
NOTICE OF MEETING

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT PANEL

FRIDAY, 6 MARCH 2015 AT 2.30 PM

THE EXECUTIVE MEETING ROOM - THIRD FLOOR, THE GUILDHALL

Telephone enquiries to Vicki Plytas, Customer, Community & Democratic Services on 023 9283 4058

Email: vicki.plytas@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

Membership

Councillor Simon Boshier (Chair)
Councillor Michael Andrewes
Councillor Alicia Denny
Councillor John Ferrett
Councillor Hannah Hockaday

Councillor Darren Sanders
Councillor Phil Smith
Councillor Alistair Thompson
Councillor Matthew Winnington

Standing Deputies

Councillor Ben Dowling
Councillor David Fuller
Councillor Terry Hall

Councillor Colin Galloway
Councillor Steve Hastings

(NB This Agenda should be retained for future reference with the minutes of this meeting.)

Please note that the agenda, minutes and non-exempt reports are available to view online on the Portsmouth City Council website: www.portsmouth.gov.uk

Deputations by members of the public may be made on any item where a decision is going to be taken. The request should be made in writing to the contact officer (above) by 12 noon of the working day before the meeting, and must include the purpose of the deputation (for example, for or against the recommendations). Email requests are accepted.

AGENDA

1 Apologies for absence

2 Declarations of Members' interests

3 Minutes of the Meetings of 25 July 2014, 29 August 2014, 5 December 2014 and 6 February 2015 (Pages 1 - 30)

RECOMMENDED that the minutes from the meetings of 25 July 2014, 29 August 2014, 5 December 2014 and 6 February 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

4 Volunteer Snow Wardens (Pages 31 - 34)

The Notice of Motion on Volunteer Snow Wardens was referred from the Council meeting of 20 January 2015 for consideration by the Scrutiny Management Panel.

The Panel will receive information from officers and will be given the opportunity to ask questions and decide how and what to report to Cabinet.

An information report by the Head of Transport and Environment is attached, which sets out the council's current measures in place to respond to snow.

RECOMMENDED that the Panel consider and decide how to take this matter forward.

Members of the public are now permitted to use both audio visual recording devices and social media during this meeting, on the understanding that it neither disrupts the meeting or records those stating explicitly that they do not wish to be recorded. Guidance on the use of devices at meetings open to the public is available on the Council's website and posters on the wall of the meeting's venue.

Agenda Item 3

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT PANEL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Scrutiny Management Panel held on 25 July 2014 at 3.00 pm in Conference Room A, second floor, Civic Offices.

(NB These minutes should be read in conjunction with the agenda for the meeting which can be viewed at www.portsmouth.gov.uk.)

Present

Councillor Simon Boshier (chairing this meeting)
Councillor Michael Andrewes
Councillor Alicia Denny
Councillor John Ferrett
Councillor Hannah Hockaday
Councillor Darren Sanders
Councillor Matthew Winnington
Councillor Ben Dowling (deputising for
Councillor Phil Smith)

Officers

Michael Lawther, City Solicitor & Monitoring Officer
Rachael Dalby, Head of Health, Community Safety &
Licensing
Alan Cufley, Head of Corporate Assets, Business &
Standards
Mike Stoneman, Strategic Commissioning Manager
Simon Moon, Head of Traffic & Environment
Paul Fielding, Assistant Head of Service -
Environment & Recreation
Stewart Agland, Local Democracy Manager

Councillor Rob New attended as lead Cabinet Member for the call-in.

16 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Alistair Thompson. Councillor Simon Boshier, vice-chair of the Scrutiny Management Panel chaired the meeting today. Apologies were received also from Councillor Phil Smith and Councillor Ben Dowling attended as his standing deputy.

17 Declarations of Members' Interests

Councillor Michael Andrewes declared that although he had expressed a view in the past, he is open minded about this matter.

18 Minutes of the Meeting held on 4 July 2014

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2014 be confirmed and signed by the chair as a correct record.

19 Call-in of Decision on "Street Scene Enforcement" taken by Cabinet at its Meeting on 26 June 2014

Councillor Simon Boshier introduced the item and referred to the call-in process.

The City Solicitor outlined the options open to members. He said that the call-in had been made on the grounds that the call-in members believed the decision may have been taken without adequate information. The City Solicitor explained that the decision today is for the panel to determine whether or not the Cabinet decision had been taken without adequate information and it was not to consider the decision itself.

Deputations were made in favour of referring the matter back to Cabinet by Councillors Lee Hunt and Lynne Stagg.

Deputations were made against referring the decision back to Cabinet by Councillors Steve Hastings and Luke Stubbs. The chair said that 21 written representations had been received on this issue and had been circulated to panel members. The written representations were about the need to do something about the issues of dog fouling and litter.

The lead call-in member, Councillor Darren Sanders introduced the reasons for the call-in which were that the decision not to proceed with the 3GS contract had been based on inadequate information. He queried the dispute over the contract start date. He said that had the contract with 3GS gone ahead, this would not be a replacement service but would work alongside existing enforcement teams. He said that a report had not been done with regard to potential court case costs. For these reasons, he felt the decision should be referred back to Cabinet for reconsideration.

The chair then invited members of the panel to put questions to the call-in member.

During discussion the following points were clarified:

- Councillor Sanders confirmed that there was no formal consultation by the previous administration although he said it was clear that people wanted a crackdown on dog fouling and litter.
- Councillor Sanders confirmed that in some urban areas for example in Swansea, the council had made a profit after entering into a contract with 3GS.
- Councillor Sanders confirmed that the previous administration had not carried out formal consultation but had doorstep conversations, emails and informal surveys and the level of response was such that the previous administration felt a pilot scheme would be sensible to introduce.
- Councillor Sanders said that the call-in had been based on inadequate financial information being available to Cabinet at the time of its decision.
- Councillor Sanders said that the timing of the previous administration's Cabinet decision shortly before the election was because stage 1 of the shared services scheme was due to finish around the same time as

the pilot in order to maximise flexibility.

The chair then invited Councillor Rob New as lead Cabinet Member to respond. Councillor New said that he had received a series of briefings from Simon Moon, Head of Transport & Environment and these had included the Head of Community Safety, Rachael Dalby. He said that when Cabinet had received further information about the proposed scheme, they had become concerned for a number of reasons including that all the professionals involved seemed to have warned against this scheme. He said that there seemed to be too many unknown factors and was concerned at the lack of proper consultation. He said that Havant Borough Council had introduced a similar scheme albeit with a different provider but he felt it was sensible to wait until their scheme had been piloted and use the outcome of their experiences as part of a potential solution for Portsmouth City Council.

