

Merton Council

Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel



Date: 18 March 2015
Time: 7.15 pm
Venue: Committee rooms D & E - Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden SM4 5DX

AGENDA

Page Number

1	Declarations of interest	
2	Apologies for absence	
3	Minutes of the meeting held on 25 February 2015	1 - 10
4	Matters arising	
5	Street Lighting - Report for Information	11 - 18
6	Call In - Tariff changes to the On Street Pay and Display Parking Machines	19 - 46
7	Performance Reporting(including focus on waste management and street scene)	47 - 52
8	Topic Suggestions 2015/16	53 - 56
9	Housing Supply Task Group - Verbal Update	

**This is a public meeting – members of the public are very welcome to attend.
The meeting room will be open to members of the public from 7.00 p.m.**

For more information about the work of this and other overview and scrutiny panels, please telephone 020 8545 4035 or e-mail scrutiny@merton.gov.uk. Alternatively, visit www.merton.gov.uk/scrutiny

Press enquiries: press@merton.gov.uk or telephone 020 8545 3483 or 4093

Email alerts: Get notified when agendas are published
www.merton.gov.uk/council/committee.htm?view=emailer

Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel Membership

Councillors:

Russell Makin (Chair)
Stan Anderson
Ross Garrod
Abigail Jones
John Sargeant
Imran Uddin
David Dean (Vice-Chair)
Janice Howard

Substitute Members:

Tobin Byers
David Chung
Edward Foley
Daniel Holden
Abdul Latif

Note on declarations of interest

Members are advised to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered at the meeting. If a pecuniary interest is declared they should withdraw from the meeting room during the whole of the consideration of that matter and must not participate in any vote on that matter. If members consider they should not participate because of a non-pecuniary interest which may give rise to a perception of bias, they should declare this, withdraw and not participate in consideration of the item. For further advice please speak with the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance.

What is Overview and Scrutiny?

Overview and Scrutiny describes the way Merton's scrutiny councillors hold the Council's Executive (the Cabinet) to account to make sure that they take the right decisions for the Borough. Scrutiny panels also carry out reviews of Council services or issues to identify ways the Council can improve or develop new policy to meet the needs of local people. From May 2008, the Overview & Scrutiny Commission and Panels have been restructured and the Panels renamed to reflect the Local Area Agreement strategic themes.

Scrutiny's work falls into four broad areas:

- ⇒ **Call-in:** If three (non-executive) councillors feel that a decision made by the Cabinet is inappropriate they can 'call the decision in' after it has been made to prevent the decision taking immediate effect. They can then interview the Cabinet Member or Council Officers and make recommendations to the decision-maker suggesting improvements.
- ⇒ **Policy Reviews:** The panels carry out detailed, evidence-based assessments of Council services or issues that affect the lives of local people. At the end of the review the panels issue a report setting out their findings and recommendations for improvement and present it to Cabinet and other partner agencies. During the reviews, panels will gather information, evidence and opinions from Council officers, external bodies and organisations and members of the public to help them understand the key issues relating to the review topic.
- ⇒ **One-Off Reviews:** Panels often want to have a quick, one-off review of a topic and will ask Council officers to come and speak to them about a particular service or issue before making recommendations to the Cabinet.
- ⇒ **Scrutiny of Council Documents:** Panels also examine key Council documents, such as the budget, the Business Plan and the Best Value Performance Plan.

Scrutiny panels need the help of local people, partners and community groups to make sure that Merton delivers effective services. If you think there is something that scrutiny should look at, or have views on current reviews being carried out by scrutiny, let us know.

For more information, please contact the Scrutiny Team on 020 8545 4035 or by e-mail on scrutiny@merton.gov.uk. Alternatively, visit www.merton.gov.uk/scrutiny

All minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the committee/panel. To find out the date of the next meeting please check the calendar of events at your local library or online at www.merton.gov.uk/committee.

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL 25 FEBRUARY 2015

(19.15 – 21:15)

PRESENT

Councillor Russell Makin (in the Chair),
Councillor Stan Anderson, Councillor Abdul Latif (substitute
for Councillor David Dean), Councillor Ross Garrod,
Councillor Abigail Jones, Councillor Imran Uddin,
Councillor John Sargeant, Councillor Janice Howard

ALSO PRESENT:

Chris Lee (Director of Environment and Regeneration), James McGinlay (Head of Sustainable Communities), Paul Walshe (Parking Services Manager), Mitra Dubet (Network Improvement and Renewal Manager), John Hill (Head of Public Protection), Cormac Stokes (Head of Street Scene and Waste), Anthony Hopkins (Head of Libraries and Heritage Services), Mario Lecordier (Traffic and Highways Services Manager), Rebecca Redman (Scrutiny Officer), Councillor Nick Draper (Cabinet Member for Community and Culture), Councillor Andrew Judge (Cabinet Member for Environmental Regeneration and Sustainability), Councillor Judy Saunders (Cabinet Member for Parking and Environmental Cleanliness)

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor David Dean.

3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 3 FEBRUARY 2015

Panel agreed the Minutes as a true record of the meeting.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Panel agreed to reorder the agenda to the following:

Item 5 – Town Centre Parking and Parking at Neighbourhood Shopping
Parades

Item 8 – Progress Update: Action Plan (Climate Change and Green Deal Task
Group)

Item 6 – Library and Heritage Service Annual Report 2014/15

Item 7 – Town Centre Regeneration Update – Verbal Presentation

Item 9 – Performance Monitoring (including focus on waste management and
street scene)

Item 10 – work programme

5. TOWN CENTRE PARKING AND PARKING AT NEIGHBOURHOOD

SHOPPING PARADES – ACTION PLANS

Paul Walshe introduced the report which updated on progress with implementation of the action plan resulting from the earlier reviews of town centre parking and parking at neighbourhood shopping parades. Paul Walshe informed the Panel that implementation has been on going and that cashless parking is one initiative that has been particularly popular. Paul also advised that the council are currently considering options for roll out of electronic signage in Wimbledon town centre.

Councillor Imran Uddin asked if the intention was to lower parking charges through the introduction of this new structure. Paul Walshe explained that the revised charges were the linear hourly rate for parking which were slightly higher than the hourly rate at present. 20 minute parking slots are being used as a base upon which to model the rates and in some areas tariffs will go up.

Chris Lee added that parking charges in town centres would be higher than outer areas. Councillor Stan Anderson asked if cashless and cash options were still available to customers. Paul Walshe explained that this was the case. John Hill explained that the council would continue to offer customers freedom of choice in the way that they pay for parking.

Councillor Janice Howard explained her concerns regarding the increase of each tariff and asked what consideration had been given to smaller businesses and the potential impact increased charges would have on their customer base. She expressed her concerns that residents may be pushed into larger stores with free parking. Councillor Andrew Judge explained that it was important to acknowledge that short stopping times are needed to shop in smaller businesses and 20 minutes of free parking has been offered to support this.

Chris Lee informed the Panel that a decision had been taken by full council as part of the budget setting in previous years to increase charges by 10% beginning in 2015/ 2016. This is incorporated into a simplified structure.

Councillor Ross Garrod asked how the 341 on street bays would be rolled out, if this would be undertaken on a staggered basis and what the expected completion date was for this work. Paul Walshe explained that no new charges had yet been implemented and that once agreed, would be rolled out over a 4 week cycle. The council are authorised to charge the new tariffs from April 1st 2015 but this will not happen overnight and requires a phased roll out. The payment for parking using mobile technology will also be implemented alongside this. John Hill added that the ability to pay with mobile phones has been implemented in town centre car parks already.

Councillor Andrew Judge explained that signage would be agreed and a decision made as to how to pursue this in due course.

Paul Walshe explained that initial discussions had also been held with private car park owners and partnership options explained. The associated costs of this model and benefits to the council would also need to be determined. John Hill stated that the department would continue to speak to private car park owners in an attempt to work in partnership to improve the range of parking services on offer to the customer.

Mitra Dubet explained that there are 34 designated shopping parades in the borough and that the department have contacted individual business units to determine need. Many are also in controlled parking zones and therefore need to balance the needs of residents, visitors and businesses. Some bays have also been changed to different functions. Dialogue has been underway with residents and businesses and site visits have been undertaken during operational hours to determine need, available space and where residents need access.

Councillor Russell Makin asked if any changes to parking bays from permit to shared use would need to be the subject of public consultation. Mitra Dubet explained that this was the case and statutory consultation was required.

Councillor Abdul Latif asked if underused loading bays could be used to allow residents to park. Mitra Dubet explained that this was happening in Raynes Park and that loading space had been created and agreement reached with local businesses on parking post delivery times and off peak hours.

Councillor John Sargeant stated that it was important that the council publicised widely that free parking is available but that residents are still required to take a ticket.

RESOLVED: Panel noted the report.

6. PROGRESS UPDATE – ACTION PLAN (CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREEN DEAL TASK GROUP)

As Member Champion, Councillor James Holmes provided the Panel with an update on progress with delivery of the action plan resulting from the task group review of climate change and the green deal.

Councillor James Holmes explained to the Panel that he had recently met with Tara Butler (Future Merton) to discuss progress and any barriers to delivery, outlining which recommendations have been successfully taken forward or implemented. Councillor James Holmes acknowledged the interdependency of certain recommendations taking place in a chronological order before, for example, the ESCO model could be fully established.

Councillor James Holmes reported that difficulty had arisen in securing legal advice to move towards the ESCO model. Therefore the implementation of a number of recommendations had been delayed. Councillor James Holmes explained that there was reduced capacity within the Future Merton team also

to deliver the action plan.

James McGinlay added that funding had been received from the Department for Energy and Climate Change and a brief developed for release in Spring 2015, as well the installation of solar PV on school buildings, which provides a quarter of the energy required by schools. Merton is also ranked 8th across London for energy efficiency in schools and the roll out of Solar PV. £200,000 has also been secured for further activities relating to the Green Deal and is targeted at advising businesses on energy efficiency.

James McGinlay explained that the council are working with Merton Chamber of Commerce and also with local schools to raise awareness of energy efficiency measures. Councillor Andrew Judge explained that preliminary conversations had been held with climate change officers at the GLA and that there is potential for district heat networks to be established through the regeneration of the High Path Estate. In addition, Sutton Council has established an ESCO and there may be opportunities to work in partnership if this is felt to be beneficial for both parties. There are also opportunities in Pollards Hill through the refurbishment of properties by Moat and in Figges Marsh by CHMP.

