

Agenda



Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Date: Thursday, 14 December 2017

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Committee Room 1 - Civic Centre

To: Councillors J Guy (Chair), M Al-Nuaimi, C Evans, M Evans, C Ferris, P Hourahine, J Hughes, L Lacey and M Spencer

Item	Wards Affected
1	<u>Agenda in Welsh</u> (Pages 3 - 4)
2	<u>Apologies for Absence</u>
3	<u>Declarations of Interest</u>
4	<u>Minutes of the Meeting held 16 November 2017</u> (Pages 5 - 10)
5	<u>Decriminalised Parking / Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE)</u> (Pages 11 - 22)
6	<u>Forward Work Programme Update</u> (Pages 23 - 26)

This page is intentionally left blank



Agenda

Pwyllgor Rheoli Trosolwg a Chraffu

Dyddiad: 14 Rhagfyr 2017

Amser: 10 y.b.

Lleoliad: Ystafell Bwyllgora 1

Y Cynghorwyr: J Guy (Cadeirydd), M Al-Nuaimi, C Evans, M Evans, C Ferris, I Hayat, P Hourahine, J Hughes and M Spencer

Eitem

Rhan 1

1. [Agenda yn Gymraeg](#)
2. [Ymddiheuriadau am Absenoldeb](#)
3. [Datganiadau o Fuddiant](#)
4. [Cofnodion y Cyfarfod a 16 Tachwedd 2017](#)
5. [Gorfodi Pacio / Parcio Sifil Wedi'i Ddadgofreoli](#)
6. [Blaenraglenb Waith](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes



Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Date: 16 November 2017

Time: 10.00 am

Present: Councillors J Guy (Chair), M Al-Nuaimi, C Evans, M Evans, C Ferris, P Hourahine, J Hughes and M Spencer

Liz Blayney (Senior Overview and Scrutiny Officer)

In Attendance:

Apologies: Councillors I Hayat

1 **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Phil Hourahine – Board Member of Newport Transport
Councillor Mark Spencer – Board Member of Newport Transport
Councillor Charles Ferris – Board Member of Newport Transport

2 **Minutes of 28 September 2017**

The minutes were approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

3 **Decriminalised Parking / Civil Parking Enforcement**

The Senior Strategy Manager presented a *'Newport Civil Enforcement Feasibility Study'* to the Committee summarising the report and highlighting key aspects of the adoption of Civil Parking Enforcement. Members discussed the need to address the parking issues within Newport, without parking being used as a revenue generator or unnecessarily adding to the financial hardship being faced by many of the public. There were concerns about the use of bailiffs in other areas, which could result in disproportionate increase in the total amount owed.

It was explained that the figures had been conservatively calculated based on the maximum work required; the actual figures were likely to be much less. The initial outlay of £1.39 million is made up of between £800,000 and £900,000 of work ensuring that the cities lines and signs are at a standard where the Welsh Assembly Government would be confident that the Council was in a position to take over CPE. It was anticipated that not all of the signs and lines will need to be replaced and as such the cost could lower. With regards to how success in the scheme is measured, Members were advised that this would not relate to the revenue or the number of tickets issued, but would be reflected in whether there was an improvement in the current issues with parking.

Members acknowledged the current problem with illegal parking in Newport had been well documents and discussed at numerous meetings. Member discussed the role of the police and the impact of the potential withdrawal of the police in the enforcement of parking.

Members were disappointed that a representative from the Police could be present to answer specific questions.

Members were disappointed that alternative options, such as paying the police to employ more staff to undertake the parking enforcement in Newport, had not been explored within the report. It was also commented that the disadvantages of the Council taking on CPE had not been included within the report. The Officers explained that this option had been discussed with the Police a number of years ago and they had indicated that this was not an option that they would consider. It was also explained that this option would result in a continued financial outlay for the Council, and any revenue gained from fines issued by the police would be returned to the Central Government.

Some of Committee commented on the lack of background information within the report, to outline other options that had been considered and the process that had been taken to date to give context to what the Committee were being asked to consider.

