



NOTICE OF MEETING

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT PANEL

FRIDAY, 29 AUGUST 2014 AT 3.00 PM

COUNCIL CHAMBER - THE GUILDHALL

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

Email: vicki.plytas@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

Membership

Councillor Alistair Thompson (Chair)
Councillor Simon Bosher (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Michael Andrewes
Councillor Alicia Denny
Councillor John Ferrett

Councillor Hannah Hockaday
Councillor Darren Sanders
Councillor Phil Smith
Councillor Matthew Winnington

Standing Deputies

Councillor Ben Dowling
Councillor David Fuller
Councillor Paul Godier

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 **Call-in of decision on "MB and MC zones" taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation at his meeting on 24 July 2014 (Pages 1 - 24)**

Councillors Lee Hunt, Margaret Foster, Darren Sanders, Michael Andrewes and Hugh Mason have asked that the decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation on 24 July 2014 in respect of item 3 on that agenda, "**Central Southsea Residents' Parking Schemes: MB Zone and MC Zone**" be called in for scrutiny.

The decision today is for the panel to determine whether the Cabinet Member's decision

- has been based on inaccurate or incorrect information
- has been taken without adequate information

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 being supplied to enable the Cabinet Member to reach his decision, then no further action is required and the matter ends here.

If the panel is not satisfied on these grounds, the panel may refer the matter back to the Cabinet Member for reconsideration stating the reasons why.

The following documents are attached:

- Supplementary report from the City Solicitor addressing the call-in concerns.
- The report entitled "**Central Southsea Residents' Parking Schemes: MB Zone and MC Zone**" considered by the Cabinet Member on 24 July 2014. (app one)
- The draft minute of the meeting held by the Cabinet Member on 24 July 2014 (app one)
- An extract of the Decision Notice published on Members' Information Service 25 July 2014
- The call-in request - (app two)

The relevant members and officers will be in attendance:

The procedure for the meeting will be as follows:-

Process of call-in

- Deputations to be heard first, followed by;
- Presentation of the call-in by the call-in member followed by questions from Scrutiny Management Panel members.
- Response from the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation followed by questions from Scrutiny Management Panel members.

- A further response may then be made by the call-in member
- The call-in member may then sum up his case
- The Cabinet Member may then sum up his case
- General debate among Scrutiny Management Panel members followed by a decision.
- The call-in member who presented to Scrutiny Management Panel will not be allowed to speak again or vote on the item, unless they are a member of the Scrutiny Management Panel.
- The Panel would then either resolve to take no action (in effect endorsing the original decision) **or** refer the matter back to the Cabinet Member for further consideration, setting out the nature of its concerns.

RECOMMENDED that the Panel considers the evidence and decides whether or not the decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation on item 3 at his meeting held on 24 July 2014 should be upheld or be referred back to the Cabinet Member for reconsideration with the Panel's reasons why.

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

The panel is asked to agree the next topic put forward for review by the H&SC Scrutiny Panel

(1) Support Services for living in Isolation

RECOMMENDED that the Panel agrees that the next topic for the H&SC Scrutiny Panel will be "Support Services for living in Isolation."

5 Date of Next Meeting

The suggested date for the next meeting is Friday 10 October 2014 at 2.30pm.

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.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3



Portsmouth
CITY COUNCIL

Agenda item:

Title of meeting: Scrutiny Management Panel

Date of meeting: 29th August 2014

Subject: Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation on 24th July 2014 in respect of item 3 on that agenda "Central Southsea Residents Parking Schemes: MB Zone and MC Zone - **Call In**

Report by: City Solicitor

Wards affected:

Key decision: No

Full Council decision: No

1. Purpose of report

To request the Panel to review the decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation on 24th July 2014 in respect of item 3 on that agenda "Central Southsea Residents Parking Schemes: MB Zone and MC Zone. The report which was considered by the Cabinet Member on the 24th July 2014 together with the minute of the Cabinet's decision is attached as Appendix One to this report.

1.1. Call-in and alternative decision making

1.1.1. These decisions were called in in accordance with part 3 of the Constitution of the Council. The summary of reasons for call in are:-

1. Inaccurate or incorrect information and
2. Inadequate information

See Appendix Two attached for further details of the reasons for call-in.

