

CORPORATE PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held on 11th April, 2019.

Present: Councillor G.D.D. Carroll (Chairman); Councillor V.P. Driscoll (Vice-Chairman); Councillors: R. Crowley, O. Griffiths, S.J. Griffiths, Dr. I.J. Johnson, P.G. King, N. Moore, L.O. Rowlands and E. Williams

Also present: Councillors L. Burnett, G.A. Cox (Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport), K.P. Mahoney, Mrs. J.M. Norman and J.W. Thomas (Council Leader).

924 MINUTES -

RECOMMENDED - T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 14th March, 2019 be approved as a correct record.

925 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST -

Councillors G.D.D. Carroll, R. Crowley, S.J. Griffiths, Dr. I.J. Johnson, P.G. King, L.O. Rowlands and E. Williams all declared an interest in respect of Agenda Item No. 6 - Proposed Parking Management Policy 2019/20. The nature of the interest was that these Councillors were also Town or Community Councillors and they had received prior dispensation from the Standards Committee to speak and vote on such matters.

Councillor N. Moore also declared an interest in relation to Agenda Item No.6 - Proposed Parking Management Policy 2019/20, his wife was a Blue Badge holder, and he had received dispensation from the Standards Committee to speak and vote on such matters.

926 RESHAPING SERVICES - PROPOSED FEES AND CHARGES WITHIN THE DIRECTORATE OF THE MANAGING DIRECTOR AND RESOURCES (REF) -

The Head of Finance presented the reference which outlined amendments to service charges levied within the Directorate of Managing Director and Resources for the financial year 2019/20. These were agreed by Cabinet at its meeting on 18th March, 2019 and were referred to the Scrutiny Committee for its consideration.

Members were advised that the service areas within the remit of the report were:

- Legal and Democratic Services
- Human Resources
- Regeneration and Planning
- Finance and Property Services.

No.

A Committee Member stated that a member of the public may be somewhat annoyed with some of increases, citing an increase from £5.00 to £5.10. In relation to this another Member commented that the increases could make cash payments difficult, and he queried methods of payment. In reply, the Head of Finance stated that the Members comments would be taken on board, and she referred to an introduction of a new payment system, available from next year that would allow cashless payments, such as chip and pin.

The Chairman queried whether any comparison had been undertaken of fees for other local authorities. In reply, the Head of Finance stated that some benchmarking against other authorities was undertaken to ensure that the fees were within a range of those charged in other areas.

Having considered the reference,

RECOMMENDED - T H A T the Committee note the charging and fee proposals for the Managing Director and Resources as set out in the report.

Reason for recommendation

Following consideration of the charging and fees proposed for 2019/20.

927 RESHAPING SERVICES - UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION (REF) -

The Head of Performance and Development presented the report which provided an update on the progress being made to implement the Council's Reshaping Services programme.

The report was a summary of activity, with individual projects being reported as required for specific endorsement of actions to progress reshaping services activities.

The Head of Performance and Development stated that Cabinet had agreed for separate reports to be presented to the other four Scrutiny Committees, to outline progress for initiatives relevant to each Committee.

The update report detailed achievements under the programme, current initiatives being considered, budget implications for the projects and future proposals and challenges.

A Committee Member queried the Amber RAG status attributed to the Town and Community Councils and Voluntary Sector Reshaping Services. In reply, the Head of Performance and Development stated that the Amber status reflected that a process was in place to encourage Town and Community Councils and the Voluntary Sector to come forward with proposals. This also included the introduction of a protocol to cover Community Asset Transfers. The Head of Performance and Development went on to state that the likely reason why there had not been much uptake was because the Council services were being protected and properly managed. He stated that if services were to be withdrawn then Town and

No.

Community Councils may feel obliged to come forward and take over these services. The Head of Performance and Development stated that the Council could be in this situation in 2020/21.

In relation to the Town and Community Council Charter, a Committee Member stated that this was a good thing and other Local Authorities were “jealous”. The Member indicated that some Town or Community Councils, including Llandough were frustrated as the Vale Council had not identified what services or assets could be transferred. The Committee Member stated that there were very little assets in Llandough for the Community Council to take over, and he stated that greater progress and momentum was needed. In reply, the Head of Performance and Development stated that there was an offer there to Community Councils but there had been very little take up. He therefore stated that it may be appropriate for the Council to focus on the larger Town and Community Councils which had greater resources.

