



NOTICE OF MEETING

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT PANEL

FRIDAY, 6 FEBRUARY 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 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 (Pages 1 - 26)

Councillors Andrewes, Hugh Mason, Foster, Winnington, Hall, Vernon-Jackson, Sanders, Dowling and Hunt have asked that the decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation on 8 January 2015 in respect of item 3 on that agenda, " Residents Parking - Permit Charges" 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 "Residents' Parking Permit Charges" considered by the Cabinet Member on 8 January 2015. (appendix one)
- The draft Record of Decisions (minutes) of the meeting held by the Cabinet Member on 8 January 2015 (appendix two)
- The Decision Notice circulated to Members and published on Members' Information Service (appendix three)
- The call-in request and reasons for call in- (appendix four)

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 Lead 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 Lead call-in member
- The Lead 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 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 8 January 2015 should be upheld or be referred back to the Cabinet Member for reconsideration with the Panel's reasons why.

4 Presentation by Head of Finance and S151 Officer on the Budget 2014/15

A presentation will be provided to members and an opportunity will be given for questions.

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: 6 February 2015

Subject: Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation on 8 January 2015 in respect of item 3 on that agenda "Residents' Parking Permit Charges" - **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 8 January 2015 in respect of item 3 on that agenda "Residents' Parking Permit Charges". The report which was considered by the Cabinet Member on 8 January 2015 together with the draft Record of Decisions (Minutes) are attached as Appendices 1 and 2 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 4 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 8 January 2015 (Appendices 1 and 2).

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 8 January 2015 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: Appendix 1 - Report by Head of Service of Transport & Environment
Appendix 2 - Draft Record of Decisions (minutes)
Appendix 3 - Notice of decision
Appendix 4 - Reasons for call-in**

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	

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda item: **Title of meeting:** Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation**Date of meeting:** 8th January 2015**Subject:** Residents' Parking Permit Charges**Report by:** Head of Service - Transport and Environment**Wards affected:****Key decision:** Yes/No**Full Council decision:** Yes/No

-
1. **Purpose of report**
To consider the current permit charges and the introduction of charges where none exist, in order to secure the future of Residents' Parking.
 2. **Recommendations**
 - 2.1 **It is recommended that a Traffic Regulation Order is promoted to enable the notification process for the following items and allow for the subsequent public consultation.**
 - 2.1.1 **An annual charge is introduced for the first Resident permit per household, effective from 1st April 2015 (to be charged on renewal); (see pages 6&7 of the report for the schedule of proposed charges)**
 - 2.1.2 **An annual charge is introduced for all permits currently issued free of charge, effective from 1st April 2015 (to be charged on renewal);**
 - 2.1.3 **Existing permit charges are increased proportionately on an annual basis.**
 - 2.2 **Following the statutory Traffic Regulation Order notification process, a further report is brought back to the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation to consider the responses to the formal public consultation on proposals contained within this Order.**
 - 2.3 **That a subsequent report relating to the Review of Residents' Parking is brought before the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation in March 2015, reporting on the public consultation response on existing parking zones and agreeing the way forward.**
 3. **Background**

3.1 35 Residents' Parking Zones currently operate in Portsmouth. Between 1999 and 2002 the charge for a first Resident permit was £25.00 and the charge for a second permit per household was £50.00. The charge for a first Resident permit was removed in 2002, and since this time residents parking schemes as a whole have been operated at a net cost to Portsmouth City Council. Effectively, a free concession is currently offered which has a real cost, and in line with the need for the council to at least recover the costs of service provision where possible and practical it is being proposed that a charge equal to the average cost per user is levied.

3.2 The 2013-2015 Residents' Parking Programme was agreed in 2012 subject to confirmation of funding as at that time there was financial pressure on the Off Street Parking Reserve and it was not a sustainable source of funding for an ongoing programme. The Programme has been on hold since 2012.

4. Reasons for recommendations

4.1 The costs involved in proposing (public consultation, statutory processes), setting up (legal documents, road markings, posts, and metal sign plates), administering (letters, permits, and parking fines), enforcing and maintaining Residents' Parking Zones are around £380,000 per annum.