1.2. Background

1.2.1. Please see the attached report and minute which provide the background to the decision which was made on 24th July 2014 (Appendix 1).

1.2.2. As the decision is not contrary to budget or policy, steps have been taken to implement the decision.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. The Panel considers the evidence and decides whether or not the decision made by the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation on 24th July 2014 should be upheld or be referred back to the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation with their reasons why it should be reconsidered.

3. Equality Impact Assessment

- 3.1. An equality impact assessment is not required as the recommendations do not have a negative impact on any of the protected characteristics as described in the Equality Act 2010.

4. City Solicitor's Comments

- 4.1. The City Solicitor's comments are embodied within this report.

5. Head of Finance's comments

- 5.1. There are no financial implications arising directly from the recommendation contained in this report. Financial implications arising from recommendations contained in any future report will be included at that time.

.....
Signed by:

City Solicitor

Appendices: Appendices one and two attached

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
Nil	

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/
rejected by the Chair of the Scrutiny Management Panel

.....

Signed by: Chair of the Scrutiny Management Panel

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda item:

Decision maker: Portfolio Holder for Traffic & Transportation

Subject: Central Southsea residents' parking schemes:
MB zone and MC zone

Report by: Head of Transport and Environment

Wards affected: Central Southsea

Key decision (over £250k): No

1. Purpose of the report

To report on the requirements for amending/revoking the MB and MC residents' parking zones in Southsea on an initially temporary basis.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the Portfolio Holder for Traffic & Transportation reconsiders the decision of MB and MC zones based in particular on comments made and issues raised in the Cabinet report of November 2013.

2.2 That should the decision be to change the scheme, the following immediate action is taken to effect changes to the MB and MC residents' parking schemes:

2.2.1 An Experimental Traffic Regulation Order is implemented to

- a) revoke the MC zone parking restrictions and;**
- b) amend the operating times of MB zone to 8am - 6pm Monday to Friday.**

2.2.2 That no further action is taken in response to the survey conducted in May 2014 of the areas around MC Zone (to be revoked as part of this recommendation).

3. Background

3.1 The introduction of the MB Orchard Road Area in November 2011 had a significant adverse effect on the adjacent roads in terms of displaced parking (the southern end of Talbot Road, Bramble Road, Ventnor Road and Shanklin Road in particular), whilst over 300 parking spaces were left unused each day.

3.2 More than 200 emails, petitions and letters that were received from residents affected by the MB zone prompted funding to be sought for a survey to be carried out in 2012. The results of that survey were largely inconclusive but showed a

small majority in favour of a residents' parking scheme. (The results are available on Portsmouth City Council's website - search 'previous permit surveys').

- 3.3 Whilst no action was taken at that time, a number of residents adjacent to the MB zone continued to campaign for a parking scheme or an amendment or revocation of the MB zone.
- 3.4 In November 2013 Cabinet received a paper proposing to extend the MB zone southwards and provide scratch cards to residents west of the extended zone. If this proposal was agreed, the requisite Traffic Regulation Order would be advertised, as required by the legislation.
- 3.5 The November 2013 paper highlighted the following concerns held by Officers:
- a) The officer recommendation had been to amend and reduce the operating times of the existing MB zone to reflect the needs of residents of the surrounding roads whilst maintaining the original objectives of the scheme. This would have improved parking availability for residents of surrounding roads when it is most needed in the evening. However, it was highlighted in the report that Ward Members did not support this view, and favoured extending the existing boundaries of the MB.
 - b) That extending the scheme to include roads further south would highly likely have the same overspill impact on roads adjoining the revised scheme boundary, and have the potential to cause displacement to other residents rather than addressing it. This would be likely to result in complaints from residents of Southsea and Eastney requesting the Council take action in their area to address the overspill issue.
- 3.6 As a result of the November 2013 paper and the displacement issues it could create, as highlighted by Officers, Cabinet Members took the decision in January 2014 that a new residents' parking scheme would be proposed for the area south of the existing MB zone, to be called MC zone, operating as Permit Holders Only for a 2-hour period per day. The purpose of the MC zone was to counter the effects of displacement parking from the MB zone and the number of vehicles associated with housing in multiple-occupation / temporary residents.
- 3.7 The MC zone was introduced in April 2014, and at the same time a questionnaire was sent to nearly 6300 properties surrounding the MB and MC zones, in response to concerns over displacement parking effects.

