

**SCRUTINY REFERRALS**

The following are attached:

- a. Referral from the Sustainable Development & Transport Scrutiny Commission re: agenda item 5 – residents parking schemes.
  
- b. Referral from the Resources Scrutiny Commission re: agenda item 5 – residents parking schemes.
  
- c. Referral from the Sustainable Development & Transport Scrutiny Commission re: agenda item 6 – Ashton Vale to Temple Meads Metrobus (rapid transit) review and update.
  
- d. Exempt Referral from the Resources Scrutiny Commission re: agenda item 6 – Ashton Vale to Temple Meads Metrobus (rapid transit) review and update. (note: circulated to Mayor and Cabinet members but not available to the public)

## Scrutiny Commission Referral Form

**Referral from:**  
**Sustainable Development and  
Transport Scrutiny  
Commission**  
**20 June 2013**

**To:**  
**The Mayor**

**Date: 26 June 2013**

**Contact Officer: Siân Parry (Scrutiny) x22074**

**Subject:**  
Residents' Parking Schemes

## **1. Reason for Referral**

The Commission discussed the Mayor's proposals for Residents' Parking Schemes (RPS) at its meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> June prior to the Cabinet meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> June. The Mayor attended to listen to people putting their views forward and answered questions from them and subsequently in discussion with the Commission.

Since the Commission's last meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> May, the Mayor reiterated that he is open to changing his approach and was flexible for example in changing the outer boundaries. He was having a 'pause' for a month to consult further on the schemes coming forward, but he wanted to accelerate the Clifton and Redland schemes where people were supportive of them. He was conscious that areas were suffering because of the time it takes to implement the necessary Traffic Regulation Orders. The Mayor guaranteed that the extensive consultation being done would be listened to and be taken into account in his further deliberations.

The Mayor explained that the Cabinet report was an enabling one and flexibility would continue and was built into the schemes. This is an informal stage for a month for further consideration of the issues that have been raised so there may not be much overall delay. He is putting in place all the resources necessary to deliver the schemes and formal consultation would come later for each scheme. The report did not set anything in stone.

The Commission then discussed the issues in detail and made the following points:

It was very concerned about the lack of paperwork and information within the report once it had been made available;

The breakdown of individual scheme costs needs to be provided;

Even though the Commission requested further information particularly in relation to data, for example comparative information from similar UK and European cities, the current use and traffic flow and air quality in recommended areas, this was not forthcoming. The Commission's view was there is not enough information for the Mayor to make a decision on all the schemes. Some information is available but there are many gaps, for example the lack of an equalities impact assessment and the wider issue of disabled parking bays being delayed across the city as a result of the schemes being implemented;

The consultation process has been very poor so far and residents have not been individually consulted;

The Mayor should ensure that there is adequate public transport infrastructure (both bus and rail) and improved park-and-ride facilities before the schemes are rolled out so that commuters will have an effective alternative to using their cars;

There should be one hour free parking across all of the schemes for visitors without a permit needed;

Businesses, both small independents and large companies, need more flexibility and their differing needs require further consideration otherwise RPS will become a disincentive for inward investment and create uncertainty for businesses in the scheme areas;

There needs to be a price freeze for four years and then raised by inflation to rebuild residents' confidence;

The outer boundaries for the recommended schemes need to be flexible depending on resident feedback. The boundaries should be expanded or if necessary, shrunk depending on the response of the public consultation;

Councillors need to be involved at a very early stage in any consultation process;

The timing of the schemes needs to be examined as some need to be done urgently but for others there is little evidence for them, e.g. Bishopston, Windmill Hill and Ashley Down;

There are differing messages coming from the Mayor and officers and this needs to be addressed as it is causing confusion in the scheme areas;

The Commission supports the proposed pricing structure for low emission vehicles.

## **2. Recommendations**

The Commission therefore recommends that the Mayor should move forward with the schemes outlined in the Cabinet report of 4<sup>th</sup> July 2012, i.e. the zones already agreed in Redcliffe, St Paul's, Easton and St Philips, Cotham North, Redland, Montpelier, all of Clifton\*, Spike Island, Bower Ashton, Southville and North East Bedminster. These should be proceeded with if they are supported by local residents through an adequate consultation process considering differing needs, including whether flexibility is needed on the outer boundary.