A Committee Member stated that for some of the programmes within the report, there were no savings attributed, adding that there was no comparison figure to indicate whether savings were on target. In reply, the Head of Finance agreed that the saving element needed to be included, has did information of why savings had not been achieved.

With regard to the number of Amber RAG statuses, a Committee Member stated that some projects, such as Catering and Youth Services were progressing, so he asked why these had not been given a Green status. In reply the Head of Performance and Development explained that in some cases, Amber would indicate where a project had not yet been fully developed, or was taking longer to implement. He agreed that more information was required which was why separate reports would be presented to all Scrutiny Committee meetings. The Committee suggested that in addition to the Red, Amber and Green statuses that a Yellow option should be available. This was formally recommended by the Committee.

Subsequently, it was

RECOMMENDED -

- (1) T H A T the contents of the report be noted.
- (2) T H A T Cabinet be advised of the recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee for outlining progress against targets, for an additional Yellow progress status to be added as an option.

Reasons for recommendations

- (1) Following the update on progress of the Reshaping Services programme.
- (2) In order to provide an additional progress status that sits between Amber and Red.

928 PROPOSED PARKING MANAGEMENT POLICY 2019/20 (REF) -

The Director of Environment and Housing presented the reference from Cabinet following its meeting on 18th March, 2019. The reference had also been considered by the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee on 4th April, 2019, which had made a number of recommendations. These recommendations were tabled for the Committee's consideration.

The Director began by stating that the Parking Management Policy was part of the Council's Reshaping Services Programme, and the policy aimed to provide better management of Council parking assets, to reduce traffic congestion and increase turnover. The Director also outlined that it was hoped to realise increased revenue in order to meet the costs of a non-statutory Council service.

In relation to the Council's budgetary position, the Director stated that the Council's budget was currently £226m which was allocated on a priority basis. The current settlement included a 4.2% budget reduction for this financial year. The Director outlined that the Council protected key services such as Education and Social Care, so it was non-statutory services which bore the brunt of savings. Of the Council's total budget, 48% was allocated to Education and 29% to Social Care. This compared to 10% allocated to Neighbourhood Services and Transport.

The Director went on to state that austerity was having a detrimental effect on Neighbourhood Services and Transport, and he advised that his Directorate alone had made £8m savings, or 26%, from its budget since 2015. In the same period, Education had made 3.7% savings and Social Services 5.3% savings. The Director added that Neighbourhood Services and Transport was required to find savings of £630,000 for this financial year. He added that if the same trend was to continue and without any extra revenue, then there would be a reduction in some of the frontline services currently provided.

In 2017, the Director advised that the Council had agreed an Income Strategy, which sought Directorates to recover costs where possible. The Director stated that town centre car parks alone cost the Council £250,000 per year, with the main costs being non-domestic rates. These were outside the control of the Council. The Director explained that for the Parking Management Policy, Option 2 was to be proposed as the preferred option, with upfront costs paid back over a period of 7 years. Option 1 required upfront costs to be funded via the Council's Capital Programme, but this had been deemed inappropriate.

With regards to the previous week's meeting of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee on 4th April, 2019, the Director advised that as a result of that Committee's recommendations, potential revenue could reduce by £100,000. With no town centre charges reducing revenue by £50,000. The Director stated that assets needed to pay for themselves and he asked Members of the Committee to look at the evidence that suggested that car parking charges did not damage town centres. He stated that charges would increase turnover where car parks were full. He also reminded Members that shoppers would still be able to park for free for a period of 2 hours, with evidence showing that most people shopped for less than this.

No.

The Chairman then invited Miss. Amanda Ewington, who had registered to speak on the matter, to address the Committee. The Chairman advised Miss. Ewington that she would have three minutes.

Miss. Ewington began by stating that austerity was hitting Council Tax payers too, referring to the 4.9% increase for 2019/20. Miss. Ewington stated that on top of this increase, the Council was proposing to charge for car parking. Miss. Ewington stated that one concern was that officers relied on a report provided by Capita, which had suggested a certain number of ticket machines. She commented that the number of machines proposed to be installed had been reduced and she queried why there had been a reduction. Miss. Ewington therefore suggested that if there were too few ticket machines then this would cause inconvenience for visitors. In addition, there was no map to illustrate where the machines would be located, so these would be difficult to find. Miss. Ewington therefore asked how long would the queues be for people trying to purchase a parking ticket, and how long would it take people to walk back to their cars. She commented that Parking Enforcement for the Council was a “get out clause”, and she queried how effective this would be.