Members discussed the impact of tighter enforcement of parking in the city centre and whether this would negatively impact upon surrounding areas. Members were advised that currently the Council Car parks in the City Centre were usually at 35 to 40% capacity meaning that there were sufficient additional spaces for people to park. Members requested more information on what other Local Authorities had done in relation to parking enforcement, including which of the Welsh LA's had implemented CPE, whether it had been successful and whether there was any differences to how this had been implemented that the Council could learn from.

The Committee discussed the statutory role of the Traffic Manager within local government, and questioned the role of this role within addressing underlying causes of illegal parking (e.g. correct signage, congestion on roads). Members were advised that the Traffic Managers role was to manage Newport's road network to reduce congestion and disruption. In Newport this function was within the Senior Strategy Managers role. The number of staff required to be employed was discussed in relation to the anticipated numbers of tickets issued. Outside of the City Centre, the Officer state they would anticipate issuing one and three quarter tickets per eight hour period and in the City Centre the Officers estimated they would be issuing seven tickets per eight hour period. The Officers explained that these figures were what they anticipated they will be issuing in 18 months after adopting CPE and reflects a change in behaviour after the initial implementation period. Members were advised that the intention was to cover costs to make the service sustainable, rather than to accrue revenue, and the figures quoted were conservative estimates at the lower end of the scale to ensure that the revenue was not over predicted. The Committee queried how the CPE would be able to contact and report certain issues that were beyond their jurisdiction, for instance if someone is parked on zig-zag lines outside of a school or zebra crossing. In those instances the CPE staff member would be able to issue a ticket and could inform the Police. The times where the CPE staff would not be able to get involved would be if the vehicle was causing a hazard to other road users, causing a major blockage and required to be moved.

The Committee asked for assurances the income generated from CPE would be ring-fenced in the budget for parking. The Officer stated that the money raised from CPE had to be ring fenced for use in parking related areas and this is set out in Welsh Assembly Government legislation.

The Committee sought reassurance that the Council would not employ a private company to run the CPE in Newport. The Officer stated that it was the recommendation of this report that that NCC operates CPE and does not use a third party.

The Committee discussed the financial set up required to establish CPE, and the Assistant Head of Finance explained that the loan to set up for CPE in Newport would be internal and

would be paid back over a specified period of time. During this time any surplus money gained during that period would be ring fenced.

The Members discussed the demands of processing Penalty Notices and asked how the Officers planned to deal with this. Working in partnership with the other Gwent Local Authorities who are deciding whether to undertake CPE there might be an opportunity to establish a more cost effective way of running CPE. This again will impact on the overall implementation costs of CPE and would be explored should the Council agree to proceed.

The Members queried whether the City Centre Ambassadors could be utilised as a support mechanism for CPE. The Officer explained that due to the nature of the role traffic enforcement staff had to be completely employed by the Council to undertake that role.

Conclusion

The Committee debated whether or not it was in a position to make a recommendation to the Cabinet Member and the Council on this matter. Some Members expressed the view that the Committee should recommend that the Council precede with CPE in principle and there was sufficient information within the report to base a decision upon. Other Members argued that more detail was needed before the Committee was in a position to make a recommendation. More information was requested on the following:

- Analysis of
 - Alternative models / options;
 - Information on what similar Authorities have implemented and enforced the scheme;
 - Whether there were more cost effective options available to address the problem;
 - Implementation issues that the Council might face;
 - Impact on CPE on parking issues – i.e. numbers of available parking in the city; centre displacement to other areas from the city centre;
 - The benefits and the disadvantages to taking on the scheme;

The Committee agreed to take a vote on the matter. The motion was put to the meeting to defer making a recommendation on this item, pending holding an additional meeting of the Committee to consider further information from officers and to discuss with matter with the police. The motion was declared carried unanimously by 8 votes to 0.

