



North Tyneside Council

Overview, Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee (Extraordinary Meeting)

16 May 2018

Tuesday 22 May 2018 Room 0.02, Ground Floor, Quadrant, The Silverlink North, Cobalt Business Park, North Tyneside **commencing at 6.00 pm**

Agenda Item

Page

1. Apologies for Absence

To receive any apologies for absence.

2. Appointment of Substitute Members

To receive a report on the appointment of Substitute Members.

3. Declarations of Interest and Notification of any Dispensations Granted

You are invited to declare any registerable and/or non-registerable interests in matters appearing on the agenda, and the nature of that interest.

You are also invited to disclose any dispensation in relation to any registerable interests that have been granted to you in respect of any matters appearing on the agenda.

You are also requested to complete the Declarations of Interests card available at the meeting and return it to the Democratic Services Officer before leaving the meeting.

4 Call-in Parking Permit Changes

3

To determine a call in of the Executive Delegated Decision regarding Parking Permit Changes.

Members of the public are entitled to attend this meeting and receive information about it. North Tyneside Council wants to make it easier for you to get hold of the information you need. We are able to provide our documents in alternative formats including Braille, audiotape, large print and alternative languages.

Councillor Jim Allan (Deputy Chair)
Councillor Alison Austin
Councillor Brian Burdis
Councillor Karen Clark
Councillor Naomi Craven
Councillor Nigel Huscroft
Councillor Sandra Graham (Chair)
Councillor Muriel Green

Church Representatives
Rev. Michael Vine
Vacant

Councillor Janet Hunter
Councillor Anthony McMullen
Councillor Andy Newman
Councillor Pat Oliver
Councillor John O'Shea
Councillor Martin Rankin
Councillor Mathew Thirlaway

School Governor Representatives
Mrs Michelle Ord
Vacant

Meeting: Overview, Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee

Date: 22 May 2018

Title: Call-in of Delegated Decision – Parking Permits

Author: Democratic Services

Tel: 0191 643 5318

Service: Law & Governance

Wards affected: All

1. Purpose of Report

This report sets out details of a call-in of a recent Cabinet Member decision and provides guidance on the provisions in the Constitution relating to Call-ins.

2. Recommendations

The Committee is asked to consider the decision of the Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport, which has been called in, taking into account the guidance set out in this report and determine the action to be taken in line with the options set out in the guidance notes.

3. Details

- 3.1 The Council's Constitution includes a procedure through which decisions of the Executive can be, 'called in' for consideration by this Committee subject to certain conditions.

These conditions are that:

- (i) At least 3 non-executive councillors must sign the appropriate request form;
- (ii) the completed request must be received by the Chief Executive within 5 working days of the publication of the decision; and
- (iii) the completed request form must clearly identify the decision concerned and specify how the decision does not fully comply with the principles of decision making and/or the Budget and Policy Framework.

3.2 In this instance

- (i) The call-in request form has been signed by Councillors J Wallace, A Austin and P Mason.

- (ii) The record of Delegated Executive decision was published on the 1 May 2018 and the request to call-in the decision was received by the Chief Executive within the 5 working days, on the 4 May 2018; and
- (iii) the call-in request identified the Executive decision in relation to Parking Permits changes and gave the following reasons for the request;
 - Due consultation (The Constitution states that it is expected that consultation will form part of the Authority's decision making process. This does not mean that consultation must take place on every decision. The level of consultation required will be appropriate to the nature of the matter under consideration. The views of those likely to be affected by a decision should be sought wherever possible).
 - A presumption in favour of openness (The Constitution states that the process through which all decisions are taken must reflect the Authority's commitment to open government and the Access to Information Rules of Procedure (see Part 4.11).
 - Consideration of financial implications (The Constitution states that the financial implications of any decision must be considered and recorded).

3.3 Detailed information relating to the decision called in is attached and includes:-

- (i) The report to Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport (1 May 2018) in relation to the Parking Permit Changes, attached as Appendix A;
- (ii) The Record of Delegated Executive Decision(s) By Cabinet Member record, attached as Appendix B
- (iii) The request to Call-in form submitted by 3 non-executive members, attached as Appendix C
- (iv) Also attached as Appendix D to this report is guidance notes in relation to the call-in procedure. The guidance note sets out the options available to the Committee in terms of further action.

4. Background Information

The following documents have been used in the compilation of this report and may be inspected at the offices of the author.

- North Tyneside Council - Constitution

North Tyneside Council

Report to Cabinet Member

for Housing and Transport

Date: 1 May 2018

Traffic Regulation Order – Permit Parking Changes

Portfolio(s): Housing and Transport		Cabinet Member(s): Councillor J Harrison
Report from Service Area:	Environment, Housing and Leisure	
Responsible Officer:	Phil Scott, Head of Environment, Housing and Leisure	Tel: 0191 643 7295
Wards affected:	All	

PART 1

1.1 Executive Summary:

In accordance with the appropriate delegation, this report seeks the approval of the Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport to implement changes to the Authority's permit parking system and formally set aside 90 objections, inclusive of 4 petitions, to the proposal. While the process requires the "setting aside" of the objections, having reflected on the feedback to the Statutory Notice, the Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport has consulted the Elected Mayor and Cabinet colleagues and adjustments to the proposal have been identified to reflect one of the most sensitive parts of the policy and, with the exception of Tynemouth TM2, make the first Resident Permit free of charge within pay and display schemes that include an exemption for permit holders ("shared use" schemes).

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport will wish to note that 5,844 letters were sent to residents and businesses within current 'resident only' parking schemes or limited waiting schemes that included an exemption for permit holders. 433 responses (7.4% of the total number of letters sent) requested removal and in no case did the response reach the trigger point 51% to suggest that the scheme ought to be removed.

1.2 Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport:

- i. considers the objections;

- ii. sets aside the objections in the interests of simplifying the application process to make the permit scheme clearer while making better use of technology, and covering the management and administrative costs of the scheme; and
- iii. determines that the Traffic Regulation Order should be made with the following amendments:
 - a) the first Resident Permit to be offered free of charge in pay and display schemes only, excluding Tynemouth TM2;
 - b) the cost of the Residents' Visitor Permit to be reduced to £25.00; and
 - c) the option of temporary virtual Vouchers for Residents to be deleted.

