



Jonathan Geall
Head of Housing and Health *and*
Acting Head of Legal and Democratic
Services

MEETING : OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
VENUE : MEETING ROOM A AND B, CHARRINGTONS HOUSE,
BISHOP'S STORTFORD
DATE : TUESDAY 10 DECEMBER 2019
TIME : 7.00 PM

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Councillor J Wyllie (Chairman)

Councillors S Bell, M Brady, K Crofton, I Devonshire, H Drake, J Frecknall,
M Goldspink (Vice-Chairman), D Hollebon, J Ranger, D Snowdon,
M Stevenson, N Symonds and A Ward-Booth

Substitutes

Conservative Group: Councillors D Andrews, S Bull and C Rowley

Green Councillor B Crystall

Labour Group Councillor C Redfern

(Note: Substitution arrangements must be notified by the absent Member to Democratic Services 24 hours before the meeting)

CONTACT OFFICER: PETER MANNINGS
01279 502174
peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk

This agenda has been printed using 100% recycled paper

DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

1. A Member, present at a meeting of the Authority, or any committee, sub-committee, joint committee or joint sub-committee of the Authority, with a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) in any matter to be considered or being considered at a meeting:
 - must not participate in any discussion of the matter at the meeting;
 - must not participate in any vote taken on the matter at the meeting;
 - must disclose the interest to the meeting, whether registered or not, subject to the provisions of section 32 of the Localism Act 2011;
 - if the interest is not registered and is not the subject of a pending notification, must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days;
 - must leave the room while any discussion or voting takes place.
2. A DPI is an interest of a Member or their partner (which means spouse or civil partner, a person with whom they are living as husband or wife, or a person with whom they are living as if they were civil partners) within the descriptions as defined in the Localism Act 2011.
3. The Authority may grant a Member dispensation, but only in limited circumstances, to enable him/her to participate and vote on a matter in which they have a DPI.
4. It is a criminal offence to:

- fail to disclose a disclosable pecuniary interest at a meeting if it is not on the register;
- fail to notify the Monitoring Officer, within 28 days, of a DPI that is not on the register that a Member disclosed to a meeting;
- participate in any discussion or vote on a matter in which a Member has a DPI;
- knowingly or recklessly provide information that is false or misleading in notifying the Monitoring Officer of a DPI or in disclosing such interest to a meeting.

(Note: The criminal penalties available to a court are to impose a fine not exceeding level 5 on the standard scale and disqualification from being a councillor for up to 5 years.)

Public Attendance

East Herts Council welcomes public attendance at its meetings and will provide a reasonable number of agendas for viewing at the meeting.

If you think a meeting you plan to attend could be very busy, you can check if the extra space will be available by emailing democraticservices@eastherts.gov.uk or calling the Council on 01279 655261 and asking to speak to Democratic Services.

Audio/Visual Recording of meetings

Everyone is welcome to record meetings of the Council and its Committees using whatever, non-disruptive, methods you think are suitable, which may include social media of any kind, such as tweeting, blogging or Facebook. However, oral reporting or commentary is prohibited. If you have any questions about this please contact Democratic Services (members of the press should contact the Press Office). Please note that the Chairman of the meeting has the discretion to halt any recording for a number of reasons, including disruption caused by the filming or the nature of the business being conducted. Anyone filming a meeting should focus only on those actively participating and be sensitive to the rights of minors, vulnerable adults and those members of the public who have not consented to being filmed.

Implementing paperless meetings will save East Herts Council approximately £50,000 each year in printing and distribution costs of agenda packs for councillors and officers.

You can use the mod.gov app to access, annotate and keep all committee paperwork on your mobile device.

Visit <https://www.eastherts.gov.uk/article/35542/Political-Structure> for details.

The Council is moving to a paperless policy in respect of Agendas at Committee meetings. From 1 September 2019, the Council will no longer be providing spare copies of Agendas for the Public at Committee Meetings. The mod.gov app is available to download for free from app stores for electronic devices.

AGENDA

1. Apologies

To receive apologies for absence.

2. Minutes - 5 November 2019 (Pages 7 - 20)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2019.

3. Chairman's Announcements

4. Declarations of Interest

To receive any Members' Declarations of Interest and Party Whip arrangements.

5. Final Report of the Parking Task and Finish Group (Pages 21 - 54)

6. Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Draft Work Programme (Pages 55 - 68)

7. Urgent Items

To consider such other business as, in the opinion of the Chairman of the meeting, is of sufficient urgency to warrant consideration and is not likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information.

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,
WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD ON TUESDAY 5
NOVEMBER 2019, AT 7.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor J Wyllie (Chairman)
Councillors S Bell, M Brady, S Bull,
K Crofton, I Devonshire, H Drake,
J Frecknall, M Goldspink, D Hollebon,
D Snowdon and A Ward-Booth

ALSO PRESENT:

Councillors G McAndrew

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Emma Cheesman	- Contract Manager - Urbaser
Mike Edley	- Interim Scrutiny Officer
Jess Khanom- Metaman	- Head of Operations
Peter Mannings	- Democratic Services Officer
Andrew Pulham	- Parking Manager
Simon Russell	- Strategic ICT Partnership Manager
Jamie Sells	- Joint Waste Services Manager
Helen Standen	- Deputy Chief Executive

Su Tarran

- Head of Revenues
and Benefits
Shared Service

211 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Ranger and M Stevenson. It was noted that Councillor S Bull was substituting for Councillor J Ranger.

212 MINUTES - 11 JUNE 2019

It was moved by Councillor I Devonshire and seconded by Councillor M Goldspink that the Minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2019 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

RESOLVED – that the Minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2019 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

213 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman said that the report on the ICT Joint Strategy was an issue that he had agreed to accept onto the Agenda on the grounds of urgency in order to facilitate the business of the Council.

The Chairman reminded Members that this meeting was the last to be attended by Mike Edley as the Interim Scrutiny Officer for East Hertfordshire District Council.

214 COUNCIL TAX LONG TERM EMPTY PROPERTIES

The Executive Member for Financial Sustainability submitted a report in respect of proposed changes to the Council Tax long term empty homes premiums from April 2020 (option B as detailed in the report submitted).

The Head of the Revenues and Benefits Shared Service used a PowerPoint presentation to present the report. She provided a definition of long term empty properties and referred to the exemption designations. Members were provided with data broken down by duration regarding the numbers of long term empty properties.

The Head of the Shared Service detailed the history before and since 2013 in respect of mandatory discounts and premium charges on properties that had been empty for more than 2 years. She referred to the Impact, Collectability and Avoidance (ICA) Review and summarised the percentage impact of the premium charged each month.

The Head of the Shared Service said that the preferred option was to introduce a maximum premium of 100%, increased from 50%, for properties that had been empty for more than 2 years. She confirmed to Councillor I Devonshire that there was another characterisation for properties that were empty as uninhabitable. She said there were no exemptions from the charge for these properties unless the Valuation Office Agency (VOA) agreed to remove them from banding. It was for the VOA to determine this not

the Council.

The Head of the Shared Service responded to queries from Councillors M Goldspink and K Crofton in respect of new homes bonus and whether there was any leeway in terms of properties that were being refurbished or rebuilt in the event of fire damage. She said that there was no appeals mechanism at the Council to decisions that had been made by the valuation office.

The Head of the Shared Service confirmed to Councillor J Frecknall that the proposed recommendation was not about raising money. She stated that it was more about encouraging changes in the usage of empty properties.

It was moved by Councillor K Crofton and seconded by Councillor M Goldspink that the Executive be advised that Option B be recommended to Council and Officers investigate the feasibility of an appeals process on the grounds of whether a house was habitable.

After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, this motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED – that (A) the Executive be advised that Option B be recommended to Council for implementation from April 2020, with a review of its impact during 2021 to consider if further increases were appropriate in our local context;

(B) Officers investigate the feasibility of an appeals process on the grounds of whether a

house was habitable.

215 WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Head of Operations submitted a report providing an overview of the Waste Management Service in East Herts over the past year. The report also provided comparative data of nearest neighbours in respect of missed bin collections and recycling rates.

The Head of Operations introduced and welcomed the Joint Waste Services Manager and the Urbaser Contract Manager to the meeting. She reminded Members that the Joint Waste Services Contract had commenced in early May 2018. Members were advised of the layers of governance within the Waste Management Service, which included monthly performance management regime meetings.

The Head of Operations said that the performance indicators underpinned the performance regime. She commented on a number of performance indicators including the indicator in respect of missed bin collections. Members were advised that Officers were satisfied with the performance of Urbaser in East Herts and in particular, the rate of 30 missed bins per 100,000 collections was very good.

The Head of Operations commented on the recycling rate of 50% and the relevant European Union (EU) target. She said that an option in future was to reduce bin size from 240 litres to encourage an increase in the recycling rate across the District.

Councillor K Crofton commented on failed bin collection rates when collection days had changed with the new contract. The Head of Operations said that data available could be manipulated with the system available to Officers. She referred to the impacts of extreme weather, both hot and cold, on the bin collection process.

In response to a query from Councillor J Frecknall, the Head of Operations stated a percentage lead performance regime would allow a more thorough and effective measure of performance management.

The Head of Operations clarified to Councillor M Goldspink that the 17 complaints received to date about bins/waste amounted to 40% of the 42 complaints received across all services in 2019/20. Councillor S Bell commented on the performance of Three Rivers in respect of refuse collections and recycling.