In response to questions Councillor New confirmed:

- That other authorities using the same company could not necessarily be used as a direct comparison with Portsmouth as different service level agreements were in place. It was difficult to ascertain exactly what these were owing to issues of confidentiality.
- The scheme being piloted by Havant Borough Council was not with 3GS.
- Councillor New said that his understanding was that the nature of contracts with companies such as 3GS was that for every fixed penalty given, the provider would get a specific amount regardless of whether it was challenged or not. Any challenge would have to be dealt with by the city council and the city council would have to pay the costs involved. Although there would be economies of scale, in terms of prosecutions, the council could find itself having to bear costs. The only costs borne by the provider would be for any incorrectly issued tickets.
- The current administration had not carried out consultation because they were not going to proceed with the scheme at this stage.
- Councillor New confirmed that he would be happy to meet with the opposition in order to discuss ways of dealing with the street enforcement issue as there were many other things that could be done. He said that dog fouling was a small part of a bigger picture and that the problem needs to be dealt with on a cross-party basis going forward. He said the current administration would carry out consultation and would involve the other groups. He confirmed that the pilot scheme in Havant finishes in approximately three months' time and that the findings would be shared with the Head of Community Safety.
- Councillor New said that he did not think the Cabinet decision had been based on information that was speculative but felt that the matter should be considered again in order to provide time for a proper evaluation.
- Councillor New said that he felt that results obtained by neighbouring authorities would be more relevant to Portsmouth than those obtained for example from Leeds or Swansea. Portsmouth had more shared services with Havant.
- Councillor New confirmed that once the Havant pilot scheme had

concluded, he intended that the matter would be aired in public.

The Head of Transport & Environment confirmed that the previous administration had asked for a report to be prepared in mid-March for a Cabinet meeting on 7 April 2014.

Councillor Sanders as lead call-in member did not wish to make a further response and so summed up his case saying that in his view inadequate financial information had been before Cabinet and that the estimated costs were not backed up by any authorities run by 3GS. He said that comparisons with Havant were not perhaps the most relevant as Portsmouth was much more densely populated than Havant and had more in common with other urban authorities. He said there was a need to introduce a pilot scheme in Portsmouth and any shared services work could dovetail into this. He felt that financial information from 3GS should have been before Cabinet.

In summary he said that the matter should be referred to Cabinet for reconsideration.

Councillor Rob New as lead Cabinet Member summed up saying that he believed that Cabinet did have adequate information before it in order to take the decision it had and that the matter should not be referred back.

During further debate the following points were made:

- The debate today had often compared schemes not being run by 3GS and therefore comparisons were not being properly made.
- A comment was made that it was the previous administration that seemed to have taken a decision without adequate information. The report that had gone to Cabinet in April 2014 had been rushed and there was no consultation carried out at that time. The senior police officers had not been consulted. Some members therefore felt that the current administration's Cabinet decision should be upheld.
- Litter and dog mess was a major problem in Portsmouth and Southsea. It was clear from the written representations that people feel that nothing is being done about this problem.

Councillor Boshier acting as chair said that the reason for the call-in was that it had been based on inadequate information being before Cabinet at the time it made its decision.

Upon being put to the vote the proposition put by Councillor Sanders to refer the decision back to Cabinet was lost.

RESOLVED that the Panel considered the evidence and decided not to refer back to Cabinet its decision taken on 26 June 2014.

20 Work Programme 2014/15 - Education, Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel

RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Management Panel agreed the following topics in the Education, Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel's preferred priority order

- (1) Pupil Premium
- (2) The provision of special educational needs in the city
- (3) School induction days for pupils.

21 Update report on Economic Development, Culture and Leisure Scrutiny Panel

The Head of Corporate Assets, Business & Standards, Alan Cufley advised that although the response report on pathways into work for young people had been prepared in time for the last Cabinet meeting, advice was received that some wording needed to be amended in the covering report which caused the delay. However the report could now come forward to the next available cabinet meeting which was being arranged for 14 August. He apologised to Councillor Winnington, the chair of the Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny Panel and said that Stephen Kitchman had now finalised the report concerned.

Councillor Winnington said he thought it disgraceful that the scrutiny report had been signed off on 1 April but had not been proceeded with in time for the Cabinet meeting that had met in July. He said that it was particularly disappointing as there was a need for some of the recommendations to be implemented in time for the new school year.

Mr Cufley said that Mike Stoneman had assured him that all the recommendations in the report were in hand ready for action once Cabinet had agreed them at its next meeting.

Councillor Winnington said he wanted it to be noted that in future officers should prepare comments on completed scrutiny reports in a timely manner as soon as they were given the opportunity to do so.

RESOLVED that Scrutiny Management Panel expects that signed off scrutiny reports and the corresponding response report should be taken to the earliest possible Cabinet meeting for consideration.

22 Date of Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting of the panel is on Friday 10 October 2014 at 2.30 pm.

The meeting concluded at 5.45 pm.

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT PANEL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Scrutiny Management Panel held on Friday 29 August 2014 at 3.00 pm in the Council Chamber, The Guildhall, Portsmouth.

Present

Councillor Alistair Thompson (Chair)
Councillor Simon Boshier (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Ben Dowling (deputising for
Councillor Winnington)
Councillor John Ferrett
Councillor David Fuller (deputising for
Councillor Michael Andrewes)
Councillor Steve Hastings (deputising for
Councillor Alicia Denny)
Councillor Hannah Hockaday
Councillor Darren Sanders
Councillor Phil Smith
Councillor Ken Ellcome
Councillor Lee Hunt

Councillor Luke Stubbs, Councillor Linda Symes and Councillor Margaret Adair attended the meeting as observers.

Officers Present

Michael Lawther, City Solicitor & Monitoring Officer
Simon Moon, Head of Transport & Environment
Nickii Musson, Operational Transport Planning Officer
Michael Robinson, Parking Operations Manager
Wayne Layton, Group Accountant

23 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Michael Andrewes, Councillor Alicia Denny and Councillor Matthew Winnington. Councillors Andrewes and Winnington had been given advice by the City Solicitor that they had a pecuniary interest.

24 Declarations of Members' Interests

Councillor Phil Smith declared that he lives in a ward where parking schemes were in operation but had sought advice from the City Solicitor who had said that this did not amount to a prejudicial interest and that he could sit on the panel today.

25 Call-in of Decision on "MB and MC Zones" taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation at his meeting on 24 July 2014

(TAKE IN THE DOCUMENTS ATTACHED TO THE AGENDA)

The chair of the panel, Councillor Alistair Thompson, explained that the purpose of the meeting today was for the panel to determine whether the Cabinet Member's decision had been based on inaccurate or incorrect information or had been taken without adequate information. He advised that if the panel is satisfied that the decision has not been based on inaccurate or incorrect information or that it was not taken without adequate information, then no further action is required and the matter ends here. He said that the meeting was not to reconsider the decision taken on 24 July 2014.

The chair said that many written representations had been received and had been circulated to members of the panel. He also advised that 8 deputation requests had been received in time and one late deputation request had been received from Mr Mottershead. He said he was minded to allow the late deputation request provided that members of the panel had no objections to this, which they did not.