1.3 Forward Plan:

Considering objections relating to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders is a standing item on the Forward Plan.

1.4 Council Plan and Policy Framework

This report is relevant to the following priorities set out in Our North Tyneside, the Council Plan 2018 to 2021:

- Our places will:
 - Provide a clean, green, healthy, attractive, safe and sustainable environment. This will involve creating a cycle friendly borough, investing in energy efficiency schemes and by encouraging more recycling.
 - Have an effective transport and physical infrastructure - including our roads, pavements, street lighting, drainage and public transport.

1.5 Information:

1.5.1 Background

The North Tyneside Transport Strategy, adopted by Cabinet on 8 May 2017, sets out the Authority's vision for transport in the borough. It seeks to ensure that ***“North Tyneside will have a safe, easy to use, healthy, affordable, accessible and integrated travel and transport infrastructure that works for residents, businesses and visitors effectively and efficiently.”*** It sets out five principles which are key to achieving this:

- i. **Improve safety, health and well-being outcomes and sustainability;** in relation to people, communities and the environment
- ii. **Support economic growth;** through effective movement for people, businesses and goods and to support the regional aim of “more and better jobs”
- iii. **Improve connectivity;** with all parts of the borough, the region, the rest of the country and the world

- iv. **Enable smart choices for all;** help people, businesses and visitors find out how to get to where they need to
- v. **Manage demand;** on transport networks and assets and address current and future transport challenges

In relation to existing car parking, the economy of North Tyneside is growing and the borough continues to be an attractive place to live, work and visit. The borough is served by cycling and walking routes of improving quality and a comprehensive public transport network. The number of vehicles on our road network continues to grow and the use of the private car remains a frequent choice. Many historic areas of North Tyneside were constructed before the era of widespread car ownership, resulting in an ever-increasing demand for car parking provision. It is difficult to balance the parking needs of residents, local businesses and visitors against this backdrop. Therefore it is important that the approach to meeting those needs should be consistent, coherent and based on a set of agreed priorities for parking investment.

In September 2017, Cabinet approved the North Tyneside Parking Strategy; agreed changes to the parking permit scheme as set out in the strategy; and agreed that the setting of parking fees and charges should be delegated to the Head of Environment, Housing and Leisure, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources and the Head of Finance, in accordance with the Authority's fees and charges policy framework.

In accordance with this, on 5 February 2018 the Head of Environment, Housing and Leisure agreed to introduce the updated parking permit scheme along with a set of fees and charges as described in the associated report.

In accordance with the statutory process, a Notice of Intention for the Traffic Regulation Order to amend the parking permit parking system was advertised in a local newspaper and on the Authority's website on 7 March 2018, outlining the proposed changes (Appendix 1).

90 objections, including four petitions, were received in response to the statutory Notice of Intention. A summary of the objections is provided below.

1.5.2 Statutory Consultation

Changes to the permit parking system are subject to statutory legal process. Changes must be advertised in the local press and on the Authority's website. This enables members of the public or businesses to object to the proposal. Any objections received are referred to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport for consideration in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation for Cabinet Members.

In conjunction with this, to ensure that all permit holders were aware of the proposals, the Authority wrote to all properties that are currently eligible for a permit notifying them of the changes.

8,504 letters were sent out, not including those that were returned by the post office as address unknown (e.g. business no longer trading) or property empty.

Of these, 5,844 letters were sent to residents/businesses within resident only schemes or limited waiting schemes that included an exemption for permit holders. The letter gave residents/businesses the opportunity to request that the scheme be revoked, provided 51% of residents/businesses within their permit zone indicated that they were in favour of its removal. Appendix 2 summarises the number of letters sent out to each permit zone and the number of responses received requesting that the scheme be removed – none received the required number to justify their removal.

The remaining 2,660 letters were sent to residents/businesses within pay and display schemes that include an exemption for permit holders. Since the pay and display element of the scheme facilitates a high turnover of parking which supports the vitality of the town centres and busy district centres, in accordance with the Authority's Parking Strategy, this letter did not give residents/businesses an opportunity to request that the scheme be revoked.

All persons who sent correspondence to the Authority raising concerns about the revised approach to permit parking were sent a reply which explained the rationale for the revised approach and advised them, if they remained unhappy with the revised approach, they could raise their concerns formally by responding to the legal notice.

1.5.3 Summary of Formal Objections

The number of objections received to the Notice of Intention is broken down as follows:

- Pay & Display with an exemption to the charge for permit holders ("shared use" schemes) – 51 formal objections, inclusive of 3 petitions
- Residents only and limited waiting schemes with an exemption for permit holders – 38 formal objections, inclusive of 1 petition
- Resident who does not currently live within a permit scheme – 1 formal objection

Details of the objections are provided in the appendices to this report as identified below together with Officer's observations, which have guided the suggested amendments.

Pay & Display Schemes with an exemption to the charge for permit holders ("shared use" schemes – see Appendix 3)

The objections can be summarised as:

- Objecting to the principle of charging residents to park outside their property and the fact that it does not guarantee a parking space

- Objecting to the discontinuation of Taxi Bay Permit on Front Street, Tynemouth, increase in cost for Bed & Breakfast vouchers and the discontinuation of the business vouchers
- Objecting to the level of cost of Visitor Permits
- Asserting a lack of consultation
- Objecting to the Pay and Display scheme and that there was no opportunity to withdraw from the scheme.

Residents Only Schemes and Limited Waiting with an exemption for permit holder Schemes (see Appendix 4)

The objections can be summarised as:

- Objecting to the principle of charging residents to park outside their property and that paying does not guarantee a parking space
- Objecting to the level of cost of Visitor Permits and challenging the impact on those requiring support at home
- Objecting to the discontinuation of business vouchers
- Objecting to temporary vouchers being “virtual”
- Asserting lack of consultation
- Asserting that the scheme is unnecessary at their location.

Residents not in current scheme (see Appendix 5)

- Objecting to the principle of charging

1.5.4 Proposed amendments to the Proposals

Following consideration of the content of all objections, the following amendments are proposed for the reasons set out below.