4. Reasons for the Recommendations.

- 4.1 Questions have been raised about the spread of residents' parking zones into areas of Southsea and Eastney that previously have experienced minimal parking problems, and have previously indicated they do not want parking restrictions.

- 4.2 The introduction of the MB zone and the subsequent extension to MC zone had a disproportionate effect on the adjacent area and those living there. The risks had been highlighted within the November 2013 Cabinet paper.
- 4.3 The housing stock in this area has narrow frontages and few off-street parking facilities, allowing less than 1 parking space per property frontage. Therefore changes to parking arrangements have a significant impact on adjacent roads.
- 4.4 The causes of parking problems are regularly cited as displaced parking from the MB zone and now the MC zone (including vehicles not entitled to permits there, residents not wishing to purchase permits for 2nd vehicles and commercial vehicles) along with the extent of student and multiple-occupancy accommodation in the area resulting in several vehicles per household.
- 4.5 Prior to, and following the implementation of the MC zone, residents expressed concerns about vehicle displacement into already-congested residential roads adjacent. The survey carried out following the Cabinet decision in March 2014 on the areas adjacent to MB and MC zones cost approximately £5575.00 and involved 6253 households. To put this into context, the MB zone has 1013 households the MC zone has 1940. Between 14% - 27% of the questionnaires were returned per area.

5. Requirements to implement the Recommendations.

If it is decided to amend the scheme, the following actions are proposed:

- 5.1 The 478 signs within the MC zone are either covered or removed.
- 5.2 Residents and businesses within the MC zone are advised in writing that;
 - a) The parking restrictions are not applicable from a specified date;
 - b) Refunds for permits will be arranged if the restrictions are to be permanently revoked;
 - c) Public consultation will take place simultaneously, and that any comments should be made in writing.
- 5.3 The 327 signs within the MB zone be replaced to reflect new operating times.
- 5.4 Residents and businesses within the MB zone are advised in writing that;
 - a) the parking restrictions will be changing from a specified date;
 - b) refunds will be arranged for any permits not likely to be required if the restrictions are to be permanently changed;
 - c) Public consultation will take place simultaneously, and that any comments should be made in writing.

6. Equality impact assessment (EIA)

- 6.1 This report has undergone a preliminary equality impact assessment and there are no equality issues arising from this report.

7. Head of Legal Services' comments

- 7.1 An Experimental Order is similar to a permanent traffic regulation order in that it is a legal document which imposes traffic and parking restrictions such as road closures, one-way streets, banned turns, bus/cycle lanes, controlled parking and on-street parking places. Such Orders are made under Sections 9 and 10 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and all other enabling powers after consultation with the chief officer of police in accordance with Schedule 9 to the 1984 Act.
- 7.2 Unlike a permanent order an experimental order can only stay in force for a maximum of 18 months while its effects are monitored and the Council decides whether or not to make the provisions permanent. There is no public consultation before the experimental traffic order is brought into effect, but from its commencement date there is a 6-month public consultation that allows representations to be submitted based on experience of the traffic scheme in operation.
- 7.3 It is possible for the Head of Service to modify or suspend an experimental order whilst it is in operation, from which a further 6-month consultation period must begin. Between 6 - 18 months the Council can arrange to make the effects of the order permanent, giving due consideration to any comments / objections made during the public consultation period, to revoke the experimental order or to let it lapse (whereby the restrictions revert to the effects of the permanent order in place).

8. Head of Finance's comments

- 8.1 The proposed Experimental Traffic Regulation Order will cost in the region of £2,500 to advertise and communicate. This will be funded from the On street cash limited budget and will reduce the transfer of any operating surplus that would be transferred to the Off street reserve.
- 8.2 The amount of income generated from scratch cards and permits over a year from the MC zone is in the region of £49,000. By revoking this scheme this contribution to the running costs of residents parking zones will be lost. The amount of civil enforcements officers currently employed by the City Council will not be reduced as a result of the scheme being revoked. The overall effect will be that the surplus currently generated from all on street activities will be reduced by £49,000.
- 8.3 Covering or removing the 478 signs within the MC zone would cost in the region of £1,000 to £2,200 respectively. This will be funded from the On street cash limited

budget and in effect will reduce the transfer of any operating surplus that would be transferred to the Off street reserve.