4 Waste Strategy Policy Review Group - Final Report

The Senior Overview and Scrutiny Officer outlined the process taken by the Policy Review Group to reach their recommendations. The Officer explained that the Strategy was broken down into three separate areas which were Trade Waste, Household Waste Recycling Centre and Three Weekly Collections. The Officer highlighted summary of the Group's recommendations contained within the final report.

The Committee thanked the Group for the extensive report, which reflected the amount of work the group and officers had undertaken. The Committee's two representatives on the Policy Review Group highlighted the key areas of the final report for the Committee's consideration. The Committee were advised that three weekly collections had been put forward by the report and supported by Officers. However the Review group could not support this approach at this time. They explained that they had been of the opinion that there were too many issues with engagement with the current system that would make three weekly difficult to implement in certain areas, in particular urban areas with little storage and communal buildings. They continued to say that they felt educating the residents of Newport was a very important element to achieving the target set by the WG. The Officer replied by

explaining even though education was vital it would only produce around a one percent increase, which would not enable the Council to meet the WG targets and avoid the fine.

The Committee discussed the targets and associated fines from WG for recycling rates, and queried how the Council had avoided the fines on two occasions. The Officer explained that we had not been fined in the past as we were working on implementing an action plan which would allow the Council to reach the targets in the future. This was set out by the Wales Audit Office and agreed by the Council. This was unlikely to be the case in the future should the Council fail to reach the targets.

The Committee queried whether other options for flats had been considered by the officers, such as the communal bins used in Europe. The Head of Streetscene and City Services explained that unlike in Wales, the community bins on the continent require the users to pay each use which limited the amount that was collected. The Officer continued to say that if the flats all started recycling at a suitable level it would only provide half to one percent, which would not be sufficient to meet the WG target and avoid the fine. The refuse trucks are currently weighed before and after visiting flats to ensure they capture the amount of refuse collected.

The Head of Streetscene explained that the report had highlighted that the only way for the Council to achieve the target set out by WG were to restrict the amount of refuse a household could put out. There were alternative options to how this could be achieved, for example through using bags and restricting residents to two black bags on a fortnightly basis, or through issuing smaller bins.

The Committee queried whether Council buildings were maximising recycling. The Officer explained that the majority of kitchen spaces now had food waste bins, and they were looking at increasing the number of other types of recycling bins throughout the offices.

The Committee discussed trade waste, and enquired why the Council was not able to compete with private waste collection services, with no legal requirement for private companies to recycle. The Committee were concerned that private companies did not offer recycling, were cheaper and as such would be a more attractive offering to businesses as they would not have to sort their waste. The Head of Streetscene commented that there was a limit to what the Council could charge for Trade waste as it could not subsidise the costs. Trade waste accounted for 5000 tonnes of waste whereas household waste is 60,000 tonnes, which would not significantly contribute to the Council's overall recycling rate.

Members discussed the purpose of the site visit to Conwy, and were advised that Conwy was chosen as it was an example of an authority that had successfully implemented three weekly collections and had a similar composition of waste to Newport.

The Committee discussed the current system for disposing of waste and discussed the feasibility of Newport having its own facilities to recycle rather than exporting to other areas. The Head of Streetscene outlined the current system and noted that Newport having its own facilities was not feasible. With regards to recyclables like glass, paper and plastic you have to reach a critical mass to make processing financially viable. The Cardiff incinerator was a regional initiative that the Council agreed to sign up to for 25 years.

Fly tipping was discussed and the potential for three weekly collection to exacerbate this problem. The Officer outlined the new powers from WG which will allow the Council to increase fines for fly tipping. The Officer continues saying that the level of fly tipping in Newport is good compared to other areas of Wales, and that the instances were not usually relating to excess refuse, but larger bulkier items. As such, the evidence suggested that changes to the frequency of household collections did not impact upon the levels of fly tipping. The Council have looked at using CCTV in fly tipping hotspots but this was deemed to be too expensive for the returns it would generate.