The Chairman then invited Vale of Glamorgan Councillors, not members of the Committee, to make their representations on the matter.

The first Vale of Glamorgan Councillor, with permission to speak, was Councillor Mrs. Jayne Norman who referred to the importance of recognising the unique characteristics that each town centre had. Councillor Mrs. Norman was concerned that town centres may struggle as had been previously suggested. In relation to her Ward of Llantwit Major, she stated that parking restrictions would hit the prosperity of the area. This was agreed by Shop Local. Councillor Mrs. Norman stated that Llantwit Major relied heavily on independent shops and local shoppers, and that these businesses would lose customers and could therefore potentially close. She stated that this would also impact on the rates collected by the Council. In addition, she outlined that if shoppers in Llantwit Major had to pay to park then they would choose to shop at the supermarket, and she was concerned that certain supermarkets may follow the Council and introduce their own car parking charges. Councillor Mrs. Norman referred to the many low paid employees which relied on free parking, and the impact that the Car Parking charges could have on their wages. Councillor Mrs. Norman also referred to the car parks in Llantwit Major that could be transferred to the local Town Council, but this would depend on the car parks being brought up to a better standard. In closing, Councillor Mrs. Norman reiterated her previous point that any restrictions would be detrimental to the prosperity of town centres and would impact on local traders.

The next Vale of Glamorgan Councillor, with permission to speak, was Councillor Gwyn John who again represented the Llantwit Major Ward. Councillor John stated that he was “disgusted” that the Council had not fully considered the public consultation in which 85% of Llantwit Major residents were against town centre car parking charging. In addition, 90% of responses objected to parking charges at Cwm Colhuw. In relation to Cwm Colhuw Councillor John added that this was a former quarry with a very rough surface that would damage cars and result in costs to the Council. He stated that the maintenance of this car park had been cut and so

No.

the Council would have to spend considerable money in order to upgrade and make it safe to use. During high tides, Councillor John stated that large boulders and rocks could easily be moved around and this needed to be considered. He also referred to the impact on the local café which was a meeting place for many older people who would be reluctant to pay for parking. If the beach café lost customers then staff would lose their jobs and the café would close. Councillor John also referred to the impact on surfers and lifeguards and whether these had been fully considered. In summary, Councillor John called for there not to be any car parking charges in Llantwit Major, stating that it would cost the Council more in claims and in order to bring the car parks up to standard. He also asked for the public to be listened to, and they had said “no” to car parking charges.

The next Vale of Glamorgan Councillor, with permission to speak, was Councillor Lis Burnett who began by stating that she did not want to repeat comments made at the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee as this Committee had a separate and different focus which was of finance and the internal workings of the Council. She stated that she had a number of key issues for the Committee in relation to the report and a few specific concerns:

- The accuracy of the reference which was not checked and contained errors.
- The report and reference stated the need for the Council to save £50m over the next three years, yet this proposal related purely to the funds for Neighbourhood Services and specifically car parks where the shortfall was £250,000 per annum. Councillor Burnett asked where would any surplus income from car parking charges be used.
- The proposal contradicted Council and Welsh Government policy on Wellbeing, Economic Development, Tourism and Town Centres e.g. the Council's Town Centre Framework, Wellbeing Improvement Objectives and the Destination Management Plan as well as the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act.
- The report did not include details for all car parks and what that funding was used for so it was impossible for Members to make an informed decision.
- The potential surplus for country parks was unclear and required further clarification as to the contribution to the operational costs of the parks.
- The Equality Impact Assessment was weak and failed to properly address differences in relation to protected characteristics e.g. a woman's experience of a visit to the seaside was very different to a man's, and was much more likely to involve caring responsibilities. Councillor Burnett stated that this may not appear relevant but when the Public Service Board Wellbeing Assessment for the Vale states that the difference in healthy life expectancy for women in the Vale was the largest in Wales at 23.4 years and one of the largest for men (20.9 years), the Council needed to avoid creating barriers to healthy activities such as regular walks around the local seaside or country parks. Councillor Burnett stated that it should be noted that the regeneration of Barry Island was as much about the wellbeing of local people as it was about economic outcomes and it had become a catalyst for year round physical activity. Physical activity was not just about visits to the gym or team sports.