The Joint Waste Services Manager confirmed that Officers were talking to Council partners. He said that Three Rivers used smaller 140 litre bins and Officers were talking to this Council and others in order to share best practice. Councillor K Crofton moved and Councillor I Devonshire seconded, a motion that the recommendation for the noting of the update report, be supported.

RESOLVED – that the update report be noted.

216 UPDATE - TASK AND FINISH GROUP (PARKING)

The Chairman of the Parking Task and Finish Group, Councillor H Drake, submitted a report on the work of the Member group that had looked into aspects of parking policy in East Herts. She said that the Members were due to meet twice more before a final report was submitted to the 10 December 2019 meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor M Brady referred to a specific issue of commuter parking in Hertford and congestion. The Chairman of the Task and Finish Group invited Councillor M Brady to identify the postcode and specific roads to the parking team at East Hertfordshire District Council.

Councillor M Goldspink referred to main recommendation vii as part of paragraph 2.7 on page 44 of the report. She believed that free parking was very useful for blue badge motorists and shoppers with disabilities. The Chairman reminded Members that a full discussion would take place at the 10 December 2019 meeting of the Committee.

The Task and Finish Group Support Officer commented on the qualifying thresholds for new resident permit schemes, which had to be individually designed, as this would promote a more efficient use of resources. He said that making changes to existing schemes was a very costly process and there were good reasons why all residents parking schemes operated on an individual basis.

The Chairman of the Task and Finish Group commented on the significant legal and time implications of preparing a new residents parking zone. She reiterated the importance of schemes being tailored to address the problems of a specific area.

Councillor D Hollebon proposed and Councillor A Ward-Booth seconded, a motion that the work undertaken thus far by the Task and Finish Group be received and the Committee's comments be fed back to the Task and Finish Group. After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, this motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED – that (A) the work undertaken thus far by the Task and Finish Group be received;
and

(B) the Committee's comments be reported to the Task and Finish Group.

217 SCRUTINY OF SOCIAL HOUSING EVENT - AGREEMENT OF TERMS OF REFERENCE AND MEMBERSHIP

The Chairman of the Social Housing Task and Finish Group submitted a report that provided the basis for a discussion by the Committee for shaping the Terms of Reference and Membership of a Task and Finish Group to better understand the issues and challenges faced by residents and housing associations.

The Interim Scrutiny Officer said that the intention was that a scrutiny day or half day events could be set up to consider these issues and challenges. He stated

that key lines of enquiry could include input from a residents' forum or a tenants' representative group to pick up any concerns.

Members were advised that the Task and Finish Group could consider how the Council could work with providers to assist residents. Members should consider appropriate representatives to invite and the Task and Finish Group would need to work with the Head of Housing and Health in respect of the intended lines of enquiry.

The Committee was advised that an interim report would be submitted in February with a final report submitted by the end of the 2019/20 civic year. Councillor M Goldspink said that 2 events could be considered with 1 held in Hertford and the other in Bishop's Stortford. Members were advised that way forward could be a single provider event which would receive the input from 2 residents' events.

Councillor J Wyllie proposed and Councillor J Frecknall seconded, a motion that the Task and Finish Group would be formed of the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Councillors M Goldspink, M Brady and N Symonds. The Group would explore how the Authority and Councillors could support tenants and improve service standards.

After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, this motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED – that (A) the Task and Finish Group would be formed of the Chairman of the

Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Councillors M Goldspink, M Brady and N Symonds; and

(B) the Task and Finish Group would explore how the Authority and Councillors could support tenants and improve service standards.

218 URGENT ITEM - ICT JOINT STRATEGY

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report that presented Members with the Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Joint Strategy. The Strategic ICT Partnership Manager gave a PowerPoint presentation on the proposals. He said that the report had already been before the Executive at Stevenage Borough Council and would be submitted to East Herts in December 2019.

The ICT Manager referred to ageing IT equipment and infrastructure and said that there had been underinvestment in IT. He said that there had been no oversight of applications and there was a need to reduce complexity in terms of hardware and the number of applications and devices in use.

The ICT Manager believed that there had been no oversight or clear governance of IT until 9 months ago and there had been an unsustainable capital underinvestment in IT for 10 years. He said that neither East Herts nor Stevenage was benefiting from the reduction in ICT costs that would be gained by partnership working. Members were advised that a 2 person team had been set up within the ICT service to

manage the security network and oversee email and web filtering. He emphasised that 90% of outgoing emails were now encrypted.

The ICT Manager detailed some key benefits of a shared ICT Service including less reliance on multiple passwords, more cloud based operations and replacement of storage solution equipment and switching equipment that was 13 years old. He detailed where investment would be made in key infrastructure including microwave solutions and a 24/7 web based solution.

The Members were presented with a slide as part of the presentation that displayed lifecycles for technology in use at the Council. He mentioned Office 365 and detailed the governance arrangements for ICT going forward. He said that the Leadership Teams at both Councils would be considering reports regarding capital and revenue budgets for the ICT Joint Strategy. Members were advised of a number of measures of success including empowering customers and benefits in respect of better security and preventing cyber-attacks.

Councillor D Hollebon was assured by the ICT Manager that both East Herts and Stevenage Officers had consulted the Society for Innovation, Technology and Modernisation (SOCITM) for advice. Councillor Hollebon said that Essential Reference Paper 'A' was missing any information regarding Health and Wellbeing – Issues and Impacts. The Deputy Chief Executive said that this would be altered before the Executive meeting.

Councillor D Snowdon commented on the use of 2 data centres. The ICT Manager said a move to cloud based solutions would reduce the reliance on 2 data centres and cost based decisions could be made as to how much was stored at these centres. The Deputy Chief Executive commented on laptops for Officers by the end of the 2019/20 financial year, subject to usage rules. She said that the budget was already in place to transform the ICT network and avoid future significant outages.

In response to a comment from Councillor S Bell regarding Microsoft Teams and potential savings, the ICT Manager said that Office 365 was a significant investment and, once installed, it should be championed and used extensively as this would reduce costs. Councillor S Bull commented on device speeds and difficulties with multiple passwords. The ICT Manager stated that Office 365 allowed single sign on which would reduce the need for multiple passwords for Officers and Members.

Councillor I Devonshire moved and Councillor H Drake seconded, a motion that the Executive be advised that delegated authority should be given to the Deputy Chief Executive, in consultation with the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the Head of Strategic Finance and Property, to negotiate and agree a new ICT Shared Service Agreement with Stevenage Borough Council. After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, this motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED – that the Executive be advised that

delegated authority should be given to the Deputy Chief Executive, in consultation with the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the Head of Strategic Finance and Property, to negotiate and agree a new ICT Shared Service Agreement with Stevenage Borough Council.

219 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME

The Interim Scrutiny Officer provided Members with a draft Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme and Members' views sought in relation to the items on the work programme. He updated Members in respect of the Hertford Town Centre item as well as the issue regarding climate change and the new climate change forum.

The Interim Scrutiny Officer said that the cycle storage Task and Finish Group was subject to discussions with the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the Scrutiny Officer regarding the Terms of Reference. He confirmed to Councillor A Ward-Booth that 2 issues on each Overview and Scrutiny agenda was a good number.

The Chairman referred to the matter of public participation and the requirement for Full Council to amend the Council's Constitution in respect of public speaking. In reply to a comment from Councillor D Snowdon, Members were reminded that the 10 December 2019 meeting of the Committee would be held at 7 pm in Charringtons House.

It was moved by Councillor J Wyllie and seconded by Councillor H Drake that the draft Work Programme, as amended be approved. After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, the motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED - that (A) the draft Work Programme as amended, be approved.

The meeting closed at 8.41 pm

Chairman
Date

EAST HERTS COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 10 DECEMBER 2019

REPORT BY CHAIRMAN OF TASK AND FINISH GROUP

REPORT OF A TASK AND FINISH GROUP REVIEW OF ELEMENTS OF EAST HERTS DISTRICT COUNCIL PARKING POLICY

WARD(S) AFFECTED: ALL

Purpose/Summary of Report

- To report on the work of a Member Task and Finish Group established to review elements of East Herts District Council parking policy.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:

That:

(A)	The findings and recommendations of the Task and Finish Group set out in paragraphs 2.2, 2.3, 2.7, 2.12, 2.16 and 2.17 be noted;
(B)	The Committee confirms its support for these recommendations to the Executive;
(C)	The Committee recommends adoption by the Council of the modified Resident Permit Zone Policy and Operational Guidance set out in Essential Reference Papers 'D(i) and (ii)'; and
(D)	The Committee supports the Group's recommendation that it be requested to undertake further scrutiny in the areas identified in paragraph 2.18 to this report.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 On 11 June 2019 the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee elected to examine elements of East Herts

Council's current parking policies as part of its work programme for the 2019/20 civic year.

- 1.2 A Member Task and Finish Group was established to undertake this review. The Group was comprised of:
 - Councillor Holly Drake (Chair)
 - Councillor John Wyllie
 - Councillor Sophie Bell
 - Councillor Mari Stevenson
 - Councillor Ian Devonshire

- 1.3 The terms of reference agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were to review the following policy areas:
 - Town centre parking policies, focussing on Bishop's Stortford and Hertford, but looking also at the needs of other towns and villages
 - Resident Permit Zone (RPZ) policy
 - Parking standards within planning policies
 - Climate change/sustainability implications of parking policy

- 1.4 At its meeting on 23 July the Task and Finish Group agreed that due to time constraints the strand of work relating to East Herts planning policy would be deleted from the programme.