The other schemes should be put on the backburner for six months so that emerging traffic patterns in the schemes can be monitored and evaluated. If the consultation shows that individual schemes are not supported, then there should be a right of refusal for residents in the area. The other points raised by the Commission should be taken into consideration as part of the consultation process and addressed by the Mayor.

The Commission supports the recommendation at Full Council on 18<sup>th</sup> May that an all-party group should be established to monitor the way forward. This should be made up of two councillors from each party across the council.

\*the earlier Cabinet report recommended part of Clifton should be implemented, but the Commission agreed that this should be amended to include all of the Clifton area.

## **3. Action required**

The Commission seeks the Mayor's support for its recommendations.

## **4. Accompanying papers (as attached)**

Draft Extract Minute

**SDT  
12.6/13**

## **RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME UPDATE**

The Chair asked that this item be taken as an item of urgent business, as it had not been published in accordance with the Access to Information requirements. However, it was necessary to consider the report in order that the Commission could submit its views prior to consideration by the Cabinet on 27 June 2013.

The Commission considered a report going to Cabinet of the Service Director, Transport (Agenda Item No. 10) relating to the Residents Parking Scheme.

During detailed discussion members of the commission highlighted the following points:

- Since the Commission's last meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> May, the Mayor reiterated that he is open to changing his approach and was flexible for example in changing the outer boundaries. He was having a 'pause' for a month to consult further on the schemes coming forward, but he wanted to accelerate the Clifton and Redland schemes where people were supportive of them. He was conscious that areas were suffering because of the time it takes to implement the necessary Traffic Regulation Orders. The Mayor guaranteed that the extensive consultation being done would be listened to and be taken into account in his further deliberations.
- The Mayor explained that the Cabinet report was an enabling one and flexibility would continue and was built into the schemes. This is an informal stage for a month for further consideration of the issues that have been raised so there may not be much overall delay. He is putting in place all the resources necessary to deliver the schemes and formal consultation would come later for each scheme. The report did not set anything in stone.
- The Commission then discussed the issues in detail and made the following points:
  - It was very concerned about the lack of paperwork and information within the report once it had been made available;

- The breakdown of individual scheme costs needs to be provided;
- Members also noted that the published Cabinet report had not contained detailed information learning the lessons from other local authorities particularly neighbouring authorities and other core cities;
- Several members referenced a previously considered Cabinet report (4 July 2012), which had made decisions on Residents Parking Schemes. The Commission asked that the Mayor implements those decisions, together with schemes in those areas which have expressed support for schemes (4 parts of Clifton);
- It was suggested that the remaining schemes particularly in the outlying areas should be held in abeyance until the lesson could be learned as a result of the implementation of the schemes above;
- The Commission confirmed that consultation should be adequate recognising that there potential differing needs in some Wards/communities which should be reflected in any proposals going forward, and should seek to minimise potential impact on businesses in the City;
- Councillor Kent expressed concern that potentially upto £3m could be spent on schemes in outlying areas which may never be implemented, as there was current insufficient information in published reports on whether there was a need for residents parking in outlying areas;
- Councillor Pearce commented that consideration should be given to the impact of residents parking schemes and large development by neighbouring authorities (particularly in South Gloucestershire), and any larger developments in the City i.e. Southmead Hospital;
- Members asked that consideration be given to increasing the number of permits for larger employers i.e. Health workers, university, schools, charities and Bristol Zoo;
- The commission noted the air quality issues for residents particularly around central Bristol and the environmental impact for those residents living in the less wealthy parts of the city i.e. those around the M32 corridor;
- That the Mayor gives consideration to cost of permits for those with a limited income;
- The Scrutiny Commission asked that the Mayor consider having a free daily allowance in parking bays which would

allow short visits, and any schemes be tailored to the local areas;

- The Commission suggested that the Mayor give consideration to a price freeze for permits which would cover a number of years (e.g. four years) and thereafter increases linked to inflation;
- It was suggested that consideration be given to visitors passes, looking at schemes introduced by other authorities including Nottingham;
- That the Mayor consult with an all party group (not necessarily a member of the SD&T Scrutiny Commission) in order to produce a more gradual phased approach with greater consultation and input from local residents and businesses; and
- The Commission welcomed the information on air quality and emissions as set out in appendix 2, which suggested tailoring the scheme to the type of car. However, expressed caution that this could have the potential to be discriminatory against those residents who cannot afford low emission vehicles.