4.2 The public Budget Consultation in September 2014 asked people if a charge should be introduced for the first Resident permit. In general 46% of people agreed with a charge for a first permit; within parking zones 41% of people agreed with a charge for a first permit.

4.3 At the Full Council meeting on the 9 December 2014 it was agreed within the setting of the budget for 2015/16 measures would be introduced to provide additional parking income or seek a reduction in the costs of the operations and for these to be consulted upon with residents.

4.4 The table below shows comparative Resident permit charges among local authorities in the southern England region.

Local Authority	1 st Permit	2 nd Permit	Additional permits / info
Portsmouth	Free	£53.50	£107.50
Southampton	£30	£30	Cost dependent on zone
Winchester	£22	£50	£50
Fareham	£40	n/a	
Chichester	£40 / £160	£80 / £200	Cost dependent on zone
Brighton & Hove	£90 - £120	n/a	Cost dependent on zone / 50% discount for low emission vehicles
Hastings	£25 / £35 / £75	£40 / £56 / £120	Cost dependent on zone
Oxford	£50	£50	3 rd £100 / 4 th £150

Reading	Free	£80.00	
Canterbury	£60 / £83 / £138	n/a	Cost dependent on zone
Dover	£50 / £70	n/a	Cost dependent on zone
Gloucester	£50	£100	
Plymouth	£30	£30	
Bristol	£48	£96	3 rd £192 dependent on vehicle emissions
Weymouth & Portland	£70		

4.4 Exceptional permits have been introduced at various times over the past 15 years, and it is recommended that all permits are charged for to enable consistency and fairness to everyone involved in a parking zone. Central and local government policies on promoting sustainable transport and reducing car use can be supported by parking charges, for example commuting as the sole occupant of a vehicle.

4.5 It is recognised that some of the zones in place and schemes that have been requested may have been supported by residents in part due to the first permit being available free of charge. Introducing a charge for the first permit may help to establish which zones are needed and/or wanted, by way of a short survey. The survey, which will be referenced on the TRO, will be conducted in the form of a leaflet distributed to each household within the existing parking zones, providing the opportunity for responses on the future of each zone in light of a new charge for a first Resident Permit. Those currently ambivalent towards parking zones could have stronger views if free permits are not available.

Additionally, the opportunity will be available to keep a parking zone but improve its operation, which residents can opt for or make suggestions via the short survey.

5. Equality impact assessment (EIA)

A preliminary assessment has been undertaken, establishing that a full Equalities Impact Assessment is not required.

6. Legal Implications

The main provisions of the regulations regarding the variation of charges for on-street parking are contained in section 25 of the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. The power to vary charges at designated parking places is contained in section 46A of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Where any charges have been prescribed by a designation order or by an order under section 46A the charges may be varied by notice.

Notice of the variation shall be given by publishing in at least once in a newspaper circulating in the area in which the parking places are situated at least 21 days before the changes are due to come into force. The notice must:-

- A) Specify the date on which it is due to come into force;
- B) Identify every parking place to which the notice relates;
- C) Specify in respect of each parking place:-

- a. The charges payable for the parking place at the date that the notice is given
- b. The charges that will be payable when the notice comes into force

Where the notice relates to an on-street parking place the local authority shall cause copies of the notice to be displayed in prominent positions in the road in which the parking place is situated.

In addition, to ensure there is the right level of consultation on this matter, leaflets will be delivered to every resident and business within the existing residents parking zones. The leaflet will contain important information, explain why the 1st permit charge is being introduced the options that are subsequently available and ask for views on how the zones should operate in the future (if at all).

7. Finance Comments

- 7.1 The introduction of charges for all residents and other parking permits will ensure that the net costs of implementing and operating schemes will be funded from the income generated.
- 7.2 Currently the costs of operating residents parking schemes are funded from income generated from On Street parking and as such has diverted this income from being used for other purposes. These recommendations are in line with the current council policy of where possible and practical levying charges for services that offset the running costs of those services.

.....

Signed by:
Head of Transport & Environment Service
Pages 6-7: Current and proposed permit charges

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
Report to Strategic Directors' Board Jan 2013	Transport Planning, 4 th floor, Civic Offices
Report to Informal Cabinet May 2013	As above

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

.....