- 1.5 Since East Herts Council adopted its Transport and Parking Strategy in 2011/12 a number of changes have been made to parking policies and we are witnessing shifting attitudes towards the role of parking in tackling global challenges such as climate change and sustainable living.

- 1.6 Whilst the remit of the Task and Finish Group was not to produce a new parking strategy for the Council, its terms of reference, the evidence gathered and conclusions reached all form a useful basis for such an endeavour. It is hoped the findings of the Group will be considered as part of the emerging discussions and priority setting exercise being

undertaken through the emerging Corporate Plan (due to be recommended to full Council in early 2020).

- 1.7 This report picks up on individual recommendations against each of the policy areas identified in the group's terms of reference; however some general conclusions have also been reached through the process of deliberation and analysis over the past five months.
- 1.8 The main conclusion of the Group is that the Council's approach to parking policy needs to serve the needs of the following stakeholders:
 - Residents
 - Commuters
 - Business employees
 - Town centre shoppers/ visitors
- 1.9 It was acknowledged that an individual can find themselves in any of these categories depending on the purpose of their journey. With that in mind parking policy needs to balance the needs of all these stakeholders and offer a fair and equitable solution for all.
- 1.10 Equally it was acknowledged that use of the car will remain an important feature for East Herts residents in the future, given the geographic make-up of the county, but that there is unlikely to be wide support within the public sector for investing in new car parking facilities. The Council's parking policies therefore need to address the fundamental challenge of making best use of a finite resource as well as encouraging behaviour change amongst stakeholders along with demand management.
- 1.11 The issue of car park charges as an important tool for addressing behaviour change was acknowledged; however the remit of the Task and Finish Group was not to address directly tariffs in Council owned car parks. Accordingly, no explicit recommendations have been made in this area. It is anticipated, however, that emerging Corporate Plan priorities,

as referenced in 1.6 (above) will be mindful of the overall findings and recommendations of this Group.

- 1.12 Lastly, the group noted that the Council is only one of the organisations playing a role in parking provision within the district and that private sector transport operators also have a responsibility to address these challenges.
- 1.13 The general conclusions for each of the policy areas reviewed can be found below:

Town centre parking policies, focussing on Bishop's Stortford and Hertford, but looking also at the needs of other towns and villages:

- Making better use of existing car park capacity to accommodate town centre shoppers/ visitors, employees and commuters is a key priority.
- Employees of town centre businesses should be recognised as a distinct set of stakeholders where a different approach should be considered.
- Rail commuters should be discouraged from using town centre parking facilities where possible.
- Parking policy in Bishop's Stortford should support the aspirations set out in the AECOM report.

Resident Permit Zone (RPZ) policy

- Residents living in RPZs value them and the terms of operation of existing schemes should not be adjusted.
- Many residents would like to have RPZs implemented in their local area and the current policy and process to enable this should be made less stringent.

Climate change/sustainability implications of parking policy

- Parking policy should support the overall direction of travel set out in the County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP4).

- Supporting investment in modal shift is a key means to alleviate both climate change and pressure on parking capacity.
- We have a pro-active approach to support for e-vehicles and this approach should be built upon.

2.0 Report

Town Centre Parking Policies (Part 1- Bishop's Stortford)

- 2.1 On 23 July the Task and Finish Group took evidence from representatives of the Bishop's Stortford Business Improvement District (BID). It noted also the publication in May 2019 of a Bishop's Stortford Parking Strategy and Action Plan (AECOM) which was felt to offer an accurate and comprehensive analysis of the current situation in the town together with a range of useful strategy proposals.
- 2.2 The Group's principle findings and recommendations from this session are summarised below. They are developed in greater detail in **Essential Reference Paper 'B'**.
- i) Design and implement measures to encourage rail commuters to park in station car parks rather than Council owned facilities on the basis that this will increase the availability of town centre parking spaces for town workers and shoppers.
 - ii) Revise the designation of Council owned car parks, placing most long stay provision at the edge of the town centre with charges set at a level that supports town centre workers in particular.
 - iii) In parallel with (ii), improve the accessibility and availability of short stay parking in the town centre with the aim of promoting the town's economic wellbeing. This to include an increase to the number of limited waiting, free bays where possible, throughout the town.
 - iv) Introduce a permit scheme for employees of town centre businesses to incentivise them to park away from the

town centre (through the shared use of Resident Permit Zones (RPZ) where possible).

- v) Better publicise the existing on-street business permit scheme in the 'Chantry' RPZ, widen the criteria for eligibility for permits and offer more flexible payment terms such as monthly/quarterly payment options.
- vi) Review Blue Badge provision in Council-owned car parks with a view to moving towards the 6% proportion recommended by the DfT where there is demonstrable demand.

Town Centre Parking Policies (Part 2 - Hertford)

2.3 At its meeting on 22 August the Task and Finish Group took evidence from a representative of the Hertford business community and from Hertford Town Council. The Group's findings and recommendations from this session are summarised below. They are developed in greater detail in **Essential Reference Paper 'B'**.

- i) Improve the quality and quantity of on-street directional signage to the town's car parks. Including the use of digital availability signage where possible (use of S106 from developments to fund this)
- ii) Support offering town centre workers use of the Wallfields staff car park at weekends due to the additional pressure on parking in Hertford at present arising from the temporary loss of the Bircherley Green multi-storey car park.
- iii) Implement a permit parking scheme whereby town workers can park at a lower charge in lesser used, edge of town car parks.
- iv) Review Blue Badge provision in car parks with a view to moving towards the 6% proportion recommended by the DfT, where there is demonstrable demand.

Parking Policies in Other Towns

- 2.4 At its meeting on 13 November the Task and Finish Group took evidence from Parish Councillors from Stanstead Abbots and St Margarets and from the District Councillor for Watton at Stone to gain insights into the parking situation in our smaller communities.
- 2.5 Task and Finish Group Members noted that many of the problems described by the representatives from these villages appear more operational in nature than policy oriented and suggested that many could be mitigated through liaison between the villages' representatives and the Council's Parking Services team.
- 2.6 The Group accepted also that many policy options that might be appropriate in a larger town would almost certainly not be suitable in smaller towns and villages and explained the importance of making local Councillors aware of significant problems in order for them to lobby the appropriate body for a solution.
- 2.7 The Group's principle findings and recommendations from this session are summarised below. They are developed in greater detail in **Essential Reference Paper 'B'**.
- i) Support the Parish Council in an approach to the provider of the free car park at Watton at Stone station, requesting that they increase the number of parking spaces in the station car park.
 - ii) Encourage the provision of improved, secure bicycle parking facilities at ALL stations.
 - iii) Encourage the delivery of improved public transport, including 'on demand' services that will link with train arrivals and departures and serve the needs of residents of outlying villages who currently have to drive to St Margarets or Watton at Stone to catch the train.

Resident Permit Zone Policy

- 2.8 At its meeting on 24 September the Task and Finish Group took evidence from two East Herts District Councillors – Cllr George Cutting (Bishop’s Stortford) and Cllr Jonathan Kaye (Ware). Both identified significant and growing problems with the availability of on-street resident parking, with a growing influx of parking in residential streets by commuters, town centre workers and (in the case of Bishop’s Stortford) ‘airport parkers’.
- 2.9 Councillors Cutting and Kaye identified Resident Permit Zones (RPZs) as part of the solution to these problems and requested the existing RPZ Policy and Operational Guidance be revised, in part to lower the threshold for eligibility. It was accepted that new schemes must be designed to operate at maximum efficiency, with non-resident parking allowed on a managed basis where this could be achieved without significant detriment to residents.
- 2.10 The Task and Finish Group requested also that a short resident survey be undertaken to gauge the reviews of residents already within an RPZ and those not currently in a scheme area on the role of RPZs in their community.
- 2.11 The survey elicited one thousand responses which were reviewed at a meeting of the Task and Finish Group on 15 October.

Key survey findings include that a majority of residents living within a scheme value the benefits it brings and that a majority of residents in non-RPZ areas badly impacted by non-resident parking would like to be considered for a scheme as part of a package of measures to prioritise residential parking in their predominantly residential streets. A summary of the responses is offered in **Essential Reference Paper ‘C(i)’**. Problems with ‘airport parking’ were also cited by a

considerable number of Bishop's Stortford residents and these are summarised in **Essential Reference Paper 'C(ii)'**.

2.12 The Group's principle findings and recommendations from the two Task and Finish sessions on RPZs are summarised below. These are developed in greater detail in **Essential Reference Paper 'B'**.

- i) Review the current RPZ Policy and Operational Guidance, in part to create more favourable eligibility criteria and terms on which new schemes might be awarded and operate. (The proposed amended version of both documents is offered as **Essential Reference Paper 'D(i) and (ii)'**).
- ii) Require that through their design, new RPZs maximise parking availability to non-resident motorists on a managed basis where this can be achieved at little or no detriment to residents (to include the creation of permit-based parking for business workers where appropriate).
- iii) Require that the implications of a proposed RPZ for the wider parking and traffic management situation in the town be fully understood and appropriate mitigations identified before that scheme is granted.
- iv) Require that scheme set-up costs are recouped over a defined number of years through the permit charge levied against residents within that RPZ.
- v) As a quid pro quo for agreeing to (ii) above, the permit charge to residents to be offset by the revenue generated from the sale of permits to businesses and their staff.

