

Call In Outcome: D57783 Parking Charges on District Car Parks

Date: 21 November 2024

Report of: Head of Democratic Services

Report to: Director of Communities, Housing & Environment

Will the decision be open for call in? Yes No

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? Yes No

Brief summary

A meeting took place on 21 November 2024 to consider two call-in requests that were received in line with Leeds City Council's Executive and Decision-Making Procedure Rules .

The call-in requests related to a key delegated decision regarding Parking Charges on District Car Parks (D57783).

Having reviewed the decision, the Scrutiny Board (Environment, Housing and Communities) agreed by majority vote to recommend to the decision maker that the decision be reconsidered.

Consequently, the Scrutiny Officer is required to produce a report for the decision maker within three working days. The principles of the report were agreed by the Scrutiny Board (Environment, Housing & Communities) at the meeting.

In the case of an officer decision being referred for reconsideration - such as that in question – the decision maker must subsequently determine whether to confirm or vary the original decision.

Recommendations

- a) The Scrutiny Board (Environment, Housing and Communities) has recommended that delegated decision **D57783 Parking Charges on District Car Parks** is reconsidered. The Director of Communities, Housing and Environment is asked to determine whether the original decision should be confirmed or varied following reconsideration.

What is this report about?

- 1 A [call-in meeting](#) took place on 21 November 2024 to consider two call-in requests that were received in line with the [Executive and Decision-Making Procedure Rules](#) as set out within Leeds City Council's constitution.
- 2 The call-in requests related to a key delegated decision regarding [Parking Charges on District Car Parks \(D57783\)](#).
- 3 Once published, the full minutes of the call-in meeting will be available on the [meeting webpage](#). A webcast of the meeting is also available via the same site.
- 4 The Scrutiny Board members in attendance for the meeting were as follows:

Cllr S Ali	Cllr B Flynn	Cllr E Bromley	Cllr A Maloney
Cllr L Cunningham*	Cllr S Golton (Chair)	Cllr J Garvani	Cllr N Manaka
Cllr L Farley	Cllr K Haigh	Cllr R Jones	Cllr R Stephenson

**Cllr L Cunningham left the meeting at 11.30am and was not therefore present to participate in the determination of the outcome of the call-in.*

- 5 The other attendees at the meeting were as follows:

Cllr N Harrington	Lead Signatory to Call-In Request 1
Cllr C Hart-Brooke	Signatory to Call-In Request 1
Cllr P Stables	Lead Signatory to Call-In Request 2
Cllr M Rafique	Executive Member for Climate, Energy, Environment & Greenspace
James Rogers	Director Communities, Housing & Environment
Gary Bartlett	Chief Officer Highways and Transportation
John Mulcahy	Chief Officer Elections and Regulatory
Jason Singh	Head of Regulatory and City Centre Services
Mark Jefford	Senior Manager, Environmental Services
Nikki Deol	Head of Service, Legal Services
Rebecca Roberts	Section Head, Legal Services
Rebecca Atherton	Principal Scrutiny Advisor

- 6 Having reviewed the decision, the Scrutiny Board (Environment, Housing & Communities) agreed by majority vote to recommend to the decision maker that the decision be reconsidered.
- 7 Consequently, the Scrutiny Officer is required to produce a report for the decision maker within three working days. The principles of the report were agreed by the Scrutiny Board at the call-in meeting.
- 8 In the case of an officer decision being referred for reconsideration - such as that in question - the relevant Director must subsequently determine whether to confirm or vary the original decision.

Key Concerns Raised by the Scrutiny Board

- 9 When submitting a call-in request the signatories must detail why, in their opinion, the decision in question was not taken in accordance with the 'overarching principles of good governance and decision making' set out in [Article 13 of the Council constitution](#).