Councillor Imran Uddin asked if any discussions had taken place with Sutton Council yet on their ESCO model. James McGinlay explained that officers met with their counterparts in Sutton Council recently and a mechanism and business case would need to be considered in terms of the benefits of working in partnership. It is also important to note that Sutton have established an ESCO but that this is not yet fully up and running. Therefore discussions are in the early stages and Merton needs to develop a business case for an ESCO.

Councillor Russell Makin proposed that officers seek further advice from officers at Peterborough Council who the task group engaged during their review.

Councillor James Holmes urged officers to keep this on the agenda and that the Panel keep a watching brief on developments.

RESOLVED: Panel requested that an update be received every 6 months on delivery of the action plan.

7. LIBRARY AND HERITAGE SERVICE ANNUAL REPORT 2014/15

Anthony Hopkins introduced the report and highlighted some of the key work streams for the service over the last year and achievements including:

- Increase in satisfaction identified through public library users survey and annual residents survey in the highest quartile;
- On going efficiencies made in the way that the service is delivered
- Updated technology resulting from a grant received from the GLA

- which would ensure faster wifi speeds in libraries;
- E-books and a library app now available;
- Further development of library sites;
- The schools libraries programme ensured every child in the borough is a member of a library;
- Expectations of the volunteer programme have been exceeded and there are now 533 volunteers in libraries;
- Heritage lottery funding secured of £8 million

Anthony Hopkins explained that on going and future challenges would be:

- Delivery of future major projects;
- Meeting demand and ensuring that the library service is responsive and continues to deliver a high quality service;
- Income and reduced budgets.

Councillor Ross Garrod wished to express thanks to volunteers and library staff and asked what can be achieved with the service given the reduced budgets. Councillor Ross Garrod also noted that digital literacy was an issue for a number of residents and asked if demand for help from staff could be met in libraries. Councillor Ross Garrod asked if libraries signpost people with digital literacy requirements to community organisations that might support them to develop these skills.

Anthony Hopkins confirmed that this support was provided on site and one to one or group training also provided. The team are working with the Citizens Advice Bureau to ensure residents are appropriately signposted and are developing this further. Emphasis is also being placed on the universal offer and the role of volunteers is changing which means that there is work to be done to ensure staff and volunteers correctly signpost residents. A training programme on this and other skills required is to be delivered shortly.

Councillor Abigail Jones expressed her thanks to the department and congratulated them on the innovative and positive developments that had been made to the library service. Councillor Abigail Jones noted that e-books appeal to certain demographics and asked how the use of libraries was being encouraged amongst these groups. Anthony Hopkins explained that the library service run annual campaigns and work with local groups to promote the available resources in libraries, as well as through library ambassadors. The service has a finite budget for publicity and marketing but the council are working regionally and nationally with partners on this.

Councillor Imran Uddin asked about signposting residents to other organisations such as the mosque and to what extent the council works with these organisations. Anthony Hopkins explained to the Panel that the library service work with 48 organisations and signpost individuals to a range of services, including the mosque.

Councillor Nick Draper urged all councillors to promote the library service and to spread the good practice at Merton, particularly to celebrate the work of staff and volunteers, and would encourage councillors to become volunteers themselves in their local libraries. Councillor Nick Draper praised Anthony Hopkins and his team for their work.

Councillor Russell Makin passed on the Panels thanks to Anthony Hopkins.

RESOLVED: Panel noted the report.

8. TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION – PERFORMANCE MONITORING

James McGinlay gave a presentation on development and progress in the regeneration schemes in the town centres in Merton, covering Morden, Raynes Park, Wimbledon, Colliers Wood and Mitcham (presentation attached).

Councillor John Sargeant asked for information on the Crossrail 2 development to be shared with the business community to alleviate their concerns. James McGinlay confirmed that the council have been liaising with the owners of centre court, with the business community and Love Wimbledon.

Councillor Andrew Judge informed the Panel that £344,000 funding had been received for developments on South Park Rd to enhance the cycle route from Clapham Common to Merton and there would be a number of interventions and measures put in place to enhance safety. There is no funding for these measures as yet but future bids would be made to make improvements in this area.

Councillor Stan Anderson enquired about the clock tower in Mitcham and asked if it would be returned to its original location. James McGinlay confirmed that it would be relocated as part of the Rediscover Mitcham project.

Councillor Ross Garrod asked when a decision would be known publicly on the Sidthorpe Car Park site, about the proposed bus lane in Mitcham and if there was an update on where the health centre in Mitcham would be located. James McGinlay explained that a decision regarding the Sibthorpe Road car park would be known publicly by March 2015, that dialogue was on going with TfL to clarify the major project scheme and that negotiations were in their final stages. TfL need to consider the competing needs of both pedestrians and traffic and that it can take up to six months for TfL to do their own checks.

James McGinlay added that Wilson Hospital was the preferred location.

Councillor Abigail Jones asked what was planned for the vacant building next to Colliers Wood tube. James McGinlay agreed to check this with planning and get back to the Panel.

Councillor Abdul Latif asked about the final decision on the cladding for the tower in Colliers Wood. James McGinlay explained that the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Applications committee have delegated authority to approve this.

Councillor Stan Anderson asked if the tower in Colliers Wood was privately owned. James McGinlay confirmed that the building was privately owned.

Councillor Nick Draper informed the Panel that a new build was planned for Colliers Wood and Abbey which included residential accommodation.

James McGinlay added that planned development in Colliers Wood was within the councils Local Plan. The redesign of the town centre is subject to master planning, which would involve residents and the business community, from summer 2015 onwards.

Councillor John Sargeant asked what the delivery mechanism would be for this programme of work in Morden and what would happen over the next year. James McGinlay explained that the council would be looking to assemble land and demonstrate to residents the potential of Morden and what it could look like. The council needs to be clear on how the scheme is to be delivered and of its financial viability, as well as working with the community. James McGinlay added that the council has a role as a planning authority and enabler in land assembly and will be looking at the residential and commercial offer and appropriate developers.

Councillor John Sargeant asked for more specific timescales for delivery and how stakeholders were briefed. James McGinlay explained that it was a case of making sure all the necessary checks and arrangements were in place and of increasing the control the Local Authority has over the development. The council are aiming to address the potential blockages in delivery to speed up the process when work starts. Stakeholders, including ward Councillors and the business and residential community receive briefings and newsletters and that this work was underway.

Councillor Russell Makin asked if there were plans for Tramlink to pass through Sutton. James McGinlay explained that the council have been working with Sutton and TfL to consult on proposed routes. There is also the potential for a route into South Wimbledon and TfL are looking into this. Councillor Abigail Jones stated that the proposal for a Tramlink in South Wimbledon was not wanted by residents. James McGinlay reinforced that this proposal was in its infancy and that whilst this had been communicated, TfL wish to undertake their own consultation on this.

James McGinlay stated that information on cycle routes and development would be brought back at a later stage to the panel when there was more clarity on what was bring taken forward.

RESOLVED: Panel agreed to add cycle routes to its list of topic suggestions for consideration as part of their 2015/16 work programme.

9. PERFORMANCE REPORT - VERBAL UPDATE

Chris Lee introduced the report and highlighted underperformance relating to waste and the total waste volumes collected and recycled or sent to landfill. Chris Lee explained that this was due to an increase in waste nationally, regionally and in Merton. This has had a knock on effect on cleanliness and resident satisfaction.

Councillor Ross Garrod asked about the increase in the rate of sickness across all departments and asked about the health of council employees, number of days lost from service and if there was an underlying issue causing this.

Chris Lee explained that sickness is actually reducing in the department and it stands at 10.02 days per FTE per annum. This is an improvement on previous year's performance. The council target is 8 days sickness and Environment and Regeneration are not the poorest performing department on this. This is because manual staff operate in all weathers; however, it is on a downward trajectory but will remain a high priority for the department. The council apply policy and procedure rigorously to this matter.

Councillor Ross Garrod asked if sickness levels were down to staff morale. Chris Lee stated that this was not the case and that the department drill into the reasons for sickness regularly. Sickness levels in this team are usually down to stress, colds and muscular skeletal issues.

Councillor Abdul Latif asked about the policy on addressing traveller communities taking up residence in parks and green spaces and how this might be prevented. Chris Lee informed the Panel that the council act swiftly to remove any unauthorised occupants on green spaces and in parks. The council work with partners such as the police and the use of the Criminal Justice Act means that Police now have certain powers that can be utilised to generate court orders and ensure removal more quickly.

Chris Lee added that the council must first undertake an appropriate assessment and make any health or welfare judgements and then apply to the court to act as quickly as possible.

Councillor Russell Makin asked if this procedure had to be followed if a traveller community had been moved and then occupied another site in the borough. Chris Lee confirmed that this was the case and that the council would apply this to each site. Councillor Imran Uddin asked if there wasn't a

period of leave and return linked to any court order which meant that it could be enforced on other sites.

James McGinlay informed the Panel that he had been working with colleagues in the police to address this issue and that a fuller proposal will be in place in March 2015.

RESOLVED: Panel noted the performance report.

10. WORK PROGRAMME 2014/15

RESOLVED: Panel agreed the removal of the following items on the agenda for its March 2015 meeting:

- Arts and Green Spaces
- Outlets in Town Centres
- CHMP update

Rebecca Redman agreed to present a proposal to the Panel at their June 2015 meeting on how they might approach performance management going forward.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel 18 March 2015

Agenda item: 5

Wards: All

Subject: **Street Lighting – Report for information**

Lead officers: James McGinlay (Head of Sustainable Communities)
Mario Lecordier (Traffic and Highways Manager)
Steve Shew (Interim Network Maintenance Manager)

Lead member: Councillor Andrew Judge - Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration

Contact officers: mario.lecordier@merton.gov.uk; (020) 8545 3202
steve.shew@merton.gov.uk; (020) 8545 3218

Recommendation: That Members note the content of this Report and provide their views on any issues they believe should be considered in the procurement.

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report provides detail on the council's street lighting stock, the available funding for planned & reactive maintenance and our approach to the future provision of new and existing street lights and illuminated street furniture. This includes information on new technology that will be used to significantly reduce energy, maintenance and CO₂ emissions in the borough.
- 1.2 It also includes information on contractor performance and options for re-procuring the contract when it expires in September 2016.