**RESOLVED - (i) that The Commission therefore recommends that the Mayor should move forward with the schemes outlined in the Cabinet report of 4<sup>th</sup> July 2012, i.e. the zones already agreed in Redcliffe, St Paul's, Easton and St Philips, Cotham North, Redland, Montpelier, all of Clifton\*, Spike Island, Bower Ashton, Southville and North East Bedminster. These should be proceeded with if they are supported by local residents through an adequate consultation process considering**

differing needs, including whether flexibility is needed on the outer boundary.

- (ii) The other schemes should be deferred for six months so that emerging traffic patterns in the schemes can be monitored and evaluated. If the consultation shows that individual schemes are not supported, then there should be a right of refusal for residents in the area. The other points raised by the Commission should be taken into consideration as part of the consultation process and addressed by the Mayor.
- (iii) The Commission supports the recommendation at Full Council on 18<sup>th</sup> May that an all-party group should be established to monitor the way forward. This should be made up of two councillors from each party across the council; and
- (iv) the earlier Cabinet report recommended part of Clifton should be implemented, but the



**Commission agreed that this should be amended to include all of the Clifton area.**

## **Scrutiny Commission Referral Form**

**Referral from:**  
**Resources Scrutiny**  
**Commission**  
**21 June 2013**

**To:**  
**The Mayor/Cabinet**

**Date: 26 June 2013**

**Contact Officer: Steve Chapman (Scrutiny Officer)**

**Subject:**

**Agenda item no. 5 – Residents’ parking schemes**

A submission from the Chair, Cllr Hopkins, on behalf of the commission is set out below.

### **Submission to Cabinet from Resources Scrutiny regarding RPZ**

Firstly, can we say that it was most regrettable that the Mayor did not attend Friday’s meeting. Attendance had been confirmed and the Commission adjusted the agenda to fit with the Mayor’s availability. We, of course, were in a similar position to SD&T with regard to late publication of the report; but, if anything, matters were even more confused because there were different understandings of the latest policy adjustments, which might have been cleared up if the Mayor had been present.

We feel strongly that it is unsafe to proceed with the report as supplied but would wish to encourage completion of the inner-city schemes where there is a clear demand and need. We understand from officers that there has been work done and, if these complete, they will do so at the current charging rate with guarantees rather than the proposed higher charging rate.

Some of our concerns:

1. The risk register is clearly inadequate and needs to be independently assessed.
2. There has been no assessment of need and, indeed, in the outer zones the only evidence available shows a total lack of commuter parking.
3. There is no evidence supplied of new future problems in the outer zones and no analysis of likely effects or even of existing scheme effects.
4. Despite officers failing to answer some of the questions supplied weeks in advance, it is clear that the current scheme in Kingsdown is more

than covering costs. We have little confidence in the financial projections and will be screening these at our next meeting.

5. We note that the financial projections take into account the 'cost' of operating enforcement but not the revenue derived. This was over £48k in Kingsdown in one year.
6. We note that there is no examination of the effect of the possible cordon charging scheme and would suggest that this is a very relevant factor. Clarity is needed in this area.
7. The suggestion that schemes will be designed up to and including TRO, but may not be implemented is more than questionable. The cost would be many hundreds of thousands of pounds which cannot be wasted.
8. Officers have no idea how many businesses are in the area proposed, let alone how they may be affected.
9. Disabled parking is mentioned in passing but no reference to costs and officers were unable to answer what charges would be.
10. Concerns regarding costs have been dismissed as the permit represents a 1% - 2% of the average running costs of a car. Whilst this may be true for the many motorists who have modern cars that depreciate, it is certainly not true of some lower income households who keep their cars going on a hand-to-mouth, make –do-and-mend basis.
11. There was concern expressed about the capacity of the department to deliver and, in particular, that other planned and budgeted-for schemes may suffer in the attempt.