The chair said that he would allow six minutes for each deputation.

Deputations were received in support of calling in the decision from Mr Whiteside, Mr Roger Shepherd, Ms Suzy Horton, Mr Matt Smart and Mr Adrian Reed,

Mr Derek Wareham, Mrs Kercher, and Mrs Sawford made general comments about parking zones and felt that parking should be looked at across the whole city.

Mr Mottershead spoke on behalf of North Kings residents and said he would be happy to support neighbours in the MC zone, but would like North Kings to be part of that zone.

The chair thanked the members of the public for their deputations.

The chair said that Councillor Linda Symes and Councillor Luke Stubbs both wished to speak on the agenda item and first invited Councillor Symes to speak.

Councillor Symes' deputation included the following points

- She said she understands the strong feelings put forward by members of the public and felt that had the parking situation been addressed when it should have been, the city would not be in the position it now is.
- She said that a piecemeal approach to the introduction of parking zones was not in her view the way forward but should be a solution that is good for everyone.
- She said no consideration had currently been given to those already suffering and a fairer system was needed for everyone.

Councillor Stubbs then made his deputation which included the following points:

- The displacement factor in the MB and MC zones was greater than in other areas of the city.
- He said there was a need to consider the city as a whole as if zones were introduced in one area displacement occurred so that cars just moved elsewhere. He said that in the future there may well be a need to limit the growth of the number of cars parked in the city. He said that a strategic approach was needed.

The chair then invited Councillor Hunt as the lead call-in member to present the reasons for the call-in.

Councillor Hunt addressed the Panel and included the following points

- He said that there had been no warning about the decision being taken by the Cabinet Member on 24 July.
- He said the decision would cost more than £90,000.
- He said that the decision had been based on inaccurate and inadequate information and that consequently the Cabinet Member should be asked to reconsider his decision.
- He said that he had no problem with a citywide strategy, but that there was no need to suspend the MB and MC zones in order to allow that.
- He said that he felt that the decision was unfair and undemocratic.

The chair then invited Councillor Ellcome to respond. Councillor Ellcome's response included the following points

- the decision he had made on 24 July had not been made for political reasons.
- He was aware of and understood the anger and frustration of residents. However he had a great deal of experience in the parking environment and said that he had introduced the first residents' parking scheme in Old Portsmouth whilst working for the city council as an officer.
- there was a need to look at the history of the parking zones. These had been first requested in 2003 to 2004 and had only finally been introduced in 2011. By 2012, a buffer zone had to be created because of the pressure caused on neighbouring areas. He said that 200 people had complained about the MC zone at that time.
- He said that in 2012, Councillor Fazackarley approved the scheme. He also considered a report for schemes for a further six areas but decided not to proceed with these owing to a lack of finance. He said that a citywide survey had been carried out but there had not been a huge number of responses. He said that most of those who did respond did not wish to have a citywide scheme.
- On 4 November 2013 a report to Cabinet had recommended extending parking zones.
- He said that a comment had been made that the only zone causing severe displacement was MB zone
- He said that on 3 March 2014, he had made a deputation himself against introducing the proposed MB and MC zones as an extra £225k would be needed to extend the scheme

The chair asked Michael Lawther, the City Solicitor to respond to whether or not the decision taken was legal. Mr Lawther said that the initial report contained extensive legal comments and confirmed he was of the opinion that the decision taken was legal.

The City Solicitor went on to clarify that the grounds for call-in being considered today were (1) that inaccurate or incorrect information had been given to the Cabinet Member and (2) that inadequate information had been given to the Cabinet Member. He went on to say that the MB and MC zones had not been revoked, they had been suspended and could only be suspended for a maximum of 18 months and that there would need to be consultation.

Mr Simon Moon, Head of Transport & Environment made the following points

- in his opinion there was an absence of a sound residential parking policy overall in Portsmouth.
- In November 2013, a citywide review had been undertaken and experts in the field had been appointed.
- No solution suited every part of the city as there were different needs and requirements in different areas.
- The basis of advice given to Councillor Ellcome was to pause and review the situation. The creation of a parking zone in one area was likely to create a problem for an adjoining area
- Financial implications were difficult to gauge. There was a cost associated but there was a high likelihood of disproportionate displacement being caused
- Currently the parking zones amounted to a subsidised scheme but it all depends on how costs are assessed. It was therefore challenging to be accurate. In essence it is difficult to pin down the cost on a scheme by scheme basis. He confirmed there would also be a cost associated with suspending these zones.

In response to questions the following matters were clarified:

- It was confirmed that consultation takes place at the same time that a suspension order is implemented and that the results of the consultation is gauged during the suspension. No consultation is required before a suspension is decided upon - only after implementation.
- With regard to inadequate or incorrect information being provided to the Cabinet Member, it was confirmed that essentially this was up to Councillor Ellcome to decide.
- It was confirmed that no other parking zones in the city had been suspended or revoked once they were operating.
- It was confirmed that the reasons given for suspending both the MB and MC zones at the meeting on 24 July were in order to find the best solution for these areas going forward.
- It was confirmed that the timescale for introducing a citywide parking strategy would depend on how long it took to rectify existing schemes.
- Officers confirmed that an experimental order had not been used with regard to parking zones but had been used for other types of traffic schemes.

- It was confirmed that the North Kings area had not been included in the MC zone because the results that came back were roughly half and half and members at the time decided not to include North Kings within the MC zone.
- Officers confirmed that their expectation that displacement of parking would be the result of introducing the MB zone had been realised. In addition those just outside the zone were also suffering displacement.
- Officers confirmed that the previous administration had identified the MB zone as a problem area and were looking at options to amend the scheme.
- The Head of Transport & Environment said that in his opinion inadequate information had been provided in the November 2013 paper as there was not enough consideration being given to the overall parking strategy. The recommendation in that report he felt would just create displacement and the more fundamental problem was the absence of a coherent parking strategy in the city. He said that elements in the 2013 paper in his opinion did not include adequate information for the decision to be taken to introduce the MC zone.
- The Head of Transport & Environment confirmed that there was strong support from ward councillors before the MB zone was brought in. He also confirmed that following the introduction of the MB zone and the displacement into MC zone, enquiries were received about extending the MB zone. He said that the MC zone was one of the last zones in the city to be introduced. He said that requests had been received to extend the MB zone further south.
- The Parking Manager, Michael Robinson confirmed that nothing was laid down in statute about the length car parking spaces had to be other than in very specific bays for example disabled parking bays. He said he was aware of an experiment that had been done which concluded that fewer cars could be parked if bays were marked out individually.
- He confirmed that the size of the vehicles was not regulated but there is a weight restriction.
- Mr Michael Lawther said that an experimental order had to be in place from between six to 18 months (unless the order was changed). He confirmed that the original decision could be judicially reviewed. If the matter was lost at the first hearing, costs could be £15k but in his view there was no substance for a judicial review. If a judicial review goes further, different costs could be incurred. It was his duty as City Solicitor to pursue costs incurred by the city council in the event that a judicial review was lost.

The chair then invited the members of the Scrutiny Management Panel to put questions to Councillor Ellcome. In response to questions Councillor Ellcome clarified the following matters:

- He would not consider ruling out charging for parking permits. He said that the council could not continue to subsidise parking. In his view the more schemes that are introduced the more a deficit will arise. He said that although current figures showed that MC zone had bucked the usual trend, penalty notices made up a lot of this revenue and after a while his view was that MC zone would also run at a loss in common with all other zones in the city. He said that putting in schemes was

- costly and would put the deficit up even more.
- In response to a query about how long a parking review would take, he said this was difficult to estimate as facts and figures needed to be obtained. Since the 24 July meeting, he had put things in motion for a review. The Cabinet Member said that he was fully aware of all the issues around residents' parking. He felt it was too piecemeal and would not work.
 - He said that the reason for suspending MB and MC zones and no others was because it was these two zones that had created most complaints. He felt that the MB and MC zones had been rushed in. The MC zone had been advertised in January and implemented in March - just before the election.
 - With regard to having adequate and accurate information, he said that he had a great deal of experience in this field having been opposition spokesperson for the Traffic & Transportation portfolio during the previous administration and had seen many reports. He was satisfied that he had had sufficient information and felt he had a great deal of knowledge on this subject. He knows the areas concerned as he has lived there. If he had felt that the information before him was inadequate or incorrect he would have asked for clarification or deferred the meeting. However he was convinced that he had enough information, that it was accurate and that it was sufficient.
 - The Cabinet Member confirmed that he was not surprised at the anger of local people concerning the decision he took on 24 July but in his view he had taken the decision for the right reasons. He felt it was the right decision. He said it was not an easy decision to take and the likelihood was that he would have to face further difficult decisions in his role as Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation. He confirmed that he had had a number of emails in support of the decision he had taken.
 - The Cabinet Member confirmed he was aware that a number of people were signing a petition about the parking zones and that he would take this into consideration, however he wanted a scheme that benefits as many people as possible in the city.

The chair then invited members of the Scrutiny Management Panel to put questions to Councillor Hunt as lead call-in member. In response to questions Councillor Hunt clarified the following points:

- With regard to a query asking for the lead call-in member to be more specific about exactly what information had been lacking or inadequate, Councillor Hunt said that there was scant information about the money involved. There was no financial information available with regard to suspending the MB zone. He said that with regard to North Kings, officers gave incorrect information in his view as there was support to extend the zone into that area.
- Councillor Hunt said there was no data included in the report concerning numbers of free spaces in roads. He felt there was not enough information in the report on which to make a decision and felt that a revised report should be prepared and that Councillor Ellcome should then be invited to reconsider his initial decision.
- Although Councillor Hunt accepted that 300 spaces had been mentioned in the report, there was no hard data to back this figure up.

Councillor John Ferrett said that the report did include the costs of the experimental traffic regulation order and the amount of income generated from scratch cards and permits and the cost of covering or removing the 478 signs within the MC zone. His view was that there was comprehensive financial information contained in the report.

Councillor Hunt said that there was no financial information in the report about the MB zone nor the amount of revenue lost from the MB zone.

The City Solicitor confirmed that when Councillor Ellcome made his decision, he only had to have adequate information in his view.

The meeting adjourned at 5.35 pm.

The meeting resumed at 5.45 pm when the chair invited the lead call-in member to sum up his case. Councillor Hunt said that he was very concerned about this decision and many people would have personal difficulties because of it. He said that in his view this decision was unfair, undemocratic and unjust and had been carried out with no consultation. He said that suspending the zones was not part of the Traffic & Transportation agenda on 24 July 2014. He said that no comparisons had been carried out with any other schemes and that in his view MB and MC zones worked better than most of the others in the city. He said that the claims about hundreds of spaces being left empty was not backed up by evidence. He said that he did not think it was right that Councillor Ellcome relied on his personal professional experience. He said that the report was out-of-date and that people had changed their minds since the November 2013 report. MC zone was making money for the council. He said there was nothing in the report before the Cabinet Member on 24 July on which to base the decision taken on the MB zone. He felt the decision was against natural justice and that it could be judicially reviewed.

The chair invited Councillor Ellcome to sum up his case. Councillor Ellcome said that he did not take the decision lightly and had carried out personal research by driving around the specific area. He said that there were empty spaces in the MB and MC zones and that there had been displacement into surrounding areas and this did not surprise him. He said that a review had been done in 2012 but nothing had been progressed as a result of it. He said that it seemed that the problem had been left unresolved. With regard to comments about financial information, he confirmed that he had not based his decision on financial grounds but on what is right for the city within financial constraints. He considered that there is a need for a proper strategy and would try to get this resolved as soon as possible. He felt he had made his decision for the right reasons and that the MB and MC zones had generated more complaints than any others in the city. He said that the council could not subsidise residents' parking schemes at a cost of £150k per year. This was just not viable. He believed that he had correct information and adequate information to enable him to take the decision on 24 July 2014.

During general debate among Scrutiny Management Panel members the following matters were raised:

- Councillor Sanders proposed that the matter be referred back to the Cabinet Member for decision as he felt the process should be robust.

He felt that alternative options were not explored at the decision meeting. He said that there was a need to reconsider the decision.

- Councillor John Ferrett said that the issue before the panel today was whether Councillor Ellcome had had adequate and accurate information before him to enable him to take the decision he had. In Councillor Ferrett's opinion he did have this information. He said that Councillor Ellcome's decision would not be universally popular but that it was a brave decision taken in public and open to scrutiny. He said this was a hugely emotive issue. However Councillor Ellcome has set out his view about having adequate information on which to take the decision he had.
- Councillor Phil Smith said he felt the decision had been taken without adequate information as there was no longer term assessment of the effect of the MC zone making it incomplete. He said that the number of empty spaces was a material consideration in his view and that if there was no specific length for each individual space it would be impossible to decide how many spaces were available in a zone. He therefore considered the information before the Cabinet Member on 24 July to be inaccurate and inadequate and should therefore be referred back.
- Councillor Dowling said that it was very clear that the report did not outline the relevant information which would have been needed to support the decision taken on the day. He felt that a more strategic report was needed and that the matter should be referred back for reconsideration.

The chair thanked all those members of the public and councillors who made deputations and also thanked those attending the meeting in the public gallery. He also thanked officers and councillors for their time today. The chair said that having listened to the debate today and taking into account the written representations and deputations, it seemed that

- There was a need for a more strategic review of parking across the city to be undertaken.
- There was a need to engage more closely with the university with regard to discouraging students from bringing their cars to the city.