Signed by:
Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation

Permit Charges: Current and Proposed

a) General

	Current (£)	Proposed (£)
Administration Fee (charged to replace a permit)	21.00	22.00
Permit without a vehicle registration specified (except when issued as a Business permit below)	No surcharge	100.00 surcharge when paper permits are discontinued and replaced by electronic permits

b) Resident permits

Current (£)				Proposed (£)			
First	Second	Third	Subsequent (if authorised)	First	Second	Third	Subsequent (if authorised)
0.00	53.50	107.50	107.50	40.00	60.00	120.00	120.00

c) Business permits

Entitlement	Current (£)			Proposed (£)		
	First	Second	Third + subsequent	First	Second	Third + subsequent
All Businesses	107.50	215.00	325.00	120.00	240.00	360.00
Independent garage / vehicle repairs * (for use in customer vehicles only)	0	0	0 (Maximum 4)	Admin fee	Admin fee	Admin fee (Maximum 4)
				(valid Mon-Sat 7am-6pm only)		
Hotels / Guesthouses with up to 30 rentable rooms (off road parking is deducted from no. of permits issued) *	0	0	0	50.00	50.00	50.00
Charities *	Admin fee	Admin fee	Admin fee	Admin fee	Admin fee	Admin fee
School staff (non-teaching)	107.50	215.00	325.00	120.00	240.00	360.00
School staff (classroom based teaching staff)*	0	0	0	Admin fee	Admin fee	Admin fee
Essential Visitor permit holders (PCC affiliated)	0	0	0	Admin fee	Admin fee	Admin fee
Essential Visitor permit holders (e.g. NHS)	Admin fee	Admin fee	Admin fee	Admin fee	Admin fee	Admin fee

* also entitled to apply for unlimited Business permits at regular cost.

d) Visitor permits (scratch cards)

Entitlement	Current (£)	Proposed (£)
All Residents (with or without a vehicle)	Up to 12 hours: 0.95 Up to 24 hours: 1.80 4 consecutive days: 5.50 7 consecutive days: 9.80	Up to 12 hours: 1.00 Up to 24 hours: 1.90 4 consecutive days: 5.70 7 consecutive days: 10.00
Hotels / Guesthouses (with more than 30 rentable rooms)		
Professional visitors to schools (e.g. Ofsted)		
Community Centres		

e) Meter Exemption permits

These permits are to be phased out, and can be renewed as season tickets if required.

Entitlement	Current (£)	Proposed (£)		
		April 2015	April 2016	April 2017
Businesses	First: 107.50 Second: 215.00 Third and subsequent: 325.00	380.00 each	750.00 each	Full annual rate (currently 1160.00 each)

Residents on the boundary of a parking zone will retain the alternative option of applying for a Resident permit (see rates prescribed in paragraph b)) or can apply for a season ticket at the proposed rates above.

f) Seafront Trader permits

These permits are to be phased out, and can be renewed as season tickets if required.

Entitlement	Current (£)	Proposed (£)		
		April 2015	April 2016	April 2017
Businesses	210.00	380.00 each	750.00 each	Full annual rate (currently 1160.00 each)

(End of Report)

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 8 January 2015 at 5 pm in the Executive Meeting Room, 3rd Floor of the Guildhall.

Present

Councillor Ken Ellcome
Councillor Lynne Stagg
Councillor Ken Ferrett

1 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

2 Declaration of Members' Interests

There were no declarations of Member's Interests.

3 Residents' Parking - Permit Charges

(TAKE IN REPORT)

The Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation welcomed everyone to the meeting. He first asked the City Solicitor to provide an opinion on the legality of the recommendations in the report in light of the Barnet case. The City Solicitor advised that the Barnet case was different as the monies in that case were not being used to pay for the cost of administering the permits as would be the case in Portsmouth. His advice was that the recommendations before the Cabinet Member were lawful. The Cabinet Member advised that a substantial number of written representations had been received and had been made available to himself and to the Opposition Spokespersons.