2 DETAILS

Inventory

- 2.1 The borough has some 16,300 items of illuminated street furniture, which include 12,831 lamp columns, 'keep left' bollards, centre island columns, belisha beacons and externally & internally lit traffic signs.
- 2.2 The light source and lamps on the boroughs columns vary as they were installed over a number of years to comply with the Code of Practice and British Standards at the time. The table below shows the disparity of the light source and lamps currently installed on the borough's columns:

LED	COSMO	SON	CDO-TT	SOX	GLS	MBFU	Total
441	1625	6396	929	3427	10	3	12831

2.3 The newest and most energy efficient lighting is LED followed by Cosmo, SON & CDO-TT, which are all ‘white light’ high pressure sodium sources that have good colour rendition and will minimise glare and light pollution.

The other light sources are now generally obsolete for lighting in an urban environment although the lamps are still available for bulk changing and maintenance.

2.4 All new lighting in the borough, whether through the capital relighting programme or through lantern conversions, will be LED.

The benefits of using LED lighting are outlined in 2.8, 2.9 & 2.10 below.

Available Funding

2.5 The table below shows the projected annual Capital and Revenue spend for each financial year from 2014/15 to 2018/19:

Funding	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Capital	£410,000	£200,000	£462,000	£290,000	£509,000
Revenue	£335,380	£340,410	£320,140	£299,570	£304,064
Total	£745,380	£540,410	£782,140	£589,570	£813,064

Note: The Capital funding figures come from the rolling relighting programme and, at the time of this report, are set. However, the Revenue figures are indicative only and based on the current 2014/15 budget plus inflation of 1.5% per annum less any savings that have been agreed for future years.

2.6 In addition to the above, there is also an energy budget of £583,000 to cover the 5,700,000 kWh of electricity to light the illuminated street furniture assets.

Statutory Responsibility

2.7 There is no statutory requirement for highway authorities to provide lighting but there is a duty to maintain it where it has been provided. This is in-line with the Council’s policy to improve road safety, crime & the fear of crime and to increase the feeling of security during the night-time environment.

New Technology and Future-proofing

2.8 Our capital relighting programme is now solely focussed on replacing existing lighting with LED, which will significantly reduce future energy, carbon tax and maintenance costs. This will help meet the Council’s MTFS targets, Merton’s Community Plan objectives and the Council’s Carbon Reduction Commitment & Climate Local Commitment targets to reduce CO₂ emissions.

2.9 LED lighting is relatively new to the outdoor lighting market and has only recently become practical for use on street lighting. It is more energy efficient than the current type of lighting used and is virtually maintenance-free, which will enable the significant reduction in energy & maintenance costs and the reduction in CO₂ emissions to be realised.

2.10 LED lighting has very good colour rendition, which will allow drivers and pedestrians to see objects and hazards in their true form and colour, thereby

minimising accidents and potential danger. They also have reduced glare as the light is directed downwards onto the road and pavement minimising the light that is directed into the driver's eyes.

- 2.11 Street Lighting is a 'universal' service and therefore a new and up-to-date lighting infrastructure will benefit all residents, businesses, other stakeholders and users of the public highway network.
- 2.12 New, improved lighting will assist in achieving our statutory responsibility to maintain lighting in a safe condition as required under the Highways Act 1980, the Code of Practice for Electrical Safety and the Code of Practice for Highway Lighting Management.
- 2.13 Over the last couple of years we have:
- Replaced 400 life-expired concrete columns with new steel columns utilising LED lanterns and this will continue into 2016/17 when the last of the life-expired concrete columns will have been replaced. We will then continue to introduce LED lighting into the borough by replacing the older steel columns;
 - Replaced the borough's internally lit illuminated bollards with solar and reflective units to drive down energy consumption;
 - Introduced LED sign lights and photocells to prevent 'day burning' and to further reduce energy;
 - Changed Centre Island Columns (CICs) to a more energy efficient light source;
 - Upgraded zebra crossings from obsolete tungsten technology to new LED belisha beacons to reduce maintenance and energy costs; and
 - Trialled a pilot CMS (Central Management System) to monitor individual units, measure energy usage and enable dimming and flexible lighting levels to be applied.

As a result of the above, energy consumption has reduced by 800,000 kWh with a projected energy saving of £80k per annum.

We have also:

- Introduced a Bi-Party Agreement with the Distribution Network Operator to enable our term contractor to operate as an Independent Connections Provider (ICP) to improve service delivery and reduce costs; and
 - Introduced a 'Share Point' IT system between Contractor and Client to streamline communication, act as a central document depository, and drive back office efficiencies.
- 2.14 Early next financial year we will be rolling out LED lighting on approximately 3,000 existing and structurally sound steel columns by fitting an LED retro-fit kit into an existing and robust lantern housing. This is a cost-efficient and relatively quick way to introduce additional LED lighting that will reduce future energy and maintenance costs, with a projected payback period of less than three years.

3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 3.1 We are also developing an ‘Invest to Save’ bid to roll out LED lighting on a further 4,000 existing and structurally sound steel columns by replacing old lanterns with new LEDs. This is more expensive to do, with a commensurate longer payback period projected to be about 15 years.
- 3.2 We have considered the use of a Central Management System (CMS) and Controllable Drivers that will be able to remotely monitor and provide dynamic control for street lights – this will enable lighting times to be trimmed and lighting levels dimmed. Additionally, lamp faults can be predicted and detected but this is likely to be obsolete with LED lighting. It would also enable us to provide precise energy consumption data for billing purposes.
- 3.3 Introducing a CMS across the borough would cost approximately £1m and thereafter would require an annual maintenance charge of between £30k and £40k. Although this could lead to further savings and operational efficiencies, these would be minimal due to the savings already achieved through LEDs. Also, the additional revenue savings achievable would not justify the capital cost due to the number of years it would take to payback.

4 MAINTENANCE

- 4.1 Works carried out under the Street Lighting Maintenance and Improvements Contract include routine fault repairs, emergency standby & callout arrangements, lantern cleaning, bulk lamp changes & cleaning, night patrols, structural testing, electrical inspection, painting and renewal.
- 4.2 The Contract also covers Capital works such as energy reduction schemes, lighting upgrades, new lighting projects, traffic schemes, street scene improvement works and the street lighting aspects of town centre regeneration projects.
- 4.3 In addition to Capital and Revenue works, the term contractor also provides professional advice and guidance on all aspects of lighting design and installation and deals directly with the Distribution Network Operator (DNO) on all faults relating to the distribution cable network that affects the street lighting service.
- 4.4 The Term Contractor – Kier MG – also provides operational support and maintenance of other electrical equipment from multiple departments including Greenspaces, Parking Services, Trading Standards, CCTV, Future Merton and Safer Merton.

5 CONTRACT PERFORMANCE

- 5.1. There are four core KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) within the contract that are monitored at the Monthly Contract Meetings. The rolling 12-month average performance figures are given in the table below:

Key Performance Indicator	KPI 2 Monthly defects found during Night Scouts	KPI 3 Monthly defects from Customer Enquiries	KPI 4a Average No. of days taken to repair a fault	KPI 4b %age of faults repaired within 3 working days
---------------------------	---	---	--	--

Target	<170	<100	<3 days	90%
Performance	117	90	2.02 days	91%

- 5.2. Mostly, the monthly targets are met with no concerns or issues. Kier MG demonstrate a positive approach to health and safety and have good systems in place to deal with any specific issues; so far it has not been necessary to issue any Corrective Action Notices for any breach of health & safety law or policy.
- 5.3 Their general level of response is good, although there have been occasions where the contractor has failed to respond to specific issues within the required timescales. However, since the contract covers 2 hour emergency call outs and repairs to all of the Councils 16,300 items of illuminated street furniture, this would be expected. To put this into context, there are approximately 180 emergency call outs and 4,300 lighting faults reported annually.
- 5.4 Kier MG have also been instrumental in generating savings and service improvements – such as those listed in 2.13 above – and through their experience and knowledge have provided advice and information on product development and best practise. They also host regular best practise forums for their clients.

6 CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

- 6.1. The 2014/15 Residents Survey identified that 71% were satisfied with Street Lighting in the borough, which is 8% higher than when the current contract started in October 2009.
- Street Lighting was ranked the fourth highest rated service in the borough behind Public Transport, Parks & Open Spaces and Recycling and is also above the London average.

7 CONTRACT RE-PROCUREMENT

- 7.1 The current Street Lighting Maintenance and Improvement Contract expires on 30 September 2016 and, since the option to extend has already been exercised, it cannot be extended any further.
- 7.2 We are currently writing an Options Appraisal Report that will outline the various options available for re-procurement, which will include:
- Tender a new Contract under the OJEU Open Restricted Tendering procedure, which will require the appointment of an external consultant;
 - Use LoHAC (London Highways Alliance Contract), which will require the completion of, and agreement to a Call-Off Contract and a robust evaluation of the cost and quality benefits and dis-benefits to Merton; and
 - Joint procurement and collaboration. There have been initial discussions with Sutton who are very keen to pursue this as all procurement costs, including those of an external consultant, will be shared. Discussions are currently on-going with Sutton, who is the only neighbouring borough where joint procurement and collaboration is a realistic option due contract set-ups in the other boroughs.

8 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

- 8.1 Although formal consultation is not required as part of this report, we will be informing Members and Stakeholders of any future developments and opportunities that may arise.
- 8.2 Ward Members and residents are also informed of impending new lighting works in their roads two weeks before work commences.

9 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

Financial

- 9.1 There are significant revenue savings that can be made by continuing to introduce LED lighting into the borough and this is currently being rolled-out under the capital relighting programme. We will also be investing £400,000 early next financial year to retro-fit LED lanterns onto existing steel columns as outlined in 2.14 above, with a projected energy and maintenance saving of £148,000 per annum and a payback period of less than three years.
- 9.2 An additional £2.2m capital allocation is required to supply and fit new LED lanterns to 4,000 existing steel columns to deliver additional energy savings. However, as outlined in 3.1 above the payback period for this is projected to be 15 years.
- 9.3 There are no Resource or Property implications.

10 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 There is no legal requirement for Highway Authorities to provide street lighting. However S 97 of the Highways Act 1980 states:
- 1.) "... every local highway authority may provide lighting for the purposes of any highway or proposed highway for which they are or will be the highway authority, and may for that purpose -*
- (a) contract with any persons for the supply of gas, electricity or other means of lighting; and*
- (b) construct and maintain such lamps, posts and other works as they consider necessary*
- 10.2 The Council has a statutory responsibility to provide a safe and efficient highway network for the benefit and safety of all road users.

11 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 New LED lighting will enhance the night-time environment encouraging people to walk, cycle & use public transport and will promote the economy and vibrancy within the borough's district centres. In addition it will enhance the quality of the public realm and maintain residents' satisfaction with Merton as a place to live and work.

