking will be critical. The County Council's parking team and Highways engineers are advising on mitigation measures. In addition a screening assessment and Appropriate Assessment is being undertaken to comply with the Habitat regulations. This may also require further mitigation to protect the the Thames Basin Heathlands SPA (Special Protection Area) As far as possible, measures will be appropriate and sympathetic to the local environment. Monitoring of displacement parking will be part of the early implementation plan and funding is built into the project to support rapid implementation of further mitigation once the scheme is implemented should the need arise.
- **Exemptions** – visitors to the car parks will be exempt from paying for parking if they are volunteering at the site or are blue badge holders.

1.7 Expenditure and Savings Profile

Below is a summary of the investment required, together with estimated income and expenditure.

The preferred option takes into consideration the outcomes of the public consultation which was concluded on the 6th November 2017. The investment is needed now to ensure that car park charging can be implemented in 2018 and allow income to be generated as early as possible.

Vehicle Charging on 5 SCC Countryside Estate Sites

Financial summary

Option 3: Cash & Card collection

Option 4: Mobile collection only

Option 5: Card & Mobile collection

			Option 3 (Cash & Card)	Option 4 (Mobile Only)	Option 5 (Card & Mobile)
Project NPV at	5.5%	£	544,600	1,800,900	1,628,400
	Project IRR	%	21%	87%	51%
	Project payback period	yrs	6	2	3

Capital

	Option 3 (Cash & Card) YR1 FY2017/18 £	Option 4 (Mobile Only) YR1 FY2017/18 £	Option 5 (Card & Mobile) YR1 FY2017/18 £
Investment	331,681	190,248	331,681

Revenue: Option 3 (Cash & Card collection)

	YR0	YR1	YR2	YR3	YR4	YR5		TOTAL 15Yr Total
	FY2017/18	FY2018/19	FY2019/20	FY2020/21	FY2021/22	FY2022/23	5 Yr Total	Total
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Total Revenue	0	196,866	292,100	331,027	364,288	382,502	1,566,783	6,716,844
Operating costs	0	163,447	256,685	272,649	285,271	291,218	1,269,270	5,016,780
Net income	0	33,420	35,415	58,378	79,017	91,285	297,513	1,700,063
Interest & depreciation	0	32,103	48,155	48,155	48,155	48,155	224,723	531,215
Net Revenue	0	1,316	(12,740)	10,223	30,862	43,130	72,790	1,168,848

Revenue: Option 4 (Mobile Collection only)

	YR0	YR1	YR2	YR3	YR4	YR5		TOTAL 15Yr Total
	FY2017/18	FY2018/19	FY2019/20	FY2020/21	FY2021/22	FY2022/23	5 Yr Total	Total
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Total Revenue	0	196,866	292,100	331,027	364,288	382,502	1,566,783	6,716,844
Operating costs	0	90,004	143,258	160,190	172,473	179,126	745,051	3,151,216
Net income	0	106,862	148,842	170,837	191,815	203,377	821,733	3,565,628
Interest & depreciation	0	18,246	27,369	27,369	27,369	27,369	127,724	304,923
Net Revenue	0	86,616	121,473	143,467	164,446	176,007	694,009	3,260,705

Revenue: Opt 5 (Card and Mobile Collection)

	YR0	YR1	YR2	YR3	YR4	YR5		TOTAL 15Yr Total
	FY2017/18	FY2018/19	FY2019/20	FY2020/21	FY2021/22	FY2022/23	5 Yr Total	Total
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Total Revenue	0	196,866	292,100	331,026	364,288	382,502	1,566,783	6,716,844
Operating costs	0	94,358	149,485	164,090	174,096	178,943	760,972	3,174,625
Net income	0	102,508	142,615	166,937	190,192	203,559	805,811	3,542,219
Interest & depreciation	0	32,103	48,155	48,155	48,155	48,155	224,723	530,690
Net Revenue	0	70,405	94,460	118,782	142,037	155,404	581,088	3,011,529

Revenue: Comparisons (Options 3, 4 & 5)

	Option 3 (Cash & Card) 15Yr Total £	Option 4 (Mobile Only) 15Yr Total £	Option 5 (Card & Mobile) 15Yr Total £
Total Revenue	6,716,844	6,716,844	6,716,844
Operating costs	5,016,780	3,151,216	3,174,625
Net income	1,700,063	3,565,628	3,542,219
Interest & depreciation	531,215	304,923	530,690
Net Revenue	1,168,848	3,260,705	3,011,529

BreakEven - Option 3 (Cash & Card Collection)

<i>Average p.a. over 15 year Period</i>	Whit	Chob	Rod	Ockham	Fetch
Total Fixed Costs	£49,779	£125,105	£20,088	£48,838	£42,025
Ave fee / visit less variable costs	£0.99	£1.38	£1.05	£0.84	£1.33
Visits required to break-even	50,386	90,332	19,090	57,990	31,510
Projected Visits	79,316	108,720	29,337	89,841	53,506
Visits to break-even as %age of Projected	64%	83%	65%	65%	59%
Current Visits per car Counter	97,000	127,000	36,000	130,000	56,000

BreakEven - Option 4 (Mobile only)

<i>Average p.a. over 15 year Period</i>	Whit	Chob	Rod	Ockham	Fetch
Total Fixed Costs	£21,882	£57,104	£9,725	£24,259	£21,816
Ave fee / visit less variable costs	£0.85	£1.21	£0.90	£0.72	£1.16
Visits required to break-even	25,686	47,138	10,809	33,739	18,857
Projected Visits	79,316	108,720	29,337	89,841	53,506
Visits to break-even as %age of Projected	32%	43%	37%	38%	35%
Current Visits per car Counter	97,000	127,000	36,000	130,000	56,000

