

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY BOARD
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
8 January 2019 (7.30 - 9.00 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Conservative Group	Ray Best, John Crowder, Philippa Crowder, Judith Holt, Robby Misir, John Mylod, Bob Perry and Timothy Ryan
Residents' Group	Ray Morgon and Barry Mugglestone
Upminster & Cranham Residents' Group'	Clarence Barrett and Gillian Ford
Independent Residents' Group	+Jan Sargent and Graham Williamson
Labour Group	Keith Darvill (Vice-Chair)
North Havering Residents' Group	Darren Wise (Chairman)

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Natasha Summers, Melvin Wallace and Nisha Patel

+Substitute members: Councillor Jan Sargent (for Natasha Summers), Councillor John Crowder (for Melvin Wallace) and Councillor Timothy Ryan (for Nisha Patel).

The Chairman reminded Members of the action to be taken in an emergency.

17 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

18 KEEPING HAVERING MOVING - THE PARKING STRATEGY AND HIGHWAYS RESURFACING POLICY

The report before members detailed the call-in of a Cabinet decision relating to Keep Havering Moving - adoption of the Parking Strategy and the Highways Resurfacing Policy.

A requisition signed by Councillors Ray Morgon and Keith Darvill had called-in the Cabinet decision.

The reasons for the call-in were as follows:

1. The report failed to demonstrate that the changes would deliver less congestion and better parking management. Where would the additional manpower required be coming from to enforce additional parking restrictions? It was also unclear from the draft parking strategy that the proposals enabled the Council to respond positively to the stated pressures.
2. There was no evidence/data to demonstrate that the proposed parking arrangements would meet local need. How do the council know what that need is?
3. Many areas around commuter hubs already had parking restrictions to stop commuter parking. How would compulsory controlled parking zones improve on this?
4. There was a lack of detail on which roads would be impacted by the compulsory CPZs.
5. There were numerous references in the draft strategy to CPZs, but it did not fully explain whether this actually means resident parking permits, as opposed to yellow lines, it needed to be made very clear whether CPZs around commuter hubs were one or the other.
6. Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) proposals should be subject to extensive local consultation on a ward by ward basis rather than a borough-wide imposition.
7. The financial implications suggested that there were none in the strategy, but may be in delivering actions. The financial implications should clearly set out there may be financial implications for residents should they be subject to resident parking permits and the current charges.
8. The financial implications should include the local authority parking accounts (as required by s55 of The Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984) for the last two years to add financial context.
9. How would the council identify those areas that need removal of grass verges to provide additional parking space and how would the conversion work be funded?
10. Conversion of grass verges to hard standing should not necessarily be limited to areas where CPZs were introduced
11. Parking pressures differed widely and were more acute in neighbourhoods of high housing density.

12. How would the lack of parking spaces on new developments be managed to reduce the impact on available parking space outside the development?

13. There should be a review of existing regeneration proposals which currently tended to provide less parking capacity which a knock-on effect of increasing demand will have leading to pressure on areas nearby to the individual regeneration.

14. There was no evidence to demonstrate that parking enforcement was fair,
Transparent, robust and evidence led.

15. There was no evidence to demonstrate that parking arrangements would be consistent around all transport hubs and Town Centres. What impact assessment had been carried out to ascertain the impact on local businesses resulting from the proposed changes.

16. How would increasing parking charges around businesses support their growth?

17. What consultation or evidence gathering had been undertaken with the local business community in forming this strategy?

18. There was a lack of information on the worst congestion hotspots in the borough.

19. The report/recommendations should be more specific on how the strategy would improve air quality and improve road safety supported by evidence in each case.

20. What were the incentive schemes to encourage residents to move away from using their car and own less polluting vehicles? There was no detail on where the money will come from to do this.

21. The outline proposals point to inconsistency of approach across the borough. It was unclear whether the report was proposing a one size fits all policy or tailor- made solutions.

22. Who would decide how each zone would be tailored to meet the needs of local people? If a zone was tailored made, how could it be consistent across the borough?

23. How would the council determine what was considered a commercial vehicle?

24. How will the targeting of overnight parking of business vehicles be addressed?
How will it affect local businesses? What threshold would be applied (eg a BT Van or a Simply Flowers from Cranham van)?

25. There was insufficient evidence within the report to support the assertion that the proposals complement other strategic policies such as the Local Plan, Air Quality Action Plan, and the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment;

26. Where was the parking strategy within the Local Plan?

27. The Cabinet and Members scrutinising such proposals should receive more information and data relating to borough wide car journeys relating to travel to work, travel to study(schools and colleges).

28. The Parking Operation Plan should be prepared in draft form for consideration with the Parking Strategy.

29. Where was the evidence to demonstrate the level of out of borough commuter parking and where it was located?

30. What was the application criteria for a PSPO around schools and what were the viable alternatives to PSPOs?

31. Given that all new parking schemes had to be approved by ward councillors, what involvement would they have to any changes in their ward?

Highways Resurfacing Policy

a)The report failed to demonstrate that the worst first roads and pavements had been determined when no account was taken of reactive repairs spend, advice from Area Liaison Officers who regularly inspected our streets, information from the CRM system, Ward Councillor views, complaints, insurance claims, footfall etc.

b) The financial implications for the Highways Resurfacing Policy failed to demonstrate indicative projections for raising increased revenue to service borrowing and the timescales envisaged from the implementation of the proposals.

c) There was a lack of detail on the capital and revenue costs resulting from the application of the Horizon system.

d) Greater clarity needed to be demonstrated in the method of selecting priorities of the highways and footways to be repaired, particularly where a number of such highways and footways were in a similar condition.

Prior to the meeting Highways officers had submitted a response to each of the points raised above.

During the debate several Members expressed concerns that the subject matter had not been consulted on with the relevant Overview & Scrutiny Sub-Committee before production of the Cabinet decision.

The Cabinet Member for Environment advised that the Cabinet decision was first reading on the subject and that there would be more consultation and debate prior to the final report being produced and that the document showed a statement of intent.

Members were also advised that an All-Member briefing would take place prior to the implementation of the plan.

The Leader of the Council explained that that Council had secured extra funding of £30million over the next three years to assist with highways maintenance.

In response to a question relating to flexibility of determination of roads and areas where CPZs would be introduced officers advised that flexibility existed and residents would be given the choice of which parking options were introduced.

Some Members felt it made more sense to consult with ward councillors in the particular area rather than use the Highways Advisory Committee (HAC).. Officers advised that HAC was the correct vehicle for making the decisions and that all ward members would be fully consulted with.

In relation to the highways resurfacing works Members were advised that full survey of the borough's roads and footways had been carried out and the data was being currently being inputted into the corporate computer software.

Members agreed that there needed to be further investigations into the classification of commercial vehicles which were parked in residential areas.

In response to a question relating to conversion costs of converting a green space to a parking space, the cost was approximately £12,000.

Members also suggested that investigation into the future provision of electric charging points be considered as a matter of priority.

At this point The Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Environment left the chamber.

The vote for the decision as to whether to uphold or dismiss the call-in was carried by 9 votes to 7.

Councillors Darvill, Sargent, Williamson, Ford, Barrett, Morgon and Mugglestone voted to uphold the call-in.

Councillors Wise, J. Crowder, Perry, Ryan, Mylod, Misir, P. Crowder, Holt and Best voted to dismiss the call-in.

It was **RESOLVED** that the call-in of the Cabinet Decision dated 12 December 2018 be dismissed.

Chairman