Climate Change/Sustainability and Parking Policy

2.13 At its meeting on 13 November the Task and Finish Group received a joint presentation from Trevor Brennan (HCC) and David Thorogood (EHDC) concerning the sustainability and climate change aspects of parking policy.

- 2.14 The central role of the County Council's Local Transport Plan 2018-2031 (LTP4) and its impact on parking policy was explained. Members noted that just as the Task and Finish Group has effectively arrived at a hierarchy of provision in situations where parking is a contested resource, with residents at the top of the pyramid, so the County Council has created a hierarchy in respect of highway users, with measures to discourage journeys at the top of the pyramid and any additional provision to meet the needs of private motorists at the bottom.
- 2.15 Air quality and congestion problems arising primarily from the use of privately owned petrol and diesel vehicles were discussed and the need to plan for and support a rapid growth in the number of electric vehicles was also underlined.
- 2.16 The Group's principle findings and recommendations from this session are summarised below. They are developed in greater detail in **Essential Reference Paper 'B'**.
- i) Establish an initial 5% of bays in EHDC car parks as electric vehicle (EV) charging bays and commit to increasing this proportion in anticipation of growing demand.
 - ii) Place a time limit on the use of EV charging bays to ensure an appropriate turnover of qualifying vehicles.
 - iii) Consider the erection of solar canopies where appropriate to generate electricity for possible sale to the National Grid.
 - iv) Support an investigation into options for the creation of on-street EV charging facilities, for example from lamp posts and raised kerbs.
 - v) Support the use of electric bicycles through the provision of dedicated charging facilities, including around stations.
 - vi) Implement variable message signage (VMS) to direct motorists to car parks with available spaces (and where appropriate to the location of those spaces within a car park). This is aimed at bearing down on the problem of

vehicles searching for available spaces which is known to contribute significantly to air pollution in town centres.

Additional Recommendations

2.17 The Task and Finish Group made additional recommendations not directly related to the agreed review areas. These are summarised below and have been developed in greater detail in **Essential Reference Paper 'B'**.

- i) Ensure public transport services are commissioned and operational at the same time as major new residential developments are occupied, to encourage new residents to shift towards public transport use as a first choice.
- ii) Encourage the implementation of car clubs, ideally electric, alongside new residential developments plus the installation of additional electric vehicle charging points throughout the town.
- iii) The Council to instruct that a letter be sent to station car park operators challenging their current parking charges and requesting that they be reduced to something closer to the prevailing all day charge in our town centres.
- iv) Residents to be encouraged to notify MAG of 'airport parking' problems and the Council to be encouraged to publicise the number and website as widely as possible using its own website, social media and other forums. (The airport has a facility to report this but it not everyone is aware of it).

Recommendations for Further Scrutiny

2.18 In the course of its deliberations the Task and Finish Group identified a number of areas where it recommends additional scrutiny is warranted, as follows:

- Policies and strategies to address 'airport parking' in primarily residential streets (primarily in Bishop's Stortford)

- Policies and strategies to address commuter parking in primarily residential streets.
- Policies and strategies to address the problem of overnight HGV parking in town centres and primarily residential streets.

3.0 Implications/Consultation

3.1 The Task and Finish Group acknowledged the tensions evident in parking policy. For example, whilst promoting economic wellbeing is a priority for our business communities and therefore the Council, should this generate additional car journeys with their deleterious effect on the environment and an already congested road network, the dis-benefits are likely to outweigh the benefits.

3.2 Similarly, whilst Resident Permit Zones are valued by their immediate beneficiaries, the risk of displacing non-resident vehicles to other residential streets must be understood and mitigated against through good scheme design. Whilst a positive effect of RPZs can be that more motorists use town centre car parks, many car parks are currently at or near capacity. Off-street provision must therefore be monitored carefully and utilised to maximum efficiency and new RPZs must be designed so as to allow non-resident parking on a managed basis, again to ensure the efficient use of valuable kerb space.

3.3 It is the view of the Task and Finish Group that, taken as a package, these proposed revisions to the Council's parking policies should help it make more efficient use of its existing parking resources both on and off street. The Group considers also that measures such as those proposed in the County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP4) should be supported in that they will assist East Herts in its delivery of a number of overarching objectives such as its environmental commitments as well as aiding the County Council in its delivery of its network management duty as outlined in S18 of the Road Traffic Act 2004.

3.5 Information on any corporate issues and consultation associated with this report can be found within **Essential Reference Paper 'A'**.

4.0 Acknowledgements

4.1 The Task and Finish Group would like to thank the following who gave evidence during its sessions:

- Karen Burton and Gina Thomas – Bishop’s Stortford BID (23/07/19)
- Dominic Woods – Hertford traders representative and Ausra Bitinaite – Hertford Town Council (22/08/19)
- EHDC Cllrs Kaye and Cutting and Sally Andrews – EHDC interim Parking Manager (24/09/19)
- Sally Andrews – EHDC Interim Parking Manager and Andrew Pulham – EHDC Parking Manager 2005-2018 (15/10/19)
- Trevor Brennan – Strategy and Programme Manager, HCC and David Thorogood – Environmental Sustainability Co-ordinator, EHDC (13/11/19)
- Julia Davis – Stanstead Abbots Parish Councillor, Clare Ewing, St Margaret’s Parish Councillor and Joseph Dumont, Stanstead Abbots District Councillor (13/11/19)

Background Papers

- Minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 11 June 2019
<http://democracy.eastherts.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=515&MId=3544&Ver=4&J=3>
- Draft minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 5 November 2019
<http://democracy.eastherts.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=515&MId=3546&Ver=4&J=3>
- Notes of the meetings of the Task and Finish Group on:
 - 27 June 2019
 - 23 July 2019
 - 22 August 2019

- 24 September 2019
 - 15 October 2019
 - 13 November 2019
 - 19 November 2019
-
- Minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 11/06/19
 - HCC Local Transport Plan 4 (2018-2031)
 - Bishop's Stortford Parking Strategy (AECOM, May 2019)
 - Bishop's Stortford Report on RPZ Shared Use Potential (2016)
 - Hertford Parking Demand Study (Project Centre, March 2017)
 - Joint presentation from HCC and EHDC on sustainability and parking policy

Contact Member: Councillor Holly Drake – Chairman of the Task and Finish Group. holly.drake@eastherts.gov.uk

Contact Officers: Ben Wood – Head of Communications, Strategy and Policy, Tel: 01992 531699
ben.wood@eastherts.gov.uk

Jess Khanom-Metaman - Head of Operations, Tel: 01992 531693.
jess.khanom-metaman@eastherts.gov.uk

Report Author: Andrew Pulham – Task and Finish Group Support Officer, Tel: 01279 502030.
andrew.pulham@eastherts.gov.uk

ESSENTIAL REFERENCE PAPER 'A'

IMPLICATIONS/CONSULTATIONS

Contribution to the Council's Corporate Priorities/ Objectives	Priority 1 – Improve the health and wellbeing of our communities Priority 2 – Enhance the quality of people's lives Priority 3 – Enable a flourishing local economy
Consultation:	<p>The following gave evidence as part of the process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Karen Burton and Gina Thomas – Bishop's Stortford BID (23/07/19)• Dominic Woods – Hertford traders representative and Ausra Bitinaite – Hertford Town Council (22/08/19)• EHDC Cllrs Kaye and Cutting and Sally Andrews – EHDC interim Parking Manager (24/09/19)• Sally Andrews – EHDC Interim Parking Manager and Andrew Pulham – EHDC Parking Manager 2005-2018 (15/10/19)• Trevor Brennan – Strategy and Programme Manager, HCC and David Thorogood – Environmental Sustainability Co-ordinator, EHDC (13/11/19)• Julia Davis – Stanstead Abbots Parish Councillor, Clare Ewing, St Margaret's Parish Councillor and Joseph Dumont, Stanstead Abbots District Councillor (13/11/19) <p>An online survey of residents' views on Residents Permit Zones (RPZs) was undertaken in September/October 2019 and generated one thousand responses.</p> <p>Consultation would be required on all occasions where a Traffic Regulation Order was required to give legal effect to a proposed change.</p>
Legal:	Many of the proposals recommended in this report would require the promotion of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to give them legal effect.