The provision and effective maintenance of street lighting plays an essential role in providing safe access on Merton's Highway, particularly for those disadvantaged groups such as those with mobility difficulties and the elderly.

12 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires all Local Authorities to consider crime and disorder while exercising their duties. The provision of LED lighting will reduce crime and the fear of crime, thereby assisting the council in discharging this duty.

13 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

- 13.1 Effective maintenance and improvement of street lighting will minimise insurance or injury risks to the Council by ensuring that the public highway is safe and serviceable, particularly during the hours of darkness.

14 BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

Committee: Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Date: 18th March 2015

Agenda item:

Wards: All

Subject: **Call in to the decision to introduce changes to the tariffs for the On Street Pay and Display Parking Machines**

Lead officer: Chris Lee (Director of Environment and Regeneration)
John Hill (Head of Public Protection)
Paul Walshe (Parking Services Manager)

Lead member: Councillor Judy Saunders Cabinet Member for Environmental Cleanliness and Parking

Contact officer: Paul.Walshe@Merton.gov.uk 020 8545 4189

Recommendation:

1. That Members note the response to the call in and decide whether to refer back to Cabinet for reconsideration.
-

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 To respond to the call in by Members concerning the decision to implement changes to the tariffs for the On Street Pay and Display parking machines as a result of the Town Centres Survey carried out between July and October 2012.

1.2 INTRODUCTION

Parking charges including tariff structures are recognised industry methods in the management of parking demand and the creation of parking spaces for ad hoc parking. These proposed changes to tariff structures are a response to the Town Centres Survey and the implementation of 20 minute free parking at shopping parades. Another important element in the redesign of the tariffs is the removal of minimum stay times and charges that are currently disproportionately high for the time our customers want to park. This was clearly identified in the Town Centre Survey as a cause for concern.

2. DETAILS

The call in is on the basis that it is not clear that the Council's decision to implement changes will address the issue of complexity of the current charging regime and that the proposals involve nothing more than an increase in headline hourly process across the board and that the following principles of decision making in Article 13 of the constitution were not applied:

- i) Due Consultation and taking of professional advice from officers;
- ii) Respect for human rights and equalities
- iii) A presumption in favour of openness
- iv) Clarity of aims and desired outcomes
- v) Consideration and evaluation of alternatives

The following is a response set out under the headings referred to above:

i) Due Consultation and taking of professional advice from officers and iii) A presumption in favour of openness

This change to parking tariffs will affect a large number of residents, businesses and visitors to Merton and yet there has been no consideration in public of what is proposed and no opportunity for any pre-decision scrutiny by the Sustainable Communities panel, despite the fact that this panel has previously considered reports on the results of the various parking surveys that have taken place in recent years and would therefore be in a good position to consider and add value to these proposals.

The purpose of these changes is to simplify the range of charges particularly around the various minimum charges and increments: this is achieved by the introduction of a linear pricing structure together with a standard minimum stay time of 20 minutes borough-wide.

“Linear” pricing means that customers will receive parking time at the prevailing hourly rate equivalent to the value of every coin they insert in a machine (the minimum coin accepted being 5p). At present a “step” tariff system operates which only allows the purchase of time in specified “blocks”, e.g. 30 minutes or even 1 hour minimum. The linear tariff will allow any amount of time to be purchased after 20 minutes based on the units of 5p a customer wishes to insert, subject to the maximum stay time allowed at the location.

The proposed hourly rates take account of Members' decision to increase the price of pay and display parking by 10% as part of the 2013 budget setting process. Although this proposed an increase of 10% over 3 years (one third of machines each year), it would not be possible or practical to implement a completely different charging process in this way – all machines will need to operate on a linear basis from the outset and the existing step hourly rates will not provide a computable sum for linear purposes.

These changes will affect visiting motorists rather than residents as the changes are being made to all of the 341 on street pay and display machines and could create spaces for resident and visitor permit holders to park in shared use bays as the new pricing structure creates spaces by managing demand.. These changes are a direct result of the results of the Town Centre Survey for all of the borough's town centres (Colliers Wood, Morden, Raynes Park, Wimbledon Village, and Wimbledon). It was clear from the results that the complexity in the tariff structures such as minimum and maximum purchase of time were major issues. The proposed linear tariffs will reduce that issue and when combined with cashless (mobile phone) parking planned to be introduced from April 2015 onwards the issues regarding overpayments for blocks of time purchased will be removed thus allowing our customers to pay less for parking.

Listed below is a comparison between Merton and its neighbouring borough of Wandsworth. In the comparison Wandsworth's current lowest charge is over 100% greater than that proposed by Merton and the other rates are comparable to Wandsworth. The highest rate proposed by Merton of £3.60 will only apply to Worple Road and St George's Road Wimbledon, these locations being at the centre of the shopping / station area where demand management is greatest.

<i>Merton</i>	<i>£1.20</i>	<i>£2.40</i>	<i>£3.00</i>	<i>£3.60</i>
<i>Wandsworth</i>	<i>£2.50</i>	<i>£2.70</i>	<i>£3.00</i>	

The report states at 4.1 that no consultation is 'required for the purpose of this report yet that does not mean that consultation is not desirable. The council seems to be taking the Town Centre Parking Surveys as a 'carte blanche' to increase tariff prices even though that is not in fact the course of action supported by the outcome of those surveys.

The proposal to increase pay and display charges by 10% was subject to the full budget scrutiny process before Members' final agreement. The changes required to implement this do not legally require this type of consultation and can be introduced after a 21 day public notice has been advertised informing of the changes to the tariffs. The Town Centre Survey was carried out after agreement at full Council and the review of tariff structures was agreed at meeting of the Sustainable Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 13th February 2013. The rationale and driver for the tariff review was not to increase tariff charges but to make them more customer friendly and give our customers the ability to purchase less time thus making it cheaper for our customers to park..

Furthermore, there is no reference in the report or decision sheet to other relevant parking surveys, such as the parking capacity study in Wimbledon and Morden town centres commissioned by the council in June 2012 from the Vincent Knight consultancy. This included an in depth look at Wimbledon on-street parking and yet the conclusions of that study do not appear to have informed this decision or even to have been considered. Similarly there is no reference anywhere to the results of the survey carried out between 12 April and 30 April 2013 on parking in Merton's neighbourhood shopping parades.

The study carried out by the Vincent Knight Consultancy only concerned itself with 2 town centres Wimbledon and Morden and the parking capacity (spaces) for those centres.

The Town Centre Survey in 2012 covered 5 town centre locations: Wimbledon Village, Wimbledon Town Centre, Morden Town Centre, Colliers Wood and Raynes Park and sought the views of the public and business on parking issues.

The Shopping parades and the free 20 minutes parking that are being introduced are one of the key factors in the structure of the new tariffs. This is because all linear tariffs are designed to facilitate the first 20 minutes paid or unpaid..

Finally, at 9) of the decision sheet, the Director states 'email documents /...'. This suggests there are other documents as well as emails upon which he has relied in making this decision and yet it is not clear what these are.

Attached as appendices are the following documents to which this comment refers to:

- 2015 02 20 Call in form
- Linear tariff 2015 final version
- Tariff change costs
- Linear tariff proposals
- Linear tariff draft

ii) Respect for human rights and equalities

The cost implications of this decision will be more heavily felt by residents and businesses in the west of the borough since the vast majority of on street Pay and Display parking machines are located in Wimbledon, Wimbledon Village, Wimbledon Park, South Wimbledon, Raynes Park and parts of Morden and Colliers Wood. This is clearly evidenced by the Appendix to the report.

Also, no consideration seems to have been given to the impact of the proposed cost increases on elderly and disabled residents who may be more reliant on using on street parking to visit shops and other local amenities.

The reason any change to the parking tariffs will be felt by the locations referred to is due the fact that the majority of the borough's controlled parking zones (CPZs) are within the areas identified. The changes proposed affect all of the on street parking pay and display machines in those CPZ's.

The tariff structure is being changed so that customers can purchase smaller amounts of parking time instead of having to purchase minimum time periods that are in excess of their needs. This will enable the users of pay and display machines to pay less for parking which addresses a further matter of concern raised by the Town Centre Survey.

The price changes will not affect elderly or disabled residents any more than other groups. Many disabled drivers have blue badges and resident permits at no cost to themselves which enables them to park free of charge in the zone they reside in.

iv) clarity of aims and desired outcomes; and v) consideration and evaluation of alternatives

With regard to clarity of aims and desired outcomes, the recommendations presented purport to be based on the outcome of the Town Centre Surveys carried out between July and October 2012. According to the report, the two general concerns that arose from that consultation were:

- a) The high cost and lack of available parking*
- b) The number of different tariffs at Pay and Display bays which causes uncertainty for motorists.*

The purpose of these changes is to simplify the range of charges particularly around the various minimum charges and increments: this is achieved by the introduction of a linear pricing structure together with a standard minimum stay time of 20 minutes borough-wide. This restructuring is not in itself proposed as a means of increasing prices but to simplify charges and provide greater convenience for customers in terms of the parking time they can purchase. However, the previously-agreed budget increase of 10% has also had to be incorporated into the proposal. In considering the level of charges it should also be noted that prices have not increased since 2011 and thus there has been an albeit modest reduction in real terms against inflation over the last four years. The agreed budget increase of 10% will redress this and coupled with the implementation of a linear tariff structure will enable the delivery of a more flexible, customer-friendly pay and display service.

Whilst some respondents to the Town Centre Survey called for lower parking charges, reducing them across the borough would increase demand, causing congestion and further concern about the availability of parking instead of resolving the issue of the "lack of available parking".

Listed below are the outcome and recommendations of the Town Centre Survey. The recommendations went to pre-decision scrutiny by the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel on the 13th February 2013 and the Leaders Strategy Group on the 25th February 2013 and then to Cabinet on the 11th March 2013 for approval:

1. Simplify Pay & Display tariffs
2. Introduce cashless (i.e. pay by phone) payments for Pay & Display parking
3. Set up a parking 'forum'
4. Install signs directing motorists to town centre car parks and showing available spaces
5. Offer more free parking
6. Enforce 2 permit per business limit in Zone W2 (Wimbledon)

As a response to item 1 of the recommendations, a reduction in the number of hourly rates from 13 to 4 and standardisation of minimum stay times to 20 minutes across the borough is proposed. In addition, a "linear" tariff model, rather than a revision to the current "step" tariff model is proposed because it will enable alignment with the free 20 minute parking already implemented at certain shopping parade locations and reduce the minimum purchase time required from, e.g. 30 or 60 minutes to 20 minutes.