The chair said that the issue before the Scrutiny Management Panel today was whether or not the Cabinet Member had had adequate and accurate information before him in order to make his decision. The City Solicitor had said that it was not possible for the Cabinet Member to have all information before him. Officers had said they felt they had provided enough information and that they believed the information provided was accurate. Councillor Ellcome himself said he felt he had had adequate and correct information before him and that he considered everything that he was aware of. The chair said that his opinion was that the matter should not be referred back.

Upon being put to the vote the proposition put by Councillor Sanders to refer the matter back to the Cabinet Member for review was lost.

RESOLVED that the panel considered the evidence and decided that the decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation on item 3 at his meeting held on 24 July 2014 should be upheld.

26 Work Programme 2014/15 - Housing & Social Care Scrutiny Panel (H&SC)

Members of the Scrutiny Management Panel wished to consider under this minute carrying out a review of parking across the city in light of the previous item on the agenda. The City Solicitor confirmed that an ad hoc panel could be set up by Scrutiny Management Panel without the need to first go to council. He advised that a pre-scrutiny review could be undertaken by Scrutiny Management Panel itself and this would enable them to be involved in formulating the strategy which would then go to council for consideration. Members of the panel agreed to progress this. Councillor Thompson said that he would write to group leaders to advise of this decision.

The panel agreed the next topic put forward for review by the H&SC Scrutiny Panel which was entitled Support Services for Living in Isolation.

RESOLVED that

- (1) the next topic for the Housing and Social Care Scrutiny Panel (H&SC) will be "Support Services for living in isolation" and**
- (2) The Scrutiny Management Panel would set up an ad hoc scrutiny panel to undertake a review into parking and instructed officers to progress this (including the production of suggested draft terms of reference for the review) and bring relevant documents to the next scheduled meeting of the panel for its consideration**

27 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for Friday 10 October 2014 at 2.30 pm.

The meeting ended at 6.40 pm.

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT PANEL

Minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Management Panel held on Friday 5 December 2014 at 2.30pm, Executive Meeting Room at the Guildhall, Portsmouth

Present

Councillor Simon Boshier(in the Chair)

Councillors Michael Andrewes
John Ferrett
Darren Sanders
Phil Smith
Matthew Winnington

28. Apologies for absence (AI 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hannah Hockaday and Councillor Alicia Denny.

29. Declarations of Members' interests (AI 2)

There were no declarations of Members' interests.

30. Presentation by Head of Finance and S151 Officer on the Budget 2014/15. (AI 3)

(TAKE IN PRESENTATION)

A hand-out of the presentation was given to members of the Panel. Mr Chris Ward gave the presentation. He drew Members' attention to slide five - Outlook for Funding and Expenditure

- High Public Debt – increasing despite strong economic growth
- Estimated Budget deficit until 2020
- Spending cuts through to 2020 at least unless policy change
- Government funding - £16m reduction in 2015/16 and £35m over 3 years
- Council Tax – Effectively capped and estimated at 2% increase p.a. (equivalent to £1.2m p.a.)
- Business Rates – Inflationary uplifts only amounting to £2.7m in 2015/16 and £6.4m over 3 years (which looks optimistic)
- Increased costs – ageing population and improved mortality
- Uncertainty of funding for the new Care Act – fully funded?
- Special Educational Needs reforms – not fully funded
- Inflation - £14m over next 3 years as pay rises return

- Interest rates – marginal positive impact in 2015/16 and rising steadily thereafter

In response to queries, Mr Ward said that

- he hoped to know before Christmas what the funding amount from Central Government would be.
- the savings requirement was fixed - all estimates were done, but were fluid and would be reflected in the future savings requirement
- he did not yet know when the Council Tax threshold would be announced, but hoped it would be before Christmas.
- interest rates were expected to rise early next year which would be good for the council, but that inflation was set to increase and there was also an expectation that pay would increase.

Mr Ward drew Members' attention to slide 9 that listed the key messages as follows:-

- Council Gross Expenditure amounts to £506m of which £297m is Not Controllable
- Of the remaining £210m of Controllable Expenditure, £70m is funded by Income which makes those costs relatively fixed, leaving circa £140m to £150m to make savings against
- Core spending therefore against which £37m of savings can be made amounts to circa 25% of total controllable spending

He went on to say that slide 11 shows budget reductions by service, with those on the left spending more money and those on the right spending less.

With regard to a query on business rates, Mr Ward said we are now in year 2. The basic principle is that if there is any business rate growth from the base line, then the Council keeps 49% and the rest goes to central government. If an area is in decline or is heavily reliant on a single business, then sudden reductions could be experienced. However PCC should not suffer more than a 7.5% reduction in any one year. This is in place until 2020 after which there will be a reset of the whole of local government funding according to need. PCC's funding could go up or down or remain the same.

In response to a query about the Northern Quarter, Mr Ward said that the scheme would be revised, as one of the ways to improve the Council's financial position is to invest for jobs and employment which will raise prosperity around the city which should in turn reduce dependency on the Council.

Mr Ward drew Members' attention to the key messages on slide 12

- Spending on Adults Social Care represents 34% of Controllable Spending, it is a comparatively low cost Service and is facing significant cost pressures – ageing population, increasing demand for dementia care
- Children's Services represents 15% of Controllable Spending, is a comparatively low cost Service and very high priority / high risk (i.e. the safeguarding of children)
- Combined, the Care Services consume almost 50% of Controllable Spending
- Traffic & Transportation and Environment & Community Safety make up a further 22% of Controllable Spending - mostly tied up in long term

contracts for Roads Maintenance, Street Cleaning, Waste Collection and Waste Disposal

- No easy answers – All Portfolios will need to make significant savings unless very severe cuts are made across some to protect others

Mr Ward said there were four strands to the Medium Term Financial Strategy

- Reduce the City's dependency on Central Government Grant ie(Increasing income)
- Reduce the extent to which the population needs Council Services ie managing demand
- Increase the efficiency & effectiveness of the Council's activity ie Value For Money
- Withdraw or offer minimal provision of low impact Services

He then drew Members' attention to the key messages in slide 18

- Over the past 4 years funding from Central Government has been cut by 30% (£44m)
- Over the same period, after accommodating all factors savings of £59m have been made
- Savings and service reductions have been made across all Council Services but with some protection provided to both Adults and Children's Social Care
- Over the next 3 years Government funding is forecast to fall by a further £35m
- Taking all factors into account the Council needs to save a further £37m (25% of controllable spending) over the next 3 years
- No easy answers – All Services will need to make significant savings unless very severe cuts are made across some Services to protect others

Mr Ward said that the recommendations to council were summarised in slides 19, 20 and 21 of the attached presentation.

- He said that there had been an overall financial improvement of £5.2m
- £3.0m to increase Capital Resources available
- £2.2m to fund Spend to Save schemes & redundancy costs

He said that the MTRS reserve was modest and replenishing it now would help in the future.