- 8.4 Amending the operating times of the MB zone (currently 24 hours per day, 7 days a week) to 8am - 6pm Monday to Friday may have a negative financial impact. Current annual income from the sale of scratch cards and permits is around £38,000. The amount of income derived from the sale of permits is £15,900, and £22,100 from scratch cards. It is likely that the sale of scratch cards will fall with reduced operating times meaning the need for them is not mandatory. The amount of permits sold may be affected and thus the exact amount is hard to quantify at this point. The amount of civil traffic enforcement officers employed by the City Council will remain unaffected, but the amount of enforcement time required for this scheme will be reduced enabling the enforcement team to cover other areas in the City.
- 8.5 Replacing the 327 signs within the MB zone would cost in the region of £8,200. This will be funded from the On street cash limited budget and in effect will reduce the transfer of any operating surplus that would be transferred to the Off street reserve.

.....
Signed by Head of Transport & Environment Service

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
1. Cabinet report 4 th November 2013	Portsmouth City Council website - http://democracy.portsmouth.gov.uk/uuCoverPage.aspx?bcr=1
2. Cabinet Report January 2014	
3. Cabinet report March 2014	

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by on

.....
Signed by Portfolio Holder for Traffic & Transportation

(End of document)

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAFFIC & TRANSPORTATION

RECORD OF DECISIONS taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation, Councillor Ken Ellcome, at his meeting held on Thursday, 24 July 2014 at 10.00 am in The Executive Meeting Room, 3rd Floor of The Guildhall, Portsmouth.

Present

Councillor Ken Ellcome

Councillor Lynne Stagg
Councillor Ken Ferrett

Also in attendance

Councillors Hugh Mason, Michael Andrewes, Luke Stubbs, Lee Hunt, Linda Symes, Robert New and Matthew Winnington and approximately 70 local residents

14. Apologies (AI 1)

Apologies for absence were received from the UKIP spokesperson, Councillor Stuart Potter.

15. Declarations of Members' Interests (AI 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

16. Central Southsea Residents' Parking Schemes: MB Zone and MC Zone (AI 3)

Over 215 written representations and emails had been received, including a petition from the lower part of Telephone Road containing 28 signatures, which had been circulated to Councillor Ellcome and the opposition spokespersons, prior to the meeting. On the morning of the meeting, copies of a further 17 emails were circulated.

Nikki Musson, the Operational Transport Officer introduced the report. She explained that the introduction of the MB Orchard Road Area residents' parking zone in November 2011 had had a significant impact on the adjacent roads with displacement parking, whilst over 300 parking spaces were left unused each day. This prompted more than 200 emails and representations from residents affected by the MB zone. As a consequence, a survey was undertaken in 2012 but the results were inconclusive. No action was taken but a small majority continued to campaign for a parking scheme or for the MB zone to be revoked. A paper was taken to the Cabinet in November 2013 which highlighted concerns from officers regarding displacement issues it could create. In January 2014 the Cabinet agreed for a new residents' parking

scheme to be introduced for the area south of the existing MB zone, to be called the MC zone, operating as Permit Holders Only for a 2-hour period per day. This was introduced in April 2014.

Deputations were heard from the following residents, Mr Matt Smart (Jessie Road), Mr Derek Mottershead, Mr Gary Hall (Esslemont Road), Mr Brian McCreesh (Havelock Road), Mr Christian Milne (Ventor Road), Jean Urry (Talbot Road), Mr Philip Wright, Mr James Massiah (Manners Road), Jon Sumpter (Livingstone Road), Mr Anthony Hadley (Delamere Road), Barbara Jones, Mr Hammond, Mr Alan Ellcome and Mr Whiteside who all spoke against and included some of the points listed below in their representations:

