

Gloucestershire County Council

Notice of call-in

To Chief Executive

We wish to make clear our support in principle for the adoption of a Residents Parking Policy. However the cabinet report has left a number of unanswered questions which are of concern both to members and residents, we trust full consideration will be given to these questions before the council proceeds with its Residents Parking Policy.

We, the undersigned six members give notice of our desire to call in the following executive decision notice of which was published on

23rd October 2009

Agenda Item 5 Adoption Of A Residents Parking Policy For Gloucestershire

That the adoption of the Residents Parking Policy, amended as detailed above, be agreed and the Group Director: Environment be authorised, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Waste, to publish a schedule of charges for parking permits which will include a discount for Vehicle Excise Duty Class A Vehicles

The grounds for the call in are that the following condition(s) are satisfied for the reasons specified:

The Cabinet, Leader of the Council or Cabinet Lead Member acted contrary to the Cabinet Procedure Rules, the Access to Information about the County Council's Formal Business and/or the principles of decision making set out in Part 2, Article 7.02 of the Constitution.

The matter contravened is

7.02.7 Their aims and desired outcomes should be clear

1. The cabinet recommendation makes clear the purpose of this decision is to give the Cabinet member in charge along with a council officer the power to raise parking charges for residents in Gloucestershire without any restriction. The cabinet must make clear the desired outcome of the charges it is seeking the power to impose on residents in parking schemes across the county.

Is the aim of the cabinet to make a profit from residents parking schemes and use it as a back-door method of raising taxes on living people in the county? Or is the cabinet committed for the charges simply to cover the costs of administering and enforcing the parking policy where residents parking schemes are introduced?

In the report presented to support the decision, there is no guidance given on the price of charges which are being considered. The cabinet has not made clear how the parking charges will be decided by the two people who will now have complete control over parking prices across the county.

2. At the cabinet meeting Cllr Waddington introduced the proposal for Supplementary Guidance to be developed to the policy on the operation of Residents Parking schemes. However, this

is new to the recommendation presented to cabinet and no details of the intention of this new Guidance policy has been made clear.

Will the Supplementary Guidance address the issue of proper consultation with local members on residents schemes in the area a member represents? The reference to members in this regard in section 20 of the cabinet report suggests members of the council will only be allowed to give “feedback” to council officers. Will the cabinet accept members role in representing their areas on these issues should be more than just feedback and members should be fully involved in the consultation and decision-making on a residents parking scheme which is within the area a member represents?

Will the Supplementary Guidance address the issue of proper consultation with permit holders over plans to alter the charge for a residents parking permit?

Will the Supplementary Guidance provide clear advice on the process for residents to request removal of schemes as well as their introduction? For example, if residents have concerns about a council policy over inflated charge increases, or the effects of a scheme locally, and decide they would prefer not to have a scheme, will the council provide an appropriate process for residents requests to remove a scheme.

Will the Supplementary Guidance ensure that the council is obliged to properly consult residents on the detail of a scheme being introduced in their area? The report recognises different residential areas have differing needs and in section 5.1 of Appendix A admits that “Design criteria will have to have some degree of flexibility of interpretation”. The report does not make clear the council’s intention about consulting local residents prior to the publication of statutory notices on these details.

7.02.8 They should be properly reasoned and alternatives that are discounted should be identified and the reasons for their rejection explained adequately

The above matter was contravened in the following ways

The cabinet decision based on the report presented does not show examples or evidence of the cabinet considering other systems for implementing residents parking zones. Has the cabinet properly reasoned its decision by considering other operational schemes and is the cabinet able to provide evidence of its consideration of alternatives?

The reasoning in section 3.13 of the appendix referring to motorcycles and presumably mopeds is not properly explained. Permits may be per registration number or the resident as often residents with motorcycles have more than one but only park one at a time on street parking.

Dated

Signed