In answer to queries about the appendices to the budget going to Council, Mr Ward

- confirmed that Council is being asked to approve Appendix A. Appendix B was concerned with how to achieve what was approved in Appendix A.
- clarified that if council tax was frozen, the central government would give the council an amount of money. However it would be a one off payment.
- Confirmed that "other expenditure" referred to in slide 20 (£1,581,400) was from the Housing Revenue Account and that any expenditure from this account had to meet HRA definitions concerning what it could be used for and this was increasingly difficult.

- Confirmed that the £0.5m earmarked for the Voluntary Sector Capacity & Transition Fund was just for this year, but if successful could be looked at again.-

The Chair thanked Chris Ward for his presentation.

The meeting concluded at 3.50pm.

Chair

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT PANEL

Minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Management Panel held on Friday, 6 February 2015 at 2.30 pm at the Guildhall, Portsmouth

Present

Councillor Simon Boshier (in the Chair)

Councillors Michael Andrewes
Alicia Denny
John Ferrett
Hannah Hockaday
Darren Sanders
Phil Smith
Alistair Thompson
Matthew Winnington

Councillor Ken Ellcome - Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation
Councillor Lee Hunt - Lead Call-in Member

Officers Present

Michael Lawther, City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer
Simon Moon, Head of Transport & Environment
Susan Aistrophe, Finance Manager
Chris Ward, Section 151 Officer and Head of Finance

1. Apologies for absence (AI 1)

There were no apologies for absence.

2. Declarations of Members' interests (AI 2)

There were no declarations of members' interests. Several councillors said they may have to leave the meeting early owing to other commitments depending on how long this meeting lasted.

3. Call-in of decision on agenda item 3 "Residents' Parking - Permit Charges" taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation at his meeting on 8 January 2015 (AI 3)

The chair made following comments:

- The minutes from the meeting held on 29 August 2014 would be brought to the next meeting for formal approval but were available in draft form on the council's website.
- He reminded members that this meeting was to consider calling in a decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation and

that questions should be put to him. Officers in attendance were there to assist the Cabinet Member should he have any queries - not to answer queries from the panel generally.

- He confirmed that written representations received had been circulated to all members of the panel prior to the meeting and that deputation requests had been made by two members of the public both of whom opposed charging for parking permits.

The chair invited Mr Dave Ashmore to make his deputation. Mr Ashmore expressed his views opposing the introduction of parking charges which included his view that this was not justified, it had been done without consultation and was really just a revenue raising exercise.

The chair then invited Julia Pilkington to make her deputation. She expressed her views against parking charges which included comments about pay and display which she said had been introduced without consultation which she did not think was legal and was also in her view unfair.

The chair thanked those making deputations for their comments and the deputees thanked members of the panel for listening to their views.

Councillor Lee Hunt, lead call-in member was invited by the chair to present the case for calling in the decision.

Councillor Hunt outlined the reasons for the call-in as set out in Appendix 4 to the report to Scrutiny Management Panel. These were:

1. There was no clarity on what the charges outlined in the consultation would be or whether any specific charge would be included in the consultation.
2. It is not clear how this integrates with the wider parking review Full Council has asked the Cabinet Member, working with the Scrutiny Management Panel, to undertake. Before the decision meeting, the Cabinet Member was not aware that £200,000 of the saving the charge will provide will be spent on the year-on-year introduction of piecemeal parking zones, which may not be accepted by the review. Moreover the Council administration has said that no new zones will be introduced before 2017. The gap between stated policy and this review should be addressed.
3. The remaining £180,000 of the costs in in setting up and maintaining the parking charges is not accurate because
 - a. It does not include the surplus £86,000 from zones MC and MZ;
 - b. There was no estimate in the report of the expected proceeds from:
 - i. The other charges;
 - ii. The introduction of an online application process;
 - iii. 2 hour MC style zones.

4. There was no full breakdown of first permit charges in other areas. For example, areas that charge less than £40 or have a free first permit for all or some include Birmingham, Exeter, Reading, Lambeth and Richmond.
5. There was no detailed equality impact assessment, especially regarding blue badge holders.
6. There was no consideration of the Atkins report on residents parking.
7. There was no consideration of the displacement effects the charge will bring.
8. It was not clear whether the zones agreed to in the 2013/15 programme will be consulted on a charge or will be surveyed / implemented on the already agreed basis.

In summary Councillor Hunt said that in his view the report going to the Cabinet Member for decision on 8 January was thin and that for the reasons outlined above he asked that the Scrutiny Management Panel agree to refer the matter back for reconsideration on the grounds that the decision may be based on inaccurate or incorrect information and may have been taken without adequate information.

The chair then invited questions from the panel members. In response to queries the following matters were clarified:

- With regard to point 4 Councillor Hunt said that he was not aware if which of the five authorities mentioned are completely free and which of them had a low cost permit charge, but said that if the decision were referred back to the Cabinet Member that information could be included in a revised report.
- With regard to the amount in the original report of £380k per annum, the Chair said that 4.1 of the report explained how the cost of £380,000 per annum had been arrived at.
- Councillor Hunt said that the information before the Cabinet Member had been inadequate because zones that made money had been omitted from the initial report as the suspended MB and MC zones would have created a surplus but for their suspension. Councillor Hunt said that MB zone would have made a profit of £48,000 in a year and MC £38,000 in a year. This had not been reflected in the report and should have been.
- Councillor Boshier said that the original report had included comparative resident permit charges among local authorities in the Southern England region which did charge for first permits.

There was a general discussion around charges with a suggestion being made by Councillor Andrewes that rather than a cost of £380,000 per annum, the cost was nearer £11,000 per annum.

The chair then invited the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation, Councillor Ken Ellcome to provide his response. Councillor Ellcome made the following points:

- The main thrust of the call-in appears to be that he had not had sufficient or adequate information before him when he made his decision. He said that he had a great deal of personal expertise in this field having been the parking manager at the city council for 13 years. He said he felt that the figures being put forward for enforcing and maintaining residents' parking zones amounted to creative accountancy in his view. He said that the previous administration had said in 2012 that parking zones could no longer be afforded as they were running at a deficit. In response to questions from the panel, Councillor Ellcome clarified the following matters:
- A full equality impact assessment had not been done at the time of the original report as that decision was to go out to consultation and the intention was to carry out a full equality impact assessment after that. He said that people were being given a choice.
- With regard to income generated by MB and MC zones, these had not run for a 12 month period so the income generated over a full year was not known. There was a surplus at the beginning but experience showed that this was often the case with new parking zones.
- With regard to a comment made about no more schemes being introduced until 2017, the Cabinet Member said that he had not said that. A review would be needed before any new zones were introduced and those with the highest priority would be progressed.
- With regard to the £200,000 per year annual budget allocation, this was the amount the previous administration had been prepared to pay to prop up residents' parking. If this money were not used to subsidise residents' parking, it could be used to provide other things such as one way streets.
- With regard to introducing pay and display areas, the Cabinet Member confirmed that it was not possible to introduce a pay and display area unless all those affected had been consulted and there was a requirement to advertise before its introduction.
- The Cabinet Member confirmed that the consultation would include those with existing schemes including those in a pay and display area. There was no point in his view in consulting residents in areas that had yet to be surveyed.