- 10 Having reviewed the decision in the context of these principles members of the Scrutiny Board recommended that the decision-makers should reconsider the original decision in light of the following concerns.
- 11 **Displacement Parking:** concern was expressed that the introduction of parking charges would lead to displacement parking on roads in surrounding areas. In reconsidering the decision, the Director is asked to provide clarity and reassurance regarding the pace at which additional Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) would be commenced should displacement parking create concerns for local residents. It was suggested that this may include consideration of introducing TROs ahead of the implementation of new charges in some circumstances.
- 12 **Impact on the economies of district centres:** It was acknowledged that district centres are highly localised with specific issues impacting to different degrees on their economies – for example, in Rothwell the proximity of out-of-town retail developments offering free parking was anticipated to be a particular challenge, whereas in Wetherby the impact of charges on summer cultural programmes was cited as a concern.
- 13 However, there were common concerns raised in relation to all district centres including ways in which a robust assessment could be made about the influence of new parking charges on footfall.
- 14 The Scrutiny Board was concerned that comparative data from other district centres outside of Leeds, where charges have already been introduced, had not been fully evaluated and may provide valuable evidence to reassure members and strengthen decision making.
- 15 In reconsidering the decision, the Director is asked to consider again the impact of car parking charges on local social and economic factors, including reviewing data/other forecasting methodologies about the potential for charges to affect the length of time people stay in a district centre and how much money they therefore might spend in the local economy.
- 16 **Proportionality:** Further to the above, the Director is asked to provide additional data to provide more assurance about the proportional impact of the introduction of charges on different stakeholder groups – for example, workers, shoppers and visitors. In relation to this Members highlighted particular challenges regarding the accessibility of district centres for some people living in the outer areas of the city with limited options for alternative methods of travel.
- 17 **Consultation:** While noting that amendments were made to the original scheme, Members expressed concern about the level of opposition to the proposed charges (reflected in the survey responses appended to the report to the decision maker) and ask that the Director again considers these factors.
- 18 **Equality of access:** The Director is asked to further consider the breadth of payment methods, particularly addressing those citizens without access to a bank card or parking app.

Next Steps

- 19 If the decision makers wish to confirm the original decision, that decision shall be submitted to the next Executive Board meeting unless urgency prevents that submission.
- 20 If urgency prevents the decision taker from submitting the decision to Executive Board for confirmation, section [8.2.6 of the Executive and Decision Making Procedure Rules](#) sets out that:

- a) The Director shall obtain the approval of the Executive Board member before implementation.
- b) Details of the Executive Member approval together with reasons of urgency will be included in the new delegated decision form.
- c) The Director and Executive Member will also be required to attend and given their reasoning to the next available meeting of the relevant Scrutiny Board.

21 If the decision makers decide to vary the decision the amended decision will not be defined as a key decision, regardless of the financial or impact thresholds. It will not therefore be necessary to include the proposed variation of decision in the List of Forthcoming Key Decisions or to give notice of the proposed decision.

What impact will this proposal have?

22 The Scrutiny Board recommended that the decision relating to Parking Charges on District Car Parks should be reconsidered.

23 Having reconsidered the decision, the decision maker is required to determine whether to confirm or vary the original decision in line with the process above.

How does this proposal impact the three pillars of the Best City Ambition?

Health and Wellbeing Inclusive Growth Zero Carbon

24 The impact of the original decision on the three pillars of the Best City Ambition is detailed in the [report to the decisions makers](#).

What consultation and engagement has taken place?

Wards affected:

Have ward members been consulted? Yes No

25 Consultation and stakeholder engagement regarding the original delegated decision is detailed in the [report to the Director](#).

What are the resource implications?

26 There are no specific resource implications linked to this report.

27 Prior to submitting a call-in request, a nominated signatory must ascertain the financial consequences to the authority of having called-in the decision. The outcome of this contact must be detailed on the call-in request proforma. Such contact had been evidenced in relation to both call-in requests regarding Parking Charges on District Car Parks.

What are the key risks and how are they being managed?

28 There are no key risks associated with this process.

What are the legal implications?

29 The Local Government Act 2000 requires that Overview and Scrutiny Committees be given the power to recommend that a decision made but not implemented, be reconsidered.

30 The Act gives local authorities considerable discretion over the detailed operation of the required call-in mechanism. However, in line with the requirements of the Act, in the case of this

decision the call-in procedure will be regarded as exhausted when the decision has been confirmed or amended following reconsideration.

Options, timescales and measuring success

What other options were considered?

31 In line with the requirements of the Executive and Decision-Making Procedure Rules set out in the Council's Constitution the Scrutiny Board was asked to determine whether a key decision subject to call-in requests should be released for implementation or referred to the decision maker for reconsideration.

How will success be measured?

32 In recommending to the decision-maker that the decision should be reconsidered the Scrutiny Board has fulfilled its requirements as set out in the Executive and Decision-Making Procedure Rules within the Constitution.

What is the timetable and who will be responsible for implementation?

33 The Scrutiny Officer is required to provide a report to the Director within three working days of the Scrutiny Board meeting.

34 If the Director wishes to confirm the original decision, that decision shall be submitted to by the decision maker to the next Executive Board meeting unless urgency prevents that submission.

Appendices

- None.

Background papers

- None