Councillor Burnett therefore asked if the Committee could consider for any proposals to give details of how the negative impact on local residents and businesses would

No.

be addressed. For example no parking charges should start before 10.00 a.m. or 8.00 a.m. only if the first two hours were free. Season tickets should be set at no more than £50 and this should also be available via a £5 monthly direct debit or £30 six monthly with no admin fee. She also asked for the residential parking scheme to be seven days a week and include areas with off-street parking. Councillor Burnett also asked for clarification around the use of surplus income that would be generated from car parks. The outcomes should be ordered so local residents would know where the money was going. Finally, Councillor Burnett asked for the proposals to be deferred until the Cabinet Member had had a chance for a full review assessment of the impact on other service areas and for meaningful engagement with key stakeholders.

Councillor Kevin Mahoney, representing the Sully Ward was then invited to address the Committee. He referred to Cosmeston Park and the impact that charges would have on the quality of life of local residents. Councillor Mahoney outlined that the Capita report had indicated that parking proposals for Cosmeston would block up Lavernock Point and would spoil the lives of the residents. He disagreed with comments made by the Operational Manager for Engineering at the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee in that resident parking zones was an option as Councillor Mahoney believed that the estate would be easily blocked. Councillor Mahoney stated that people already paid for their services and he expressed frustration around Welsh Government Policy in allowing large housing developments that would see most of the Green Belt built upon. Councillor Mahoney commented that there needed to be better access to green spaces and he called Welsh Government Policy “outrageous”. Councillor Mahoney questioned the decision to appoint Capita, at a cost of £48k to the Council. In closing, Councillor Mahoney stated “please do not introduce charges”.

In coming back to some of the points raised, the Operational Manager for Neighbourhood Services and Transport outlined the following:

- Comments regarding ticket machines were not correct as the requirement had been reviewed and changes made due to the accessibility and hours of operation.
- In relation to queues, new machines for Barry Island would be contactless so payment would be quicker and easier, and there would also the ability to pay via a new mobile phone app.
- In relation to town centre characteristics, the Operational Manager agreed all town centres were different, and she welcomed a rationale debate. The Operational Manager outlined that charges for all town centres were not going ahead. In relation to competition with local supermarkets, she clarified that the Filco store in Llantwit Major did already have restricted parking which was enforced. She added that the Council proposal was for there to be 2 hour free parking.
- In terms of the maintenance of car parks, the Operational Manager stated that she was not aware of any significant claims that had been brought against the Council.
- Previously, a budget of £145k had been set aside for improvements to the car parks but this had been taken out during the budget process setting.

No.

- In relation to consultation, the Operational Manager disagreed with the comments made stating it had been well responded to. The Operational Manager also outlined that the impact on the beach café in Llantwit Major had been considered and what was being suggested was not all year round charging with free parking available during the winter. This would benefit local residents.
- In regard to the comments around the weakness of the Equality Impact Assessment, she stated that she had looked at this again and the one change that had been made was as a result of teachers' comments in relation to Holton Road Primary School and staff being required to walk to and from the car park in darkness. As a result, there had been a reduction in the times for charges.
- In relation to building on green spaces, the Operational Manager stated that this related to the Local Development Plan and was outside the remit of the Committee. She stated that the proposals were trying to cover the costs for maintaining car parks.

The Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport was then invited to make comments and he stated that back in 2015, the then Cabinet Member and the Leader provided a presentation to the Scrutiny Committee supporting the introduction of car parking charges. He stated that the comments made by the then Cabinet Member that "no one liked charging but the Council needed to face reality that it needed to increase revenue", this was as relevant now as it was then.

There was then a point of order raised by both Councillor Lis Burnett and Councillor Gwyn John, not Members of the Committee. Both Councillors outlined that proposals back in 2015 were different to those currently being considered. Councillor John, as the then Cabinet Member, disagreed with the use of his quote by the current Cabinet Member and asked for the comments to be withdrawn. The Chairman advised that the point of order would be reflected in the minutes.