The Cabinet Member invited the Head of Transport & Environment, Mr Simon Moon to introduce the report. He explained that the purpose of the report was to consider the current permit charges and the introduction of charges where none exist, in order to secure the future of residents' parking. He explained that the purpose of the meeting today was to seek authority from the Cabinet Member for a Traffic Regulation Order to be promoted to enable the notification process for the items set out in paragraph 2 of the report and to allow for the subsequent public consultation. Mr Moon advised that paragraph 3.1 of the report provided a brief summary of how the 35 residents' parking zones have operated since 1999. Paragraph 3.2 of the report states that the residents' parking programme has been on hold since 2012.

Mr Moon advised that paragraph 4.4 of the report shows a table comparing resident permit charges among local authorities in the south of England region and advised that only Reading currently offers the first parking permit

free of charge.

Mr Moon said that pages 6 and 7 of the report set out permit charges both current and proposed. He drew attention to an error in this part of the report. On page 6 with the table of charges, against resident permits it suggests third permits will be issued automatically and only subsequent permits to that have to be authorised. The norm with residents parking schemes is that up to two permits will be issued and third and subsequent permits have to be authorised.

The Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation asked for additional clarification about the reasons for suspending the residents' parking programme in 2012. Mr Moon said that the affordability of schemes meant that there was considerable pressure on the Traffic & Transportation cash limit because of the increasing costs of enforcing the schemes. He confirmed that when the schemes were suspended the Council was losing approximately £150K per year. Councillor Ellcome said that although one or two schemes had been in profit at the time of the suspension, the other 33 schemes were not profitable.

In response to queries the following matters were clarified:-

- Councillor Ellcome said that as part of the measures included in the budget, residents in each parking zone would be asked whether or not they wished to continue it or not. There would be no point in reviewing the parking zones if residents wished to scrap them. The choice was either to scrap the scheme or pay for it;
- Councillor Ellcome confirmed that questionnaires would be sent out asking whether residents would be prepared to pay for a scheme or would prefer not to have a scheme;
- Councillor Ellcome confirmed that he expected to take a decision in March once the consultation, if approved today had been carried out.

The Head of Transport & Environment explained that the purpose of the meeting today was to request authority from the Cabinet Member to start the process and once this had been given, specific steps had to be followed. Letters would be sent to residents explaining what was happening and asking them whether they want a scheme with a charge or not. A report would be brought back to the Cabinet Member in March. A further report would be needed following a review of the existing residents schemes with details such as the times when the restrictions would be operative.

- The Cabinet Member confirmed that if the majority of residents were against paying a charge for a scheme, it would not be imposed upon them. If there was no scheme there would be no charge and residents would have to park where they could;

- Councillor Ellcome confirmed that where residents in zones agree to pay, they will be kept, but where residents were not prepared to pay for a parking zone scheme, there would not be a scheme. A query was raised as to whether there was any way in which a charge could be imposed just for second cars and commercial vehicles and Councillor Ellcome said that he would need to take advice from officers. Denise Bastow advised that to do this a high charge would have to be made for second and third permits due to the small number of second and third permits issued.

The Cabinet Member said that he had read all the written deputations and a number of them had commented about lack of enforcement. The Parking Manager said that this was not borne out by the figures. Last year 40,000 parking charge notices were issued. 10,000 of those were issued in residents' parking zones relating to those parking without the correct permits. He said that a careful eye is kept on all schemes and it is possible to gauge from the number of PCNs (Parking Charge Notices) being issued as to where enforcement needed to be increased. He confirmed that there were more enforcement problems late at night as although there are staff on duty, current terms and conditions for staff make working until 2am unattractive.

Councillor Ellcome said that he would be happy to allow 4 minutes for each deputation to be made. The first deputation was made by Ms Barbara Jones whose deputation included the following points:-

- She was against the first permit charge and felt that to go from no charge at all to £40 was unreasonable;
- She disagreed with the assertion in 4.4 of the report that charging for permits would lead to fairness to everyone as non-car owners were penalised as their visitors with cars had to buy scratch cards which was a very expensive option;
- She queried why there was a need to carry out a further consultation when a survey in September showed that the majority did not support a charge for a first permit.
- Ms Jones did not see how the situation in Portsmouth differed from that in the Barnet case.
- She was concerned also with displacement of the problem from one area to another.

