

Working Plymouth

Wednesday 8 July 2015

PRESENT:

Councillor Ricketts, in the Chair.

Councillor Murphy, Vice Chair.

Councillors Ball, Deacon, Fletcher, Hendy, Jarvis, Martin Leaves, Morris, Storer and Wheeler.

Also in attendance: Paul Anderson (Account Manager), Mike Artherton (Parking, Marine and Highways Policy Service Manager), Councillor Coker (Cabinet Member for Strategic Transport and Planning), Victoria Hutchins (Watchman in Chief), Gill Peele (Lead Officer), Helen Rickman (Democratic Support Officer), Dan Sharpe (Senior Planner), Adrian Trim Councillor Vincent (Cabinet Member for Streetscene) and Councillor Vincent (Cabinet Member for Streetscene).

The meeting started at 4.00 pm and finished at 6.00 pm.

Note: At a future meeting, the committee will consider the accuracy of these draft minutes, so they may be subject to change. Please check the minutes of that meeting to confirm whether these minutes have been amended.

46. TO NOTE THE APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Members noted the appointment of Councillor Ricketts as Chair and Councillor Murphy as Vice Chair for the Working Plymouth scrutiny panel 2015 – 2016.

47. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest in accordance with the code of conduct.

48. MINUTES

It was agreed that the minutes of 18 March 2015 were an accurate record of the meeting.

49. CHAIR'S URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of Chair's Urgent Business.

50. WORKING PLYMOUTH TERMS OF REFERENCE

Members noted the Working Plymouth terms of reference.

51. WORK PROGRAMME

Councillor Vincent (Cabinet Member for Streetscene) and Councillor Coker (Cabinet Member for Strategic Transport and Planning) provided Members with a brief overview of their portfolio responsibility priorities in order to help inform the Working Plymouth work programme.

Members were advised that –

- (a) priorities for Councillor Vincent's portfolio included refuse collections (specifically removing waste bins from the road), Waterfront improvements and street furniture replacement. The aim was to improve the look of the city by 2020 in order to attract visitors and businesses;
- (b) priorities for Councillor Coker's portfolio included maintaining the impetus from the Transport Board and the Local Enterprise Partnership, working with colleagues in Devon, Torbay and Somerset to get the maximum funding for transport issues in Plymouth, overseeing the contract for highways maintenance due in 2017 and overseeing the development of the Plymouth Plan.

In response to questions raised it was reported that –

- (c) recycling in the city was currently at a 38% collection rate; the Council was looking to encourage schools and outlets such as restaurants to increase their recycling;
- (d) the Fort Side Business Park was a major development currently under proposal; Councillor Coker confirmed that he was due to have a meeting with the Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Infrastructure to discuss the long term objectives for the area. The traffic modelling for this scheme would be shared with Working Plymouth once it was available.

Members discussed the inclusion of the following items on the Working Plymouth work programme and agreed to recommend them to the Co-operative Scrutiny Board for approval:

- Recycling food waste
- Update on the Mayflower 2020 celebrations
- Tamar Bridge and Torpoint Ferry – tags, charges and repair work
- Difference between city centre parking and district parking
- 1000 club in relation to apprenticeships/ encouraging women back into work
- Waste
- History Centre
- Building regulation and planning department and how they work together
- Section 106 money – collecting/ spending

Order of Business

With the permission of the Chair, the order of business on the agenda was amended, as set out below in the minutes.

52. INDIVIDUAL STREET PARKING ISSUES

Mike Artherton (Parking, Marine and Highways Policy Service Manager) provided Members with a presentation on individual street parking issues.

Members were advised that –

- (a) a review upon On Street Parking was undertaken in September 2010 to

assess residents parking, business permits and 'forced rotation'; three main changes included increased residents parking in specific areas, pay and display bays in under-utilised areas as well as dual use sites;

- (b) forced rotation was implemented in certain sites in Crownhill and Union Street whereby the machine would issue a ticket for a specific period of time making people unable to park there again once the ticket had run out;
- (c) a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) was a defined area requiring vehicles to display a valid permit during prescribed hours in order to restrict non-residential use; there were 51 Controlled Parking Zones in Plymouth with 22 variations. The first zone was implemented in 1974;
- (d) the review was undertaken because there was a lack of a defined criteria to determine requests for CPZs; the review started in December 2013 and heard evidence from MPs, Councillors, Neighbourhood Liaison Officers, the Chamber of Commerce, Plymouth Community Homes and transport and planning officers. The review was concluded in April 2014 and approved by Cabinet in July 2014;
- (e) as a result of the review it was determined that the trigger to instigate a CPZ was to determine if 20% or more of residents parking was regularly occupied by non-residential vehicles; residents were also required to inform elected members of challenges experienced when parking and members would work with the community to help address issues. A ballot would then be undertaken whereby a 30% response was required to assess if a CPZ should be implemented – 51% or more of those having responded to the ballot would need to be in support of the CPZ for it to be successful;
- (f) the review determined that all future CPZ's should apply 7 days a week, that the minimum intervention to address the problem should be used, restrictions should apply for 3, 6, 12 or 24 hours a day, hours of operation of a CPZ should be determined co-operatively between members and residents and vehicles exceeding 5.5m should be excluded;
- (g) since the review officers had supported Members at community meetings, created a 'polling card' to support consultation and supported members balloting in four wards; three ballots had achieved the required return rate and new CPZ schemes were now being implemented in St Judes, Crownhill and Stoke.