Financial:	<p>Some proposals are likely to require initial capital and/or revenue funding although this may then result in a new/increased revenue stream. Costs and revenue potential of the main proposals are outlined in Essential Reference Paper 'B'.</p> <p>Initiatives which require little or no initial funding or where possible non-core funding (eg S106 contributions) may be available are identified in the report and/or in Essential Reference Paper 'B'.</p>
Human Resource:	<p>Implementation of many parking schemes – e.g. a new permit scheme or RPZ – can require significant officer time and input, even when elements of the process are outsourced to consultants. It will be important to take account of this when consideration is given to implementing the recommendations contained in this report.</p>
Risk Management:	<p>In key areas such as the availability of off-street parking in our main towns, increasing car use means demand for parking risks reaching or exceeding supply on a regular basis.</p>
Health and wellbeing – issues and impacts:	<p>Implementation of these measures may assist in the delivery of a range of benefits, for example through a reduction in traffic congestion and consequential improvements in air quality.</p>
Equality, diversity and human rights considerations, and whether Equality Impact Assessment required:	<p>None identified</p>
Environmental Sustainability	<p>Implementation of these measures may assist in the delivery of a range of benefits, for example through the increased use of more sustainable transport modes and a reduction in traffic congestion leading to improvements in air quality.</p>

Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Parking

Issue	T&F Group Recommendation	Perceived Benefits	Perceived Risks	Dependencies	Costs Estimate*	Revenue Considerations	Resource Implications	Comments
Rail commuters occupying lower priced EHDC car parks rather than station car parks, leading to a lack of spaces for town workers and shoppers who tend to arrive later in the day.	Implement strategies to direct commuters to station car parks through amendments to EHDC car park charges, car park re-designation, changes to conditions of use and changes to the terms of the Council's 'pay by phone' offer.	Increased capacity in EHDC car parks for town workers and shoppers. Rail commuters using the car parks provided at the station and/or alternative modes of transport.	Adverse publicity.	None perceived	TRO amendment costs - approx. £3,000 Signage change costs - approx. £5,000 Machine re-programming costs - approx. £5,000	N/A	Potentially revenue neutral. Vacated spaces likely to be occupied by workers/shoppers.	With station car park charges at c. £10/day and EHDC car park charges at c. £4-6/day, some commuters park in EHDC car parks early in the morning leading to a later shortfall in capacity for town workers and the shoppers on whom the town's businesses depend.
Town centre car parks operating at or near capacity on a regular basis.	Review designation of car parks (long stay/short stay/mixed use) to ensure most efficient use, primarily by directing long stay parking to the edge of the town. Implement 'shared use' RPSs where possible, to include provisions for business parking on a managed basis. Encourage modal shift.	More space in town centre car parks to ensure maximum availability for shoppers and service users on whom local businesses depend.	Need to ensure sufficient long stay capacity is provided. Does not address overall supply issues.	None perceived	TRO amendment costs - approx. £3,000 Signage change costs - approx. £5,000 Machine re-programming costs - approx. £5,000	Maximising efficient use of car parks should yield more revenue per space per annum.	Occupancy survey required. Officer time.	Demand exceeding supply on a regular and increasing frequency. Need to squeeze maximum use out of the existing resource, through smarter designation.
Parking charges seen as too high by town centre workers (e.g. retail)	Create discounted permit parking scheme for town workers, including as part of 'shared use' RPSs.	Support for town workers.	Impact on Council revenue. Risk of abuse. Scheme maintenance costs unless self-managed (virtual parking?).	None perceived	TRO costs - approx. £3,000 Signage costs - approx. £5,000 Possible software costs TBC Possible requirement for additional, temporary administrative staff to manage introduction of the scheme	Reduced revenue from this category of user, but may be recovered through increased 'casual' use of vacated car park spaces.	Could be expensive to administrate unless it operated on a self-service (i.e. virtual?) basis.	N/A
Insufficient Blue Badge bay provision in car parks.	Insufficient Blue Badge bay provision in car parks.	Review provision with a view to moving towards the 6% provision recommended by the DfT where a need is demonstrated.	Proportion of Blue Badge bays remaining unused whilst overall capacity pressures increase, risking adverse publicity	None perceived	TRO amendment costs - approx. £3,000 Signage costs - approx. £5,000	N/A - in East Herts Blue Badge motorists park free of charge and without time limit wherever they park in a car park.	Occupancy surveys required.	N/A

* Traffic Regulation Order, machine re-programming or changes to signage were implemented at the same time and across towns.

Hertford Town Centre Parking

Issue	T&E Group Recommendation	Perceived Benefits	Perceived Risks	Dependencies	Costs Estimate*	Revenue Considerations	Resource Implications	Comments
Lack of on-street directional signage to the town's car parks.	Improve the quantity and quality of on-street directional signage.	Improved	None perceived	Funding	TBC		See comments (right)	Possible availability of £20k Section 106 contribution linked to McMullen/Sainsbury development at Hartham
Shortage of affordable parking for town centre workers (especially retail sector)	Offer use of the Wallfields staff car park to town centre workers at the weekend, whilst Bircherley Green MSCP is unavailable.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support to town centre workers. 2. Frees up spaces in town centre car parks for shoppers and others. 	No ability to enforce without TRO	None perceived	N/A - if done without TRO and/or parking machines and signage.	N/A - assumption that vacated spaces will be occupied by paying customers.	None perceived	The temporary loss of Bircherley Green MSCP has led to a shortage in off-street parking provision for the town.
Shortage of affordable parking for town centre workers (especially retail sector)	Implement a permit parking scheme whereby town workers can park at a lower charge in lesser used, edge of town car parks.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support to town centre workers. 2. Frees up spaces in town centre car parks for shoppers and others. 	None perceived	None perceived	TRO costs - approx. £3,000 Signage costs - approx. £5,000 Possible software costs TBC	N/A - assumption that vacated spaces will be occupied by paying customers.	None perceived	N/A
Insufficient Blue Badge bay provision in car parks.	Review Blue Badge provision in car parks with a view to moving towards the 6% level recommended by the DfT, where a need is demonstrated.	Improved provision to better meet the needs of the growing number of Blue Badge holders.	Proportion of Blue badge bays remaining unused whilst overall capacity pressures increase, risking adverse publicity	Successful promotion of a TRO	TRO amendment costs - approx. £3,000 Signage costs - approx. £5,000	N/A - In East Herts Blue Badge motorists park free of charge and without time limit wherever they park in a car park.	Occupancy surveys required.	N/A

* Significant elements of cost could be reduced if changes requiring the promotion of a Traffic Regulation Order, machine re-programming or changes to signage were implemented at the same time and across towns.

nt Permit Zone (RPZ) Policy Recommendations

Issue	T&E Group Recommendation	Perceived Benefits	Perceived Risks	Dependencies	Costs Estimate	Revenue Considerations	Resource Implications	Comments
Current Policy and Operational Guidance makes it difficult for new RPZs to be awarded.	Amend Resident Permit Zone Policy and Operational Guidance to lower threshold for eligibility.	Prioritises limited on-street parking capacity in residential streets for use by residents in areas where demand exceeds supply. Could help address problems with 'airport parking' (Bishop's Stortford)	Can displace car parking to streets just outside scheme boundary, where a problem may not have hitherto existed. Car parks may not be able to accommodate additional demand from displaced vehicles (B Stortford, Hertford and Ware). Risks 'sterilising' kerb space during the working day when many residents have commuted out of the Zone. Risks stimulating demand which the Council is unable to satisfy.	HCC - statutory consultees.	Cost of design, consultation and implementation of each new scheme = c. £20,000+	Seek to operate all schemes on a cost neutral basis through the sale of permits and visitor parking time. (N.B. Statute prohibits local authorities from seeking to generate a surplus from charged on-street parking)	Considerable officer time involved in designing, consulting and implementing a new scheme; therefore these activities are invariably contracted out.	Statute prohibits local authorities from seeking to generate a surplus from on-street parking provision.
Considerable costs of RPZ design, consultation implementation.	Require that scheme design and implementation costs are recouped over a defined number of years through the permit charge levied to residents within that RPZ.	Accords with the Council's 'user pays' principles and ensures the direct beneficiaries of a scheme help fund its creation rather than the burden falling on the wider Council taxpayer.	Resident opposition.	None perceived	c. £20,000+ for a typical scheme.	Seek to operate all schemes on a cost neutral basis through the sale of permits and visitor parking time. (N.B. Statute prohibits local authorities from seeking to generate a surplus from charged on-street parking)	Considerable officer time involved in designing, consulting and implementing a new scheme; therefore these activities are invariably contracted out.	Initial set-up costs significant. Expect residents to pay back implementation costs through permit charges in early years.
Risk of RPZ areas being underused during the working day.	Require that new schemes also accommodate non-resident parking on a managed (i.e. permit) basis during the week, where this can be achieved at little or no detriment to residents.	Ensures the most efficient use of the available kerb space.	Resident opposition.	None perceived	N/A	Likely revenue neutral. Revenue would accrue from the sale of permits; however recommendation is that this is used to defray the cost of permits to scheme residents.	Considerable officer time involved in designing, consulting and implementing a new scheme; therefore these activities are invariably contracted out.	Only offer new schemes if residents also prepared to accept non-resident parking on a managed basis where this is achievable.

Sustainability and Climate Change

T&E Group Recommendation	Perceived Benefits	Perceived Risks	Dependencies	Costs Estimate	Revenue Considerations	Resource Implications	Comments
Create an initial minimum 5% EV charging bays in each EHDC car park and increase in anticipation of rapidly growing demand.	Supports EV use and encourages procurement of EVs.	Bays underused on occasions, exacerbating capacity issues in some car parks.	Availability of funding. Availability of suitable power supply.	TBC	None perceived. Parking charges would still be paid and the EV driver would pay for the electricity consumed.	N/A	Rapid growth in the procurement of pure electric vehicles requires growth in provision of parking places on an equally rapid basis.
Place a time limit on the use of EV charging bays.	Ensures a reasonable turnover of charging vehicles.	None perceived	None perceived	TRO costs - approx. £3,000	None	None	As technology improves, charging time will reduce. These are CHARGING bays, NOT parking places.
Erect solar canopies in car parks where possible.	Will generate electricity for possible sale to the National Grid.	None perceived	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	None
Investigate the potential for on-street EV charging and require that such provision is made a planning condition linked to planning applications for significant new developments.	Increased provision.	None perceived	Power supply. Location of other electrical services. Suitability of location.	TBC	TBC	TBC	None
Encourage use of electric bicycles by implementing dedicated recharging provision.	Increased use of electric bicycles.	None perceived	Power supply. Location of other electrical services. Suitability of location.	TBC	TBC	TBC	None
Implement Variable Message Signing (VMS) to direct motorists to available car parks and parking places.	Reduces incidents of motorists cruising around searching for spaces which increases air pollution - especially in AQMAs.	None perceived	Power supply. Suitability of locations. Need to install loops in car park entrances and exits.	TBC	None	TBC	Reduces air pollution and congestion.