The Cabinet Member then continued and stated that over 2000 responses had been received and these had been examined by officers and proposals amended with some charges taken out. The Cabinet Member outlined that there would be no charges on Sundays and Blue Badge holders would be eligible for free parking. The Cabinet Member referred to actions to address issues of displacement as a result of an increase in resident parking permits and he stated that the Council needed to address the issue of traffic congestion as this was only going to increase. He therefore believed that firm action was needed.

A Committee Member and former Leader of the previous Administration stated that he wanted to make a few points in relation to the previous Administration's proposals. He stated that there were some errors within the reference, with the actual Cabinet meeting in which the proposals were discussed being on the 25th February, 2013 and not 21st February. The Committee Member stated that on-street parking was removed and the then Administration had taken on proposals that were originally outlined by the previous Administration, led by Councillor Kemp. The proposals from 2013 were robustly scrutinised by the Scrutiny Committee (Economy and Environment) on 1st September, 2015, but he explained that the schemes being suggested then were totally different to the schemes in front of the Committee today.

No.

The proposals back in 2013 related solely to Barry and Cowbridge, and the Committee Member referred to parking at the Court Road Multi-Storey where it had been proposed for there to be some element of free parking for staff. He went on to state that as a result of initial objections, the then Cabinet Members undertook more consultation with traders and with the Chamber of Trade in Cowbridge, and it was clear that there was no support for the proposals and so they were dropped.

A Committee Member then outlined some general points, stating that he recognised that officers were under pressure in regard to finances, but as the proposals were a political choice then a decision had to be made either for or against parking charges. This had been ongoing for a period of 8 years, and the Member commented that over that time, there would have been a huge cost on staff time and resources. He therefore felt that the matter required a decision to be made. The Committee Member stated that he was unclear if the revenue that would be generated would be of benefit to the Council, and he queried the evidence which indicated that there would be little impact on town centres. Therefore, he was worried that if this was wrong then it would be people's livelihoods that would be affected. He outlined a general concern around the impact on staff following charges at the Court Road Car Park and also concern with the negative impact on the town centre of Barry. The Member stated that as charges were to operate differently in different towns, then he would have liked to have heard a bit more around the impact to Cowbridge Town Centre.

In reply to the Member's comments, the Director of Environment and Housing stated that the problem with car parking charges was that it was not an exact science. In addition the impact of displacement would not be fully known until after the proposals had been brought in. He used Wyndham Street Car Park as an example, which he knew that most shoppers would only use for a period less than 2 hours. He stated that the proposals for Barry was about creating turnover and that officers would take full responsibility for the report. He stated that he was confident that the proposal would create turnover as people found it very difficult to find spaces especially on a Saturday. The Director outlined that in reality there was no such thing as a free car parking space and the Council needed to recover costs or there may be future reports outlining proposals to close some car parks.

A Committee Member, referring to Option 2, stated that for some car parks, such as Kendrick Road, it had been projected that there would be a loss in revenue. The Member stated that surely for these car parks the proposals would not be progressed, also referring to a potential loss of revenue at Coastal car parks at Ogmere By-Sea and Penarth Llwyn Passat. The Member added that he agreed with the previous Member's comments relating to revenue, and he stated that the figures being presented would encourage the Council to progress car parking charges but he queried whether the revenue to be generated was realistic. The Member also referred to Court Road Car Park for which he had calculated that the proposals would generate revenue of 5 pence per space per day for the Council. He stated that car parking charges seemed fine in other areas, but not for Barry Town Centre. In reply, the Director stated for Option 2, the overall income to be generated was projected to be in the region of £500k. He also advised that proposals for Coast Car Parks that generated a negative return would not be implemented. He then clarified that Option 2 was based on upfront costs paid back over 7 years, but there were a

No.

number of options available when considering the purchasing of new ticket machines which for example could be on a lease basis. This was still to be determined. The Director concurred with the Member's analysis in relation to Court Road Car Park but it would be better to have some revenue in order to cover some of the Council's costs.