Conclusion

The Chair thanked the Policy Review Group and the Officers for their contributions to the discussion, and highlighted the summary of the recommendations of the review group within the final report. The Committee agreed to support the findings of the Review group and forward the final report to the Cabinet Member. The Committee supported the continuation of the review group to input into the development and implementation of the Waste Strategy as appropriate.

5 Forward Work Programme

The Senior Overview and Scrutiny Officer provided the group with a summary of the Committee's work programme with specific reference to the reports due to be considered at the next two meeting.

It was confirmed that there would be an additional meeting scheduled to consider the additional information requested in relation to Civil Parking Enforcement and to discuss the matter with the police prior to making a recommendation.

Members discussed the availability of the agenda prior to the Committee's meetings. The Senior Overview and Scrutiny Officer advised the Committee that that agendas were published a minimum of 3 clear working days prior to the meeting in line with legislation. Where possible, agendas were published before this, however it was dependant on when reports were finalised.

The meeting terminated at 12:50

This page is intentionally left blank

Scrutiny Report

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Part 1

Date: 14 December 2017

Subject Decriminalised Parking / Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE)

Author Overview and Scrutiny Officer

The following people have been invited to attend for this item:

- Paul Jones – Head of Streetscene and City Services
- Steve Davies – Senior Strategy Manager
- Chief Inspector Mike Richards – Gwent Police
- Inspector Robert Jenkins – Gwent Police

Section A – Committee Guidance and Recommendations

1 Recommendations to the Committee

The Committee is asked to:

- 1.1 Consider the additional information (at **Appendix 1**) provided by the Officers in relation to Civil Parking Enforcement;
- 1.2 To discuss Civil Parking Enforcement with the representatives from the Police;
- 1.3 Determine if it wishes to make a recommendation to the Council as to whether the Council should proceed with undertaking Civil Parking Enforcement.

2 Context

- 2.1 At its meeting on 16 November 2017, the Committee considered a review on Newport Civil Parking Enforcement and discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the Council taking over parking enforcement. A summary of the Committees discussion can be found in the [minutes](#) of the meeting. The Senior Strategy Manager presented a 'Newport Civil Enforcement Feasibility Study' to the Committee summarising the report and highlighting key aspects of the adoption of Civil Parking Enforcement.
- 2.2 At this meeting, Members of the Committee acknowledged the current problem with illegal parking in Newport had been well documents and discussed at numerous meetings. Member discussed the role of the police and the impact of the potential withdrawal of the police in the enforcement of parking.
- 2.3 The Committee debated whether or not it was in a position to make a recommendation to the Cabinet Member and the Council on this matter. Some Members expressed the view that the

Committee should recommend that that the Council precede with CPE in principle and there was sufficient information within the report to base a decision upon. Other Members argued that more detail was needed before the Committee was in a position to make a recommendation.

2.4 The Committee **agreed** to request that the Officers provide more information before they made their recommendations. These included:

- Alternative models / options of CPE;
- Information on what similar Authorities have implemented and enforced the scheme;
- Whether there were more cost effective options available to address the problem;
- Implementation issues that the Council might face;
- Impact on CPE on parking issues – i.e. numbers of available parking in the city centre displacement to other areas from the city centre;
- The benefits and the disadvantages to taking on the scheme.

The Officers responses are attached to this report at **Appendix 1**.

2.5 The purpose of this meeting is to enable the Committee to consider the additional information requested above in relation to CPE and to discuss the issue of the Parking enforcement with a representative of the Police.

2.6 The Committee is asked to determine if it wishes to make a recommendation the Cabinet Member and Council on whether the Newport City Council should adopt Civil Enforcement Powers.

2.7 The remit of the Committee does not extend to the considerations of specific parking issues and concerns within Newport such as the types of parking restrictions in place on specific streets. It is focused on whether the overall issue of parking enforcement should be taken on by the Council and whether this would be beneficial when measured against the anticipated impact on budget and resources.

3 **Information Submitted to the Committee**

3.1 Attached at **Appendix 1** is a response from the Officers to the Committees' request for additional information.

3.2 Information in response to the Committees request for Information on what similar Authorities have implemented and enforced the scheme has been requested by NCC officers, and will be circulated to the Committee and available online to the public as soon as it is received.

3.2 The Committee has previously received the following documents in relation to CPE:

- [Newport City Council Civil Parking Enforcement \(CPE\) – Summary from Officers](#)
- [Newport Civil Parking Enforcement Review – Report by AECOM Consultants \(September 2016\)](#)

Members are asked to make use of the printed copies of these documents from the previous meetings papers. Additional copies are available by request.

4 **Suggested Areas of Focus**

4.1 It is suggested that the Committee focus on the additional information provided by the Officers while considering the minutes from the previous meeting a

- 4.2 The Committee might decide to focus on any areas of parking enforcement that the Police have specific knowledge of. This questioning might allow the Committee to develop more insight into the pre-existing pitfalls and problems of parking enforcement in Newport.

Section B – Supporting Information

5 Links to Council Policies and Priorities

- 5.1 The Officers have drawn links to the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act in their submission of evidence to Scrutiny.
- 5.2 The Council's Draft Corporate Plan 2017 – 2022. One of the Thriving City aims is to combat illegal parking through a step change in behaviour and enforcement.

6 Risks

- 6.1 There is a risk of Newport being without Parking Enforcement of any kind if the Cabinet Member and Council decide against adopting CPE.

7 Financial Implications

7.1

	Year 1 (Current) £	Year 2 £	Year 3 £	Ongoing £	Notes including budgets heads affected
Costs (Income)	588,073 1,386,204 (538,434)	588,073 (610,359)			Operational Costs (p.a) Capital set up costs (One off) **
Capital s (Savings)					
Net Impact on Budget	-19,655	22,286			

** The capital funding for the estimated set-up costs is currently shown on the basis of an internal Loan. If applied, the repayment method over a thirty year period, with a 2.35% interest charge, would impose an annual charge of £63,038 which would clearly put pressure on the sustainability of the scheme.

8 Background Papers

- 8.1 [Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee – 16 November 2017](#) (web link) – Minutes and agenda available online.

Report Completed 07/12/17

This page is intentionally left blank

Additional Information Report

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Proposed Application for Civil Parking Enforcement Powers

The Committee debated the potential application for CPE power's within the city on the 15th November. The following questions were asked

Question 1 Alternative Models/Options available

With the Police currently proposing to withdraw from parking enforcement and legislation only allowing the powers to be transferred to the Local Authority, the only options are:-

- Do not apply for Civil Parking Enforcement powers which will see the city with no parking enforcement over and above endorsable parking enforcement by the Police
- Apply to Welsh Government for the introduction of CPE within the City of Newport

In 2016, Newport City Council offered to fully fund a Police officer to undertake parking enforcement within the city centre. Although a service level agreement was drafted, the Police declined to enter into the agreement.

Even if the police had agreed that this was a possible solution, the cost to implement suitable traffic enforcement would be in excess of £50k per year and would only cover the city centre with one officer. It was also confirmed that attendance would be subject to availability as the officer could not be assigned to parking only.

As all fines would be retained by central government, there would be no FPN income to offset these costs and would have represented poor value for money for Newport when compared to the CPE proposal.

There are a number of alternative delivery models available / have been considered should the decision be taken to proceed:

- Collaborative working with one or more of the other 4 Gwent Authorities who are now considering CPE powers following confirmation of withdrawal by Gwent Police.
 - 1) All 5 authorities collaborate on enforcement
 - 2) All 5 authorities collaborate on back office
 - 3) Collaborate with 1 or more as above

It has subsequently been confirmed that 4 of the 5 Gwent authorities do not want to collaborate on enforcement but would be willing to consider back office collaboration

- Fully outsource enforcement to a private enforcement company

This was deemed as having no merit by all 5 authorities

Question 2 Information on what similar Authorities have implemented and enforced the scheme

Awaiting information from external source (This information will be sent out to Committee Members as soon as possible)

Question 3 Whether there were more cost effective options available to address the problem of Parking Enforcement

The only option available to Newport is to apply to WG for CPE powers which is cost neutral.

As stated, Newport City Council previously offered to fully fund a Police officer to undertake parking enforcement within the city centre. Although a service level agreement was drafted, the Police declined to enter into the agreement. This option would also be considerably more expensive when compared to the CPE proposal

With the inevitable withdrawal of the Police from enforcement, Newport City Council is the only body who can apply for these powers within the city.

The 1984 Road Traffic Regulation Act allows authorities to enforce permitted on-street parking places; however, it does not allow them to enforce the adjacent waiting restrictions.

Unless enforcement is applied in a uniform manner across a geographic area there is a risk of displacement of parked vehicles and causing other more serious traffic safety and congestion issues.

Consequently, the only way to achieve overall enforcement in an area is to establish a Civil Enforcement Area and Special Enforcement Area, as defined in the Traffic Management Act 2004, and for the Council to take responsibility for all non-endorsable parking contraventions in that area.

Therefore, although the capital set up / implementation costs are an estimate, which will be clarified following the signs/lines review and procurement of professional services, such costs are unavoidable if the city is to make an application to Welsh Government for CPE powers.

It is anticipated that the proposed CPE scheme will be broadly financially sustainable over time. However, if the resulting financial equation is not sustainable; it is a matter of adjusting the scale of the enforcement resource until a better balance is found.

This is not an attempt to issue more PCNs but to align the resource level to the available income generated.

A lower number of PCNs per hour of enforcement shows high compliance levels and the enforcement service can be down sized accordingly. The emphasis is that CPE is a traffic management tool not a means for local authorities to raise income.

Question 4 Implementation issues that the Council might face

Awaiting information from external source (This information will be sent out to Committee Members as soon as possible)

Question 5 Impact of CPE – i.e. numbers of available parking places in the city centre /displacement to other areas from the city centre

Existing Parking Provision within the City Centre

General parking is provided in the larger multi storey car parks, surface car parks and on street limited waiting provision. The locations and capacity are as follows:

Car Parks

Location	Capacity
Park Square	395
Kingsway	1050
NCP Queensway	392
Stow Hill	43
Hill Street	59
Emlyn Street	42
Blaenavon Wharf	37
NCP Bridge Street	44
NCP North Street	62
NCP Stow Hill	76
Maindee	53
Friars Walk	350
On street business parking	90
Newport Station	184
Total Available spaces	2877

Although no data is available for the privately owned car parking facilities, Park Square currently operates at 24% average occupancy with peak occupancy never more than 31% (excluding city centre event days etc).

Due to the uncontrolled access and egress from our surface car parks, it is difficult to establish accurate occupancy rates over and above numbers of tickets issued. However, it has been estimated at circa 52% averaged across the day

On Street Parking (City Centre)

Several lengths of road within the city centre are the subject of limited waiting traffic orders, generally restricted to 20 minutes, 1 and 2 hour maximum wait. The locations and capacities are as follows

Location	Number of spaces	Restriction
Caxton Place	5	one hour
Baneswell Road	16	one hour
Bridge Street	5	one hour
Stow Hill	5	one hour
Charles Street	9	one hour
Victoria Place	5	two hours
Hill Street	17	one hour
Park Square	38	two hours
Victoria Road	6	two hours
Ivor Street	7	one hour
Commercial Street	43	one hour
Cardiff Road	17	20 minutes
North Street	17	one hour
West Street	3	one hour
Total Available on street parking places	193	

On Street Taxi Provision

Location	Capacity
Station Street	5
Bridge Street	6
Friars Walk	10
Stow Hill	6

Corn Street	5
Queensway	7
Baneswell Road	6
North Street	5
Upper Dock Street	6
Total Taxi Capacity	56