Mr Wareham then gave his deputation which included the following points:-

- He was not in favour of residents' parking zones. He said that it was not a question of the money but that he wanted something in return. He

wanted the right to park anywhere where it was legal to do so and;

- He said he thought the best way forward was to reassess everything.

Honorary Alderman Tom Blair gave his deputation which included the following points:-

- There had been problems with parking in the city for a long time and the residents' parking zones were intended to solve this. Initially the parking zones were adequately enforced but as the scheme expanded, enforcement reduced. People experienced problems in finding somewhere to park from around 6 pm at night and having to pay £40 on top of the difficulty in finding a space to park makes matters worse;
- He thinks the cost of the schemes should be reduced;
- He said that paragraph 4.5 concerning consultation appeared to be confused.

The Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation said that a proper survey would be done in the same way as the original survey had been carried out. There would be a form for completion and the consultation results would be brought back to a future meeting.

Ms Gill Norman then gave her deputation which included the following points:-

- She was speaking for the operators of Clarence Pier which came under Proposal F Seafront Trader Permits. She said that this proposal would result in an increase from £210 per annum to £1160;
- She said this would be bad for the general seafront economy;
- She suggested that given the seasonal nature of the businesses on the seafront, there should be an opportunity to pay monthly.
- She said that the Park & Ride facility does not go as far as the seafront;
- Her concern was that she wanted her staff to be able to park safely and securely especially as they often worked late at night and that the parking should either be free or reasonably priced.

Councillor Ellcome said that he would look at this but mentioned that it was possible to use the park-and-ride and then change to the hovercraft bus to get to the seafront.

Mr Billy Edwards, an owner of some concessions on the seafront, then gave

his deputation which included the following points:-

- He said that the increase was too high. He had many staff who could not always find a car park space;
- He said that his business was seasonal;
- He said that in winter he had maintenance issues and health and safety matters to deal with.

Councillor Ellcome thanked members of the public for their deputations

The City Solicitor was asked about whether there was a contract where a person had paid a parking charge for a space but no space was available. The City Solicitor advised that this was not a contractual relationship but was governed under the Road Traffic Regulation Act which only gives a right to be able to park if there is a space available as the benefit was to Council Tax payers in a whole area where they benefit from having a parking zone.

Mr Michael Robinson, Parking Manager said that parking regulations restricts parking and traffic and there were always winners and losers.

Councillor Lynne Stagg, speaking as an opposition spokesperson, queried the figures in the report but was advised that these were estimates.

Councillor Gerald Vernon-Jackson then made his deputation which included the following points:-

- There were two options in the consultation - either pay £40 or lose a parking zone. He asked whether there would be an additional question, being whether residents wished to keep the scheme as it is.

Councillor Ellcome said that on the basis of the potential deficit he is not anticipating including that additional question.

Councillor Gerald Vernon-Jackson continued with his deputation.-

- He believed it is worrying that there is no question in the survey about keeping the scheme as it is and thinks that should be an option;
- He said that a parking review had not yet been completed yet this report seemed to arrive at a conclusion before a review had started;
- He said that the words from seafront traders in their deputations were very worrying and that an increase from £210 to £1160 seemed excessive. He believed this was the wrong thing to do when we are trying to promote a thriving seafront;

- He said that the two schemes that were making money for the Council had been suspended. He felt this should be looked at within the review but that a decision to charge everyone before the review had completed seemed to imply that an outcome has been decided;
- He felt that things appeared to be being done the wrong way around.

Councillor Lee Hunt then made his deputation which included the following points:-

- He felt the decision should be deferred;
- There appears to be a discrepancy in the figures.
- There appeared to be a perception that the MB and MC zones were making a loss rather than making a profit;
- The consultation needs to be fair and he feels there is a need to ask an additional question in the questionnaire ie whether residents wish to keep the scheme as it is;
- He said there appeared to be confusion about the parking review and his view is that the entire matter needs to be re-thought.

