

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 3 AUGUST 2016**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Derek Levy, Abdul Abdullahi, Edward Smith, Terence Neville
OBE JP and Claire Stewart

ABSENT Katherine Chibah

**STATUTORY
CO-OPTees:** *1 vacancy (Church of England diocese representative), Mr
Simon Goulden (other faiths/denominations representative),
Mr Tony Murphy (Catholic diocese representative), Alicia
Meniru & 1 vacancy (Parent Governor representative) - Italics
Denotes absence*

OFFICERS: Ian Davis (Director of Regeneration and Environment), Bob
Griffiths (Assistant Director Planning, Highways and
Transport), David Morris (Head of Parking), Andy Ellis
(Scrutiny Officer), Clare Bryant (Scrutiny Secretary)

Also Attending: Councillor Joanne Laban, Councillor Daniel Anderson
(Cabinet Member, Environment) and 3 members of the public.

77

WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

Attendees were welcomed to the meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Katherine Chibah, and
Tony Murphy. It was noted that Councillor Claire Stewart was substituting for
Councillor Katherine Chibah and Councillor Terence Neville was substituting
for Councillor Joanne Laban as she was leading on the Call-in item.

The Chair then outlined how the meeting was to proceed. The meeting would
focus on the Call-in – ‘Results of The Proposal to Changes Resident Permits
Tariffs’ and questions would be taken on this item in relation to the ‘Reasons
for Call-in’.

The Chair also reminded members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
that they need to be fully committed to ensuring that scrutiny works in Enfield
by being impartial and leaving party politics out of the scrutiny process.

Officers were asked to arrange a development session for all the members of
OSC and those interested in the Scrutiny process. It hoped that the session
will consider the GLA workbook and the role of Councillors at Scrutiny.

78

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

79

**CALL IN OF REPORT: RESULTS OF THE PROPOSALS TO CHANGES
RESIDENT PERMITS TARIFFS**

The Chair invited Councillor Laban to outline the reasons for the Call-in, - 'The majority of respondents disagreed when asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the Council's proposals to change from a CO2 emissions based scheme to one in which permits are based on engine size.'

Councillor Laban stated:

- The changes to the residents permit tariffs according to paragraph 3.6 of the report were subject to consultations. Despite the consultation, the views of the residents had not been taken into consideration.
- The NSL contract for parking enforcement had been extended by one year. The cost of the new contract was an increase on the price of last years. There was no work done to look into the savings which could have been made by looking for a new provider for parking enforcement in the borough. Had this been looked into the options for the consultation may have been different, or there may have been no need for the consultation at all.
- Paragraph 4.6, Chart 1 shows that the majority of the residents disagreed with the proposals to change from a CO2 emissions based scheme to one based on engine size.
- Could the changes to the tariffs not have waited until a new contract for parking enforcement in the borough has been developed as the current suggested savings do not have the support of the residents?

Councillor Laban requested that the decision be referred back to the Cabinet Member for Environment for reconsideration.

The Chair invited Councillor Anderson to respond, as follows:

- The decision to extend the NSL contract could have been Called-in when the decision was made in July so the extension of the contract should not be discussed at this Call-in.
- Changes to the tariffs for permits would be needed even if this particular model was not chosen; there would have been a price increase regardless.
- Paragraph 3.3 refers to the cost of enforcement and administration has increased by 42% whilst the income from tariffs has only increase 20%, creating a deficit.
- Less than 4% of permit holders have cars that are considered CO2 efficient which shows the current scheme which benefits those with low CO2 emissions has not encouraged people to switch to less polluting cars.
- The current scheme which benefits those with lower CO2 emissions benefits those who can afford a new car and discriminates against those who can't.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 3.8.2016

- Any formula used to work out the costs of residents parking tariffs must be fair, easy to use and understand.
- Other options were considered such as length of car and value of car although these would be hard to monitor and assess.
- The system chosen was reasonable, fair to all and balanced.

The following questions and comments were then taken from Members of the Committee:

Councillor Keazor asked what is the purpose of a consultation if the decision goes against what the residents want? She wanted to know whether resident's views should have been taken into account.

Councillor Anderson answered that the consultation was more about hearing people's views. A number of factors were taken into consideration for this consultation such as the pricing of tariffs being based on the emissions of cars which would favour people who can afford a new car. Any ideas from the consultation that were reasonable were considered.

Councillor Smith stated that it was difficult to say how much engine size contributes to pollutions. He asked why people on higher incomes are not asked to pay more; as typically, those with larger engines have a bigger income?

Councillor Anderson responded by saying that even if the system used currently was to stay in place there would have been a need to increase the prices of tariffs regardless. Value for money and pollution were the main factors when considering the new scheme hence why those with larger incomes are not being asked to pay more.

Councillor Abdullahi asked what percentage of residents responded based on the area?