In providing his initial comments, a Committee Member stated that for people living in Llandough displacement parking from staff at the hospital would be a problem. He also believed that car parks needed to be maintained and so there would be costs to the Council. He referred to charges that had been introduced by Cardiff Council which he knew in the initial phase had brought in a large amount of revenue but this had decreased when people became more aware of where free parking was available. He therefore issued caution, as he was not sure that proposals in relation to parking enforcement were cost neutral especially as people's parking behaviour would change. The Member also referred to the installation of ticket machines, stating he was unsure if the right number of machines would be installed on Barry Island. The Member stated that he liked the idea of a 2 hour free period as it was difficult for visitors to do anything in less than an hour. In relation to car parking enforcement, the Member stated that there was the view that the only place that enforcement was undertaken was within town centres and this needed to be looked at. The Member also outlined that displacement could be a problem so there was an extra need for greater enforcement.

In reply to the Member's comments, the Director stated that he was confident that the Civil Parking Enforcement would be cost neutral as the service could do more especially where there would be more local knowledge of events. The Director stated that more enforcement could be carried out, which at present was focussed too much on town centres, and so, if extra staff were deployed then they could be utilised on Barry Island. In relation to meters, the Director stated that these would be looked into and he explained that there was a move to better digital payment methods through the use of an app and pay by phone options. These would be free to use which would also work alongside contactless payment machines so payment for visitors would be easier. In relation to displacement parking, the Director stated that this had been flagged up by the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee and was something that the Directorate had to consider before proposals were progressed. In terms of the two hour free parking, the Director stated that this had been trialled previously and had resulted in a loss of income for the Council. He stated that there was a balance between the level of charging and the amount of free time available, but plans for free two hour parking in town centres would remain in place. The Director stated that if visitors wanted to stay longer than two hours then there was the ability to pay for extra time. He explained that the alternative option would be for greater parking enforcement which would result in people being issued with parking fines.

The Committee Member then referred to the Residential Parking Policy and the fact that there was a large number of residents permits already in existence that were provided free of charge. The Member stated this was a long standing issue and it seemed unfair that some residents would have free parking while their neighbours would have to pay. This was inconsistent. The Member's other concern in relation to residential parking permits was the escalating charge for more than one permit.

No.

The Member also agreed with the point raised by Councillor Lis Burnett in relation to the Equality Impact Assessment and the consideration of women and mothers. He stated that the proposals could affect women who would usually be on a lower wage so this needed to be considered. The Member also stated that if charging was required then he would like to seek some form of distinction made between the winter and summer months. In addition, he expected that the summer months would have longer charging periods as there would be more opportunities for people to visit the country parks and coastal facilities.

In response to the Member's comments, the Operational Manager stated that permits would be on renewal so people would have to apply when their permit ran out. With regard to the escalation of charges for more than one vehicle, she stated that this was due to the limited spaces available in streets so the proposal would encourage people to consider their travel arrangements. In terms of distinction between winter and summer months, the Operational Manager outlined that this already existed for coastal resorts but expansion of this was up to the Committee. In terms of the Equality Impact Assessment she stated that the issues raised had already been dealt with, with the hours of charging being amended. Further to these comments, the Director stated that seasonal charging was a fair point as he did not want to overcharge visitors during winter periods. He also advised that in relation to residential permits there was a balance as too many could be issued to too few individuals and this would lead to complaints from neighbours. He advised that if charges were agreed then a report reviewing arrangements and the impact of charges would be brought back to the Committee.

In commenting on some of the key points raised, a Committee Member stated that for the public the big problem was that the proposals would be seen as a "cash cow" and that needed to be considered. He stated that charges in Penarth, Llantwit Major, Kendrick Road and Thompson Street were not viable as they did not generate enough revenue. He stated that he had no issue with two hour free parking that had been suggested for Kendrick Road. He outlined whether it was possible to include two hour free period upon no return as a possible alternative. The Member stated that charging for the multi-storey car park in Barry was "wrong" and he outlined that Capita had recommended for this not to be charged. Back in 2015, the previous Capita report suggested that the top level be free as a possible space for staff parking. This would not make much difference to shoppers but would aid staff and help in the reduction of displacement. With regard to coastal car parks, the Member stated that there needed to be an element of free time especially for on-street parking on Barry Island. In relation to transferrable permits, the Member stated that this needed to be based on a vehicle number plate, on the basis of one car, one place at one time. Around country parks the Member also believed that a two hour free period was required perhaps up until 10.00 a.m. This would assist local visitors. The Member also queried where surplus money would be allocated to, and he stated that greater consideration of displacement parking was needed especially for Cosmeston. The Member, as former Leader of the previous Administration, stated resident permits had been issued back in the days of the old Borough Council, and had been something that successive administrations had failed to tackle. He stated that it was therefore unfair to charge for those residential permit holders when it had not been dealt with for such a long time.