We intend to be examining the scheme again next month, with clear expectations that it will either have been radically amended by the Mayor or blocked by call-in prior to changes.

We sincerely hope that by then officers are in a better position to answer relevant questions and apply themselves to so doing.

## Scrutiny Commission Referral Form

**Referral from:**  
**Sustainable Development and  
Transport Scrutiny  
Commission**  
**20 June 2013**

**To:**  
**The Mayor/Cabinet**

**Date: 26 June 2013**

**Contact Officer: Siân Parry (Scrutiny) x22074**

**Subject:**

Ashton Vale to Temple Meads MetroBus (Rapid Transit) Review and Update

### **1. Reason for referral**

The Commission considered the Mayor's Review of the Ashton Vale to Temple Meads Bus Rapid Transit scheme at its meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> June. Officers explained that there were three options: Option 1- the current scheme; Option 2- an alternative alignment along Cumberland Road; Option 3- an alternative alignment along Hotwells Road. The methodology leading to the proposals was explored with officers and the Commission made the following points:

- It had concerns about the robustness of the methodology;
- The variation in the number of passengers using the different options needed to be taken into account;
- It had queries about whether any consultation had been done with residents on Cumberland Road, particularly about the impact on parking spaces within the wider context of RPS proposals;
- Costings of the impact on walking and cycling along the route, for example on Ashton Swing bridge;
- The impacts of the changes to Bristol City Football Club's proposals for its new stadium.

The issues of using Bedminster Roundabout as an alternative in Option 2 and the interaction between Ashton Vale to Temple Meads BRT and the North Fringe to Hengrove Package proposed route were also discussed. Officers addressed these questions in detail (see draft extract minute attached at Appendix 1).

After full consideration of the Options, the Commission agreed to put forward the following recommendation to the Cabinet meeting on 27th June:

### **2. Recommendation**

The Commission agrees that Option 2 is the best option put forward and supports it going forward.

This was not a unanimous decision, but favoured by the majority of Commission members. In particular though, concerns were expressed about the slightly higher risk of this Option and the impact on Bedminster roundabout.

**3. Action required**

The Commission seeks the Mayor's support for these recommendations.

**4. Accompanying papers (as attached)**

Draft Extract Minute

## **UPDATE NOTE ON ASHTON VALE TO TEMPLE MEADS METROBUS (RAPID TRANSIT) REVIEW**

At this point the meeting was adjourned to receive exempt advice from the Service Director, Legal.

On resumption of the meeting, the Commission considered a report going to Cabinet of the Service Director, Transport (Agenda Item No. 11) relating to the Rapid Transit Review.

The Commission considered the Mayor's Review of the Ashton Vale to Temple Meads Bus Rapid Transit scheme at its meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> June. Officers explained that there were three options: Option 1- the current scheme; Option 2- an alternative alignment along Cumberland Road; Option 3- an alternative alignment along Hotwells Road. The methodology leading to the proposals was explored with officers and the Commission made the following points:

- It had concerns about the robustness of the methodology;
- The variation in the number of passengers using the different options needed to be taken into account;
- It had queries about whether any consultation had been done with residents on Cumberland Road, particularly about the impact on parking spaces within the wider context of RPS proposals;
- costings of the impact on walking and cycling along the route, for example on Ashton Swing bridge;
- the impacts of the changes to Bristol City Football Club's proposals for its new stadium.

The issues of using Bedminster Roundabout as an alternative in Option 2 and the interaction between Ashton Vale to Temple Meads BRT and the North Fringe to Hengrove Package proposed route were also discussed. Officers addressed these questions in detail (see draft extract minute attached at Appendix 1).

After full consideration of the Options, the Commission agreed to put forward the following recommendation to the Cabinet meeting on 27th June:

The Commission agrees that Option 2 is the best option put forward and supports it going forward.

This was not a unanimous decision, but favoured by the majority of Commission members. In particular though, concerns were expressed about the slightly higher risk of this Option and the impact on Bedminster roundabout.

**RESOLVED - (i) that the report be noted; and  
(ii) that the Commission agrees that Option 2 is the best option put forward and supports it going forward.**