



Rutland County Council

Catmose Oakham Rutland LE15 6HP
Telephone 01572 722577 Facsimile 01572 758307 DX 28340 Oakham

Record of a meeting of the **PLACES SCRUTINY PANEL** held in the Council Chamber, Catmose, Oakham at 7.00 pm on **Thursday 25 April 2013**

PRESENT: Mr M E Baines (Chairman, in the Chair)
Mr W J Cross
Mr J T Dale
Mr D C Hollis
Mr J Lammie
Mr B A Montgomery
Mr M A Oxley
Mrs C L Vernon

OFFICERS PRESENT: Mrs V Brambini Operational Director for Places
Mr D Brown Operational Director for Places
Mrs J Fraser Parking Services Manager
Mrs K Dunleavy Democratic Services

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr T C King Portfolio Holder for Finance and Places Asset Management
Mr M D A Pocock Portfolio Holder for Resources and Places Operations

NON-PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT: Miss G Waller

APOLOGIES: There were no apologies received.

---oOo---

Mr Baines had notified the Governance Officer (Rutland) of a disclosable pecuniary interest in the Parking Review 2013 item and a public question that was to be submitted relating to South Street and Penn Street. In view of the disclosable pecuniary interest, Mr Baines had decided to step down from his Chairman duties until the Parking Review item and questions had been discussed.

It was agreed that agenda item 10, Parking Review 2013 would be taken as the first item of Scrutiny Business.

In the absence of the Chairman Mrs Vernon was appointed Chairman. At 8.50 pm Mr Baines joined the meeting and took the chair.

---oOo---

939 RECORD OF MEETINGS

- i The Record of the Meeting of the Places Scrutiny Panel held on 14 February 2013, copies of which had been previously circulated, was confirmed and signed by the Chairman.
- ii The Record of the Meeting of the Special Places Scrutiny Panel held on 14 March 2013, copies of which had been previously circulated, was confirmed and signed by the Chairman.
- iii The Record of the Meeting of the Special Joint meeting of the Places and People (Children) Scrutiny Panels held on 21 March 2013, copies of which had been previously circulated, was confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

940 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following Declarations of Interest in respect of agenda item 10, Parking Review 2013 were received:

Councillor Montgomery declared on grounds of probity as he held a blue badge, he intended to stay but would not contribute to the debate.

Councillor Oxley declared on grounds of probity as his mother owned a blue badge, however he did not benefit from its use. Councillor Oxley intended to contribute to the discussions.

Councillor Dale declared a pecuniary interest due to property he owned on South Street and Pillings Road. Councillor Dale intended not to enter into any discussions over parking on these streets.

Councillor King declared a disclosable pecuniary interest due to his share holding in a business off Pillings Road. Councillor King intended not to enter any discussion regarding parking for Pillings Road.

Councillor Vernon declared on grounds of probity due to employment at a business near Lands End Way.

Councillor Lammie declared on grounds of probity as he had been entitled to a parking permit due to his involvement with a resident association, but had renounced his use of it.

Councillor Baines had previously notified the Governance Officer (Rutland) of a disclosable pecuniary interest in the Parking Review 2013 item and a public question that was to be submitted relating to South Street and Penn Street.

---oOo---

At this point Mr Dale left the room.

---oOo---

941 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS

The following questions were submitted at short notice by Mr Colin Bath, a member of the public regarding agenda item 10, Parking Review 2013, specifically in relation to Penn Street and South Street.

- a How will the Council be able to control our priority parking permit against non-residents parking (see page 5 on Scrutiny) quote "Where residents compete in their own street with other groups (local workers, commuters, etc.) enforcement will give greater priority to residents". How?
- b What restrictions will be imposed on the non-residents parking?
- c Your proposal means that resident's parking permit can only be realistically used in our own street between 8am to 10am and 3pm to 6pm, hardly a residents parking permit do you think.