- Cost of Residents’ Visitor Permit to be reduced to £25 per annum.

Rationale: The reduction in charge will benefit residents that require high numbers of Visitors e.g. older and disabled people.

- The option of Virtual Vouchers for Residents’ Visitors to be deleted – residents would only be allowed to obtain one annual Residents Visitor Permit. The option would be reviewed at a later date when residents are more accustomed to virtual permits and then only as an alternative to the annual Residents’ Visitor Permit.

Rationale: Offering one option will be less confusing for residents

- The first Resident Permit to be offered free of charge in pay and display schemes with an exemption to the charge for permit holders (“shared use” schemes) only, excluding Tynemouth TM2.

Rationale: The pay and display restriction is consistent with the Authority's Parking Strategy and necessary to encourage a high turnover of parking in Town Centres and busy commercial streets. As many of the properties do not have alternative off-street parking provision, this amendment provides them with a cost-free option for on-street parking for the first vehicle in each household.

The pay and display section of the TM2 Permit Zone was introduced as a later phase at the request of the residents as it offered more likelihood that it would encourage high turnover. It only applies to the side of the road that does not have direct residential frontage.

1.6 Decision options:

The following decision options are available for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport:

Option 1

Approve the recommendations set out in section 1.2.

Option 2

Not approve the recommendations set out in section 1.2 and agree that the Traffic Regulation Order be made unchanged.

Option 1 is the recommended option

1.7 Reasons for recommended option:

Option 1 is recommended in the interests of simplifying the application process to make the permit scheme clearer while making better use of technology, and covering the management and administrative costs of the scheme.

1.8 Appendices:

- Appendix 1 Legal Notice of Intention relating to parking permit changes
- Appendix 2 Details of responses received from residents within Resident Only/Limited Waiting with an exemption for permit holder schemes offering them the opportunity to revoke the scheme.
- Appendix 3 Summary of formal objections received from residents living in Pay & Display schemes with an exemption to the charge for permit holders.
- Appendix 4 Summary of formal objections received from residents within Resident Only/Limited Waiting with an exemption for permit holder schemes
- Appendix 5 Summary of formal objection received from resident who is not currently eligible for a permit
- Appendix 6 – Suggested amendment to the charges for parking permits

1.9 Contact officers:

Colin MacDonald, Senior Manager Technical and Regulatory Services,
0191 643 6620
Andrew Flynn, Integrated Transport Manager, 0191 643 6083
Nicholas Bryan, Highway Network Manager, Capita, 0191 643 4808
Garry Hoyle, Parking & Regulation Manager, Capita, 07740530302
Alison Campbell, Senior Business Partner, 0191 643 7038

1.10 Background information:

The following background papers/information have been used in the compilation of this report and are available at the office of the author:

- 1) North Tyneside Transport Strategy (approved by Cabinet on 8 May 2017)
http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=568803&p_subjectCategory=41
- 2) North Tyneside Parking Strategy (approved by Cabinet on 11 September 2017)
http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=569773&p_subjectCategory=41
- 3) Report to Cabinet of 11 September 2017 – ‘North Tyneside Parking Strategy’
http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=569773&p_subjectCategory=41
- 4) Equality Impact Assessment
http://october.northtyneside.gov.uk:7778/pls/portal/NTC_PSCM.PSCM_Web.download?p_ID=569743

PART 2 – COMPLIANCE WITH PRINCIPLES OF DECISION MAKING

2.1 Finance and other resources

Cabinet on 11 September 2017 agreed that the setting of parking fees and charges be delegated to the Head of Environment, Housing and Leisure, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources and the Head of Finance.

It is anticipated that the costs of operating the new parking permit scheme can still be contained within the anticipated income that will be generated from the proposed charges. However, should any unforeseen financial implications arise these will be brought back to Cabinet as appropriate.

2.2 Legal

The Traffic Management Act 2004 places a duty on the Authority to manage highways in order to secure the expeditious movement of traffic (including cycling and walking) on its network and on adjacent networks. The management of on and

off street parking provision is a key component of ensuring the highway is managed effectively.

Proposals that involve amendments to existing traffic regulation orders are subject to statutory legal process set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Regulations that flow from that Act, namely, the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996. All schemes are formally advertised and include a 21-day period for objections. Before making a Traffic Regulation Order the Authority must consider all objections made and can decide whether to make the Order unchanged, to make the Order with modifications or not to proceed with the Order.

In accordance with the Elected Mayor's scheme of Delegation to Cabinet Members, if any objections cannot be resolved, then the Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport is asked to consider those objections made and determine the Traffic Regulation Order.

The Legal Notice of Intent was published in the local press on 7 March 2018 and may be cited as the North Tyneside Council (On Street Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2017 Variation Order 2018 Amendments to Parking Permit System

2.3 Consultation/community engagement

2.3.1 Internal Consultation

Internal consultation has taken place with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources and the Head of Finance.

2.3.2 External Consultation/Engagement

The permit scheme which forms part of the North Tyneside Parking Strategy was developed following a review in 2015 by Overview, Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, which involved representations from residents and businesses.

The Council wrote to all properties that were eligible for a permit notifying them of the proposals. This is outlined in section 1.5.2 of the report.

2.4 Human rights

The proposals within this report do not have direct implications in respect of the Human Rights Act 1998.

2.5 Equalities and diversity

There are no adverse equalities or diversity issues arising from this report.

2.6 Risk management

There are no risk management implications directly arising from this report.

2.7 Crime and disorder

There are no crime and disorder implications directly arising from this report.

2.8 Environment and sustainability

There are no environment and sustainability implications directly arising from this report.

PART 3 - SIGN OFF

- Deputy Chief Executive

☒

- Head of Service

☒

- Mayor/Cabinet Member

☒

- Chief Finance Officer

☒

- Monitoring Officer

☒

- Head of Corporate Strategy

☒

NORTH TYNESIDE COUNCIL

**(On Street Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2017 Variation Order 2018
Amendments to Parking Permit System**

North Tyneside Council gives notice that it proposes to make a Variation Order under Sections 32, 45, 46, 46A, 51 and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as amended, and all other enabling powers. The effect of the Variation Order, if made, will be to amend the On Street Parking Places Consolidation Order 2017 to introduce a virtual permit for the majority of permit types that are specific to a vehicle, new permit charges and vary restrictions on the number of permits available per property as follows:-

Permit Classification	Current Restriction on number of permits per household/property	Current Permit Type	Current Cost	Proposed Changes
Resident Permit	None	Paper Permit	First permit free; additional permits are £20 per permit per year	Introduce Virtual Permit with maximum of 3 per household. All permits charged at £25 per year
Residents' Visitor Permit	Max. of 1 per household	Paper Permit (transferrable)	Free Replacement cost for lost permit - £20	Retain Paper Permit with maximum of 1 per household at £50 per year Replacement cost for lost permit - £25
Supplementary Vouchers for Residents	None	Paper Permit (transferrable)	£1 for each 3 hour period, only valid in permit only restrictions	Introduce Virtual Permit with maximum of 50 per household per year (each voucher provides a max 3 hour period) - £1 for each 3 hour period, voucher valid in permit only and shared use* restrictions

Business Permit	None	Paper Permit (transferrable)	£50 for first two permits; additional permits are £250 per permit per year Replacement cost for lost permit - £20	Retain Paper Permits with maximum of 2 per business All permits charged at £250 per year Replacement cost for lost permit - £25
Supplementary Vouchers for Businesses	None	Paper Permit (transferrable)	£1 for each 3 hour period, only valid in permit only restrictions	Permit Classification discontinued
Supplementary Vouchers on Front Street, Tynemouth for Businesses	None	Paper Permit (transferrable)	£1.80 for each 4 hour period	Permit Classification discontinued
Church & Community Centre Permit	Max. of 1 per property	Paper Permit (transferrable)	Free Replacement cost for lost permit - £20	Permit Classification discontinued
Care Home Resident Permit	Max. of 1 per flat	Paper Permit (transferrable)	Free Replacement cost for lost permit - £20	Retain Paper Permit with maximum of 1 per flat Permit charged at £25 per permit Replacement cost for lost permit - £25
Supplementary Vouchers for Landlords	None	Paper Permit (transferrable)	£1 for each 3 hour period, only valid in permit only restrictions	Introduce Virtual Permit £1 for each 3 hour period, voucher valid in permit only and shared use restrictions
Supplementary Vouchers for Bed & Breakfast / Hotel establishments	None	Paper Permit (transferrable)	£1 for each day, voucher valid in permit only and shared use* restrictions	Introduce Virtual Permit £5 per day, voucher valid in permit only and shared use

				restrictions
Supplementary Vouchers for Tradesmen	None	Paper Permit (transferrable)	£1 for each 3 hour period, only valid in permit only restrictions	Introduce Virtual Permit £1 for each 3 hour period, voucher valid in permit only and shared use* restrictions
Community Worker's Permit	Max. of 1 per applicant	Paper Permit (with clock; non-transferrable)	£20 per permit per year Replacement cost for lost permit - £20	Retain Paper Permit with clock (non-transferrable) with maximum of 1 per applicant Permit charged at £25 per permit Replacement cost for lost permit - £25
Staff Permits	None	Paper Permit (transferrable)	£20 per permit per year Replacement cost for lost permit - £20	Retain Paper Permit Permit charged at £25 per permit Replacement cost for lost permit - £25

Details of the proposed variation may be examined at the address below between 8.30am and 4.00pm on Mondays to Fridays or on the Council's website www.northtyneside.gov.uk (Statutory Notices). If you wish to object to the proposals, you should send the grounds for your objection in writing to the undersigned or via email to

democraticsupport@northtyneside.gov.uk by 28 March 2018. Any objections received will be available for public inspection.

7 March 2018

V Geary, Head of Law & Governance
Democratic Services, Quadrant, Silverlink North, Cobalt Business Park, NE27 0BY

Appendix 2 – Responses to letter offering resident’s opportunity to withdraw from the parking permit scheme

Zone Ref.	Location	No. of letters issued	No. of returns requesting removal of scheme	%
Annisford				
A1	Burradon Road	15	3	20
Benton				
BEN5	Clydedale Avenue area	92	14	15
Cullercoats				
CC1	Cliff Top area	6	0	0
CC2	Beverley Terrace	81	5	6
Forest Hall				
FH1	Nicholson Terrace area	102	13	13
Longbenton				
LB1	Manorfields area	351	45	13
LB3	Chesters Avenue area	245	10	4
Monkseaton				
MN1	Kenilworth Road	20	3	15
North Shields				
NS1	William Street area	131	1	1
NS2	Alma Place area	377	49	13
NS3	Beaumont Street area	105	10	10
NS4	Drummond Terrace area	155	11	7
NS6	Rothbury Terrace	23	1	4
NS8	Dockwray Square area	260	36	14
NS9	Hawkeys Lane area	28	5	18
NS11	Barnstaple Road	13	0	0

Tynemouth				
TM1	Percy Street, Bath Terrace area	364	5	1
TM1-2	Lovaine Row/Percy Gardens	31	1	3
TM2	Hotspur Street, Percy Park, Oxford Street areas	971	41	4
Whitley Bay				
WB1	Whitley Road area	197	9	5
WB2	Roxburgh Terrace area	497	24	5
WB4	Ventnor Gardens area	361	32	9
WB5	Beech Grove/The Avenue	42	5	12
WB6	Grosvenor Drive area	180	20	11
WB7	Esplanade area	256	13	5
WB8	Road to side of WB Service Centre	3	0	0
Wallsend				
WD1	North Road/Park Road area	118	5	4
WD1-4	Park Road	35	2	6
WD2	Park Avenue/Park View area	61	5	8
WD3	Elton Street East area	31	6	19
WD4	Coronation Street area	197	17	9
WD6	Holly Avenue/Laurel Street area	315	27	9
WD8	Hugh Street area	106	4	4
WD9	Embleton Avenue area	14	0	0
WD12	Bath Close/Bingley Close	10	0	0
WD13	Rae Avenue	51	11	22
		5844	433	

Appendix 3 - Pay & Display restriction with exemption for permits (no opportunity to withdraw) - 51no.

Name	Location of Complainant	Reason(s) cited
A-1	TM3 - Front Street, Tynemouth	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space. Objecting to the discontinuation of the Taxi Bay permit in Front Street, Tynemouth.</p> <p>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The Taxi Bay permit has led to confusion as it only provides an exemption to the restriction for 30mins on Monday to Friday between the hours of 8am – 5pm.</p>
A-2 (Petition - 47 signatures)	TM3 - Front Street, Tynemouth	<p>Objecting to the increase in charge for the B&B temporary vouchers. Objecting to the removal of the Taxi Bay Permit on Front Street, Tynemouth. Objecting to the increase in charge for the Business Permits and the discontinuation of temporary Vouchers for Businesses.</p> <p>Officer Observation – The current charge for B&B vouchers is not proportionate to the cost of charged parking in this area. There have been a number of initiatives in the town centres to support the vitality of the commercial areas e.g. free parking in car parks, restrictions that encourage high turnover of parking. The Business permit forms part of this offer providing provision for essential operational vehicles and the Business Permits were previously charged at £250 per permit. The reduction in charge led to a significant increase in complaints regarding abuse of the permits. Reinstating the previous cost will reduce the potential for abuse/complaints from residents and brings it in line with the cost of other permits e.g. Annual Car Park Permits, Foreshore Permit. The Taxi Bay permit has led to confusion as it only provides an exemption to the restriction for 30mins on Monday to Friday between the hours of 8am – 5pm.</p>
A-3	WB1 - Clifton Terrace, Whitley Bay	<p>Does not own a vehicle; objecting to Visitor Permit charge</p> <p>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges.</p>
A-4	WB1 - Egremont Place, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space.</p> <p>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. A resident Only permit scheme would not be in accordance with the Council's Parking Strategy.</p>

A-5	WB1 - Street Unknown	<p>Objecting to parking charges and asserting that virtual permits will cause confusion for residents.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-6	WB1 - Trewitt Road, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to charges proposed.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A -7	WB1 - Trewitt Road, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to charges proposed.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-8	WB1 - Victoria Terrace, Whitley Bay	<p>Asserting a lack of consultation.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The Authority has complied with its legal obligations in relation to the changes.</i></p>
A-9	WB2 - Coquet Avenue, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the fact that there was no opportunity to withdraw from the scheme. Asserting that the Pay & Display restriction should be removed from Coquet Avenue.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The Pay & Display restriction is consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy as it encourages a higher turnover of the parking.</i></p>
A-10	WB2 - Roxburgh Terrace, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the charge for a parking permit and the fact that it does not guarantee a parking space.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy. It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking place. A resident Only permit scheme would not be in accordance with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>

A-11	WB2 - Roxburgh Terrace, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the charge for a parking permit and the fact that paying does not guarantee a parking space.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy. It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking place. A resident Only permit scheme would not be in accordance with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-12	WB2 - Roxburgh Terrace, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy. A resident Only permit scheme would not be in accordance with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-13	WB3 - Brook Street, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking place. The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-14	WB3 - Brook Street, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit. Asserting that the first Resident Permit should be free and Visitor Permit/additional Resident Permits charged.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-15	WB3 - Brook Street, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the charge for a parking permit. Asserting that first Resident Permit should be free.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i></p>

A-16	WB3 - Cambridge Avenue, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space. Objecting to the level of cost of the Visitor Permit. Requesting a concessionary rate for disabled, vulnerable and low income residents. Objecting to the level of cost of the Business Permits. Asserting that the level of cost of the Staff Permit should be increased such that it is the same level as the Business Permit. Expresses the view that the proposed new charges should apply to all permit holders from the same date, rather than from when existing permits expire.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy. There have been a number of initiatives in the town centres to support the vitality of the commercial areas e.g. free parking in car parks, restrictions that encourage high turnover of parking. The Business permit forms part of this offer providing provision for essential operational vehicles and the Business Permits were previously charged at £250 per permit. The reduction in charge led to a significant increase in complaints regarding abuse of the permits. Reinstating the previous cost will reduce the potential for abuse/complaints from residents and brings it in line with the cost of other permits i.e. Annual Car Park Permits, Foreshore Permits. Implementing the new charge at the same time will cause administrative issues – residents with existing charged permits will have to be refunded for unused period.</i></p>
A-17	WB3 - Ocean View, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-18	WB3 - Ocean View, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-19	WB3 - Ocean View, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space, and to the charges proposed for parking permits.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The</i></p>

		<i>Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i>
A-20 (Petition - 114 signatures)	WB3 - Oxford Street, Brook Street, Whitley Bay	Objecting to the charges proposed and that paying does not guarantee a parking space. <i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i>
A-21	WB3 - Oxford Street, Whitley Bay	Objecting to the charges proposed. <i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i>
A-22	WB3 - Oxford Street, Whitley Bay	Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space. <i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i>
A-23	WB3 - Oxford Street, Whitley Bay	Objecting to the Pay & Display scheme in Oxford Street, Whitley Bay, asserting that this is unnecessary. <i>Officer Observation – The current restriction is in accordance with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i>
A-24	WB3 - Oxford Street, Whitley Bay	Objecting to the charges proposed for parking permits and that paying does not guarantee a parking space during the evening. <i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking place. The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i>

A-25	WB3 - Park Avenue, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-26	WB5 - Beech Grove, Whitley Bay	<p>Requesting that Beech Grove, Whitley Bay, should be designated as ‘residents only’ parking at all times.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – If residents feel that the operational hours should be extended then they should contact the Traffic and Road Safety team to review the situation in line with the agreed assessment criteria. In line with the criteria, the restriction should be proportionate to the extent of the problem and be consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-27	WB5 - Countess Avenue, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-28	WB5 - Countess Avenue, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-29	WB5 - The Avenue, Whitley Bay	<p>Requesting that the permit scheme should be made ‘residents only’ at all times.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – If residents feel that the operational hours should be extended then they should contact the Traffic and Road Safety team to review the situation in line with the agreed assessment criteria. In line with this criteria, the restriction should be proportionate to the extent of the problem and be consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-30	WB5 - Warkworth Avenue, Whitley Bay	<p>Scheme only applies to back lane – requesting that the scheme should be extended to the front street if charges for permits are introduced.</p>

		<i>Officer Observation – If residents feel that the current boundaries of the scheme should be extended then they should contact the Traffic and Road Safety team to review the situation in line with the agreed assessment criteria. In line with this criteria, the restriction should be proportionate to the extent of the problem and be consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i>
A-31 (Petition - 57 signatures)	WD1 - Beech Grove, Laburnum Avenue, Woodbine Avenue, Wallsend	Asserting a lack of consultation. Objecting to the fact that paying for a permit does not guarantee a parking space. <i>Officer Observation – The Authority has complied with its legal obligations in relation to the changes. It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking place. A resident Only permit scheme would not be in accordance with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i>
A-32	WD1 - Beech Grove, Wallsend	Supportive of the introduction of virtual permits while objecting to the level of cost of the Resident and Visitor Permit. <i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i>
A-33	WD1 - Beech Grove, Wallsend	Objecting to the proposed charges. <i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i>
A-34	WD1 - Beech Grove, Wallsend	Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space. <i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges and the first permit offered at a concessionary rate to reflect the fact that the scheme cannot be removed as it is consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i>
A-35	WD1 - Beech Grove, Wallsend	Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space. Expresses the view that the number of permit holders results in residents being unable to park near their property at evenings and weekends.

		<i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The current restriction is in accordance with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i>
A-36	WD1 - Beech Grove, Wallsend	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space, and the hours of restriction do not include evenings and weekends.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking place. If residents feel that the operational hours should be extended then they should contact the Traffic and Road Safety team to review the situation in line with the agreed assessment criteria. In line with this criteria, the restriction should be proportionate to the extent of the problem and be consistent with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-37	WD1 - Laburnum Avenue, Wallsend	<p>Objecting to the proposed charges and the fact that households within a Pay & Display scheme did not have the opportunity to request the removal of the scheme.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The current restriction is in accordance with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-38	WD1 - Laburnum Avenue, Wallsend	<p>Asserting that the Pay & Display scheme is unnecessary at their location.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The current restriction is in accordance with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-39	WD1 - Laburnum Avenue, Wallsend	<p>Does not own a vehicle; objecting to the charge for a Visitor Permit.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges.</i></p>
A-40	WD1 - Laburnum Avenue, Wallsend	<p>Asserting that the Pay & Display scheme is unnecessary at their location.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The current restriction is in accordance with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-41	WD1 - Laburnum Avenue, Wallsend	<p>Asserting that the Pay & Display scheme is unnecessary at their location.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The current restriction is in accordance with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-42	WD1 - Laburnum Avenue, Wallsend	<p>Asserting that the Pay & Display scheme is unnecessary at their location.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The current restriction is in accordance with the Council’s Parking Strategy.</i></p>
A-43	WD1 - Laburnum	Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space.

	Avenue, Wallsend	<i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking place.</i>
A-44	WD1 - North Parade, Whitley Bay	Requests that the Pay & Display restriction should apply at all times. <i>Officer Observation – If residents feel that the operational hours should be extended then they should contact the Traffic and Road Safety team to review the situation in line with the agreed assessment criteria. In line with the criteria, the restriction should be proportionate to the extent of the problem and be consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i>
A-45	WD1 - North Road, Wallsend	Does not own a vehicle; objecting to the charge for a Visitor Permit. <i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges.</i>
A-46	WD1 - Woodbine Avenue, Wallsend	Objecting to the fact that paying for a permit does not guarantee a parking space. <i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking place.</i>
A-47	WD1 - Woodbine Avenue, Wallsend	Objecting to the proposed charges and specifically to the charge for a Visitor Permit. <i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges.</i>
A-48	WD1 - Woodbine Avenue, Wallsend	Objecting to the fact that paying for a permit does not guarantee a parking space and the fact that a charge is proposed for the first Resident Permit. <i>Officer Observation – the suggestion would not cover the management and administrative costs of the scheme.</i>
A-49	WD1 - Woodbine Avenue, Wallsend	Objecting to the proposed charges. Expresses the view that there should be a one-off charge for the first Resident and Visitor permit, with no renewal fee. <i>Officer Observation – the suggestion would not cover the management and administrative costs of the scheme.</i>
A-50	WD1 - Woodbine Avenue, Wallsend	Objecting to the proposed charges. Expresses the view that the cost of Business Permits should be increased. <i>Officer Observation – the suggestion would not cover the management and administrative costs of the scheme.</i>
A-51	WD5 - Duke Street, Whitley Bay	Objecting to the Pay & Display scheme and that there was no opportunity to withdraw from the scheme. <i>Officer Observation – The current restriction is in accordance with the Council's Parking Strategy.</i>

Appendix 4 - Permit Holder Only/Limited Waiting with exemption for permit holders (offered the opportunity to withdraw) - 38no.

Name	Location of Complainant	Reason(s) cited
B-1	LB1 - Manor Drive, Longbenton	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. Hence it is not unreasonable to charge where the local authority is incurring costs in implementing a scheme that, while not guaranteeing a space, increases the likelihood of finding a convenient parking place and in general should enhance the amenity of the area. A residents' parking scheme can also obviate the need for a resident to incur expenditure on installing a crossover and converting their front garden to hardstanding for off-street parking. The response from residents did not reach the trigger point of 51% to suggest that the scheme should be removed.</i></p>
B-2	LB1 - Manor Place, Benton	<p>Does not own a vehicle; objecting to the charge for a Visitor Permit.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges.</i></p>
B-3	NS2 - Alma Place, North Shields	<p>Objecting to the charge for a Visitor Permit. Asserting that the scheme is unnecessary at their location.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges. The response from residents did not reach the trigger point of 51% to suggest that the scheme should be removed.</i></p>
B-4	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Staff member from vets)Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets). Objecting to the stipulation that the Business Permits will be limited to two per business.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers. The Business Permit is for essential operational vehicles only e.g. delivery vehicles. It is a transferrable permit that can be used on multiple vehicles. Limiting the number of Business Permits available to each business will discourage them from being utilised by staff.</i></p>

B-5	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-6	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-7	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-8	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-9	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-10	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>

B-11	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-12	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-13	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-14	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-15	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-16	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>

B-17	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-18	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-19	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-20	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-21	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Customer of vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets).</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers.</i></p>
B-22	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>Objecting to the charge for a parking permit and the fact that paying does not guarantee a parking space. Expresses the view that the scheme should not be removed owing to parking considerations related to the Vets.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. The response from residents did not reach the trigger point of 51% to suggest that the scheme should be removed.</i></p>

B-23	NS2 - Ayres Terrace, North Shields	<p>(Staff member from vets) Objecting to the discontinuation of temporary Business Vouchers and asserting that this would be detrimental to the operation of the business (Vets). Objecting to the stipulation that the Business Permits will be limited to two per business.</p> <p>Officer Observation - The new permit criteria includes the provision of a section of non-permit parking in front of businesses to support customer parking without the financial burden of having to purchase temporary vouchers. The Business Permit is for essential operational vehicles only e.g. delivery vehicles. It is a transferrable permit that can be used on multiple vehicles. Limiting the number of Business Permits available to each business will discourage them from being utilised by staff.</p>
B-24	NS3 - Newcastle Street, North Shields	<p>Objecting to the charges proposed for parking permits.</p> <p>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. Hence it is not unreasonable to charge where the local authority is incurring costs in implementing a scheme that, while not guaranteeing a space, increases the likelihood of finding a convenient parking place and in general should enhance the amenity of the area. A residents’ parking scheme can also obviate the need for a resident to incur expenditure on installing a crossover and converting their front garden to hardstanding for off-street parking. The response from residents did not reach the trigger point of 51% to suggest that the scheme should be removed.</p>
B-25	NS8 - Dockway Square, North Shields	<p>Objecting to temporary vouchers being ‘virtual’.</p> <p>Officer Observation – The virtual permit option for Residents’ Visitors should be removed to avoid confusion.</p>
B-26	NS8 - Linskill Street, North Shields	<p>Objecting to the charges proposed for parking permits and specifically for the Visitor Permit.</p> <p>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges.</p>
B-27	TM2 - Bath Terrace, Tynemouth	<p>Objecting to the charges proposed for parking permits. Asserting lack of consultation.</p> <p>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. Hence it is not unreasonable to charge where the local authority is incurring costs in implementing a scheme that, while not guaranteeing a space, increases the likelihood of finding a convenient parking place and in general should enhance the amenity of the area. A residents’ parking scheme can also obviate the need for a resident to incur expenditure on installing a crossover and converting their front garden to hardstanding for off-street parking. The response from residents did not reach the trigger point of 51% to suggest that the scheme should be removed.</p>

B-28	WB4 - Cliftonville Gardens, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the charges proposed for parking permits.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. Hence it is not unreasonable to charge where the local authority is incurring costs in implementing a scheme that, while not guaranteeing a space, increases the likelihood of finding a convenient parking place and in general should enhance the amenity of the area. A residents’ parking scheme can also obviate the need for a resident to incur expenditure on installing a crossover and converting their front garden to hardstanding for off-street parking. The response from residents did not reach the trigger point of 51% to suggest that the scheme should be removed. A reduction in the proposed charge for the Residents Visitor permit may make the charges more acceptable.</i></p>
B-29	WB4 - Cliftonville Gardens, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the charges proposed for parking permits and specifically for the Visitor Permit.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. Hence it is not unreasonable to charge where the local authority is incurring costs in implementing a scheme that, while not guaranteeing a space, increases the likelihood of finding a convenient parking place and in general should enhance the amenity of the area. A residents’ parking scheme can also obviate the need for a resident to incur expenditure on installing a crossover and converting their front garden to hardstanding for off-street parking. The response from residents did not reach the trigger point of 51% to suggest that the scheme should be removed. A reduction in the proposed charge for the Residents Visitor permit may make the charges more acceptable.</i></p>
B-30	WB4 - Clovelly Gardens, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the level of cost of Visitor Permits and the fact that paying for a permit does not guarantee a parking space.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges.</i></p>
B-31	WB4 - Clovelly Gardens, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the charges proposed for parking permits.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation - It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. Hence it is not unreasonable to charge where the local authority is incurring costs in implementing a scheme that, while not guaranteeing a space, increases the likelihood of finding a convenient parking place and in general should enhance the amenity of the area. A residents’ parking scheme can also obviate the need for a resident to incur expenditure on installing a crossover and converting their front garden to hardstanding for off-street parking. The response from residents did not reach the trigger point of 51% to suggest that the scheme should be removed. A reduction in the proposed charge for the Residents Visitor permit may make the charges more acceptable.</i></p>

B-32	WB4 - Eastbourne Gardens, Whitley Bay	<p>Asserting the scheme is unnecessary at their location.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – The response from residents did not reach the trigger point of 51% to suggest that the scheme should be removed. A reduction in the proposed charge for the Residents Visitor permit may make the charges more acceptable.</i></p>
B-33	WB6 - Grosvenor Drive, Whitley Bay	<p>Asserting lack of consultation. Expresses the view that the situation is caused by non-residents and that the proposal does not take account of a potential increase in income at charged car parks owing to displacement of parking.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. Hence it is not unreasonable to charge where the local authority is incurring costs in implementing a scheme that, while not guaranteeing a space, increases the likelihood of finding a convenient parking place and in general should enhance the amenity of the area. A residents’ parking scheme can also obviate the need for a resident to incur expenditure on installing a crossover and converting their front garden to hardstanding for off-street parking. The response from residents did not reach the trigger point of 51% to suggest that the scheme should be removed. A reduction in the proposed charge for the Residents Visitor permit may make the charges more acceptable.</i></p>
B-34 (Petition - 19 signatures)	WB6 - Kings Drive, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the charges proposed for parking permits, and to temporary vouchers being ‘virtual’.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. Hence it is not unreasonable to charge where the local authority is incurring costs in implementing a scheme that, while not guaranteeing a space, increases the likelihood of finding a convenient parking place and in general should enhance the amenity of the area. A residents’ parking scheme can also obviate the need for a resident to incur expenditure on installing a crossover and converting their front garden to hardstanding for off-street parking. The response from residents did not reach the trigger point of 51% to suggest that the scheme should be removed. A reduction in the proposed charge for the Residents Visitor permit may make the charges more acceptable.</i></p>
B-35	WB6 - Kings Drive, Whitley Bay	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space. Asserting a lack of consultation.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation –It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. Hence it is not unreasonable to charge where the local authority is incurring costs in implementing a scheme that, while not guaranteeing a space, increases the likelihood of finding a convenient parking place and in general should enhance the amenity of the area. A residents’ parking scheme can also obviate the need for a resident to incur expenditure on installing a crossover and converting their front garden to hardstanding for off-street parking. The response from residents did not reach the trigger point of 51% to suggest that the scheme should be removed. A reduction in the proposed charge for the Residents Visitor</i></p>

