

Minutes

of the Meeting of the

Strategic Planning, Economic Development and Regeneration Policy and Scrutiny Panel Wednesday, 29th January 2020

held in the New Council Chamber, Town Hall.

Meeting Commenced: 14:00 Meeting Concluded: 16:05

Councillors:

P John Crockford-Hawley (Chairman)
P Mike Solomon (Vice Chairman)

P Peter Crew
P Richard Tucker
A Steve Bridger
P Gill Bute
P Sarah Codling
P Mark Crosby
A Karin Haverson
A Steve Hogg
P Huw James
A Patrick Keating

P: Present

A: Apologies for absence submitted

Also in attendance: Councillors Mike Bird, Mark Canniford, Ashley Cartman, Caroline Cherry, Sandra Hearne, John Ley-Morgan.

Officers in attendance: Rob Thomson, Colin Medus, Steve Thorne (Development and Environment); Brent Cross, Leo Taylor (Corporate Services)

SPR Public discussion (Standing Order SSO 9)

19 None

SPR Apologies for absence and notification of substitutes

20 Apologies from Councillors Steve Bridger and Steve Hogg; no substitutions.

SPR Declaration of disclosable pecuniary interest (Standing Order 37)

21 None

SPR Reference from the Executive Meeting - 7th January 2020: 4.1 Car

22 **Parking Review Initial Recommendations including Adjustments to Parking Fees and Charges (EXE 58) (Agenda Item 4)**

The Chairman reminded Members that the focus of this meeting was, in accordance with the above reference, to give feedback to the Executive Member for Business, Economy and Employment on specifically the practicalities of introducing parking restrictions and the proposed consultation process. He added that there would also be an opportunity later in the meeting for Members to consider and comment on the initial recommendations arising from the review.

The Chairman referred to a letter sent by the Executive Member to those Councillors whose wards would be directly affected by the proposed changes, seeking views on how the consultation process would be carried out. Members' concerns that this letter had not been brought to the Panel's attention were acknowledged and the Chairman requested that it now be circulated to all Councillors.

Members' raised the following points (with officer/Executive Member responses shown in italics):

(1) Could businesses be invited to join the consultation? *Although it would be difficult to identify all businesses, those with a retail premises could be contacted and engaged with.*

(2) The Chairman requested that all public comments received by Members be forwarded to officers.

(3) In a previous parking consultation involving the Panel, advance notice was sent to Town Councils to give them time to engage with and coordinate feedback from local businesses and residents. Was this possible on this occasion? - *The Executive Member for Finance and Performance confirmed that all town and parish councils would be consulted with an expectation that they would provide a key conduit for the community response.*

(4) Members questioned the relevance of evidence gathered in Weston-super-Mare to the impacts of parking charges in the diverse towns and villages in the rest of the district. This was particularly the case in localities that had poor public transport links. – *Officers maintained this evidence was useful, referring to lessons learnt around displaced parking. Public transport providers were to be included in the consultation.*

(5) Could it be an option within the consultation for Town and Parish Councils to take control of car parks within their areas? - *This was possible but it would need to be understood that such an arrangement would be on commercial terms.*

(6) North Somerset employers and contracted agencies, businesses and key workers in particular needed to be made aware of the consultation as they could be affected by the changes – *This was acknowledged. The Executive Member commented that employers had a role in ensuring staff*

awareness about the consultation and could usefully coordinate feedback.

Concluded: that whilst the Panel substantially agreed with the proposed consultation process, it be:

Recommended to the Executive Member Business, economy and employment: that, all district Councillors, rather than only those in whose ward the specific proposal related to, should be engaged in the consultation process.

The meeting then moved on to discussion about the initial parking recommendations as set out in the Executive report:

(1) The Panel heard reasons for and against the proposed **exemption of Portishead Lakegrounds** from on-street parking charges and following debate:

Concluded: that it be recommended to the Executive Member that the *Portishead Lakegrounds* should not be exempt from consultation proposals on a scheme of on-street charges.

(2) Members then debated the case for and against **on-street charges on Clevedon sea front**. There was also discussion around the potential use of permits to support sea front amenities and events (Sailing Club, Pier and Pleasure boat visits etc). Officers confirmed that the report and recommendations were silent on the issue of parking permits, and that this may be something that the Executive could consider going forward.

Concluded: that it be recommended to the Executive Member that Clevedon sea front be included within the consultation proposals for a scheme of on-street parking charges.

(3) Discussion moved to **on-street charges on Nailsea High Street**. Members noted that there were only 12 parking bays on Nailsea High Street and considered whether a 3-hour maximum parking limit was suitable for this location

Concluded: that it be recommended to the Executive Member that that the consultation proposals for maximum parking limit for Nailsea High Street be 1 hour.

(4) There was further debate around the three **off-street car parks in Nailsea** (two of which were privately run and not subject to the Council charging scheme) with concerns raised that the charges raised the Council managed car park would lead to people using the other two privately owned car parks. Officers commented that there had already been interest in raising charges in the private car parks and emphasised the importance of convenience as a factor determining where people chose to park. They also

reiterated the need to recover the costs of enforcement and car park maintenance and the need for an equitable approach across the district.

(5) In discussing proposals around **cashless payments**, Members considered that older people, or those with learning difficulties, may struggle to pay using the MiPermit app. Officers pointed out that payments could be made by making a phone call, and that there would still be machines available to pay using coins.

(6) Other issues under discussion included:

- the limited time waiting bays in Clevedon, opposite Proper Job – would parking charges apply? - *Officers confirmed that charges would be introduced at all limited time bays.*
- Clevedon Library car park was not on the list – was this an omission? *Officers confirmed that parking at Clevedon Library was not administered by North Somerset Council.*
- It was noted that any income accrued from parking fees and charges would go to North Somerset Council, not the individual towns and parishes.
- Equality Impact Statement – *Officers confirmed that this, along with proposed mitigations, would be further developed as the proposals were firmed up.*

Concluded: that Members set out above be forwarded to the Executive Members and officers.

Chairman