Miscellaneous Recommendations

Issue	T&F Group Recommendation	Perceived Benefits	Perceived Risks	Dependencies	Costs Estimate	Revenue Considerations	Resource Implications	Comments
Airport Parking in primarily residential roads (Bishop's Stortford)	Publicise reporting mechanism to Manchester Airports Group. Implementation of RPZs may also help bear down on 'airport parking'.	Maximizes available on-street parking for use by residents.	None	None	None	None	Comms time.	Online survey of residents suggests this is a seen as a chronic problem for residents in several areas of Bishop's Stortford.
Airport Parking in primarily residential roads (Bishop's Stortford)	Engage with MAG consultative forums to notify of problems and secure remedial funding.	Secure MAG funding to implement remedial measures.	None	None	N/A	None	None	MAG maintains a fund for distribution to local authorities and others aimed at alleviating proven 'airport parking' problems.
Reduced dedicated parking provision associated with new developments leading to cars parking on the highway.	Ensure public transport services are commissioned and operational at the same time as major new residential developments are occupied, to encourage new residents to shift towards public transport use as a first choice.	Encourages modal shift	Risk of negative comments because of the perception already existing that infrastructure, including schools and medical services, isn't operational at the same time as occupation	None	N/A	None	None	None
Reduced dedicated parking provision associated with new developments leading to cars parking on the highway.	Encourage the implementation of car clubs and bike clubs, ideally electric, alongside new residential developments plus the installation of additional electric vehicle charging points throughout the town.	Encourages modal shift	None	None	N/A	None	None	None
Parking charges at station car parks encouraging some commuters to exploit EHDC car parks to the detriment of town workers and shoppers who tend to arrive later in the day.	Letters to be sent to station parking providers by the Council, lobbying for more appropriate charges at station car parks.	More spaces in EHDC car parks available for workers and shoppers.	Refusal to engage	None	None	None	None	None
Lack of secure cycle parking facilities.	Continue to lobby providers for improved cycle storage facilities at stations	Encourages modal shift	None	None	None	None	None	None
Lack of secure cycle parking facilities.	Require cycle parking provision as part of S106 agreements to ensure provision in town and village centres.	Encourages modal shift	None	None	None	None	None	None
Further areas for investigation.	Recommend fresh T&F Group to look in depth at: * Airport parking * HGV overnight parking * Commuter parking	Issues receive greater analysis leading to policy and strategy recommendations.	None	None	None	None	None	These areas were identified for additional investigation at the T&F Group meeting on 19/11/19

This page is intentionally left blank

Statistical Analysis of RPZ Survey - Postcodes with Three or More Responses

ERP C(i)

Town	Postcode	Number of respondents	Road Name	Percentage of road who responded
Bishops Stortford	CM23 5NT	5	Avenue Rd	15.0%
	CM23 5LF	3	Beldams Ln	10.0%
	CM23 5JF	5	Brooke Gardens	23.0%
	CM23 3TB	3	Firlands	5.0%
	CM23 5DA	3	Fulton Cresent	10.3%
	CM23 5NQ	9	Grange Rd	17.0%
	CM23 3JT	3	Mazoe Rd	6.0%
	CM23 3JN/CM23 3JL	10	Rhodes Av	23.0%
	CM23 3QH	3	Scott Rd	3.0%
	CM23 3JP	3	Shangani Rd	19.0%
	CM23 5PS	3	Stansted Rd	14.0%
	CM23 5AG	7	Stortford Hall Park	44.0%
	CM23 2PB	3	Wentworth Dr	3.5%
	CM23 3US	11	Wilson Close	22.0%
	CM23 5BS	8	Woodlands	27.5%
	CM23 3JR	9	Zambesi Rd	24.0%
Sawbridgeworth	(No postcodes with 3 or more responses)			
Ware	SG12 7AG	3	Clements St	7.0%
	SG12 7NG	3	Homefield Rd	10.3%
	SG12 0PZ	3	Milton Rd	4.0%
	SG12 7EJ	3	King Edward Road	7.0%
Hertford	SG14 3AR	5	Byde St	10.0%
	SG13 7DA	3	Currie St	7.0%
	SG14 1LY	3	Grange Close	11.0%
	SG13 8AD	7	Gwynns Walk	26.0%
	SG14 3AQ	6	Molewood Rd	11.0%
	SG14 3AG	11	Nelson St	44.0%
	SG13 7LF	4	Park Rd	11.0%
	SG14 3AZ	3	Parkhurst Rd	8.0%
	SG14 1PJ	3	Port Hill	25.0%
	SG14 3AF	4	Port Vale	8.0%
	SG13 7DD/SG13 7DN	12	Tamworth Rd	15.0%
	SG14 3HB	4	Trinity Grove	22.0%
	SG14 3AN/SG14 3AW	19	Wellington St	24.0%
SG13 8EX/SG13 8EZ	35	West St	50.0%	
Buntingford	SG9 9AE	3	High Street	3.0%
	SG9 9AP	3	Union Terrace	33.0%
	SG9 9DE	3	Bowlers Mead	12.0%

Known cluster areas derived from above table

Bishops Stortford				
CM23 3JT	3	Mazoe Rd	50	6.00%
CM23 3JN/CM23 3JL	10	Rhodes Av	43	23.00%
CM23 3JP	3	Shangani Rd	16	19.00%
CM23 3US	11	Wilson Close	50	22.00%
CM23 3JR	9	Zambesi Rd	37	24.00%
Total Responses in this area	36		total number of houses in this area	196
				18.37%
Hertford				
SG14 3AR	5	Byde St	49	10.00%
SG14 3AQ	6	Molewood Rd	54	11.00%
SG14 3AG	11	Nelson St	25	44.00%
SG14 3AZ	3	Parkhurst Rd	38	8.00%
SG14 3AF	4	Port Vale	48	8.00%
SG14 3AN/SG14 3AW	19	Wellington St	79	24.00%
Total Responses in this area	48		total number of houses in this area	293
				16.38%

Key	
	(including multiple postcodes on one street) Over 15 responses from one street
	Over 7 responses from one street
	Responses from streets in a cluster
	Streets in RPZ

This page is intentionally left blank

CM23.3UR Zambesi Road	No	Yes	<p>It is a daily struggle to find a parking space on my street let alone outside my house, due to commuters and shoppers for the town, and even worse, people using it as holiday parking before taking the train to Starbuck airport. I have two young children and often carry associated bags and accessories, which makes parking a long distance from my house extremely uncomfortable and inconvenient. Another issue is local residents from my and surrounding streets parking their large commercial vehicles in and around my street, each of which take up more space than a normal car.</p>
-----------------------	----	-----	---

EAST HERTS COUNCIL RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING POLICY

INTRODUCTION

A Resident Permit Parking Scheme (RPZ) may be introduced to assist residents living in an area where on-street parking demand significantly exceeds supply and where it is not appropriate to manage this demand using conventional parking restrictions.

This document sets out the policy framework that underpins the adoption and operation of RPZs in East Herts.

Schemes will be implemented and will operate in accordance with Operational Guidance which operates in parallel with this Policy.

The Member Role

- Considerable financial and other resources are expended during the investigation, design and implementation of a resident permit parking scheme. For this reason and to ensure the Council's proposals are in line with the community's wishes, Member involvement in the process from its earliest point is essential. No scheme will progress to detailed survey, design and consultation stage until it receives support from all District Councillors for the affected area(s).

Award of Schemes

- East Herts Council will prioritise residents' parking needs in primarily residential areas where there is evidence derived from surveys that demand for on-street parking significantly exceeds supply, due to the presence of non-residents' vehicles.
- East Herts Council will follow the extensive consultation process set out in Statute and Operational Guidance. The Council will seek to implement an RPZ only in areas where, following consultation, a majority of those residents who express a view wish to be included in a scheme.
- East Herts Council will follow Statute, Operational Guidance and best practice when designing, implementing and administering its resident permit parking schemes. In particular the Council will:
 - Seek to ensure that schemes operate in support of the Council's network management obligations as set out in Part 2 (16) of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and other relevant legislation.
 - Seek to ensure that each RPZ does not generate a net financial surplus for the Council.
- East Herts Council will assess the wider effects on the community when considering the implementation of an RPZ, including the potential for vehicle displacement, the additional demand for off-street parking that may be

generated and the ability of nearby car parks to accommodate this demand. These issues will be addressed through the scheme design, consultation and reporting processes.

- Except where this is not possible for sound operational reasons East Herts Council will only introduce 'shared use' RPZs, to ensure the most efficient use of on-street parking provision.