David Morris, Head of Parking, informed the committee that he did not have that data available at the meeting but could confirm that there were more respondents from the West of the borough than the East. This could be due to the fact that there are more CPZ's in the West of the borough.

Councillor Abdullahi questioned whether if the costs of the current scheme went up would the under 65's of had to pay more to subsidise the over 65's.

David Morris responded by saying that there would have been an increase of £45.00 per year if Enfield Council stayed with the current systems. Blue Badge holders would still get their permits for free.

Councillor Neville questioned whether when the consultation began in February, was this not a suitable time to look into a new contract for parking enforcement or negotiate costs on the current contract?

Councillor Anderson responded that the contract with NSL could have been Called-in early this year and the call-in today would focus on the reasons for call-in.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 3.8.2016

Councillor Neville commented on the level of pollution in Enfield being one of the worst in London, could residents be limited to one having one permit?

Councillor Anderson responded by talking about the Cycle Enfield Scheme being set up in the borough which will encourage residents to use alternative modes of transport. He commented that only 8 people in the entire borough had 3 permits. Councillor Anderson added that he wanted to create a system which paid for itself by tariffs based on engine size.

Councillor Stewart asked Councillor Laban and Councillor Anderson what consultation meant to them and whether the consultation process was the only determinant of the decision.

Councillor Laban responded first by saying the residents in Enfield want a Council that they feel listens to them and reflects their needs. As the Council uses other people's money we should ensure that we get the best use of it. As the majority of residents disagreed with the consultation, residents feel their views were not considered.

Councillor Anderson then answered by explaining that the consultation process was to understand what people's issues were and what they had to say in the response. Overall, he felt that residents did not understand that regardless of the scheme chosen there would have been cost increases. If the scheme did continue to run at a loss, the difference would have to be picked up by Council tax which would be paid by everyone, not just those with resident's permits.

Councillor Levy asked whether the data in the report was raw. David Morris confirmed the data was pure and the figures had not been weighted.

Councillor Levy referred the Committee to page 22 of the agenda which showed the proposed parking charges for 2016 for cars between 1001cc and 1999cc the cost to park per day would be between 30 and 45 pence. Do you believe the previous permits were too low?

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Officers from Environment responded by discussing benchmarking exercises which had taken place against other London authorities. Enfield has a much smaller CPZ (3,000 residents) than its neighbouring borough Barnet who has over 10,000 residents on the scheme.

Councillor Levy questioned whether residents ever request a CPZ?

David Morris confirmed that residents do request CPZ's and recently the CPZ in Southbury Road was increased at the request of residents to improve parking in the area.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 3.8.2016

Councillor Smith asked about what consideration was given when dropping the discount for over 65's, as this age group are more likely to have frequent visitors such as careers and visitors? He also mentioned that reducing costs by improving efficiencies had not been addressed in the report?

Councillor Anderson informed the Committee that visitors and business permits would not be changed so will not affect the over 65's disproportionality. To Councillor Smith's second question, Councillor Anderson responded by informing the group that the Contractors were met with regularly to discuss costs. As parking enforcement is a labour intensive job the cost will always be high.

Councillor Keazor asked what the average increase will be for residents from the old system to the new system?

Councillor Anderson responded that the average vehicle is about 1000cc to 2000cc and residents will see an increase of £30 to £50.

The following questions were raised by members of the public:

Q) A resident from St Andrews Road said she had lived in her home since October and was concerned that neither she nor any of her neighbours had received a consultation form?

A) They did not have the figures on who responded from what area they will look into this to see if anyone from St Andrews responded as it is possible that some residents may have missed their letters.

Q) If Enfield CPZ is considerable less than Barnet, how is it possible it is currently running at a loss?

A) Although there are only 3,300 residents on the scheme in Enfield they are spread across the borough which means Enforcement Officers must travel across the borough to do their job.

Councillor Anderson summarised that one issue had brought the 'Results of the Proposals to Change Resident Permits Tariffs' to Call-in and that was the consultation process. The consultation process takes into account what the residents want and what the current administration can offer. The decision to base tariffs on engine size is fairer to all as well as trying to balance the budget. Councillor Laban summarised that a large number of people pay for parking and are unable to get a parking space. To say that poorer people have smaller cars is unfair as those with a family will need to have a bigger car. On the whole, the Council should reflect the residents and the decision taken does not do this. Councillor Laban requested the decision be referred back to the Cabinet Member for Environment to reconsider.

The Committee then voted on the decision as follows,:

Councillors Abdullahi, Keazor and Stewart voted in favour of the decision.

Councillors Neville and Smith voted in to refer the decision back to the Cabinet member.

The Chair **CONFIRMED** the decision.

80

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No issues were raised during any other business.

81

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The item for the 8th September 2016 meeting on the Budget Review will now be moved to 11th October 2016 which is already set aside for a Call-in. The meeting on the 8th September will still go ahead.

82

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC