

To: Susan Priest, Head of Paid Service

From: Councillor Peter Gane

19th February 2019

Dear Susan Priest.

1. I am writing to Call In Report Number C/18/76 - 'Informal Consultation on Proposals to Extend Controlled Parking Zones F & G' published on 19th February 2019.

2. In relation to criteria (a) to (g) of the Call-In procedures, I would like to submit the following points.

The reasons for the Call In are:

- It is clear from the informal consultation that has taken place, that in the Zone F extension area, only 45.1% of respondents supported the introduction of the extension whereas 47.5% opposed it. Amongst local businesses in the area there was no support and 75% opposed the extension. This is based on a 35.3% response to the consultation, which will probably be higher than the turnout at the forthcoming local elections in May within the ward.
- Despite there being no overwhelming majority in favour of the extension of the Zone F CPZ, residents will see it being introduced for part of the area. In contrast, in Zone G, with the clear exception of Harbour Way, there was 74% of household respondents and 33% of local businesses in favour within Zone G. This figure increases to over 80% in favour if Harbour Way responses are excluded from the final figures. Therefore, there is clear support for the CPZ extension in Zone G, albeit on a lower response level of 26.6% of all consultees and we fully support the introduction.
- The final recommendations for the extension of Zone F are not fully supported by all roads within the Zone F Consultation area and some of these have now being excluded from the proposed extension, namely Black Bull Road, Albert Road, Edward Road, Bonsor Road and all roads west of Black bull Road within the proposal. However, in one of the largest roads within the proposed extension, Garden Road, there was only 39% in favour yet they will be included within the proposed extension.

- Other roads included such as Walton Road did not demonstrate majority support in favour of extending the scheme yet are included in the proposed extension which will have an impact on staff working at Mundella Primary School who currently park there during the day when parking is not a problem as there are no parking facilities at the school, a point raised with the local councillors by the Headteacher. Other roads to now be included in the scheme based on the proposed decision made only had very marginal support, e.g. one or two additional households as a maximum in support with the exception of Watkin Road with 64% in favour and Jesmond Street with 67% in favour.
- Based on this evidence, and with the clear will of the whole Zone F extension consultation area being opposed, it is inconceivable that the proposals in their current format based on the decision that has been made, can be supported.
- Finally, in the Council minutes of 19th September 2018, the Cabinet Member for Transport gave a reply in Questions to Councillors about Zone F CPZ and the 2 Permits per household rule that "following a recent desktop study, and on-site surveys, which revealed many of the roads in this zone have capacity, additional permits are now being sold to residents". If there is spare capacity, one questions why firstly, an extension to the CPZ is required, secondly, why is the scheme now reverting back to 2 permits per household and what happens to those who have additional permits for Zone F, and lastly, has the policy now been amended without any further consultation on the matter.
- The proposed Zone F extension may require significantly amendment such as only including Watkin Road as a natural addition adjacent to the current Zone F CPZ and the proposals to extend it further could be further reviewed in 12-18 months' time if so required. Unfortunately, Jesmond Street, the only other street with a large majority of residents in favour of the scheme, cannot really be included in isolation as it does not border the existing scheme and this would need to be considered further.

3. It does not relate to a decision taken in accordance with the urgency procedures as laid out in the Council's Constitution.

4. It would be good to hear further from The Head of Commercial and Technical Services, the Transportation Manager, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Commercial and any other interested parties that may wish to make representation including the District Council Ward Councillors.

5. I wish to ask further questions relating to the points that have been raised and to explore further options for postponing or amending the proposed decision.

6. In relation to the criteria (h) to (m) of the Call In procedure, under items (i), there is not a clear majority in favour of extending the Zone F CPZ as outlined in the decision made according to the informal consultation. That a review would be more appropriate or further consultation using alternative techniques such as face to face interviews. Under (j) it does not demonstrate a clear majority in favour of extending the Zone F CPZ scheme within the consultation area and under (k) there is not a clear majority in favour of extending the Zone F CPZ as outlined in the decision made according to the informal consultation.

Signed:

