

In accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 46.2, we the undersigned, hereby give notice that we wish to call-in the Executive decision – Parking Review – 20 minutes Free Parking Initiative made on Thursday 17th October 2013 by Cabinet.

In accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 46.5, we the undersigned, hereby give notice that we wish to call-in the Executive decision with the following reasons.

1. Inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision;

- a) The report was published on Monday 14th October, clearly stating that no discussion or consultation had taken place with anyone regarding the outcome of the trial.
- b) A press statement issued on the 15th October makes it clear the Leader of the Council took the decision to stop free parking 2 days prior to the meeting of cabinet. Therefore, cabinet was just rubber stamping a decision already made.
- c) Introducing a loss of PCN income at this late stage is a cynical attempt to move the goal posts and to construct a report to undermine the trial results.
- d) A number of petitions had previously been presented to Council around parking indicating local residents and businesses are strong advocates of free periods of parking. This clearly shows that the decision makers have ignored the voices of residents and local businesses.
- e) Carers - free parking will have a direct impact on Carers in the Borough, who may be financially disadvantaged by re-introducing parking charges in Rayners Lane, and by the scheme not being extending to the wider Borough. This is an important element of the community whose views must be taken into account to discharge the Councils PSED.
- f) Lack of adequate consultation with local businesses. The actual pilot was put in place to support local businesses. At no point in the Cabinet papers does it refer to the feedback from local businesses in the Rayners Lane area during the period the pilot took place, and whether they support or oppose the wider role out. The report also does not consider, or ask for feedback on, whether local businesses had an income boost during the free parking trial. The PH for business Cllr. Kam Chana stated at the meeting that consultation took place, but this information is nowhere to be seen. This information may have had an impact on the views of his Cabinet colleagues.
- g) The cabinet report ignores and does not take into account the COMPACT agreement with the voluntary and community sector regarding consultation. The business sector e.g. Harrow in Business and North West London Chamber of Commerce, would certainly have a view on this policy. Also the wider voluntary groups would have a view because their 'users' may benefit from the wider role out of a short period of free parking. The COMPACT document has clearly not been taken into account when making the decision
- h) This dictatorial style of decision making of not listening to the views of stakeholders undermines the role and duty of the local authority to consult and support their local residents.

- i) The way the decision was made contradicts the Nolan Principles; in particular, openness and personal judgement. For example the decision had already been made prior to the meeting of Cabinet and therefore ignored any views made at the meeting.

2. The absence of adequate evidence on which to base a decision;

Page 18 of the supplementary gives evidence of fewer PCNs being issued; this is flawed evidence. It compares July/August, with August/ September, therefore giving no controls for seasonal variations. In 2012, there was a downward trend in income between July, August and September. In July 2012 income was 605K, in August 2012 it was 580K and September 2012 it was 551K.

It is also the case that there have been 3500 more PCNs issued across the borough in the first 6 months of this year, compared to last year. This has resulted in an increase of income for the council. Therefore the cost of the 20 min free parking will be in line with the budget.

The Local Government Minister has openly said that car drivers should be able to stop on yellow lines for up to 30 minutes in order to boost local businesses. This was not considered within the report.

In a recent debate in the House of Commons the Conservative MP for Harrow East, Bob Blackman, has himself come out in support of free periods of parking. This, like the views of other elected representatives, and local residents was not considered within the report.

3. The decision is contrary to the policy framework, or contrary to, or not wholly in accordance with the budget framework;

The decision contradicts Council agreed policies that ensure there is a joined-up, cross-sector approach to agreeing the delivery of local priorities.

4. The action is not proportionate to the desired outcome;

There is no mention within the report as to how the decision is proportionate to achieving the Councils agreed vision and priorities.

We fervently believe that PCNs should not be used to raise money and that the council should welcome the fact that fewer PCNs being issued means that motorists are complying with the rules.

By law PCNs should be used to enhance road safety and traffic flow and not increase the income of councils. Indeed a decrease in the number PCNs is to be welcomed as it shows that road users are obeying road signage and so increasing road safety and traffic flow. This point has been emphasized by the Local Government Minister, Eric Pickles, particularly in regard to CCTV.

5. A potential human rights challenge;

As part of their PSED, cabinet need to take due regard of equality implications. The report clearly states that the EQiA had not been reviewed (para 2.50) following the trial,

meaning the decision makers would be unaware if any equality implications had arisen, either from the trial or from not extending the trial.

Furthermore, the decision does not reflect the wider sector and the delivery of services, which may contribute to greater inequality and poorer outcomes.

6. Insufficient consideration of financial advice.

Within the report it states quite clearly that the effect on parking income would be broadly in line with the financial assessments in preparation of the MTFs and agreement of the budget. However, it also clearly states that it anticipates fewer PCNs to be issued, suggesting a “loss of income” circa £310K.

The loss of monies received from PCNs should not be used when making a decision; otherwise it suggests that the council is targeting the use of PCNs to generate income for the council. The decision to cancel free parking, based on the use of income from PCNs, would lead residents to believe that the council thinks it’s a good thing to make money from issuing parking fines.

In view of the reasons outlined above, and due to recent changes within the political administration of the Council, we would like the committee to consider referring the decision to Full Council in accordance with the powers and duties given to the Call-In Sub-Committee as stated within the Constitution

Hard copy signed by:

Councillors David Perry, Graham Henson, Thaya Idaikkadar, Margaret Davine, Krishna Suresh and Phillip O’Dell