The linear model will also fit in with the convenience offered by cashless (pay-by-phone) parking (see item 2) by allowing the user to register for a parking period of their choice (subject to the 20 minute minimum and the maximum stay time at the location).

However, the report does not indicate which, if any, of these concerns this decision is trying to address and it actually appears to compound concerns by generally increasing charges across the board. The Appendix clearly shows that, of all the many tariff changes that are proposed, only in the following 5 streets is it planned to reduce tariffs:

Home Park Road

Arthur Road

Worple Road

Leopold Road

Lake Road

In every other street, tariffs will rise. Although denied in section 7) of the report, this nevertheless suggests that, the intention – at least in part - of these changes is to target the motorist for ever higher parking charges in order to raise revenue for the council. Otherwise why not simply leave the majority of tariffs (apart from those which are out of sync) the same?

As previously stated the aim is to simplify the tariff structures addressing the variations in the minimum purchase of time and giving customers greater flexibility in the amount of time they can purchase (subject to maximum stay times).

Moreover, in terms of the financial and resource implications of this decision, whilst the report outlines the cost of implementing the tariff changes, it provides absolutely no information or projections for the revenue that will be generated in future years from increasing the majority of tariffs.

This decision unfortunately shows a complete lack of imagination on the part of the council. Given that one of the purposes of the 2012 parking review was to address "the high cost of parking", now just to increase parking charges seems a perverse

response. Indeed it shows a complete lack of regard for all those businesses and residents who responded to the 2012 survey. Significant majorities of respondents (54% in Raynes Park, 80% in Wimbledon and 77% in Wimbledon Village) said they were dissatisfied with the cost of parking and yet these are the very areas where it is proposed parking tariffs should now increase thereby simply further compounding the problem.

The aim is to simplify pay & display tariffs incorporating the 10% increase agreed as part of the budget setting process. Consideration was also given to the Shopping parades and the free 20 minute parking periods that are being introduced. This is one of the key factors in the structure of the new tariffs as they are all designed to facilitate the first 20 minutes paid or unpaid. With the ability to purchase the time needed as opposed to the current fixed minimum purchase period of 30 or 60 minutes, many of our customers will not need to purchase parking time in unnecessarily large “blocks” of time when they only require a few minutes (subject to a minimum of 20 minutes).

The Director may state on the decision sheet that the tariff increases are ‘minimal’ but that is not borne out by the figures in the Appendix. For example, in Francis Grove it is proposed that tariffs will increase by 50% in one go (from £2.00 to £3.00).

The “banding” of £1.20, £2.40, £3.00 and £3.60 was determined with reference to existing price differentials based on the geographical proximity of roads to the town centre in each area. The proposal seeks to reduce the current 13 differing hourly rates to 4 as indicated in the table below:

Proposed	£1.20	£2.40	£3.00	£3.60					
Existing	90p	£1.00	£1.10	£1.40	£1.90	£2.00	£2.40	£2.50	£2.60
Existing continued	£2.70	£2.80	£2.90	£4.00					

Moving to linear tariffs will mean that although the hourly rate goes up in the majority of cases, motorists will only need to pay for the time they require, so in many cases will end up paying less than they would under the existing tariffs, many of which have a minimum stay of 30 or 60 minutes . Many respondents to the survey expressed a desire for shorter minimum stays to allow them to quickly visit shops and businesses without having to waste money paying for a whole hour.

The increase in tariff for Francis Grove is because the location at present is anomalous in being centrally located but currently costing significantly less than machines on nearby roads (such as Worple Road). By increasing the hourly rate, demand for parking at this location will be more effectively managed.

In addition, the report states that there are no alternative options. However, various other options do exist which would help address the concern regarding the high cost of parking:

- i) Include charging based on 15minute periods rather than full hours (which need

not involve 5p coins)

An approach of 15 minute periods would not provide the flexibility of the proposed “linear” system. If a payment of 5p is to be eliminated, the hourly rate would either need to reduce to 80p (i.e. 20p for 15 minutes) or increase to £1.20 (i.e. 30p for 15 minutes). If a price reduction is considered, as stated previously, this would not incorporate the 10% increase already agreed as part of the budget setting process.

In addition, the 20 minutes free parking already in operation at certain locations will not easily compute with 15 minute paid periods. In the proposal, the only mandatory minimum period will be 20 minutes across the whole borough – beyond that the motorist will be able to purchase as much time as they like up to the maximum stay time at the location (subject to a minimum 5p increment).

ii) Offset hikes in headline tariffs by getting rid of incremental 1 hours

There are no 1 hour increments proposed in the linear system. After a minimum payment for 20 minutes, the customer pays in increments of as little as 5p for equivalent parking time at the prevailing hourly rate.

iii) Extend free parking time

This would be subject to wider consultation outside the remit of the Town Centre Surveys and this tariff proposal and whilst there would be budgetary impacts it is unknown how much of an effect this would have.

iv) Provide refunds where requested (online or by phone now that cashless parking has finally been introduced in the borough)

The linear tariff proposal will remove the perceived need for refunds as customers only need to pay as required for the parking time. If using the cashless parking facility customers can extend time with the service provider if they find that their initial purchase is insufficient. With regard to coin payment refunds, there is no machine available in the parking industry which provides refunds against paid for parking if the customer does not require all of the purchased time.

v) Consider contact-less payment whilst new meters are being implemented

Currently there are no new P&D machines being proposed. Provisional estimates show that any type of replacement machine would cost approximately £4000 per machine. It would therefore cost £1.5M to replace all machines across the borough including car parks.

The Director himself states on the decision sheet that there is an ‘infinite range of alternatives’. Yet there is no evidence that the alternatives above or any others were ever considered and, if they were, no explanation as to why these other options were disregarded.

The fact is that simply increasing tariffs does not address the problem of the complexity of parking tariffs currently in place in Merton. If the council was

really serious about listening to residents and addressing this complexity (which is the real issue here), they would surely have considered other alternatives too.

Whilst there are several alternatives in restructuring the existing “step” tariff system, by changing minimum stay times or hourly rates, none of these will offer the flexibility of a “linear” tariff system. The aim of this project is to reduce the number and complexity of the existing tariffs whilst delivering a structure that takes account of the introduction of 20 minute free parking in shopping parades and also allows the customer to purchase the time they wish rather than the minimum time that the current tariffs dictate thus reducing the amount spent on parking. The proposal being put forward is the only one that can achieve the desired outcomes of simplifying the current tariff structure and delivering a better payment option for customers.

This decision is unfortunately an anti- business response to what was a request from residents for a pro-business solution. As such, we would ask that the decision is reconsidered and the council seeks to employ a more imaginative approach to simplifying parking tariffs and deploying investment so as to better serve residents and properly help energise Merton’s high streets and neighbourhood parades for the future.

Comments received during the town centre survey showed that many businesses highlighted a need for motorists to be able to stop briefly to visit local shops – some respondents gave the example of having to spend a minimum of 55p in Raynes Park just to stop and buy a newspaper. Under the new scheme the minimum will be 40p, a reduction of 37.5%.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

4.1 None for the purpose of this report

5. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

5.1 None for the purposes of this report.

6. TIMETABLE

6.1 Not applicable

7. FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The cost to implement these changes 18K.

8. LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The Council is required to issue a Notice of Variation - Under Section 35C and 46A of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, a Local authority has powers to vary off and on-street parking charges respectively. In both cases a Notice is published in a newspaper circulating in the local area giving at least 21 days notice of the variation. The Notice does not invite representation, and its effects become operational at the end of the Notice period.

As part of the Councils legal obligation it is not our intention to make these changes for the purpose of raising revenue as describe in the above report

- 9. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**
 - 9.1 None for the purposes of this report.
- 10. HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS**
 - 10. 1 none for the purposes of this report.
- 11. RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**
 - 11.1 None for the purposes of this report.
- 12. APPENDICES**
 - 12.1 Details of the existing charges and the proposed changes
- 13. BACKGROUND PAPERS**
 - 13.1 None

SIGNED ELECTRONICALLY BY COUNCILLORS STEPHEN CROWE,
SUZANNE GROCOTT AND DANIEL HOLDEN

Merton Council - call-in request form

1. Decision to be called in: (required)

Tariff changes to the On Street Pay and Display Parking Machines

2. Which of the principles of decision making in Article 13 of the constitution has not been applied? (required)

Required by part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(ii) of the constitution - tick all that apply:

(a) proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);	
(b) due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;	X
(c) respect for human rights and equalities;	X
(d) a presumption in favour of openness;	X
(e) clarity of aims and desired outcomes;	X
(f) consideration and evaluation of alternatives;	X
(g) irrelevant matters must be ignored.	

3. Desired outcome

Part 4E Section 16(f) of the constitution- select one:

(a) The Panel/Commission to refer the decision back to the decision making person or body for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of its concerns.	X
(b) To refer the matter to full Council where the Commission/Panel determines that the decision is contrary to the Policy and/or Budget Framework	
(c) The Panel/Commission to decide not to refer the matter back to the decision making person or body *	
* If you select (c) please explain the purpose of calling in the decision.	



4. Evidence which demonstrates the alleged breach(es) indicated in 2 above (required)

Required by part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(ii) of the constitution:

We are all in favour of the simplification of parking tariffs. Whenever parking in certain parts of the borough, the complexity of charges is incredible, especially with various minimum charges and minimum increments.

However, it is not clear that the council's decision will address this issue. The simplification seems to involve nothing more than increases in headline hourly prices across the board.

(b) due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers; and (d) a presumption in favour of openness;

This change to parking tariffs will affect a large number of residents, businesses and visitors to Merton and yet there has been no consideration in public of what is proposed and no opportunity for any pre-decision scrutiny by the Sustainable Communities panel, despite the fact that this panel has previously considered reports on the results of the various parking surveys that have taken place in recent years and would therefore be in a good position to consider and add value to these proposals.

The report states at 4.1 that no consultation is 'required for the purpose of this report' yet that does not mean that consultation is not desirable. The council seems to be taking the Town Centre Parking Surveys as a 'carte blanche' to increase tariff prices even though that is not in fact the course of action supported by the outcome of those surveys.

Furthermore, there is no reference in the report or decision sheet to other relevant parking surveys, such as the parking capacity study in Wimbledon and Morden town centres commissioned by the council in June 2012 from the Vincent Knight consultancy. This included an in depth look at Wimbledon on-street parking and yet the conclusions of that study do not appear to have informed this decision or even to have been considered. Similarly there is no reference anywhere to the results of the survey carried out between 12 April and 30 April 2013 on parking in Merton's neighbourhood shopping parades.