No.

In relation to residential permits, the Operational Manager stated that the cost for the Council to administer the fee was £6.10. However, this did not cover the legal orders, the costs of which were far higher. She liked the idea of one car, one place at one time permit and was open to the idea of a group permit for Cosmeston and Porthkerry. She outlined that the Residential Parking Permit Policy would need to be closely monitored to ensure that it was working effectively.

The Director in coming back to some of the points raised by the Member, stated that revenue for Kendrick Road and Thompson Street car parks appeared low, but the main aim of the proposals was about increasing turnover. The Director stated that both car parks would be full all day and if the charges did not bring in any revenue then charging would be looked at again. The Director advised that it would be better to see the parking patterns first, so he suggested that charges for these car parks should remain. In terms of the multi-storey car park at Court Road, the Director outlined that there were 114 uncontrolled parking spaces within a distance of 100 meters of Holton Road Primary School. This indicated that there were spaces available. Within a radius of 400 meters there were 395 on street spaces available. The Director added that for those who worked in the area options were available. He also advised that Court Road car park was the most expensive car park to maintain.

A Committee Member stated that it was being projected that the proposals would generate £2.3m over 7 years and the Member queried how did this compare to other areas like Cardiff. The Director stated that the figures would be nowhere near the amount generated in Cardiff. He reiterated his previous comments that car parking costs the Council £250,000 per year, with non domestic rates being the largest part of this. If the Council was unable to meet its costs then there may be a further rise in Council Tax. This, the Director said, was not appropriate and it was fairer to charge at point of service. If the proposals were not exercised then some car parks may become a liability, which would lead to the Council having to make even more difficult choices such as either stopping grass cutting or removing car parks. The Director also made the following points:

- Confirmation that revenue from the country parks would be put back into the country parks.
- Transferrable season tickets would be looked into.
- Recognition that arrangements for volunteers needed to be considered.
- A review of all car parking charges would be undertaken especially as parking behaviours would have changed.
- If ticket machines for Kendrick Road and Thompson Street were not needed, because charging was not effective, then these would be used elsewhere.
- There were a number of ways that ticket machines could be purchased, including a hire purchase scheme. Costs provided in the report related to the highest expected level.

A Committee Member queried whether the social economic circumstances of the population had been fully considered. The Member stated that he was concerned that the proposals would penalise the poorest in society. The Member indicated that he did not agree with the idea of unlimited parking permits, and he made a formal recommendation to the Committee that, for those individuals who already had an existing permit, it would be better if their first permit was free. The Member also

No.

asked whether it was possible to offer some sort of free parking during night time hours. In addition, the Member referred to the inequality that would exist because low paid staff on Holton Road would have to pay for parking, while Council staff and Elected Members would still be able to park for free. The Member stated that if low paid staff were required to pay then so should those on higher wages. The policy needed to be equitable and consistent.

In answer to the Member's points regarding residential parking permits and poverty, the Director stated that most permits, around 2000, were for central Barry. He added that a charge of £10.00 a year was not excessive, with another option being to move parking bays. The Director explained that it was important to consider that Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) would cost the Council thousands of pounds to implement and he stated that he did not want there to be a two tier system in operation. With regard to free parking during night time hours, the Director stated that this could be looked into, but vehicles parked overnight would have to be moved before 8:00am the following morning. The Director reiterated that there were 395 uncontrolled free spaces around Holton Road. Some people would have to pay for parking and some would have to walk further to their place of work. He added that the policy was aimed at benefiting shoppers.

As a Local Ward Member for Llantwit Major, a Committee Member commented that detail of the maintenance and costs of car parks in Llantwit Major was needed before proposals were to be progressed. He stated that in relation to Cowbridge, charging would cause displacement and make people find alternative parking spaces. In response, the Operational Manager advised that no decision of the car parks in Llantwit Major had yet been made, so there would be prior discussion with the Town Council. For Cowbridge, the aim of the proposals were to attract more shoppers, but staff who worked in the Town would have to consider their options.