- There is more displacement from the Fratton residents parking zone and over 60% empty spaces in other residents parking zones so why target the MB zone?
- Residents' survey in 2014 had 25% return rate with 2/3s of the streets wanting residents parking.
- Cheap shot for political gain with poor arguments put forward to change or revoke the residents parking.
- The 2-hour residents parking zone goes some way to good working for all so why change?
- Residents can park near to their homes when they come home from work.
- Removal of MB and MC makes no sense.
- Complete disregard to residents views.
- MB zone caters for all, residents and non-residents.
- Why do you want parking for residents in the MB zone to go back to being a nightmare?
- MC zone were promised a full consultation after 12months, not 4.
- Your concern should be home owners and residents not students and van drivers.
- Spirit of temporary traffic orders is public consultation so what is so urgent about this matter and why has there been no public consultation?
- Council claim that it is the number of empty spaces in the zone which needs addressing but other zones have a much higher number of empty spaces and they are not being addressed.
- Roads in MC zone are predominantly full and should be hailed a success, not revoked.
- Now far less student vehicles in MC zone.
- Unjust and unfair to change this.
- Both zones were made at residents' requests.
- GA and LB zones both have empty spaces and yet are not being revoked.
- Residents have expressed their views so many times.
- MC zone is the only zone in Portsmouth with a 2-hour restriction.
- No regard for public opinion.
- How much money has been spent on this?
- Either revoke all residents parking zones in the city or none.
- Had no response to my email from Councillor Ellcome.

- If we hadn't heard about this decision from our ward councillors we would never have had the opportunity to express our views.
- The 2014 survey should supersede the 2012 one.
- Number of complaints should tell you how residents feel.
- Fought for years to get residents parking in MB.
- Football traffic/commuters/evening trippers/HMOs/endless stream of taxis/large vans/mobile homes - we had to put up with the lot and it was a nightmare.
- Councillor Ellcome wants us to go back to parking chaos.
- Displacement areas should be given their own residents parking.
- HMOs pay for additional vehicles or park outside of the zone.
- Do you really expect residents to drive around roads looking for a parking space?
- Should be encouraging businesses to flourish.
- Keep MC zone as an example for other zones.
- Councillor Ellcome doesn't live in our area and doesn't know the problems we experience.
- Will we get a refund if the residents' parking is revoked?
- Would like to thank the ward councillors for keeping us informed.
- Dispute the number of empty spaces quoted by the council.
- Completely undemocratic.
- Council just takes away all the time.
- The Leader believes in openness and transparency but not in this case.
- Extremely premature to cancel a temporary zone only 4 months into it and officers haven't had sufficient time to assess the zone.

A deputation was also heard from Mr Wareham, who spoke in favour and included the following points in his representations:

- Councillor Ellcome is having to deal with a previous decision.
- When Councillor Hunt was a conservative he didn't want residents parking.
- Now the LibDems wants residents parking zones.
- Don't like residents parking.
- Should do the same as the IOW where everyone pays for a permit and is then permitted to park in any road.

Councillors Hugh Mason, Michael Andrewes and Lee Hunt included the following points in their deputations:

- Parking in northern St Jude ward is now critical.
- Decision is not open and transparent.
- Not about setting residents against each other.
- Dispersal areas want their own residents parking zones.
- Had numerous surveys, all in favour of residents parking.
- If it is about dispersal then why aren't you revoking other adjacent zones?
- High level of students are distorting the results, who would normally have to pay for permits.

- Councillor Ellcome should apologise to residents who are being treated differently to other areas.
- Trying to sneak through a temporary order.
- Leave MB and MC zones alone.
- Many residents initially objected to the residents parking zones but are here today to say that the 'soft touch' approach works.
- These zones have been life changing for residents allowing them to park near to their homes and taking the nightmare of parking away.
- Listen to the residents here today and listen to the representations you have received.
- Councillor Ellcome needs to make a decision for the residents and not a political decision.

Councillors Luke Stubbs and Linda Symes included the following points in their deputations:

- No easy answer to the parking problems in a city with so many Victorian properties.
- If you walk around the MB zone you do see a lot of empty space, you don't see that in Fratton.
- Have great sympathy for the residents of the MB zone trying to seek a parking space.
- MB zone has hundreds of empty spaces.
- Need to think strategically and look at all parking areas.
- Would support the suspension of the MB and MC zones.

