



Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board (City Development)

Date: 16th December 2008

Subject: Inquiry on Residents Parking Schemes

Electoral Wards Affected: All



Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

☐

Community Cohesion

☐

Narrowing the Gap

☐

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Scrutiny Board (City Development) has now completed its inquiry Residents Parking Schemes . The Board is now in a position to report on its findings and its conclusions and recommendations resulting from the evidence gathered.
- 1.2 A copy of the draft final report has been circulated to all Members of the Board for comments prior to this meeting and is now attached for consideration at today's meeting, along with a summary of the evidence considered during the inquiry.

2.0 Consultation

- 2.1 Scrutiny Board Procedure Rule 16.3 states that "where a Scrutiny Board is considering making specific recommendations it shall invite advice from the appropriate Director prior to finalising its recommendations. The Director shall consult with the appropriate Executive Member before providing any such advice. The detail of that advice shall be attached to the report".
- 2.2 In this case the specific recommendations involve the Director of City Development and Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods. They have each been invited to consult with their respective Executive Member and provide any advice that they wish to provide at this stage, before the Board Members, finalise their report. The following comments have been received from the Chief Highways Officer on behalf of the Director of City Development:

"I refer to your email of 26th November and the comprehensive report relating to the above. I would make the following comments:

1. The notion of Residents funding such schemes remains a concern given the likely high cost to residents (because of the statutory process and lengthy consultations involved) and the uncertainty around outcomes (there being no guarantee of a scheme being implemented on the ground because of the consultations and process involved). I can foresee a scenario where residents incur significant costs but achieve little benefit. In summary, there is no objection in principle to third parties funding schemes; the concern is that such an approach may cause more problems than would be solved.

2. Point 16, page 6 needs clarification please. If the intention is to re-direct Pay and Display revenue to residents to refund the cost of them implementing the scheme in the first instance, I am not aware of a mechanism to do this. Can the intention be clarified please.

3. Point 43, page 12. The change of policy to introduce a charge for residents parking and visitors parking permits is one which, given its City wide implications, needs to be approved by the Executive Board.”

2.3 Once the Board publishes its final report, the relevant Directors will be asked to formally respond to the Scrutiny Board’s recommendations within 2 months of receipt of the Board’s report in accordance with Scrutiny Board Procedure Rule 15.1.

3.0 Recommendations

3.1 The Board is requested to:-

- (i) Agree the Board’s final report and recommendations.
- (ii) Request that the relevant Directors formally respond to the Scrutiny Board’s recommendations within 2 months of receipt of the Board’s report.

Background Papers

None Used