BreakEven - Option 5 (Card/ Mobile Collection)

<i>Average p.a. over 15 year Period</i>	Whit	Chob	Rod	Ockham	Fetch
Total Fixed Costs	£26,686	£74,694	£13,021	£36,774	£23,486
Ave fee / visit less variable costs	£0.92	£1.31	£0.97	£0.78	£1.16
Visits required to break-even	28,985	57,065	13,413	47,390	20,301
Projected Visits	79,316	108,720	29,337	89,841	53,506
Visits to break-even as %age of Projected	37%	52%	46%	53%	38%
Current Visits per car Counter	97,000	127,000	36,000	130,000	56,000

1.8 Funding the Project

The infrastructure for option 5

Capital Investment	Option 5
Planning, Design & Consultation, incl Habitat Regs Assessment, Project staff	24,561
Equipment and infrastructure	270,132
Displacement parking	36,988
Total	331,681

The business case makes provision for the repayment of the funding costs over the 15 year period analysed.

It has been assumed that the full amount of investment will come from borrowing by SCC in 2017/18. It is assumed that the loan will be repaid along with 4% interest pa. Payback by year 3 with an IRR of 51%.

Option 5:

Net revenue (after operating and borrowing costs) from car park charging across the proposed sites will contribute £283,647 (FY2018/19 to FY2020/21). By FY2020/21 this will be £118,782 and will continue to grow thereafter. This will help meet SCC savings target of zero contribution toward the cost of managing the Estate by the end of March 2021.

1.9 Risk, Assumptions, Issues and Dependencies analysis

The main risks to project success are:

Funding

There is no other available source of funding; if funding is not secured for the installation of car park charging infrastructure, this project cannot go ahead and the opportunity to generate a net revenue of £3.0m over 15 years will be missed.

Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA)

Three of the sites proposed in this business case are located in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The project team is liaising with Natural England to discuss the potential displacement of visitors from the car parks to other parts of the SPA. As a statutory stakeholder, it's important that NE is engaged and their concerns are resolved as part of the preliminary work. As part of the activity, a consultant is now undertaking a Habitat Regulations Assessment. The work breaks into two stages; an initial screening that assesses the risk that the implementation of parking charges would have on other locations, resulting in changes in the distribution of visitors on relevant European protected sites and possibly also changes in the numbers of visitors. If there is a notable concern, a second stage (Appropriate Assessment Stage) would be required.

Displacement parking on to roadside verges

The introduction of car park charging to car parks that have been free to use to date could result in displacement parking on roadside verges in the vicinity of the car parks and to other car parks where it is free to park. The SCC Parking Team has reviewed the sites and produced a proposal for mitigation. Where mitigation is required, it will be sympathetic to the local environment.

Political/Reputational risk

Parking on the SCC Countryside Estate is currently free unlike other sites managed by the National Trust and Forestry Commission. Experience of Newlands Corner demonstrates that there will undoubtedly be a significant level of adverse comment about the introduction of car park charging across a range of sites. It will therefore be important to engage with stakeholders early, making a strong public benefit case and showing how the income raised will benefit Surrey. A public consultation has been carried that ended in early November to gather views on the potential introduction of car park charging. This has been used to inform the recommendations within this report. It is notable that only 1258 responses were received despite the consultation being advertised on site, on line and outlined at public liaison meetings near the countryside sites.

An additional concern that arose from the consultation was around the impact on those on low incomes being excluded from accessing the countryside. There remains in Surrey a

number of green spaces that can still be accessed by car without having to pay for parking. Where feasible cycle parking will be included at some of the car parks in order to reduce the need to drive to the sites.

Equality

It is important to charge fairly and equitably all vehicle owners who use the car parks. An Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out for the Project and the project team will liaise with the neighbourhood policing team and Surrey Police Independent Advisory Group regarding Ockham.

Political support

E&I Select Committee have scrutinised the recommendations and supported option 5 as the preferred option.

Project Team

Key to the successful delivery of this project will be ongoing support from the Project Board and the continuous presence of a project team (from SCC and SWT) with the required skills and experience. SCC is providing the Project Lead.

Internal Approval Processes

Both organisations (SCC and SWT) have their own internal approval processes and associated timetables. It is essential that these are made clear to all parties by the Project Leader to avoid project delay and/or missed opportunities. See Project Milestones below.

Financial assumptions/risks

Assumptions underpinning the financial estimates are provided. These have been derived from experience and research on schemes implemented at other similar sites (managed by the National Trust, Forestry Commission and other Councils). Appendix 1.

Income

The financial case relies on income projections which increase over time with growth in charges, visitor numbers and length of stay. The estimates used are considered to be prudent and 'mid-case' at their most optimistic. Nonetheless, if any of the growth is less favourable than envisaged this could have a significant impact on revenue generated.

Local resistance to car park charging could affect the number of visitors in Year 1 and this is reflected in the figures. Experience at other sites indicates that car park charges are soon accepted as a necessary cost and visitor numbers quickly recover and grow. The business case factors this in.

Vandalism, theft and loss of income

The location of the car parks in isolated, rural areas means an increased risk of vandalism and theft. By implementing a cashless system, the likelihood of this is significantly reduced.

Force Majeure

Foot and Mouth or other countryside force majeure issues could reduce the number of visitors to the countryside and have a negative impact on income.

1.10 Project Milestones

Activity	Month / Year
Formal and informal consultation	July - Nov 2017
Project and business case development	Sept – Nov 2017
Securing necessary approvals	Nov – Feb 2018
Procurement and implementation	Feb - July 2018

1.11 Recommendation

It is recommended that Option 5 be implemented. Income from car park charging will contribute a net revenue of £3.0m over 15 years to the Countryside Estate, helping the Estate to become self-funding. IRR is 51% and will payback in 3 years