Councillor Michael Andrewes then gave his deputation which included the following points:-

- He commented that there had been a large number of written representations in a short period;
- He wants what is best for Portsmouth & Southsea and does not think that there should be taxation without a democratic and a fair process being carried out;
- There needs to be a city-wide review of this matter which should be democratic and transparent. He said that this matter should wait until that had been completed;
- People in Southsea have a great burden on parking spaces owing to the numbers of people coming to shop. This provided an economic benefit. He was concerned about people being able to park in Southsea but now there would be a charge where it used to be free;
- The MB and MC zones appeared to have worked well and produced money for the Council. However, if residents wanted these zones to be reinstated they would have to pay a charge of £40 for the first permit;

- He said there was a problem of displacement and areas surrounded by parking zones would have a huge parking problem.

The City Solicitor confirmed that the residents' parking permit charges report was not a key decision.

Councillor Ellcome said that the MB and MC zones would be included as part of this consultation.

- He said that the Liberal Democrats suspended parking zones in 2012 owing to the loss of £150K per annum;
- He said that the MB and MC zones have not been in force long enough to see whether or not they would be profitable over a 12 month period;
- Councillor Ellcome said he was concerned about an option to keep the status quo as some areas were running with a deficit;
- Councillor Ellcome said that he and the administration took the view that it is up to residents to decide what happens in their areas. He said that if a charge of £40 were to be imposed, this would equate to 75 pence a week.

Susan Aistrope, Finance Manager explained that the actual running cost of the schemes would be £180K net of income. The annual budget set to implement news scheme is £200K giving a total of £380K. She said that these were estimates as the costs of charging enforcement officers and enforcing PCNs was not known exactly. She said there is an annual budget of £200K for a new scheme set up. This would cover consultation signage and implementation. Once that limit had been reached then they would stop introducing schemes in that financial year.

Councillor Ellcome was asked whether if the amount of £200K for setting up a new scheme was taken out of the figures, would there still be a shortfall? Councillor Ellcome said that he did not have that information and would have to advise at a later stage.

The City Solicitor said that it would be acceptable to put in a question on the survey - Do you want the scheme or not? However this would usually be delegated to officers, so by going out to consultation PCC was already going further than it needed to legally. However, any questionnaire would first go to the City Solicitor for approval

Councillor Stagg felt there must be other ways of generating revenue other than by introducing a £40 charge. She felt there was not enough time to look at alternatives.

Councillor Ellcome said that he was not aware of other suggestions to raise revenue and that this was initial consultation.

Councillor Ken Ferrett, speaking as an Opposition Spokesperson, said that consultation was likely to be fair and that a simple 'yes/no' answer would seem to be straight-forward. He said that the schemes were currently costing the Council Tax payers money and that the survey would also take into account representations made by those people who do not currently have parking zones and who may wish to.

In response to a question about whether the £200K in the budget this year for surveying new parking areas had been spent, Susan Aistrop said that this was on-street and therefore outside cash limits but that none of that had been spent at this point.

Councillor Ellcome said that he had received a letter from Mike Hancock MP about this matter and also from Councillor Eleanor Scott. He had taken into account their comments. Councillor Ellcome also said that although he was going to approve the first recommendation the actual amounts of the charge would be decided at the March meeting. This was to allow for further clarification on costs so that if he could reduce the costs following receipt of that information, he would do so.

DECISION:

(1) A Traffic Regulation Order is promoted to enable the notification process for the following items and allow for the subsequent public consultation:

(i) An annual charge is introduced for the first resident permit per household, effective from 1st April 2015 (to be charged on renewal);

(see pages 6&7 of the report for the schedule of proposed charges)

(ii) An annual charge is introduced for all permits currently issued free of charge, effective from 1st April 2015 (to be charged on renewal);

(iii) Existing permit charges are increased proportionately on an annual basis.

(2) Following the statutory Traffic Regulation Order notification process, a further report is brought back to the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation to consider the responses to the formal public consultation on proposals contained within this Order.

The meeting concluded at 6.30 pm.