Finally, at 9) of the decision sheet, the Director states 'email documents /...'. This suggests there are other documents as well as emails upon which he has relied in making this decision and yet it is not clear what these are.

(c) respect for human rights and equalities;

The cost implications of this decision will be more heavily felt by residents and businesses in the west of the borough since the vast majority of on street Pay and Display parking machines are located in Wimbledon, Wimbledon Village, Wimbledon Park, South Wimbledon, Raynes Park and parts of Morden and Colliers Wood. This is clearly evidenced by the Appendix to the report.

Also, no consideration seems to have been given to the impact of the proposed cost increases on elderly and disabled residents who may be more reliant on using on street parking to visit shops and other local amenities.

(e) clarity of aims and desired outcomes; and (f) consideration and evaluation of alternatives;

With regard to clarity of aims and desired outcomes, the recommendations presented purport to be based on the outcome of the Town Centre Surveys carried out between July and October 2012. According to the report, the two general concerns that arose from that consultation were:

- a) The high cost and lack of available parking
- b) The number of different tariffs at Pay and Display bays which causes uncertainty for motorists.

However, the report does not indicate which, if any, of these concerns this decision is trying to address and it actually appears to compound concerns by generally increasing charges across the board. The Appendix clearly shows that, of all the many tariff changes that are proposed, only in the following 5 streets is it planned to reduce tariffs:

Home Park Road

Arthur Road

Worple Road

Leopold Road

Lake Road

In every other street, tariffs will rise. Although denied in section 7) of the report, this nevertheless suggests that, the intention – at least in part - of these changes is to target the motorist for ever higher parking charges in order to raise revenue for the council. Otherwise why not simply leave the

majority of tariffs (apart from those which are out of sync) the same?

Moreover, in terms of the financial and resource implications of this decision, whilst the report outlines the cost of implementing the tariff changes, it provides absolutely no information or projections for the revenue that will be generated in future years from increasing the majority of tariffs.

This decision unfortunately shows a complete lack of imagination on the part of the council. Given that one of the purposes of the 2012 parking review was to address "the high cost of parking", now just to increase parking charges seems a perverse response. Indeed it shows a complete lack of regard for all those businesses and residents who responded to the 2012 survey. Significant majorities of respondents (54% in Raynes Park, 80% in Wimbledon and 77% in Wimbledon Village) said they were dissatisfied with the cost of parking and yet these are the very areas where it is proposed parking tariffs should now increase thereby simply further compounding the problem.

The Director may state on the decision sheet that the tariff increases are 'minimal' but that is not borne out by the figures in the Appendix. For example, in Francis Grove it is proposed that tariffs will increase by 50% in one go (from £2.00 to £3.00).

In addition, the report states that there are no alternative options. However, various other options do exist which would help address the concern regarding the high cost of parking:

- i) Include charging based on 15minute periods rather than full hours (which need not involve 5p coins)
- ii) Offset hikes in headline tariffs by getting rid of incremental 1 hours
- iii) Extend free parking time
- iv) Provide refunds where requested (online or by phone now that cashless parking has finally been introduced in the borough)
- v) Consider contact-less payment whilst new meters are being implemented

The Director himself states on the decision sheet that there is an 'infinite range of alternatives'. Yet there is no evidence that the alternatives above or any others were ever considered and, if they were, no explanation as to why these other options were disregarded.

The fact is that simply increasing tariffs does not address the problem of the complexity of parking tariffs currently in place in Merton. If the council

was really serious about listening to residents and addressing this complexity (which is the real issue here), they would surely have considered other alternatives too.

This decision is unfortunately an anti- business response to what was a request from residents for a pro-business solution. As such, we would ask that the decision is reconsidered and the council seeks to employ a more imaginative approach to simplifying parking tariffs and deploying investment so as to better serve residents and properly help energise Merton's high streets and neighbourhood parades for the future.

5. Documents requested

All papers provided to the Director of Environment and Regeneration, Director of Corporate Services and relevant Cabinet Member(s) prior to, during and subsequent to the decision making process.

All emails, reports and associated documentation relating to On Street Pay and Display Parking Tariffs provided to the relevant Cabinet Members, Leader of the Council, Chief Executive, Director of Environment and Regeneration, Director of Corporate Services and other council officers.

The detailed financial analysis of a) the projected costs to the council of these tariff changes i.e. how the £39,000 is broken down; and b) the revenue projected to be generated for the council over each of the next 5 years as a result of these tariff changes.

The detailed analysis of the impact of the proposed tariff changes on the future health of Merton's high streets and neighbourhood parades.

The Equality Impact Assessment (or any other equalities analysis carried out) on the impact of these tariff changes.

All correspondence not only between the relevant Cabinet Members, Leader of the Council, Chief Executive, Director of Environment and Regeneration, Director of Corporate Services and other council officers themselves, but also with business representatives, residents associations and other community groups on the proposed tariff changes.

6. Witnesses requested

Chris Lee (Director of Environment and Regeneration)

Councillor Judy Saunders (Cabinet Member for Environmental Cleanliness and Parking)

John Hill (Head of Public Protection)

Paul Walshe (Parking Services Manager)

Paul McGarry (Future Merton Manager)

Relevant representative from Merton Chamber of Commerce

Representatives from local business groups in the borough affected by the proposals e.g. Wimbledon Village Business Association, Love Wimbledon etc.

7. Signed (not required if sent by email):

8. Notes – see part 4E section 16 of the constitution

Call-ins must be supported by at least three members of the Council.

The call in form and supporting requests must be received by by 12 Noon on the third working day following the publication of the decision.

The form and/or supporting requests must be sent:

- **EITHER** by email from a Councillor's email account (no signature required) to democratic.services@merton.gov.uk
- **OR** as a signed paper copy to the Head of Democracy Services, 8th floor, Civic Centre, London Road, Morden SM4 5DX.

For further information or advice contact the Head of Democracy Services on 020 8545 3864

Parkeon Ltd
 10 Willis Way
 Fleets Bridge Industrial Estate
 Poole, Dorset, BH15 3SS
 Tel: 01202 339494
 Fax: 01202 667293

Quote No. PS/35/0034



PRODUCT SUPPORT QUOTE

Parkeon Contact

Name Steve Jones Tel: 01179 575 577 Ext. 247
 Position Service Solutions Manager
 Department Product Support

Dates

First Contact
 Quote Issued 22nd January 2015
 Accept/Reject

Product/Service Description	Part Number	Quantity	Price (£)	TOTAL (£)
To Supply:				
Neops (MMC) customisation		15	220.00	3300.00
Neops copy licence		44	25.00	1100.00
Frib (chip) customisation		51	220.00	11220.00
Frib copy licence		231	46.00	10626.00
Call out		10	142.00	1420.00
Labour (per hour)		170.5	59.00	10059.50
Delivery		1	15.00	15.00
Please note that up to 20 tariff labels will take approximatley 3 weeks from receipt of approved drafts. For larger quantities please ask for a guide lead time.				

Page 66 of 69

Reference: Engineer to supply and fit software and labels to 59 Strada machines and 282 Stelio machines. A total of 341 machines at various sites for LB Merton.	Sub Total	£ 37,740.50
	Discount	
	TOTAL	£ 37,740.50

Customer Details:	
Customer	LB Merton
Contact	John McIver
Address 1	Various sites
Address 2	
Post Code	
Phone	020 8545 4071
E-mail	john.mciver@merton.gov.uk

Work to be carried out during normal hours; Mon-Fri, 08:30 - 17:00. If this quote is accepted please send a purchase order to our Poole office, (sales_uk@parkeon.com) The times used in this quotation are estimated against similar work, our invoice will reflect the actual time spent on-site as entered on the engineer's service report.

Please note that this quotation for supply/replacement of new or exchange parts includes for the transfer of ownership of the original removed/unserviceable parts to Parkeon.

This quote is valid for 90 days only from the date of issue. Please note that our prices do not include delivery, installation, labour costs and VAT unless otherwise stated.

This page is intentionally left blank

Zone	Current Forecast
W3	167851.10
W4	84436.62
VC	284175.70
W1	241198.46
W2	136204.29
VN	189945.78
VON	18705.81
VOS	174641.26
VOT	56197.52
P1	79764.27
3F	72209.82
4F	61290.86
S1	56542.53
CW	35534.19
W6	37346.39
2F	12778.30
P2S	67733.03
W5	6556.14
W6	37346.39
P2	17960.96
P3	25931.25
VNE	1814.82
S2	34556.86
5F	46595.06
RPN	32511.28
RP	55868.80
SW	15736.58
M1	16153.07
MP1	24118.62
W7	23524.83
3E	57750.70
RPE	14052.34
RPS	30759.74
H1	6921.23
H2	13256.69
S3	16245.94
GC	26459.15
MT	4617.56
M2	13587.93
Total	2298881.87

Forecast (1)	Difference (1)	Forecast (2)	Difference (2)
174636.86	6785.76	174636.86	6785.76
92626.30	8189.68	87739.58	3302.96
307647.79	23472.09	264940.91	-19234.79
259820.48	18622.02	252548.90	11350.44
144393.84	8189.55	139631.75	3427.46
223488.92	33543.14	177838.05	-12107.73
22157.96	3452.15	17341.00	-1364.81
207614.94	32973.68	160597.64	-14043.62
63440.72	7243.20	57571.30	1373.78
81279.43	1515.16	81279.43	1515.16
84701.70	12491.88	68401.49	-3808.34
72953.98	11663.12	56203.11	-5087.75
62894.88	6352.35	59561.55	3019.02
38960.97	3426.78	37880.77	2346.58
41155.23	3808.84	38879.80	1533.41
14174.28	1395.98	12885.53	107.23
63221.29	-4511.74	63221.29	-4511.74
7152.15	596.01	7152.15	596.01
41155.23	3808.84	38879.80	1533.41
19593.77	1632.81	19593.77	1632.81
28288.64	2357.39	28288.64	2357.39
2903.71	1088.89	1088.89	-725.93
37698.39	3141.53	37698.39	3141.53
50830.97	4235.91	50830.97	4235.91
35466.85	2955.57	35466.85	2955.57
60947.78	5078.98	60947.78	5078.98
17167.18	1430.60	17167.18	1430.60
17621.53	1468.46	17621.53	1468.46
26626.32	2507.70	24893.29	774.67
14114.90	-9409.93	14114.90	-9409.93
63140.38	5389.68	62372.51	4621.81
15329.83	1277.49	15329.83	1277.49
33556.08	2796.34	33556.08	2796.34
4152.74	-2768.49	4152.74	-2768.49
7954.01	-5302.68	7954.01	-5302.68
9747.56	-6498.38	9747.56	-6498.38
19436.09	-7023.06	19436.09	-7023.06
5037.34	419.78	5037.34	419.78
14823.20	1235.27	14823.20	1235.27
2487914.22	189032.35	2277312.43	-21569.44