The Portfolio Holder for Resources and Places Operations, Mr Pocock, responded to Mr Bath's questions and comments. In summary, responses included:

- a Where residents of town centres normally competed for road parking space in their own streets with other groups such as local workers, commuters or visitors; parking restrictions and enforcement gives greater priority to residents;
- b There may be scope for, and a desire to, introduce extended short term on-street parking throughout the town centres with additional time limited bays;
- c Historically, priority has been given to residents permit holders in these bays and Members have supported this and blocked previous call's for a limited waiting option. If we are to support the shopping vitality of the town then allowing a limited wait at certain times when most bays have the capacity would make better use of these parking areas;
- d There would be 1 hour non-return within 2 hours limited waiting. The restrictions will be enforced just as the other limited waiting areas in the town for every vehicle not displaying a permit or badge;
- e Residents' access to the parking areas would be from 8am to 6pm, which would be the same as the current system; and
- f Visitors would be able to park for limited periods of one hour under the revised scheme.

Mr Wells, a member of the public addressed the Panel with a question regarding the parking review item in relation to the proposed Cabinet recommendation 3.5: That introducing limited waiting, between 10am and 3pm, to the resident's permit holder bays in Oakham be approved.

"In order to assess the likely impact on residents and traffic movements, are the Council able to quantify the number of non-residents vehicles expected to make use of the bays, and the likely turnover of those vehicles per hour?"

The Portfolio Holder for Resources and Places Operations, Mr Pocock, advised that in order to assess the likely impact, the question would be referred to the Parking Services Manger in order to provide a response. The response would be sent to Mr Wells and all Panel Members in due course.

942 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS

No Questions with Notice had been received from members.

943 NOTICES OF MOTION FROM MEMBERS

No Notices of Motion had been received from members.

944 CONSIDERATION OF ANY MATTER REFERRED TO THE PANEL FOR A DECISION IN RELATION TO CALL IN OF A DECISION

No matter had been referred to the Panel for a decision in relation to call-in of a decision in accordance with Procedure Rule 206.

SCRUTINY

945 PARKING REVIEW

Report 107/2013 was received from the Operational Director for Places.

The Operational Director for Places advised of the recommendations to Cabinet over restricted parking for Oakham, Uppingham, Stamford Road and Edith Weston village roads. The recommendations for parking restrictions had been developed in line with the recent Strategic Parking Review (SPaR), which had been approved by Council in March 2012.

The Places Scrutiny Panel was requested to comment on the recommendations to Cabinet, which included:

- a That the variations to parking restrictions be approved;
- b That proposals for on-street parking restrictions on Stamford Road and roads off, should not progress at this time;
- c That the changes to parking charges be approved;
- d That the request of Uppingham Town Council to extend the current subsidy agreement to the end of June 2013 be approved;
- e That introducing limited waiting, between 10am and 3pm, to the resident's permit holder bays in Oakham be approved; and
- f That the administration charge increase, to £40, for issuing a resident's parking permit be approved.

The following points were noted during the discussion on the proposed variations to parking restrictions:

- i There had been a reoccurring problem with congestion due to heavy goods vehicles parking and loading and the recommendation was supported by some of the Members; however, there were concerns raised over whether introducing the changes would affect businesses in the area, in particular those on Lands End Way;
- ii Some Members felt that the variation in parking restrictions on Market Street on market days would be good for the economy, although the introduction of the suspension of double yellow lines may cause confusion;
- iii The placement of double yellow lines in villages was thought to be unsightly and

that alternative options should be considered in order to be mindful of the tourism trade that Rutland attracted;

- iv Anglian Water had recently revised their car parking arrangements which had resulted in adverse parking arrangements at Normanton and Edith Weston. This had put residents and young children in danger due to drivers speeding;
- v Members were disappointed that the Rutland Water Partnership Board had not been consulted over the installation of double yellow lines; and
- vi The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Asset Management, Mr King, advised that the last Rutland Water Partnership meeting had been held in November 2012, this was why it had not been possible to provide the Board with an update on the Parking Review proposals.

