

**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 CHARLES

- 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 \_\_\_\_\_

|   |  |                                     |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| <b><u>AGENDA ITEM/MINUTE NO.</u></b>  |  |                                     |
| <b><u>REPORT TITLE / MINUTE / DATE OF CABINET MEETING / PORTFOLIO DECISION MEETING / MIS DATE</u></b> |  |                                     |
| <b><u>REASONS FOR “CALL IN” and WHY</u></b>   | 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