

**EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL
NOTES OF A MEETING OF SAFER, CLEANER, GREENER SCRUTINY STANDING
PANEL
HELD ON TUESDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2014
IN COMMITTEE ROOM 1, CIVIC OFFICES, HIGH STREET, EPPING
AT 7.30 - 8.53 PM**

Members Present:	Mrs J Lea (Chairman), Mrs H Brady (Vice-Chairman), Mrs T Cochrane, Ms Y Knight, Mrs M Sartin (Chairman of the Council), Mrs P Smith and P Spencer
Other members present:	G Waller
Apologies for Absence:	R Butler, G Chambers, L Girling and S Murray
Officers Present	J Gilbert (Director of Environment and Street Scene), K Durrani (Assistant Director (Technical)), J Nolan (Assistant Director (Environment & Neighbourhoods)), C Wiggins (Safer Communities Manager) and A Hendry (Democratic Services Officer)

25. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (COUNCIL MINUTE 39 - 23.7.02)

The Panel noted there were no substitute members.

26. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

27. NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The notes of the 7 January 2014 meeting were agreed as a correct record.

28. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT CONSULTATION ON LOCAL AUTHORITY PARKING

The Department of Transport had issued a consultation document on Local Authority Parking. The deadline for response was 14 February 2014. The consultation was based around the premises that local authorities should adopt local parking strategies which compliment and enhance the attractiveness of high streets and town centres.

The consultation used the term "local authority" as a generic one, when in reality, unless agency arrangements are in place, responsibility for parking on the highway rests with the Highway Authority, in this area, Essex County. However, having withdrawn local agencies, on-street responsibility now rests with North and South Essex Parking Partnerships. In respect of off-street parking however, districts do have direct responsibility, even if discharged through a third party such as a contractor or NEPP.

The consultation sought responses to ten main questions. The Joint Committee of the North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP) approved responses to the consultation

at its Committee meeting on 8 January 2014. Members were asked if they wished to consider any additional comments to the NEPP response.

The meeting went through each of the ten questions in turn, considering if any extra comments were needed.

Question 1 - *Do you consider local authority parking enforcement is being applied fairly and reasonably in your area?* Members agreed with the NEPP answer.

Question 2 – *The Government intends to abolish the use of CCTV cameras for parking enforcement. Do you have any views or comments on this proposal?* Members agreed with the NEPP answer but wanted to add that it would be a good idea to reference the large rural spread of our district and point out the (isolated) pressure points within the district (the spread of schools) that would need some sort of mobile enforcement.

Question 3 – *Do you think the traffic adjudicators should have wider powers to allow appeals?* Members agreed with the NEPP and EFDC's answer.

Question 4 – *Do you agree that guidance should be updated to make clear in what circumstances adjudicators may award costs? If so, what should those circumstances be?* Members agreed with the NEPP answer.

Question 5 – *Do you think motorist who lose an appeal at parking tribunal should be offered a 25% discount for prompt payment?* Members agreed NEPP and EFDC's answer but wanted to expand our comment to indicate that we understood that there would be a cost to this.

Question 6 – *Do you think that local residents and firms should be able to require councils to review yellow lines, parking provision, charges etc. in their area? If so what should the reviews cover and what should be the threshold for triggering a review?* Members agreed with the NEPP and EFDC's answer.

Question 7 – *Do you think that authorities should be required by regulation to allow a grace period at the end of paid for parking?* Members agreed with the NEPP and EFDC's answer.

Question 8 – *Do you think that a grace period should be offered more widely, for example for overstaying in free bays, at the start of pay and display parking and paid for parking bays and in areas where there are parking restrictions or single yellow lines?* Members agreed with the NEPP and EFDC's answer.

Question 9 – *If allowed, how long do you think the grace period should be?* Members agreed with the NEPP and EFDC's answer.

Question 10 – *Do you think the Government should be considering any further measures to tackle genuinely antisocial parking or driving? If so, what?* Members agreed NEPP comments but wanted to add the following as our comments:

- On NEPP point 'a', we should add that a person may have the right to use a bridleway (e.g. as an access point) Bona-fide use had some merit. Did not like the use of the words "sensible and responsible" as this was not easy to enforce.

- Also on NEPP point 'c' it should be noted that pavements get badly damaged as well.
- On NEPP points 'i' and 'g' we did not know how this would work in practice – they may produce more appeals. Also, 'i' would need careful legislation drawn up to cover this.

29. COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP ASSESSMENT 2014-15 AND THE EFDC COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP PLAN.

The Panel were told that the two Community Safety Partnership (CSP) reports had come to this meeting too soon as they still had to be considered by the Community Safety Partnership Strategic Panel. The first document, the CSP Assessment 2014-15 was purely a factual document looking at the statistics over a period of time. However, the second report the 'Epping Forest District Council Community Safety Partnership Plan' should firstly be considered by the Strategic Panel and then brought to this Panel for any further comments at their April meeting. Officers apologised for the pre-empting of this schedule, but noted that members had now been given plenty of time to study the documents in depth.

The meeting noted that the Community Safety Partnership membership consisted of the Police, the new privatised Probation Service (still to come), Fire and Rescue Service, Corporation of London, Lea Valley Regional Park Association, the Local Strategic Partnership and the Clinical Commissioning Group. Although it was noted that a lot of the partners did not actually turn up to the meetings, officers did write and try and 'nudge' them into attending; but it was acknowledged that they did have a lot of other partnership meetings they had to attend.

30. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND WORK PROGRAMME

The Panel noted their terms of reference and work programme. They noted that for item 16 of the work programme on 'highway accident statistics'; officers would try and get the county's Casualty Reduction Officer to address the meeting in the new year.

31. REPORTS TO BE MADE TO THE NEXT MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Panel noted that they should report back to the O&S Committee that they had commented on the DfT Consultation on Local Authority Parking.

Councillor Smith asked that officers look into the ECC recycling survey that had gone up online. Officers noted that it was about the closure of what were termed Civic Amenity Sites and that part of this would be picked up through the new waste contracts currently being negotiated. However, they would ask the Portfolio Holder how he would like to deal with this.

This page is intentionally left blank