The Committee considered a suggestion that parking at Country Parks should be free up until 10:00am. This was agreed as it was felt that this would benefit local visitors. Members also discussed new residential parking zones, and it was agreed that when surveys of parking were being proposed, for prior consultation to be held with the Local Ward Member on the duration and time that the surveys would be undertaken. The Committee also agreed that the first Resident permit should be free for those individuals who had already been issued one. A Member also called for Traffic Restriction Orders to be based on more detailed and robust information, and he requested for this to be discussed further.

In closing the debate, the Chairman thanked everyone for their contributions.

Subsequently, it was

RECOMMENDED -

(1) T H A T the recommendations of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee made at its meeting on 4th April, 2019 be endorsed.

(2) T H A T prior to any traffic surveys for residential parking zones, for Ward Members to be consulted on the duration and days that the surveys cover.

No.

- (3) T H A T one parking permit should be available for residents, which is transferrable between town centres, resorts and country parks.
- (4) T H A T special free parking arrangements are put in place for volunteers.
- (5) T H A T free parking be available at country parks up until 10.00 a.m.
- (6) T H A T seasonal variations of charges for permits be introduced i.e. a six month or annual option that covers summer or winter months.
- (7) T H A T for those individuals who already had an existing permit, that their first permit should be free.
- (8) T H A T further discussions and consideration of new Traffic Regulation Orders be undertaken, which should be based on more robust data.

Reasons for recommendations

- (1) Following consideration of the recommendations made by the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 4th April, 2019.
- (2) In order that local Ward Members are consulted prior to the undertaking of traffic surveys for residential parking zones.
- (3) In order that an individual can purchase one permit that covers multiple areas.
- (4) In order that volunteers have special parking arrangements.
- (5) In order that parking at country parks is free up until 10.00 a.m.
- (6) In order that the proposals reflect the difference between winter and summer months.
- (7) In order that existing permit holders are able to have their first permit free.
- (8) In order that the evidence base for Traffic Regulation Orders are robust and effective.

929 VALE OF GLAMORGAN PUBLIC SERVICES BOARD UPDATE (MD) -

The Head of Performance and Development presented the report which provided an update on the work of the Vale Public Services Board (PSB) in delivering the Vale of Glamorgan's Wellbeing Plan, published in May 2018.

The PSB had four wellbeing objectives and was taking forward a range of actions. The four wellbeing objectives were:

No.

- (1) Enable people to get involved, participate in their local communities and shape local services.
- (2) Reduce poverty and tackle inequalities linked to deprivation.
- (3) Give children the best start in life.
- (4) Protection, enhance and value the environment.

Members noted that regular reports were provided to the PSB and an annual report would be published in July 2019.

The PSB had held two workshops to assist in the work of the PSB, one was facilitated by the Children's Commissioner and focussed on embedding the rights of the child within the work of the PSB. The second workshop was a Healthy Boards sessions facilitated by Academi Wales and enabled the PSB to reflect on the strengths and areas for improvement.

A copy of the full progress report was attached at Appendix A to the report. Paragraphs 2.6 through to 2.14 provided an overview of some of the issues highlighted at the February meeting of the PSB.

A Committee Member stated that there was not much public coverage of the work of the PSB, and the Member felt that there should be more promotion by Welsh Government. In reply, the Head of Performance and Development stated that this was a really good point and he advised that the Vale of Glamorgan Council was involved in all of the PSB actions. He then referred to a video that was being put together to highlight the work of the PSB and this would show how important partnership working was.

As it was his final Scrutiny meeting, the Committee offered its thanks and appreciation to the Head of the Head of Performance and Development and congratulated him for all his efforts and hard work.

Having considered the report it was

RECOMMENDED -

- (1) T H A T the Committee's thanks be passed onto the staff and partnership agencies involved with the Public Services Board.
- (2) T H A T the progress made by the Public Services Board in delivering the Wellbeing Plan be noted.
- (3) T H A T the work of the Public Services Board is shared with all Councillors and external organisations.

No.

Reasons for recommendations

- (1) To offer thanks to the staff and organisations involved with the Public Services Board.
- (2) Following consideration of the work being undertaken by the Vale of Glamorgan Public Services Board.
- (3) In order for the work of the Public Services Board to be shared with a wider audience.