Financial Principles

- East Herts Council will recover the set-up costs of an RPZ over a defined period through the sale of permits and visitor parking time within that RPZ.
- East Herts Council will cover the operational costs of an RPZ from the residents who benefit from the scheme – primarily from the sale of permits, visitor parking time and income from shared use parking. At all stages during the consultation process the Council will give residents its 'best estimate' of the likely initial cost of permits should a scheme be implemented, to allow residents to make an informed decision on whether to seek inclusion in a scheme.
- Scheme revenue and costs will be reviewed on an annual basis as part of the Council's annual fees and charges process.
- East Herts Council will not take into account Penalty Charge Notice revenue that may arise from the implementation of a scheme when setting and reviewing scheme charges.
- Any inadvertent surplus arising from the Council's on-street parking operations (including RPZs) will be ring fenced for use by the Council in accordance with S55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- Any revenue surplus generated from 'shared use' schemes through the sale of 'pay and display' or commuter parking permits will be offset against permit and visitor parking charges to scheme residents.

Review of Schemes

- East Herts Council will review resident satisfaction with a newly introduced RPZ approximately six months after implementation. This review will also canvass the views of residents, Councillors and others from the wider area, outside the scheme's boundary, to ensure its full effects are understood. Where beneficial, the scheme may then be modified.

Removal of Schemes

- Receipt of a significant number of requests for the removal of an established scheme will be managed in line with the 'Consultation and Implementation' process set out in Section 6 of Operational Guidance.

**EAST HERTS COUNCIL
RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING SCHEMES
OPERATIONAL GUIDANCE**

1. INTRODUCTION

Resident permit parking schemes (RPZs) may be offered to assist residents living in areas where on-street parking demand significantly exceeds supply and where it is not appropriate to manage parking problems using conventional parking restrictions.

This document supports the policy framework that governs the prioritisation, implementation and operation of RPZs in East Herts.

2. ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF AN RPZ

Implementing an RPZ can bring advantages and disadvantages:

Advantages

- Discourages commuter/long term parking in residential streets
- Enhances the environment in residential areas
- Residents find on-street parking is easier and more convenient
- May engender improved traffic management
- Can deliver road safety benefits
- Encourages the use of alternative, more sustainable modes of travel
- Can reduce traffic and congestion

Disadvantages

- Possible negative effects of displaced commuter parking
- Costs of implementation and management
- Residents and their visitors have to pay to park in their street
- Permits do not absolutely guarantee a parking space
- May only help manage an under-supply of spaces, not solve underlying supply problems
- Can lead to inefficient use of on-street parking spaces
- Possibility that a RPZ may reduce availability of on-street parking, with consequent problems for visitors and businesses

Permit Scheme Design

To ensure the efficient use of available on-street parking, RPZs should only be implemented on a 'shared use' basis whereby resident permit parking is shared *on a managed basis* with non-resident motorists such as local business workers (in the form of a permit scheme) or 'casual' users parking on a virtual (e.g. pay by phone) basis.

3. INITIAL CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERATION OF AN RPZ

Criteria that should be met before an RPZ request can be shortlisted:

- There should be early evidence of resident and District Councillor support for an RPZ (e.g. petition, build-up of email requests or letters).
- The kerb space occupied by non-residents should be greater than 40% at times when parking problems caused by non-residents occur (survey required).
- There should be sufficient kerb space to enable a minimum of 75% of all households within the proposed scheme area to park at least one vehicle on-street (survey required).

4. FINAL CRITERIA FOR RPZ PRIORITISATION

Final criteria that will inform the order of progression of shortlisted RPZ requests:

- Availability of external funding.
- Any beneficial tie-in with other work being undertaken e.g. town centre enhancements.
- Resolves problems for emergency and utility vehicle access.
- The availability of off-street parking for non-residents in the area.
- The impact of displacing non-resident cars.
- The size of the proposed RPZ.

The final decision as to whether to progress a shortlisted RPZ to design and consultation stage and the outline terms on which that scheme should be developed will rest with the Portfolio Holder acting in consultation with the Head of Service and on the advice of the Parking Manager.

The geographical area of a proposed RPZ will be based on officer judgement, informed by considerations such as the presence of natural or man-made boundaries, requests logged, input from District Councillors and any conditions attached to external funding (where applicable).

5. CONSULTATION AND IMPLEMENTATION PROTOCOL

All proposed RPZs will be subject to consultation. The process will comprise:

- Preliminary consultation with District Councillors for the affected ward(s) and wards immediately adjacent to the proposed scheme area.
- A survey of all residents and businesses within the proposed area to identify the level of concern regarding parking difficulties and to establish the level of support for an RPZ. This consultation will also be used to identify the community's outline requirements for a RPZ. The results of this questionnaire will be used to inform the development of a proposed RPZ.
- To qualify for progression to design stage, a simple majority of the total number of households in streets where a scheme is proposed (50% +1) must respond formally to this initial questionnaire and a simple majority of these respondents (50% + 1) must vote in favour of a scheme.

- Officers may re-consult in streets where the vote is tied, where residents' wishes appear unclear or where officers are aware of decisions made in nearby streets may make impact the situation elsewhere; however any decision by officers to depart from the above position must be clearly justified in relevant commissioning reports and communicated to affected residents.
- Except in the case of very small scale schemes, a second round of consultation should be by means of a public exhibition or public meeting as appropriate to the size and scale of the potential RPZ. This will allow officers to answer questions on a one to one basis and to further refine elements of the proposed scheme's design.
- The next, formal stage of the process will involve the advertisement of a Traffic Regulation Order in the local media, on-street Notices and using the Council's social media where appropriate.
- The resolution of statutory objections to a Traffic Regulation Order is a matter for officers; however in exceptional circumstances where the volume and/or type of objection is viewed by officers as significant and/or when a petition has been received that qualifies the lead petitioner to address the Council, the matter may be referred to an appropriate committee of the Council for review.
- All RPZs will be reviewed approximately six months after implementation. This review will include a survey of District Councillors, residents and businesses in and around the scheme area, following which point modifications may be made following the promotion of an Amendment Order, where these are seen as beneficial to the needs of residents and others.

6. DETAILED DESIGN PRINCIPLES

When designing an RPZ there should be a clear understanding of the parking problems in the area and the implications of the introduction of the RPZ. Accordingly, when considering the needs of the residents and determining the layout of an RPZ the following detailed points must be addressed:

- Maintaining traffic flow & visibility at junctions
- Vehicle access
- Emergency vehicle access
- Loading/unloading requirements
- Bus stops
- Needs of blue badge holders
- Limited waiting areas for local businesses
- Needs of visitors and other categories of drivers who need to park within the zone
- The mix of the area (residential/commercial).
- Safety of the public and other road users within the zone

The objective in all cases should be to maximise amenity for residents whilst taking into account the needs of the wider community.

Signage and markings are required to be in accordance with the current Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions and the relevant sections of the Department for Transport Traffic Signs Manual. Special authorisation will be obtained from the Department for Transport before any non-standard scheme is implemented. Individually marked or designated parking bays will not normally be provided.

Residents of new housing developments within established scheme areas (e.g. apartment buildings or existing buildings converted into apartments) will not automatically be considered for inclusion in that scheme where private off-street parking is included in the development. In other cases, primarily where new houses are built that do not have private off-street parking there should be a presumption towards creating on-street permit eligibility for that new address and in such circumstances the developer should be required to meet the costs of amending and advertising the relevant TRO as part of the planning process.

Private roads and roads that are not maintained at public expense will not be considered for inclusion in a resident permit parking scheme.

7. SCHEME CHARGING PRINCIPLES

Permit charges shall be determined by the Council and set at a level that recoups the implementation costs over a defined period and also meets the annual operational costs of individual RPZs.

Any net surplus arising from the sale of 'shared use' parking within an RPZ will be used to offset the cost of resident permits in that scheme area (not including PCN revenue).

Residents within a proposed scheme area will be given the Council's best estimate of the likely permit charge at the earliest possible stage in the consultation process. Residents will be required to signify their agreement to these charging principles before a scheme is progressed to design and formal consultation stages.

8. RPZ OPERATIONAL TERMS

Outline operational terms of a proposed RPZ will be set out at the start of the consultation process and will be refined through the process of consultation with residents, local Members and through the TRO process.

The following principles will apply:

- The number of resident permits offered per household will be based on an officer assessment of the availability of kerb space versus the number of households within the proposed scheme area.
- The quantity of visitor parking hours offered per annum will be approximately 20% of the annual operating hours of the RPZ. (For example, if a scheme operates for 10 hours a day, 6 days a week, approx. 600hrs of visitor parking time will be issued per household).
- The operational hours of a scheme will be considered on an individual basis and as a rule they will be set at the minimum necessary to secure the primary objective of that scheme whilst maximising its potential for legitimate use by other motorists.

9. SPECIAL PERMITS

To qualify for a special parking permit an organisation or individual will be required to demonstrate:

- That they are providing essential care, health or other essential community service for residents within the RPZ.
- That there is a need for them to park within the RPZ to provide that service.

A carer individual or organisation will be required to apply using the Council's online permit management system. If their application meets the Council's criteria they will be granted permits. The Council may require additional, supporting documentation in support of an application.

10. REVIEW OF AN RPZ

Review of Schemes

The Council will review resident satisfaction with a newly introduced RPZ approximately six months after implementation. This review will also canvass the views of residents, affected Councillors and others from a wider area outside the scheme's boundary, to ensure its full effects are understood. Where beneficial, the scheme may then be modified as per the process set out in Section 6 of this document (Consultation and Implementation Protocol).