- With regard to a specific question about the earliest that the two Cosham areas would be included, the Cabinet Member said he could not give a definitive answer as there was a need first to carry out a review, then to carry out a survey. The principle would then need to be decided as to whether or not to charge. It was therefore unlikely that surveys would be done before June or July but that was an estimate.
- Councillor Ellcome said that his personal view was that people living in residential parking zones received a benefit that others not living in parking zones do not receive. He felt that residents who do have the benefit of a parking zone should pay for that privilege and should not be subsidised by other taxpayers not in receipt of that benefit.
- With regard to 1.2.2 of the City Solicitor's report, the Cabinet Member confirmed that a draft survey had been prepared and approved by the City Solicitor but that this had not been sent out yet as it was felt to be prudent to wait until this meeting concluded. He said that the amount charged for the first permit was likely to be less than £40 and may reduce to around £30 and the intention was not to increase the charge once introduced by more than the rate of inflation.
- With regard to additional displacement as a result of introducing a first permit charge, this was difficult to predict. He did not have a particular figure in mind as this would depend on how the schemes were devised or implemented.
- In response to a query asking what would happen if there was an exact 50% split in whether or not residents in a particular area wanted to have a zone introduced, the Cabinet Member said this was extremely unlikely to happen but if it did then he would take a decision at that time. It was possible that in such circumstances there would be a need to re-consult.
- In response to queries about why the original report had not drawn comparisons between Portsmouth and other areas in respect of how they brought in their schemes and whether these had been brought in for residents only or introduced with no charge and then bringing in a charge, the Cabinet Member said he did not consider how other authorities had brought in their parking zones to be relevant to Portsmouth. He said that the zones in Portsmouth were running at a deficit and that this could not continue.
- The Cabinet Member said that the Barnet case made it clear that parking charges money was only to be used for parking issues and not to subsidise other budgets.
- The Cabinet Member reiterated that an equality impact assessment was not of benefit at this time as there was no way of assessing whether a person had reached a decision based on affordability. He said that a full equalities impact assessment would be done following the consultation.

- In response to a query about how much savings could be made if residents carried out transactions online, the Cabinet Member said he had received estimates only which seemed to suggest that if everyone carried out transactions online, it could perhaps save £10,000. However this was purely hypothetical. In any event, the transactions would need to be processed.
- The Cabinet Member said that the procedure for carrying out a review had not yet been decided, but practical steps had been taken. The timeline had been started, the order of zones introduction had been drafted and beat surveys have been done.
- Every scheme would be reviewed starting with MB and MC zones.
- There was no money to introduce new schemes this year.

There followed a general discussion concerning the timing of the introduction of possible charges. It was confirmed that these would not come in with effect from 1 April this year and the Cabinet Member said he did not yet know when a charge would be introduced. In theory a decision could be taken in early May so a charge could be introduced with effect from June or July but this was dependent on a number of factors.

The City Solicitor said that a contentious decision such as this would be avoided during the purdah period.

The chair then invited Councillor Hunt to sum up his presentation. Councillor Hunt said that:

- The Cabinet Member had admitted that he had been confused about the £200,000 at the time of his decision meeting.
- He said he had no figure in mind about additional displacement caused by the effects of bringing in a charge.
- There was no detailed equality impact assessment.
- There was no estimate in the report of the expected proceeds from the introduction of an online application process.
- There was no option in the consultation asking whether residents wished to keep the scheme as it is.

For these reasons and those outlined in Appendix 4 to the report, he felt that the decision taken by the Cabinet Member on 8 January 2015 should be referred back to him for reconsideration.

The City Solicitor confirmed in response to a query that the equalities impact assessment requirement relates to protected characteristics. A full equalities

impact assessment was not required in respect of the report that had been before the Cabinet Member on 8 January.

The Cabinet Member summed up his case saying

- He was well aware of the Atkins Report on residents' parking as the parking strategy had gone to Cabinet in 2013 under the previous administration. He had read the Atkins Report at that time and had read it since then to refresh his knowledge of it. The previous administration did not take the difficult decision to introduce charging for parking permits and therefore the parking zones continued to run but with a deficit. The current administration had inherited a situation which was unsustainable in their view and therefore a difficult decision was needed now.
- With regard to the assertion that Mr Moon had said that no schemes would be introduced until at least 2017, the Cabinet Member reminded members that it was he who made the decisions - not Mr Moon - and he had not taken any such decision. He intended to move things forward as soon as possible.
- With regard to MB/MC zones, these had been implemented against officer advice at that time by the previous administration and five other areas suffered from the displacement effects.
- He agreed he should have known about the £200,000.

There followed a general debate among members of the Scrutiny Management Panel.

The City Solicitor further clarified the issue concerning equality impact assessment. The report before the Cabinet Member on 8 January 2015 proposed a consultation be undertaken and was not taking a decision on introducing charges. When the actual decision report comes before the Cabinet Member, a full equalities impact assessment would be undertaken but it would be premature until then.

Councillor Winnington felt that a full EIA was not premature and that those economically disadvantaged would be more likely to be against the introduction of charges so the mere fact of putting such a question to them would validate a full equalities impact assessment being carried out. He also felt there was not enough information in the original report on other authorities. He felt that the original report was inaccurate as there was nothing in it about other ways to make zones pay for themselves. There was not enough background information and for these reasons he felt the decision should be referred back to the Cabinet Member.

Councillor Thompson said that had the report been the final decision then he would accept the equalities impact assessment points as being valid. However what had been recommended in the report was to go out to consultation. He felt that adequate information had been before the Cabinet

Member and that it would be in his opinion strange to say that the Cabinet Member had not had enough information before him in order to decide to go out to consultation. He said that the original decision should in his view stand and the matter should not be referred back. In the meantime he felt it would be useful if Councillor Ellcome could circulate to all members of the panel details of all the parking schemes other local authorities had introduced.

Councillor Andrewes felt that referring the decision back to the Cabinet Member would give him the opportunity to defend residents from cost of living increases rather than by adding to them. He felt that parking zones could be introduced and run more cheaply. He said that the MB and MC zones had been running at a surplus before their suspension. He said that parking zones were not suitable for all areas of the city and that parking problems may affect people coming to certain areas of the city. He said that he felt that correct information had not been in front of the Cabinet Member at his decision meeting on 8 January, for example he did not have any information on potential savings that could have been made on the introduction of an online application process.