Forecast (3)	Difference (3)	Forecast (4)	Difference (4)
174636.86	6785.76	150270.69	-17580.41
92626.30	8189.68	81478.30	-2958.32
307647.79	23472.09	264940.91	-19234.79
259820.48	18622.02	226267.51	-14930.95
144393.84	8189.55	125787.00	-10417.29
223488.92	33543.14	193055.01	3109.23
22157.96	3452.15	18946.65	240.84
207614.94	32973.68	176270.07	1628.81
63440.72	7243.20	59527.77	3330.25
85542.75	5778.48	76795.11	-2969.16
84701.70	12491.88	73834.89	1625.07
72953.98	11663.12	61786.73	495.87
62894.88	6352.35	60672.66	4130.13
38960.97	3426.78	38960.97	3426.78
41155.23	3808.84	41155.23	3808.84
14174.28	1395.98	14174.28	1395.98
80531.82	12798.79	63221.29	-4511.74
7152.15	596.01	7152.15	596.01
41155.23	3808.84	41155.23	3808.84
19593.77	1632.81	19593.77	1632.81
28288.64	2357.39	28288.64	2357.39
2177.78	362.96	2177.78	362.96
37698.39	3141.53	37698.39	3141.53
50830.97	4235.91	50830.97	4235.91
35466.85	2955.57	29555.71	-2955.57
60947.78	5078.98	50789.82	-5078.98
17167.18	1430.60	17167.18	1430.60
17621.53	1468.46	17621.53	1468.46
26626.32	2507.70	26626.32	2507.70
28229.80	4704.97	28229.80	4704.97
63140.38	5389.68	63140.38	5389.68
15329.83	1277.49	12774.85	-1277.49
33556.08	2796.34	27963.40	-2796.34
8305.48	1384.25	8305.48	1384.25
15908.03	2651.34	15908.03	2651.34
19495.13	3249.19	19495.13	3249.19
30959.74	4500.59	30959.74	4500.59
5037.34	419.78	5037.34	419.78
14823.20	1235.27	14823.20	1235.27
2556255.01	257373.14	2282439.92	-16441.95

Rebecca Redman

From: John McIver
Sent: 05 March 2015 11:05
To: Paul Walshe
Subject: FW: Linear Tariff proposals

John McIver | Finance & Infrastructure Manager

Parking Services

London Borough of Merton

Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX

Direct: 020 8545 4071 | Switchboard: 020 8274 4901

Mobile: 07972 920648

john.mciver@merton.gov.uk

www.merton.gov.uk

From: Paul Atie
Sent: 23 September 2014 15:05
To: John McIver
Cc: Paul Walshe; Jim Rogers; Mario Lecordier; Mitra Dubet; Chris Lee; Mitra Dubet
Subject: RE: Linear Tariff proposals

Hi All,

I agree generally with John's Tariff proposals. However, I would have expected that if the Council is increasing/decreasing the minimum charge of £1.10, it should go across all machines that have that tariff. Therefore the machines in Raynes Park tariff should go up to £1.20 or reduce the rest of those machines that currently charge £1.10 across the Borough in line with £1 proposed for Raynes Park. Applying this principle would increase or reduce the income. More importantly, it would reduce the number of tariffs to 4 and it would be fairer to visitors that use our machine across the Borough.

I know you are just looking to reduce the numbers of tariffs across the Borough but how does the 20 minutes free fit into the proposed tariff bearing in mind that the administration wants to introduce 20 minutes free in the first instant at all shopping parade and then on all pay and display bays.

Regards,

Paul Atie | Senior Engineer
Network Improvement and Renewal
London Borough of Merton,
Merton Civic Centre,
London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX,
Direct: 020 8545 3214 |
Switchboard: 020 8274 4901
paul.atie@merton.gov.uk
www.merton.gov.uk

Merton Council - Putting you First



From: John McIver
Sent: 23 September 2014 12:07
To: Paul Atie
Subject: FW: Linear Tariff proposals

Paul,

Attached copy of the 4 proposals. I also attach a covering email explaining version 4 in a bit more detail.

John

From: Jim Rogers
Sent: 22 September 2014 11:37
To: Chris Lee
Cc: Paul Walshe; Mario Lecordier; John McIver
Subject: Linear Tariff proposals

I attached the incorrect tariff sheet, please see the correct attached sheet.

Jim

From: Jim Rogers
Sent: 22 September 2014 11:11
To: Chris Lee
Cc: Paul Walshe; Mario Lecordier; John McIver
Subject: FW: Linear tariff draft 2014-15.xlsx

Chris,

Following our recent meeting with regard to proposed changes to the Pay and Display tariffs within the borough and the proposal to move towards linear based tariff structures.

Please find attached a list of our current proposals

Forecast 1 looks at increasing some prices above the 10% threshold and reducing others so the cheapest charge in the borough is £0.60 p/h and the most expensive is £4.20 p/h – a total of 7 tariffs.

Forecast 2 looks at reducing prices to a lower denominator of £0.60 if increasing it to the next denominator of £0.60 exceeds the 10% threshold

Forecast 3 looks at having a minimum price of £1.20 p/h and a maximum of £4.20 – a total of 6 tariffs. All prices have been increased to the next denominator of £0.60, regardless of whether or not it exceeds the 10% threshold.

Forecast 4 looks at introducing a minimum rate of £1.20 ph to avoid the 5p tariffs and brings in a minimum rate of £1.00 across the Raynes park area. The tariffs in this plan are brought in following the parking consultation and looks at reducing the on street cost of P&D in town centres. While the initial figures would show a loss of approx. £16k, john has also shown that a 10% increase in P&D costs in 2015/16 would show an increase of approx. £118k at these rates.

In all structures, the more expensive hourly rates will be town centre locations with P&D charges dropping as you move away from these locations and head into more residential areas.

The details of these proposals have been passed to the Traffic and Highways team to review and make comment on in light of plans and projects, particularly in Town centre and shopping parades that may impact on these.

It is proposed that following a review of these tariffs by T&H, any required changes will be made and the details of the tariff structure proposals passed to the appropriate cabinet members for their review as well.

Jim Rogers
Business and Customer Services Manager
Parking Services

This page is intentionally left blank

Environment and Regeneration performance January 2015

PI code and description	Jan-15					YTD result	Annual YTD Target	Current YTD status
	Value	Target	Status	Long Trend	Short Trend			
Public Protection								
CRP 044 Parking services estimated revenue	£987,112	£1,025,000				£9,878,281	£9,734,328	
SP 041 % of service requests replied to in 5 working days (EHTSL)	90.54%	85%				88.37%	85%	
SP 042 Income generation by EHTSL	£22,536	£20,000				£399,963	£320,000	
SP 111 No. of underage sales test purchases	Quarterly information received					87	139	
SP 127 % of parking permits issued within 5 working days	95%	90%				94.80%	90%	
SP 248 No of one stop shop sessions	Quarterly information received					34	34	
SP 254 % Data capture from air pollution monitoring sites	Quarterly information received					71.63%	90%	
SP 255 % licensing apps. processed within 21 days.	Quarterly information received					98.03%	95%	
SP 258 Sickness- No of days per FTE (parking)	2.05	0.91				14.56	9.29	
SP 316 % of Inspection category A,B & C food premises (annual)	Annual measure					91	95	
SP 332 no. of local multi agency problem solving meetings	Quarterly information received					25	21	
SP 381 % of food premises rated 2* or above	Quarterly information received					93.22%	92%	
SP 384 Backlog of PCN correspondence	1,092	500				462.5	500	
SP 397 % of cases won at PATAS	63.95%	50%				58.75%	50%	
SP 398 % of cases lost at PATAS	19.77%	23%				19.39%	23%	
SP 399 % of cases where council does not contest at PATAS	16.28%	27%				21.86%	27%	
Streetscene and waste								
CRP 047 / SP 068 Number of refuse collections including recycling and kitchen waste missed per 100,000	44.3	55				50.59	55	
CRP 048 % of sites surveyed on local street inspections for litter that are below standard	12%	7.50%				7.30%	8.50%	
CRP 049 / SP 059 Number of fly tips reported in streets and parks	310	266				3,262	2,660	
SP 046 Total Income from commercial waste	£276,718	£350,000				£1,187,610	£1,475,000	
SP 058 % of sites surveyed on local street inspections for litter that are below standard	Quarterly information received					9.36%	7.50%	
SP 061 Days lost through sickness per FTE (street cleaning)	1.08	0.83				10.07	8.34	
SP 062 % Sites surveyed below standard for graffiti	Quarterly information received					2.36%	5%	
SP 063 % Sites surveyed below standard for flyposting	Quarterly information received					0.64%	1%	
SP 064 % Residents satisfied with refuse collection (annual)	Annual performance received					70%	74%	
SP 065 % Household waste recycled and composted	34.58%	42%				34.58%	42%	
SP 066 Residual waste kg per household	469.39	420				469.39	420	
SP 067 % of municipal solid waste sent to landfill (waste management & commercial waste)	64%	47%				59%	47%	
SP 071 Days lost from through sickness per FTE (waste mgmt)	3.03	0.83				18.03	8.34	
SP 135 % MOT vehicle pass rate (transport passenger fleet)	Quarterly information received					95%	95%	
SP 136 Average % time passenger vehicles in use (transport passenger fleet) (Annual)	Annual measure					90.35%	65%	
SP 137 % User satisfaction survey (transport passenger fleet) (annual)	Annual measure							
SP 139 % Sites surveyed below standard for weeds	Quarterly information received					9.02%	14%	
SP 140 % Sites surveyed below standard for Detritus	Quarterly information received					12.67%	12%	
SP 253 Pest Control income	£4,931	£13,333				£102,677	£133,330	
SP 262 % Residents satisfied with recycling facilities (annual)	Annual performance received					72%	75%	
SP 269 % Residents satisfied with street cleanliness (annual)	Annual performance received					54%	60%	
SP 271 In-house journey times (transport passenger fleet) (annual)	Annual measure					70%	85%	
SP 353 Number of town centre FPN's issued (waste enforcement) (annual)	Annual measure					38	750	
SP 354 Total waste arising per households (KGs)	73.13	73				747.55	730	
SP 355 Spot checks on contractors (Transport Commissioning)	2	4				41	42	
SP 377 % customer satisfaction with commercial waste service (annual)	Annual measure							
SP 378 % market share for commercial waste	Quarterly information received					24.09%	30%	
SP 392 % satisfaction of parents / carers on taxi journeys (annual)	Annual measure							
SP 393 Average sickness days per FTE (transport fleet)	1.95	1				18.54	10	
Sustainable Communities								
CRP 045 / SP 118 Income (Development and Building Control)	127,784	146,666				1,726,744	1,633,328	
CRP 046 / SP 023 Maintain level of Capital receipts to support the financial strategy (excluding Merton Priory Homes)	Quarterly information received					£1.9m	£1m	
CRP 050 Volume of planning applications	187	161				2,100	1,610	
CRP 051 / SP 114 % Major applications processed within 13 weeks	50%	62%				55.56%	62%	
CRP 052 / SP 115 % of minor planning applications determined within 8 weeks	55.10%	65%				57.68%	65%	
CRP 053 / SP 116 % of 'other' planning applications determined within 8 weeks (Development Control)	86.77%	82%				85.98%	82%	
SP 015 Income generated - Merton Active Plus activity	£445	£1,140				£43,860	£45,120	
SP 020 Housing supply - new build units (annual)	Annual measure					489	320	
SP 024 % Vacancy rate of property owned by the council	Quarterly information received					0.53%	4%	
SP 025 % Debt owed to LBM by tenants inc businesses	Quarterly information received					8%	9%	
SP 026 Residents % satisfaction with parks & green spaces (annual)	Annual performance received					72%	72%	
SP 027 Young peoples % satisfaction with parks & green spaces (annual)	Annual performance received					77	71	
SP 028 Total LBM cemeteries income	£32,640	£40,000				£391,793	£323,000	
SP 029 Total outdoor events income	£0	£0				£406,055	£341,000	
SP 032 Number of Green Flags (annual)	Annual performance received					5	5	
SP 040 % Market share retained by LA (Building Control)	61%	75%				61.12%	75%	
SP 117 % appeals lost (Development & Building Control)	Quarterly information received					26.33%	35%	
SP 250 Income from Morden Assembly Hall	£7,013	£3,300				£43,912	£33,000	
SP 251 Income from Watersports Centre	£1,625	£3,600				£338,375	£348,510	
Jan-15							Annual YTD	Current





