11. REMOVAL OF AN RPZ

Significant evidence of local support for the removal of an RPZ will be managed in the same manner as the process set out in Section 6 of this document (Consultation and Implementation Protocol).

This page is intentionally left blank

EAST HERTS COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 10 DECEMBER 2019

REPORT BY CHAIRMAN OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

WARD(S) AFFECTED: None

Purpose/Summary of Report

- To review and determine Overview and Scrutiny Committee's future work programme.

RECOMMENDATION FOR OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:	
That	
(A)	The draft work programme, going forward shown in Essential Reference Paper 'B', be agreed.
(B)	Members' comments be provided in terms of the detail they require for the key agenda items at the next meeting.

1.0 Background

1.1 Items previously required, identified or suggested for the Overview and Scrutiny (OS) work programme are set out in **Essential Reference Paper 'B'**.

1.2 Scrutiny committees have the power of influence and are entitled to review and scrutinise the functions of the Council and the decisions of the Executive. The Committee serves as a 'critical friend' and is not a decision-making body but can make recommendations to the Executive and who must respond formally to recommendations within a given timeframe.

2.0 Report

- 2.1 The draft agenda for 2019/20 meetings of Overview and Scrutiny Committee is shown in **Essential Reference Paper 'B'**. The timing of some items shown may have to change depending on availability of essential data (eg. from central government) external sources and officers.
- 2.2 At the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings on 11 June and 5 November, 2019 concerns were expressed by Members regarding the economic perspective of Hertford Town Centre and particularly with regard to the Bircherley Green site and the absence of any redevelopment. Members agreed at an earlier Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting that a Task and Finish Group be established to review the economic stability of Hertford Town Centre (and particularly from the perspective of Bircherley Green). Please see **Essential Reference Paper 'C'** for a summary in relation to Hertford Town Centre. While the planning application is a separate issue Members might want to consider what the Council can do in the interim to help with local issues?
- 2.3 At the meeting on 5 November 2019, Members also noted the inclusion of Cycle Storage provision following the submission of a Scoping Document from a Member and Climate Change within the Work Programme as potential items for scrutiny. Work is ongoing in the background to establish whether these are suitable subjects for scrutiny in terms of evidence gathering. The Scrutiny Officer will provide a summary at the meeting on these issues, as possible topics for Scrutiny.
- 2.4 The other key items on the 4 February 2020 Agenda will be an update in relation to Section 106 allocations. Members may be aware that there was a report to Performance Audit and Governance Oversight Committee on this subject in September 2019 when Members were provided with an update on the current position in relation to Section 106 contributions and actions taken by the Infrastructure

Contributions and Spend Manager. Members may wish to review this report from a scrutiny viewpoint. Additionally there will be a report from the Head of Communications, Strategy and Policy summarising Gov.Metric feedback in terms of customer satisfaction which depending on content, Members may wish to identify issues to scrutinise.

- 2.5 Overview and Scrutiny Committee, at its meeting on 5 November 2019, agreed to set up and Task and Finish Group to explore how the Council and Members could support tenants and improve service standards. It is anticipated that a meeting of the Task and Finish Group can be convened before the end of December to agree the specific lines of enquiry in order to progress these with Housing Associations and to aid the establishment of the two residents' events.
- 2.6 Members are welcome to submit a scrutiny proposal at any time by completing a Scrutiny Proposal Form (Available from the Scrutiny Officer) which will provide officers with sufficient information to assess it is appropriate for Scrutiny and to ensure their specific questions are addressed. The Scrutiny Officer will then liaise with officers and the Scrutiny Chairman to consider the best way to address the subject and complete a scoping document.
- 2.7 Members are also asked whether there is any training relevant to scrutiny or to the function and remit of the OS Committee that they wish to suggest.

Background Papers:

None

Contact Officer: Jonathan Geall, Head of Housing and Health, Tel: 01992 531594. jonathan.geall@eastherts.gov.uk

Report Author: Lorraine Blackburn, Scrutiny Officer, Tel: 01279 502172. lorraine.blackburn@eastherts.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

ESSENTIAL REFERENCE PAPER 'A'

IMPLICATIONS/CONSULTATIONS:

Contribution to the Council's Corporate Priorities/ Objectives	Priority 1 – Improve the health and wellbeing of our communities Priority 2 – Enhance the quality of people's lives Priority 3 – Enable a flourishing local economy
Consultation:	Committee Members and Officers
Legal:	None
Financial:	None
Human Resource:	None
Risk Management:	None
Health and wellbeing – issues and impacts:	None
Equality, diversity and human rights considerations, and whether Equality Impact Assessment required:	None
Environmental Sustainability	None

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny (OS) Committee Work Programme 2019/20 – DRAFT

[Please note: This is a working document and will be subject to regular amendment].

The items below represent key topics of enquiry by the scrutiny committee

Meeting Date	Topic	Lead Member and Lead Officer	Notes
11 June 2019	Agree draft work plan		
	Agree T&FG ToR and Membership		
	Discuss questions for Service updates on waste and website on 17/9		
17 September 2019 cancelled	Waste KPIs	Head of Operations <u>Urbaser Rep and Exec Member</u>	
	Website customer Satisfaction	Head of Communications, Strategy and Policy	
	Progress report on T&F		
	Discuss questions for Service updates on 05/11		
	Work Programme		

Meeting Date	Topic	Lead Member and Lead Officer	Notes
5 November 2019 (Deadline for reports 24 October)	Waste Management	Head of Operations	
	Agree ToR and membership for Social Housing Scrutiny event in 2020)	Discussion by members led by Scrutiny officer	Head of Housing and Health
	IT - Value for Money	ICT Manager, Helen Standon, Exec Member	Value for money of the Shared relation IT Service
	Update from the T&F Group (Parking)	Head of Operations	
	Work Programme		
10 December 2019 (Deadline for reports 1 December)	Progress Update on Implementation of Climate change recommendations	David Thorogood & Cllr Graham McAndrew Update on progress since Task and finish group report in Dec 2018.	Scrutiny Officer to update following feedback from the EHDC Environment and Climate change Forum meeting which was to have been held on 4 Dec but cancelled because of Purdah.
	Consider ToR for Cycle storage provision T&FGs	Discussion by members led by Scrutiny officer	Meeting arranged (17 Dec) with B/S Town Council to establish what provision there is in the town. It is anticipated that this meeting will help form the key lines of enquiry.
	Final report and	Head of Comms, and	

Meeting Date	Topic	Lead Member and Lead Officer	Notes
	Recommendations of T&FG (Parking)	Councillor H Drake	
	Work Programme	Scrutiny Officer	
4 February 2020 (Deadline for reports 22 January 2019)	Update on Section 106 allocation etc	Infrastructure Contributions and Spend Manager	Report to PAGO on 24 September on allocations in relation to the current position of Section 106 contributions and actions taken.
	Updates from T&FGs		
	Pre-Planning Advice	Head of Planning	Head of Planning to review the pre planning advice process and charges at the start of the year. It suggested that this be reviewed 20/20 -20/21 once that has been in place for 6 months and had a chance to imbed.
	Work Programme Update		
	Website customer Satisfaction	Head of Comms, Strategy and Policy	Feedback in terms of customer satisfaction. Possibly a subject for scrutiny?
31 March 2020	Final report from T&FG Social Housing	Head of Housing and Health	Scrutiny Officer to feedback on two events
	Final report from T&FG Cycle storage		

Meeting Date	Topic	Lead Member and Lead Officer	Notes
	Carry forward items to 2020/21		

Task and Finish Groups

Member Scrutiny Proposals - update

Other items for 2019/20:

This page is intentionally left blank

Viability of Hertford Town Centre - Update

Summary:

- 1.1 At an earlier meeting of Overview and Scrutiny Members discussed the issue of Hertford Town Centre in terms of its economic viability but particularly in relation to Bircherley Green and the impact this was having on the environment. Subsequently at its meeting on 5 November 2019 Members felt that there was sufficient evidence to support the establishment of a Task and Finish Group but that this be delayed until February 2020 in order to allow the new owner of Bircherley Green Site (Chase Home) time to submit a planning application.
- Chase New Homes (owners of Bircherley Green) have indicated they are keen to submit a planning application this side of Christmas. Obviously that will be a key vehicle for town centre improvement and the Council looks forward to receiving it.
 - It is worth noting however that East Herts Council is also making significant investment in the town generally. This includes the Council's agreement to invest a significant sum of money in expanding Hertford Theatre so it becomes a higher profile destination and refurbishing of Hartham Leisure Centre (which will bring significant enhancements to the health and wellbeing offering with the town).
 - Town centre businesses have also recently come together to form a trader's association. Both the district and town council are supporting them where possible and this formal group now gives businesses within the town centre a stronger, more coherent voice on matters of interest.

- Retail as a sector, is struggling (locally, nationally and globally) i.e. changes in how people shop e.g online and Hertford's offer is slowly changing from one of shops to a mixture of catering, social and leisure. This is essential for the town centre to stay relevant. Data presented to PAGO on the 29 October (available on line) indicates town centre vacancy rates are not a cause for concern (with the only empty units being at Bircherley Green). Equally data from "*Visit Herts*" indicates more people are visiting Hertford and spending more money when they do so. Evidence from independent reports suggest that there are challenges but Hertford still has a strong base of independent shops and is well placed for the future.

2.0 Conclusion:

- 2.1 While the planning application is a separate issue, Members might want to consider what the Council can do in the interim to help with local issues of concern?