In response to questions raised it was reported that –

- (h) parking spaces were approximately 5.5m in length therefore would not exclude traditional transit vans;
- (i) it was the role of Members to work with their local community to assess the needs of residents and establish if there was a perceived need for a CPZ;
- (j) officers were not aware that people were parking in residential areas across the city and then getting a taxi to the train station as it was cheaper than parking however agreed to look into this issue;
- (k) officers were not aware when the contract for the privately operated car park

in Mutley was due to run out however would confirm and report back to Members;

- (l) of the four CPZ ballots that had been undertaken recently, only three were successful;
- (m) officers were assessing if 'forced rotation' parking would be beneficial at the Royal William Yard to help ease parking issues;
- (n) officers were aware that new housing developments and the variation of houses to HMOS (houses of multiple occupation) were causing increased pressure on the highway network; the Cabinet Member for Strategic Transport and Planning was continuing to work on this issue;
- (o) officers agreed to provide the CPZ presentation to Members.

The Chair thanked Councillors Vincent and Coker for their attendance at the meeting.

Agreed that Street Parking Issues would be included on the panel's work programme for a further update to be provided at a future meeting.

53. **HIGHWAYS PARTNERSHIP / LIVING STREETS**

Adrian Trim (Head of Highways, Parking and Marine Services), Victoria Hutchins (Watchman in Chief), Paul Anderson (Account Manager), Dan Sharpe (Senior Planner), Councillor Coker (Cabinet Member for Strategic Transport and Planning) and Councillor Vincent (Cabinet Member for Streetscene) provided Members with a presentation upon the Highways Partnership/ Living Streets.

Members were advised that –

- (a) initially in 2013 there was a small budget set aside for highways schemes in the city that could be requested by the police, MPs, local Councillors and local residents; there were approximately 2000 requests per year of which it was considered that only 1200 applications were valid;
- (b) the valid schemes would be judged alongside a set criteria to ensure they were of benefit to the city; out of the 1200 valid applications, officers considered they could only realistically deliver 10 requests;
- (c) Councillor Coker, as Cabinet Member for Transport, amended the scheme to the Living Streets budget whereby ward councillors were allocated a sum of money, approximately £4000 per ward, to help prioritise works via consultation with local residents;
- (d) the programme was designed for small highways schemes that, when implemented, could benefit the quality of life for local communities;
- (e) the Living Streets scheme was introduced as a pilot and mistakes had occurred due to miscommunication, but the workings of the scheme had improved;
- (f) it was considered that local Councillors were best placed to advise on

priorities for their local community. Once a scheme had been submitted it was the job of officers to develop initial costs and design the scheme; this could take up to six weeks;

- (g) schemes relating to Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) or works involved with underground services could take up to a minimum of six weeks to progress due to the requirement to advertise; planned traffic or highways works to be undertaken in the area would also be considered;
- (h) scheme costs were continually reviewed to ensure that Councillors were provided with the most accurate information available; the Council was only charged for the cost of work incurred;
- (i) schemes involving TROs including double yellow lines, controlled parking zones or speed limits had to be advertised due to a statutory requirement; this added costs and time to the scheme;
- (j) 90 schemes had been delivered through the Living Streets programme;
- (k) Councillors had been provided with their Living Streets information packs for 2015/16 and had been invited to meet with officers to discuss options;
- (l) officers fell behind with schemes in the last quarter of the financial year as several applications were committed during this period and Officers were not prepared for this;
- (m) applications linking to white bar markings or disabled parking bays should not be submitted through the Living Streets budget as these were subject to separate rules and regulations.

In response to questions raised it was reported that –

- (n) pedestrian crossings were included within the scope of the Living Streets scheme;
- (o) the Living Streets table of schemes did not list who requested the scheme or when it was requested; Officers agreed to provide this information for future schemes as well as monthly updates including updated information as the schemes progress, the date schemes were requested and approved, estimated budget figures, actual budget figures and a rolling balance per Ward/Councillor;
- (p) Officers had undergone training for the administration of the Living Streets scheme;
- (q) Officers took on board comments that Ward Councillors should see all applications for the Living Streets scheme before they were added to the published list;
- (r) Officers were double checking applications to ensure that requests were allocated to the correct ward budget;
- (s) Officers agreed to email Working Plymouth Councillors with a copy of the

Living Streets powerpoint presentation;

- (t) every scheme was assessed on its own merits;
- (u) the Council was under contract with Amey to undertake works associated with the Living Streets scheme; Members were assured that value for money was provided;
- (v) works undertaken by Amey were of a high quality and those employed were accredited to work on the highway network. Services that had to be re-routed because of works carried out by Amey would be put back correctly.

The Chair thanked Officers and Cabinet members for their attendance.

Agreed to recommend to the Co-operative Scrutiny Board that Living Streets is included on the Working Plymouth work programme and that an extra meeting of the panel is arranged to scrutinise and seek assurance regarding the Living Streets process and costs involved.

54. **TRACKING RESOLUTIONS AND UPDATE FROM THE CO-OPERATIVE SCRUTINY BOARD**

The Democratic Support Officer advised Members that the Co-operative Scrutiny Board had not yet had their first meeting and that tracking resolutions from the Working Plymouth panel from 2014/15 had been completed.

55. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

There were no items of exempt business.