PI code and description	Value	Target	Status	Long Trend	Short Trend	YTD result	Target	YTD status
SP 257 % Town centre vacancy rates	Quarterly information received					5.39%	10%	✓
SP 260 % Streetworks inspections completed	Quarterly information received					32.97%	35%	●
SP 263 % modal share for walking and cycling in the borough (annual)	Annual measure					35.7	35.8	●
SP 265 Reduce total no. killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents (annual)	Annual measure					60	54	●
SP 314 External funding and internal investment £	Quarterly information received					£244,390	£260,000	●
SP 318 Number of outdoor events in parks	0	0	✓	↓	↓	143	123	✓
SP 320 % Emissions reduction from buildings (annual)	Annual measure					6%	4%	✓
SP 325 % of residents rating Leisure & Sports facilities Good to Excellent (annual)	Annual performance received					44%	51.50%	●
SP 327 % to Emergency callouts within 2 hours (traffic & highways)	100%	100%	✓	↑	↑	100%	100%	✓
SP 328 % Streetworks permitting determined	99.50%	98%	✓	↑	↑	98.81%	98%	✓
SP 329 Percentage of Condition Surveys completed on time (traffic and highways) (annual)	Annual measure					92%	90%	✓
SP 349 14 to 25 year old fitness centre participation at leisure centres	8,318	8,600	●	↑	↑	82,458	82,600	●
SP 350 Percentage of jobs completed where no Fixed Penalty Notice issued	89.40%	98%	●	↑	↑	93.38%	98%	●
SP 379 % enforcement site visits within 14 days	Quarterly information received							?
SP 382 New jobs created - number of apprenticeships (Annual)	Annual measure							?
SP 383 Number of new businesses created through the Economic Development Strategy (EDS) (Annual)	Annual measure							?
SP 385 Volunteer input in parks management (number of groups) (Annual)	Annual measure							?
SP 386 Property asset valuations (annual)	Annual measure							?
SP 389 Carriageway condition - unclassified roads defectiveness condition indicator (annual)	Annual measure							?
SP 390 Footway condition - defectiveness condition indicator (annual)	Annual measure							?
SP 391 Average number of days taken to repair an out of light street light	Quarterly information received					1.98	3	✓
SP 395 Number of new jobs created through the Economic Development Strategy (EDS) (annual)	Annual measure							?
SP 396 % modal share for walking and cycling in the borough (annual)	Annual measure							?

Performance Monitoring Report – Sustainable Communities – Monthly – January 2015

PI Code & Description	Polarity	Jan 2015					YTD Result	Annual YTD Target	YTD Status
		Value	Target	Status	Short Trend	Long Trend			
CRP 059 / SP 008 No. of people accessing the library by borrowing an item or using a peoples network terminal at least once in the previous 12 months	High	62,204	54,500				62,204	54,500	
CRP 060 / SP 009 No. of visitors accessing the library service on line	High	158,631	95,850				158,631	95,850	
CRP 062 / SP 035 Number of homelessness preventions	High	490	458				490	458	
CRP061SP036MP045 Number of households in temporary accommodation	Low	126	125				120.4	125	
SP 037 Highest no. of families in Bed and Breakfast accommodation during the year	Low	2	10				3.8	10	
SP 038 Highest no. of adults in Bed and Breakfast accommodation	Low	4	10				2	10	
SP 279 % Self-service usage for stock transactions (libraries)	High	95%	95%				95%	95%	
SP 280 Active volunteering numbers in libraries (Rolling 12 Month)	High	300	180				300	180	
SP 282 Partnership numbers (Libraries)	High	41	30				41	30	
SP 284 Income Target (Merton Adult Education)	High	£28,418	£45,230				£471,280	£700,090	
SP 287 Maintain Income (Libraries)	High	£234,485	£235,500				£234,485	£235,500	

This page is intentionally left blank

Performance Monitoring Report – Sustainable Communities – Quarterly Indicators as at December 2015

PI Code & Description	Polarity	Q3 2014/15					YTD Result	Annual YTD Target	YTD Status
		Value	Target	Status	Short Trend	Long Trend			
SP 333 Number of Commercial learners (Merton Adult Education)	High	117	250				117	250	
SP 360 Number of enforcement / improvement notices issued	High	38	40				38	40	
SP 361 Number of Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) approved	High	31	49				31	49	
CRP 063 / SP 242 Number of Personal Development Learners (academic year)	High	2,196	1,500				2,196	1,500	
SP 277 Social Housing Lets	High	378	270				378	270	

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Date: 18th March 2015

Agenda item: 8

Subject: Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2015/16 – Topic Suggestions

Lead officer: Julia Regan, Head of Democracy Services

Lead member: Councillor Russell Makin, Chair of the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Contact officer: Rebecca Redman, Scrutiny Officer (rebecca.redman@merton.gov.uk)
020 8545 4035

Recommendations:

- A. That Members of the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel give consideration to the issues and items they may wish to scrutinise as part of their 2015/16 work programme.
-

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 At the beginning of each municipal year, each Overview and Scrutiny body determines the issues it wishes to build into its work programme for the forthcoming year. The Overview and Scrutiny bodies have specific roles relating to budget and business plan scrutiny and performance monitoring, and these should automatically be built into the work programme.
- 1.2 In addition to this, Overview and Scrutiny bodies may choose to build a work programme which involves scrutinising a range of issues through a combination of pre-decision scrutiny items, policy development reviews carried out by task groups, performance monitoring, ongoing monitoring items and follow up to previous scrutiny work. Any call-in work will be programmed into the provisional call-in dates identified in the corporate calendar as required.
- 1.3 Given that each Overview and Scrutiny body has six scheduled meetings over the course of 2015/16 (representing a maximum of 18 hours of scrutiny per year), the key challenge for scrutiny Members is how they can reconcile the competing demands of the range of issues they could choose to (or are required to) scrutinise against the time available.
- 1.4 The remit of the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel is as follows:

- housing, including housing need, affordable housing and private sector housing
- environmental sustainability, including energy, waste management, parks & open spaces and the built environment
- culture, including tourism, museums, arts, sports & leisure
- enterprise and skills, including regeneration, employment, adult education & libraries
- transport

2. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

2.1 N/A

3. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

3.1 To assist Members to identify and prioritise a work programme for 2015/16, the Scrutiny Team will undertake a consultation programme with Panel Members, Co-optees, members of the public, LB Merton Officers, Local Area Agreement partners (Merton LSP) and Voluntary and Community Sector organisations to determine other issues/items for Members consideration for inclusion in the Panels 2015/16 work programme.

4. FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 There are none specific to this report. Scrutiny work involves consideration of the financial, resource and property issues relating to the topic being scrutinised. Furthermore, scrutiny work will also need to assess the implications of any recommendations made to Cabinet, including specific financial, resource and property implications.

5. LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Scrutiny work involves consideration of the legal and statutory issues relating to the topic being scrutinised. Furthermore, scrutiny work will also need to assess the implications of any recommendations made to Cabinet, including specific legal and statutory implications.

6. HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

6.1 It is a fundamental aim of the scrutiny process to ensure that there is full and equal access to the democratic process through public involvement and engagement. The reviews will involve work to consult local residents, community and voluntary sector groups, businesses, hard to reach groups, etc and the views gathered will be fed into the review.

6.2 Scrutiny work involves consideration of the human rights, equalities and community cohesion issues relating to the topic being scrutinised. Furthermore, scrutiny work will also need to assess the implications of any recommendations made to Cabinet, including specific human rights, equalities and community cohesion implications.

7. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Scrutiny work involves consideration of the crime and disorder issues relating to the topic being scrutinised.

8. RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

8.1 There are none specific to this report. Scrutiny work involves consideration of the risk management and health and safety issues relating to the topic being scrutinised. Furthermore, scrutiny work will also need to assess the implications of any recommendations made to Cabinet, including specific risk management and health and safety implications.

9. APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT

9.1 There are no appendices to this report.

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

10.1 No background papers were used in the production of this report.

This page is intentionally left blank