On Street Disabled Persons Parking Places (Ranks) Provision

Location	Capacity
Railway Street	5
Station Street	5
<i>Under</i> elevated section of Old Green	13
Skinner Street	4
Upper Dock Street	6
Talbot Lane	11
Ivor Street	4
Hill Street	14
Commercial Street	10
Cardiff Road	2
Fothergill Court	2
Kingsway (<i>on slip road o/s Dolman Theatre</i>)	3
Baneswell Road	6
Total DPPP (Rank) Capacity	85

Notes:

- (1) Valid Blue Badge holders can also wait for up to (3) hours on '*prohibitions*' of waiting e.g. double yellow lines, or solid single yellow lines – so long as an 'obstruction' is not being caused
- (2) Valid Blue Badge holders can also wait indefinitely where others are '*restricted*' to limited waiting
- (3) Valid blue badge holders are NOT permitted to *park* on 'Loading Bays' (*unless a loading 'operation' was being undertaken*), as is the case with *any* other vehicle;
- (4) Valid blue badge holders are NOT permitted to park on a clearway, including a bus stop clearway.
- (5) Valid blue badge holders are NOT permitted to wait on taxi ranks.
- (6) Valid blue badge holders can also wait indefinitely on resident permit parking schemes which are *time limited* for other users

- (7) Valid blue badge holders are permitted to wait for a *maximum period of three hours* on a residents' ONLY permit parking place.

Potential Impact of Parking Enforcement - Displacement

With spare capacity within the existing city centre car parks and enforcement likely to free up limited waiting on street that is currently blocked by over staying, it is anticipated that there is adequate off/on street parking to accommodate current levels of “illegally parked” vehicles. However, there is a commitment to review parking provision post implementation with the intention to increase off street facilities should there be a need.

The city centre areas currently covered by Resident Parking Traffic Orders were set out in the original report.

Resident Parking Zones (RPZ's) are introduced to address peak time commuter parking and assist residents to find a parking space near their home.

Existing Council policies will remain in place to assess and if necessary, address displaced commuter parking in residential areas as a result of the CPE proposal. There are no grounds to review the existing qualification criteria for RPZ's with the implementation of CPE.

Question 6 The benefits and the disadvantages to taking on the scheme

Advantages of the adoption of CPE powers

- Ensures parking policies are implemented effectively
- Improved compliance will be seen in permitted parking spaces and maximised turnover of available kerb space parking
- Improved traffic flow and management
- Aids accident reduction
- Parking responsive to the public's needs
- Authorities may use any revenue from parking charges and penalty charges to fund enforcement activities
- They can use any surpluses to improve offstreet parking or for certain other transport-related purposes / environmental schemes.
- Encourage the use of available off street parking capacity
- Proposal is in line with Government policies for restraint over the Growth and impact of traffic in urban areas
- Encouragement of the use of public transport and the restraint of commuter-based parking
- Effective deterrent to the growth in traffic/ car ownership in city centre areas.
- Improved local accountability and level of service to residents and others affected by illegal parking.
- Performs well in delivering key Wellbeing objectives for current and future generations

Disadvantages of the adoption of CPE powers

- On the adoption of CPE powers, there is no mechanism to reverse the decision and hand them back to Gwent Police
- The Council will be taking on additional responsibilities and duties that will impact on existing staff resources in the short term.
- Set up costs are significant but reflect mandatory expenditure to comply with the application and business case and will be financed through income from FPN's
- Process of gaining the powers will take 15- 18 months
- With all 5 Gwent Local Authorities undertaking this process, availability of suitable consultancy services and staffing may be of concern
- The issue of physical violence after the start of CPE is also important to consider.

This page is intentionally left blank

Scrutiny Report

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Part 1

Date: 14 December 2017

Subject: Forward Work Programme Update

Author Overview and Scrutiny Officer

Section A – Committee Guidance and Recommendations

1. Recommendations to the Committee

The Committee is asked to:

- (i) Endorse the proposed schedule for the next two Committee meetings;
- (ii) Confirm the topics to be considered, the invitees for each item, and indicate whether any additional information or research is required; and
- (iii) Note the list of reports that have been sent to the Committee for information over the last month.