Councillor Lynne Stagg questioned why these particular zones had been picked out and why residents aren't being listened to. Should consult with the residents first and then make a decision. She also questioned why the MC zone wasn't being left for 12months as promised to the residents when it was introduced. All temporary orders are re-surveyed after 12months with a view to making any necessary changes needed.

Councillor Ken Ferrett felt that a proper strategy was needed for residents parking. The current resident parking zones have been piecemeal.

The City Solicitor advised all present that with regards to recommendation 2.2.1a), the cabinet member does not have the authority to revoke and can only suspend parking restrictions.

Councillor Ken Ellcome reported that he had received between 250 and 300 emails, both for and against the proposals. He apologised for not responding to them all and explained that he does have other council responsibilities too. However, he confirmed that he would answer all of the emails he had received. He also explained that he endeavours to work for all residents and not just the ones in his ward. This is not a political decision and he wants to address the issues raised by the original MB zone. He had asked officers to look at the parking around these zones some weeks ago. Now that there are so many schemes we need to look strategically across the city. He felt that it was a mistake at the time to introduce the MC and MB zones.

DECISION: Councillor Ellcome considered all comments made and in particular issues raised in the Cabinet report of November 2013. He agreed to implement an experimental traffic regulation order to suspend both the MC and MB zone parking restrictions with effect from 1 September 2014.

This page is intentionally left blank

	WARD	DECISION	OFFICER CONTACT
3		<p>Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation decision meeting - 24 July 2014</p> <p>Councillor Ken Ellcome made the following decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Southsea residents' parking schemes: MB zone and MC zone. Councillor Ellcome considered all comments made and in particular issues raised in the Cabinet report of November 2013. He agreed to implement an experimental traffic regulation order to suspend both the MB and MC zone parking restrictions with effect from 1 September 2014. • Southsea Town Centre Improvements: Osborne/Palmerston Road. Councillor Ellcome approved the commencement of works in Osborne Road, considered all the options presented to him in the officers report and agreed to take forward Option 2 for Palmerston Road, in consultation with the Portsmouth Disability Forum and the City Centre Manager, and that relevant TROs associated with this option be implemented. • Henderson Road Proposed Traffic Calming Scheme. Councillor Ellcome agreed that a hybrid safety scheme be drawn up to improve traffic calming in Henderson Road, in consultation with the ward councillors and local residents. He also agreed to relocate the existing 20mph signage. <p>NB Call-in Date: 1 August 2014</p>	<p>Lucy Wingham Local Democracy Officer Tel: 9283 4662</p>

This page is intentionally left blank



OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT PANEL

"CALL IN"
REQUEST

WE THE UNDERSIGNED WISH TO "CALL IN" FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT PANEL THE DECISION(S) OF THE CABINET TAKEN ON THE 04 DAY OF JULY 2014 IN RELATION TO THE REPORT/MINUTE NUMBER SHOWN BELOW:

- ① • councillor LEE HUNT (Sign) _____ (Print)
- ② • councillor MARGARET FOSTON (Sign) _____ (Print)
- ③ • councillor DARRON SANDERS (Sign) _____ (Print)
- councillor _____ (Sign) _____ (Print)
- councillor _____ (Sign) _____ (Print)

Dated _____

PTG

<u>AGENDA ITEM/MINUTE NO.</u>	
<u>REPORT TITLE / MINUTE / DATE OF CABINET MEETING / PORTFOLIO DECISION MEETING / THIS DATE</u>	
<u>REASONS FOR "CALL IN" and WHY</u>	Believe the decision may be based on inaccurate or incorrect information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Believe the decision may have been taken without adequate information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Believe the decision may be contrary to the Council's agreed Budget and policy framework <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

TRAFFIC & TRANSPORTATION
MEETING: GENERAL SOUTH
RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME
H.B. ZONE AND A.C. ZONE 3 ETC.
24/7/14

Once completed please return to Local Democracy Manager
Telephone: 023 9283 4055 Fax: 023 9284 1322

- Please provide a brief summary of reasons for call in
- Please state what alternative action it is proposed should be taken by decision maker

* SEE ATTACHED.