Councillor Boshier said that no decision had yet been made to introduce charges, the decision had just been to go out consultation. Councillor John Ferrett said that there was a need to make parking self-sustaining. Currently the parking zones are running at a deficit. He had no doubt that Councillor Ellcome's decision on 8 January had been taken in light of adequate information. On the basis of evidence received at this meeting, he felt the decision should not be referred back to the Cabinet Member.

Councillor Sanders said he felt the decision should be referred back. He said the figures do not ally with council policy and that a parking review should take place before any decision is taken on parking charges. Councillor Thompson said that for information one of the authorities mentioned in paragraph 4 of Appendix 4, Richmond actually charge £90 for a first vehicle and only Class A cars, which were numerically few, were free.

The chair of the panel said that the decision before members today was to determine whether the Cabinet Member's decision on 8 January had been based on inaccurate or incorrect information or had been taken without adequate information. He advised that the panel had received two oral deputations and had received written representations and that if the panel is satisfied in the light of everything that had been heard today that the decision had not been based on inaccurate or incorrect information or that it was not taken without adequate information, then no further action is required and the matter ends here.

It was proposed by Councillor Matthew Winnington and seconded by Councillor Darren Sanders that the decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation on item 3 at his meeting held on 8 January 2015 should be referred back to the Cabinet Member for reconsideration with the panel's reasons why.

Upon being put to the vote this was LOST.

RESOLVED that the panel considered the evidence and decided that the decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation on item 3 at his meeting held on 8 January 2015 be upheld.

Apologies were given by Councillors John Ferrett, Alistair Thompson, Matthew Winnington for having to leave at this point. Councillor Hockaday said it was likely she would have to leave part way through the following item.

4. Presentation by Head of Finance and S151 Officer on the Budget 2014/15 (AI 4)

(TAKE IN PRESENTATION)

Mr Chris Ward provided a presentation of the budget. He said that for local government, spending cuts would continue because of the savings that were required to be made. The strategy was to match in-year income with in-year expenditure. He advised members that government funding reductions were likely to continue until 2018/19 at which point central government funding would only amount to 47% of that which was received in 2011/12.

Mr Ward advised members of details of the revised budget that would be going to full council on 10 February 2015. These were set out on the second slide of page 5. He drew members' attention in particular to the reduced trading income from MMD and the Port.

With regard to the reduction in retained business rates, Mr Ward explained that PCC has to make a judgement about how many successful appeals against business rates there are likely to be. Any gains or losses are shared with central government. Central government allow local authorities to spread the impact of the losses over a five year period. However it is also open to the local authority to pay the entire loss in one single year and this might then result in the local authority receiving a safety net payment from central government. On this occasion PCC received £3m from central government which overall was better for the council. In order to pay the full amount owing in one year PCC has had to draw on its reserve, but this was a planned outlay.

With regard to 2015/16, the net budget amount to £168.4m which represented a big change from the net figure of £182.1m for 2014/15. Mr Ward outlined the expenditure and income changes which included new burdens such as the Care Act and SEND reforms, inflation, increase in contingency, improved trading income from MMD and Port. He outlined the funding changes which included government funding reduction of £14.3 million, additional council tax income of £2.7m and additional business rate income of £1 million.

He said that the reduction in expenditure amounted to £6 million, the reductions in funding amounted to £10.5 million and therefore the total increase in the use of general reserves amount to £4.5 million.

Mr Ward then outlined the capital programme 2013/14 to 2018/19 as set out on the slides on page 9. Mr Ward said that most of the capital had to be spent on meeting statutory responsibilities and that approximately 70% of the total capital resource went into schools.

With regard to capital investment proposals, Mr Ward explained that for the Limberline Road industrial units, the cost of buying the lease was smaller than the value of the freehold site.

He also explained that utility management and consumption reduction related to items such as the use of solar panels.

With regard to the demolition of the floating dock jetty and lengthening of berth 2, this did not include dredging. It was also dependent upon satisfactory new trade assurances and an approved financial appraisal. These were proposals only and the full council would be taking a decision on these matters on Tuesday.

Mr Ward drew members' attention to the summary on page 10 of the presentation including the proposed council tax freeze and the summary of the budget forecast 2015/16 to 2018/19 and the capital programme proposals outlined in the summary on page 11 of the presentation.

The chair thanked Mr Ward for his presentation.

The meeting concluded at 6.30 pm.

Councillor Simon Boshier

THIS ITEM IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Title of meeting: Scrutiny Management Panel
Subject: Snow Wardens
Date of meeting: 6 March 2015
Report by: Head of Transport and Environment
Wards affected: All

1. **Requested by** - the City Council 20 January 2015

2. Purpose

The Notice of Motion (a) Volunteer Snow Wardens was proposed by Councillor Michael Andrewes and Seconded by Councillor Lynne Stagg. It stated:

The council notes:

Many areas such as Lambeth, Waltham Forest, Edinburgh and Telford and Wrekin now operate a scheme for “snow angels” or snow volunteer wardens. This provides basic equipment and training to enable people to clear their pavements and help in times of snow and bad weather

This would give the city added resilience in times of bad weather and harness people’s desire to help out in these times and help reduce deaths during winter months when vulnerable and older people are at risk.

The costs for this are likely to be fairly minimal and mostly capital expenditure in equipment and it would help prevent other costs to the council and public services.

The council therefore resolves:

To ask the Scrutiny Management Panel to undertake a short “task and finish” review of the idea and make a recommendation on whether and how to implement it and report to cabinet as quickly as possible given that there might be bad weather soon.

THIS ITEM IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY

3. Information Requested

Portsmouth City Council currently has a 25 year Highways PFI contract which looks after all the roads and footways in the event of severe weather. This includes snow, heavy rain/flooding and high winds.

In the event of Snow, 4 gritting lorries are deployed to clear the roads and Colas operatives are relocated from their normal duties to clear the footways. These total approx.120 as below include:-

- Cleansing operatives x75
- Supervisors x 4
- Highway engineers x 25
- Electrical engineers x 8
- Grounds Maintenance x 8

Four inspectors will also carry out continual inspections across the city.

In addition to this, in the event of snow the Highways PFI Team at PCC open up a **Snow Response Room** on the 4th floor core 2-3. Here the team coordinate communications and clearance works with Colas and other PCC services to ensure a joined up approach across the whole city. This can include clearing routes for delivering meals to vulnerable people.

The team in the Snow response Room will also co-ordinate PCC staff, who also are unable to carry out their daily duties plus volunteers to assist with the footway clearances. (ie parking officers, enforcement officers).The PFI team have the following equipment in storage for use in the event of snow.

- Snow Pushers x 5
- Rucksacks (incl maps, risk assessments,) x6
- Gloves x 20
- Shoe grippers x 20
- Brooms x 10
- Hand salt spreaders x10
- Orange large shovels x 10
- Black large shovels x 10
- Day to day shovels x 29

THIS ITEM IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY



.....
Signed by Head of Transport and Environment

This page is intentionally left blank