2. Context

- 2.1 The purpose of a forward work programme is to help ensure Councillors achieve organisation and focus in the undertaking of enquiries through the Overview and Scrutiny function. Effective work programming is essential to ensure that the work of Overview and Scrutiny makes a positive impact upon the Council's delivery of services.
- 2.2 The Centre for Public Scrutiny's Good Scrutiny Guide recognises the importance of the forward work programme. In order to 'lead and own the process', it states that Councillors should have ownership of their Committee's work programme, and be involved in developing, monitoring and evaluating it. The Good Scrutiny Guide also states that, in order to make an impact, the scrutiny workload should be co-ordinated and integrated into corporate processes, to ensure that it contributes to the delivery of corporate objectives, and that work can be undertaken in a timely and well-planned manner.
- 2.3 Further information about the work programming process, including the procedures for referring new business to the programme, can be found in our Scrutiny Handbook on the Council's Scrutiny webpages (www.newport.gov.uk/scrutiny).

3. Information Submitted to the Committee

3.2 The following information is attached:

Appendix 1: The current Committee forward work programme;

Appendix 2: List of information Reports sent to the Committee over the last month.

Section B – Supporting Information

4 Risk

- 4.1 If proper work programming procedures are not put in place, the organisation and prioritisation of the work programme is put at risk. The work of Overview and Scrutiny could become disjointed from the work of the rest of the Council, which could undermine the positive contribution Overview and Scrutiny makes to service improvement through policy development.
- 4.2 This report is presented to each Committee every month in order to mitigate that risk. The specific risks associated with individual topics on the work programme will need to be addressed as part of the Committee's investigations.

5 Links to Council Policies and Priorities

- 5.1 Having proper work programming procedures in place ensures that the work of Overview and Scrutiny makes a positive impact upon the Council's delivery of services, contributes to the delivery of corporate objectives, and ensures that work can be undertaken in a timely and well-planned manner.

6 Financial Implications

- 6.1 There will be financial consequences for some of the reviews undertaken. These will be commented upon by the Head of Finance as the reports are presented. The preparing and monitoring of the work programme is done by existing staff for which budget provision is available.

Background Papers

Scrutiny Handbook

**Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee
– Forward Work Programme**

<u>Overview and Scrutiny Committee</u>		
<u>Forward Work Programme October to December</u>		
8 January 2018 at 10am		
Topic	Invitees	Information Required/ Committee's Role
City Centre Public Spaces Protection Order	Helen Wilkie – Public Protection Manager Representatives from the Police (TBC)	<p>The Committee were due to have an update on the recommendations made in relation to implementing the City Centre PSPO in March 2018. This has been brought forward to an additional meeting in January.</p> <p>The Committee will receive a report from Officers outlining issues with the enforcing the PSPO, and recommending a process for consultation on potential changes to the PSPO.</p> <p>The role of the Committee will be to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment on the proposed consultation process; • Agree to receive the outcomes of the consultation at its meeting in March, when it will have the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes before the report being submitted to the Council for a decision.

Thursday 1 February 2018 at 10am		
Topic	Invitees	Information Required/ Committee's Role
Draft Budget Proposals 2018/19 – Coordination of comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meirion Rushworth - Head of Finance; - Rhys Cornwall – Head of People and Business Change - Cllr David Williams – Chairperson of the Performance Scrutiny Committee – People; - Cllr Chris Evans – Chairperson of the Performance Scrutiny Committee – Place and Corporate. 	<p>To receive the comments and recommendations made by the other Scrutiny Committees,</p> <p>Make recommendations to the Cabinet relating to the Budget Process and Public Engagement</p> <p>Confirm the final list of comments to be forwarded to the Cabinet for</p>

**Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee
– Forward Work Programme**

Information Reports

To be circulated to Members by email for comment and included in monthly Information Report section of Work Programme report.

None scheduled.		
-----------------	--	--