INADEQUATE FINANCIAL INFORMATION;
DID NOT ASK RESIDENTS WHAT THEY
THOUGHT; INADEQUATE INFORMATION
AND INCORRECT INFORMATION SURROUNDING
VIABILITY OF MC & MB ZONES. I GNORED
OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS OVER MB ZONE.
LACK OF INFORMATION ON MB & MC ZONE
COMPARED TO OTHER PARKING SCHEMES;
FAILED TO PUBLISH AND MAKE AVAILABLE
AND ACT ON THE CONSULTATION IN THE
ZONES SURVEYED 1 TO 5; THEREBY,
DENYING THE PUBLIC ACCESS TO THIS
INFORMATION; THIS INCLUDES FAILING
TO PUBLISH THIS INFORMATION BEFORE
MAKING A DECISION.

2/2 2/3

APPENDIX ONE



Portsmouth
CITY COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT PANEL

**"CALL IN"
REQUEST**

WE THE UNDERSIGNED WISH TO "CALL IN" FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT PANEL THE DECISION(S) OF THE CABINET TAKEN ON THEDAY OF.....20XX IN RELATION TO THE REPORT/MINUTE NUMBER SHOWN BELOW:

- councillor _____ (Sign) _____ (Print)
- ④ • councillor _____ (Sign) MICHAEL ANDREWS (Print)
- ⑤ • councillor _____ (Sign) HUGH MASON (Print)
- councillor _____ (Sign) _____ (Print)
- councillor _____ (Sign) _____ (Print)

Dated _____

<u>AGENDA ITEM/MINUTE NO.</u>		
<u>REPORT TITLE / MINUTE / DATE OF CABINET MEETING / PORTFOLIO DECISION MEETING / MIS DATE</u>		<u>TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT MEETING - CENTRAL SOUTH A</u> <u>MRS DAVE AND MC PONE ETC</u> <u>24/7/2016</u>
<u>REASONS FOR "CALL IN" and WHY</u>	Believe the decision may be based on inaccurate or incorrect information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Believe the decision may have been taken without adequate information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Believe the decision may be contrary to the council's agreed Budget and policy framework	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Once completed please return to Local Democracy Manager
Telephone: 023 9283 4055 Fax: 023 9284 1322

- Please provide a brief summary of reasons for call in
- Please state what alternative action it is proposed should be taken by decision maker

3/3

We believe the decision may be based on inaccurate information or incorrect information or may have been taken without adequate information:

- There was inadequate financial information.
- They did not ask residents what they thought: There was no consultation on the suspension of the MC and MB zones and there has been no review of the MC zone.
- Ignored officer recommendation on the MB zone: The decision taken on the MB zone to completely suspend it (not just operate it at specific times) was not an option on the committee paper and so residents may have been denied the opportunity to voice their views on this if they had known that it was a possibility.
- Other options were not considered and information not supplied on them: If the aim by the Cabinet Member was to remove parking zones in Southsea then removal of the KB, KC, KD, LA, LB and MA zones was not considered.
- The surveys around the MC zone were not considered or published prior to the meeting either on the website or as part of the decision meeting papers. The previous two surveys in some of these areas were not considered.
- The report of the Parking Officer of 2nd August 2005 was also not considered. This said: "Southsea around Albert Road - this area has long been affected by social parking from the pubs and restaurants in the area and also the Kings Theatre. There has been in some parts also been a knock on effect from displaced parking from the west Southsea scheme."

The decision may be contrary to the council's agreed Budget and policy framework:

- The current procedures for reviewing residents parking zones says that it will be done 12 months after the introduction of the zone. It is not yet 12 months since the introduction of the MC zone.
- The procedures for introducing residents parking zones say that informal surveys will be considered with a view to proceeding to a TRO. This has not happened with the areas around the MC zones. The only reason seems to be "turnout" of those replying to the survey but this is contrary to the council's current policy where there needs to be no minimum level of people returning surveys to proceed.

Alternative action proposed:

- That MB and MC zones are not suspended. That MC zone is reviewed after 12 months in line with the council's policies on residents parking zones and a decision on its continuation taken following the results of that consultation.
- That the survey results for the five areas around MC zone are published and considered by a meeting of the Cabinet Member for Transport and Traffic with a view to bringing forward TROs to introduce residents parking zones in the areas where a majority were in favour