**Notification to all Members of the council
of decisions by the**

Issued by the Head of Customer, Community & Democratic Services

Friday 9 January 2014

The details set out below will be published in the next Members' Information Service, but in the meantime are notified to all Councillors in accordance with Rule 15(a) of the Policy and Review Panels Procedure Rules

The following decisions have been taken by the Cabinet (or individual Cabinet members) and will be implemented unless the call-in procedure is activated. Rule 15 of the Policy and Review Procedure Rules requires a call-in notice to be signed by any 5 members of the Council. The call-in request must be made to Democratic.Services@portsmouthcc.gov.uk and must be made by not later than 5pm on Friday 16 January 2015.

If you want to know more about a proposal, please contact the officer indicated. You can also see the report(s) on the Council's web site at www.portsmouth.gov.uk

	WARD	DECISION	OFFICER CONTACT
		<p>Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation Decision Meeting - 8 January 2015</p> <p>The cabinet Member has made the following decisions:-</p>	<p>Joanne Wildsmith Customer, Community & Democratic Services Tel: 9283 4057 (Parking permit queries to the Parking Team Tel: 9268 8310) joanne.wildsmith@portsmouthcc.gov.uk</p>
3	All Wards	<p>Residents Parking - Permit Charges</p> <p>DECISIONS:</p> <p>(1) A Traffic Regulation Order is promoted to enable the notification process for the following items and allow for the subsequent public consultation:</p> <p>(i) An annual charge is introduced for the first Resident permit per household,</p>	<p>Simon Moon, Head of Transport and Environment</p>

	WARD	DECISION	OFFICER CONTACT
		<p>effective from 1st April 2015 (to be charged on renewal); <i>(refer to pages 6&7 of the report for the schedule of proposed charges)</i></p> <p>(ii) An annual charge is introduced from for all permits currently issued free of charge, effective from 1st April 2015 (to be charged on renewal);</p> <p>(iii) Existing permit charges are increased proportionately on an annual basis.</p> <p>(2) Following the statutory Traffic Regulation Order notification process, a further report is brought back to the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation to consider the responses to the formal public consultation on proposals contained within this Order.</p>	

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 8 DAY OF JANUARY 2015 IN RELATION TO THE REPORT/MINUTE NUMBER SHOWN BELOW:
ITEM 3 - RESIDENTS PARKING - PERMIT CHARGES

- councillor Sign) MICHAEL ANDREWS (Print)
- councillor Sign) HUGH MASON (Print)
- councillor Sign) MARGARET FOSTER (Print)
- councillor Sign) MATTHEW WENNINGTON (Print)
- councillor Sign) TERRY HALL (Print)

Dated _____

<u>AGENDA ITEM/MINUTE NO.</u>		
<u>REPORT TITLE / MINUTE / DATE OF CABINET MEETING / PORTFOLIO DECISION MEETING / MIS 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 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

04/10 - SEE ATTACHED

Reasons for call-in.

The decision may be based on inaccurate or incorrect information and may have been taken without adequate information because:

1. There was no clarity on what the charges outlined in the consultation would be. Indeed, it was not clear whether any specific charge would be included in the consultation at all.
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. This is relevant as £200,000 of the saving the charge will provide will be spent on the year-on-year introduction of piecemeal parking zones, something the review may not agree with and the Cabinet Member did not know about before the decision meeting and that the council administration has said that no new zones will be introduced before 2017. The decision should be sent back so this gap between stated policy and this review can be accommodated.
4. The remaining £180,000 was inaccurate/incorrect because:
 - a. It does not include the £86,000 surplus the Council says MC and MB zones make
 - b. There was no estimate of the proceeds from the other charges in the report, introducing an online system for applying for permits, more efficient or 2 hour MC style zones.
5. There was no full breakdown of first permit charges in other areas and the list that was given seems to be partial. Areas that for example charge less than £40 or have a free first permit for all or some include Birmingham, Exeter, Reading, Lambeth, Richmond.
6. There was no detailed equality impact assessment, especially regarding blue badge holders.
7. There was no consideration of the Atkins report on residents parking
8. There was no consideration of the displacement effects the charge will bring
9. 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 in the already agreed

Appendix 4 to Report to Scrutiny Management Panel

Residents Parking Permit Charges - Call In

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.

This page is intentionally left blank