Officers responded to Members comments and questions. In summary the responses included:

- vii The building merchants located on Lands End Way would be required to remove their vehicle from the road when loading and unloading;
- viii There had been a large number of complaints received regarding lorries using junctions as lorry parks and loading and unloading on Lands End Way;
- ix It had been necessary to place double yellow restrictions in some village locations such as Hambleton and Whitwell due to parked vehicles obstructing the highway;
- x Enforcement of the parking measures, if adopted, would involve regular checks by enforcement officers; and
- xi The installation of ditches near some of the village locations had been considered as an alternative to yellow lines; however, it was felt that such an option would have been more visually intrusive and more expensive.

---oOo---

7.45pm - The meeting was adjourned to allow Members to read through comments received from residents over the parking restriction proposals. The meeting was reconvened at 7.50pm

---oOo---

The following points were noted during the discussion over the proposed on-street parking restrictions on Stamford Road:

- xii The Operational Director for Places, Mr Brown, advised that there was limited scope to remove double yellow lines from Uppingham Road to accommodate displaced parking due to the visibility splays required at the junctions and the stacking area required for cars waiting at the traffic lights.

The following points were noted during the discussion over the proposed request of Uppingham Town Council to extend the current subsidy agreement to the end of June 2013:

- xiii Officers advised that businesses had been approached, where applicable, in order to encourage them to introduce a parking refund incentive for their customers. To date no expressions of interest had been received.

---oOo---

Mr Dale left the meeting whilst the proposed increase in parking charges for Uppingham and Oakham were discussed.

---oOo---

The following points were noted during the discussion over the proposed increase in parking charges for Uppingham and Oakham:

- xiv The neighbouring authority parking charge comparisons included within the report did not seem to be realistic;
- xv Cheaper car parking offered at places such as Corby may have a detrimental affect on the economy of Uppingham if the parking charges were set too high, as people were less likely to visit the market town to do their shopping;
- xvi Some Members felt that it would be beneficial to compare the effect of increased car parking charges against changes in shopping behaviours with similar small market towns such as Oundle; and
- xvii In additional to the local comparison, The Operational Director for Places, Mr Brown, advised that a report on the impact of parking charges on town centre trade showed that the proposed parking charges for Uppingham and Oakham were below the national average.

The following points were noted during the discussion over the proposed introduction of limited waiting, between 10am and 3pm, to the resident's permit holder bays in Oakham:

- xxviii There was an issue with the lack of restrictions after 6pm, as non-residents could park in the residents bays for long periods and sometimes overnight;
- xix Consideration should be given to extend the restrictions to include the times of between 6 -10pm;
- xx Consideration should be given to extend restricted parking in other areas of the town centre such as Station Road;
- xxi The Portfolio Holder for Resources and Places Operations, Mr Pocock, advised Members that the residents parking restrictions were not solely due to visitors to the area and that it should be noted that most properties may own more than one vehicle; and
- xxii The Parking Services Manager, Mrs Fraser, advised that proposals within the Parking Review included changing some double yellow lines on South Street to single yellow lines to allow parking from 6pm to 8am.

The following points were noted during the discussion over the proposed administration charge increase to £40 for issuing a resident's parking permit:

- xxiii Consideration should be given to spread the cost of the increase by increments over a three year period;
- xxiv Some Members commented that the administration fee for parking permits was last updated in 1998;
- xxv Consideration should be given by the Council to increase the fee in order to cover the cost of producing the permit rather than to make a profit; and
- xxvi The Operational Director for Places, Mr Brown, confirmed that the additional income that would be received from the increase would amount to £7,500 from the 300 permits that are expected to be issued.

Following discussion the Panel wished their comments to be noted by Cabinet. In summary the main comments included:

- i Consideration should be given to extend the residential parking restrictions of 8am - 6pm in other areas of Oakham as well as South Street;
- ii That parking administration fees be increased to £25 instead of £40;
- iii Some Members wished to see an incremental increase to parking permit administration fees;
- iv Rutland Water Partnership to be consulted over the parking review;
- v Any feedback regarding businesses wishing to opt into a parking refund scheme for their customers should be included in the consultation.

AGREED:

- i) That Panel noted the contents of Report No. 107/2013.
- ii) That amendments and additions to on-street parking restrictions were to be considered.
- iii) That changes to parking and permit charges were to be considered.

---oOo---

8.50pm – Mr Baines joined the meeting and resumed the Chairman position. Mr Dale also returned to the meeting.

---oOo---

946 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

A verbal update on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) from the Operational Director for Places, Mrs Brambini was received.

Members were advised that Cabinet had approved the draft schedule in March 2013; this was due to be circulated for a six week public consultation.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Asset Management, Mr King, advised the Panel that following presentation at Parish Council (PC) meetings, there were questions raised over the 25% transfer of the levy receipts over to the PCs who would then benefit. Parish Councils had drawn up wish lists reflecting improvements they wished to receive for their area. The requests received, had included playground equipment, highway improvements, extensions to burial grounds and the provision of community halls.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Asset Management, Mr King, also advised that Government consultation over the CIL liability on self build of single dwellings being relaxed would prove a challenge to interpret and implement.

AGREED:

- i) That Panel noted the verbal update.

---oOo---

9pm – Mrs Vernon left the meeting and did not return.

---oOo---

947 SITE ALLOCATIONS

A verbal update on the progress of the Site Allocations document from the Operational Director for Places, Mrs Brambini, was received.

Members were advised that this document was due to be submitted for public consultation. The Operational Director for Places, Mrs Brambini, also advised the Panel that comments following the public consultation would be incorporated into the final document and then presented to the Planning Inspector in October 2013.

The following points were noted during the discussion:

- i A presentation had been held at Ketton Parish Council in order to discuss their options over Site Allocations;
- ii The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Asset Management, Mr King, advised that if a public meeting was required for Ketton to discuss the Site Allocations options, officers would be available to attend;
- iii The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Asset Management, Mr King, advised that the document was almost complete apart from any inclusion required for Ketton; and
- iv A summary of responses received from Parish Councils that were submitted during the previous consultation period were available on the Council's website or if details were required they could be requested.

AGREED:

- i) That Panel noted the verbal update.

948 STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

Report no. 102/2013 from the Strategic Director of Resources was received.

The Portfolio Holder for Resources and Places Operations, Mr Pocock, introduced the report the purpose of which was to update on the current status of the Risk Register.

The following points were noted during the discussion:

- i Members highlighted an anomaly on the Risk Register report between the individual risks and the matrix, and queried whether Risk 12 Catmose Campus and Risk 19 Significant Planning Applications were up to date. The risk alerts appeared to be different to those that had recently been reported to the Audit and Risk Committee;
- ii The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Asset Management, Mr King, confirmed that the green light had been given to proceed with Digital Rutland and that the Council was working with British Telecom on the ground surveys and planning applications;
- iii Members commented that it would be valuable to receive date stamped Risk

- iv Registers; and
The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Asset Management, Mr King, advised that Members were able to gain access to the online Risk Register system.

AGREED:

- i) That the Panel noted the contents of the Risk Register and the actions underway to address the risks.
- ii) That the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Asset Management, Mr King, would confirm by email to Members the status of Risk 12 - Catmose Campus and Risk 19 - Significant Planning Applications.
- iii) The Operational Director for Places, Mrs Brambini, would arrange for the Risk Register to be dated and provide a link to the online Risk Register system.

PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS AND TOPICS

949 WORKING PROGRAMME 2012/13 AND REVIEW OF FORWARD PLAN

The Panel was asked to consider the Forward Plan and Work Programme 2012/13.

The following items were noted as being of interest for future Panel meetings:

- i Site allocation and CIL update; and
- ii Recording of meetings.

950 REVIEW OF RISK REGISTER

Members held no discussion on this item, due to the Strategic Risk Register presentation earlier in the meeting.

951 ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There was no other urgent business.

952 DATE AND PREVIEW OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 18 June 2013 at 7pm.

---oOo---

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.20pm.

---oOo---