		<i>permit may make the charges more acceptable.</i>
B-36	WB6 - Kings Drive, Whitley Bay	Objecting to the level of cost of Visitor Permits and challenging the impact on those requiring support at home. <i>Officer Observation – The Residents Visitor Permit charge should be brought in line with other Resident Permit charges.</i>
B-37	WB7 - Victoria Avenue, Whitley Bay	Objecting to the level of cost of permits on the basis that the permit restriction at this location only applies to the back lane. <i>Officer Observation – The response from residents did not reach the trigger point of 51% to suggest that the scheme should be removed. A reduction in the proposed charge for the Residents Visitor permit may make the charges more acceptable.</i>
B-38	WD6 - Vine Street, Wallsend	Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space. <i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. Hence it is not unreasonable to charge where the local authority is incurring costs in implementing a scheme that, while not guaranteeing a space, increases the likelihood of finding a convenient parking place and in general should enhance the amenity of the area. A residents' parking scheme can also obviate the need for a resident to incur expenditure on installing a crossover and converting their front garden to hardstanding for off-street parking. The response from residents did not reach the trigger point of 51% to suggest that the scheme should be removed. A reduction in the proposed charge for the Residents Visitor permit may make the charges more acceptable.</i>

Appendix 5 - Not part of current permit scheme - 1no.

Name	Location of Complainant	Reason(s) cited
C-1	Brier Vale, Whitley Bay (not part of current permit scheme)	<p>Objecting to the principle of charging residents for a parking permit when this does not guarantee a parking space. Expresses the view that the parking bay on Park View should be marked out as individual bays to increase capacity.</p> <p><i>Officer Observation – It has never been the case that a parking permit provided a guarantee of a parking space. Hence it is not unreasonable to charge where the local authority is incurring costs in implementing a scheme that, while not guaranteeing a space, increases the likelihood of finding a convenient parking place and in general should enhance the amenity of the area. A residents' parking scheme can also obviate the need for a resident to incur expenditure on installing a crossover and converting their front garden to hardstanding for off-street parking.</i></p>

Appendix 6 Suggested amendment to charges for parking permits

Classification	Restriction on number	Permit type, as agreed by Cabinet September 2017	Existing charge	Proposed charge
Resident Permit (Pay & Display schemes with an exemption for permit holders)	None	Virtual Permit Max. of 3 per household	First permit free (valid for 2 years) Additional permits £20 per permit per year	First permit free (valid for 1 year) Additional permits £25 per permit per year
Resident Permit (Resident Only schemes and Limited Waiting with exemption for permit holders)	None	Virtual Permit Max. of 3 per household	First permit free (valid for 2 years) Additional permits £20 per permit per year	£25 per permit per year
Visitor Permit	1 per household	No change	Free (valid for 2 years)	£25 per permit per year
Business Permit	None	Paper Permit Max. of 2 per business	First two permits £50 per permit per year Additional permits £250 per permit per year	£250 per permit per year
Care Home Resident Permit	1 per unit	No change	Free (valid for 2 years)	£25 per permit per year
Community Worker's Permit	1 per applicant	No change	£20 per permit per year	£25 per permit per year
Tradesmen Voucher	None	Virtual Permit Up to 10 vouchers valid for 3 hours each (further vouchers at the Council's discretion).	£1 for each 3 hour period	£1 for each 3 hour period
Landlord Voucher	None	Virtual Permit Up to 10 vouchers valid for 3 hours each (further vouchers at the Council's discretion).	£1 for each 3 hour period	£1 for each 3 hour period
Bed & Breakfast / Hotel Voucher	None	Virtual Permit Justification will be sought from the applicant if high numbers of vouchers are requested.	£1 for each day	£5 for each day

Those shown in the table above are the only types of permit which are to be available.

Record of Delegated Executive Decision(s) By Elected Mayor/Cabinet Member(s)

1. Subject of decision

Traffic Regulation Order – Permit Parking Changes

2. Name and Portfolio of Cabinet member(s) (Decision Maker)

Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport
--

3. Head of Service

Head of Environment, Housing and Leisure
--

4. Details of any Conflict of Interest and any Dispensation granted in respect of such Interest

None

5. Executive summary (To be taken from written report)

<p>In accordance with the appropriate delegation, this report seeks the approval of the Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport to implement changes to the Authority's permit parking system and formally set aside 90 objections, inclusive of 4 petitions, to the proposal. While the process requires the "setting aside" of the objections, having reflected on the feedback to the Statutory Notice, the Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport has consulted the Elected Mayor and Cabinet colleagues and adjustments to the proposal have been identified to reflect one of the most sensitive parts of the policy and, with the exception of Tynemouth TM2, make the first Resident Permit free of charge within pay and display schemes that include an exemption for permit holders ("shared use" schemes).</p>

<p>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport will wish to note that 5,844 letters were sent to residents and businesses within current 'resident only' parking schemes or limited waiting schemes that included an exemption for permit holders. 433 responses (7.4% of the total number of letters sent) requested removal and in no case did the response reach the trigger point 51% to suggest that the scheme ought to be removed.</p>
--

6. Alternative Options considered

Option 1 – Approve the recommendations set out in section 1.2 of the report.

Option 2 – Not approve the recommendations set out in section 1.2 of the report and agree that the Traffic Regulation Order be made unchanged.

7. Decision(s)

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport has considered the objection and has agreed to:

- i. set aside the objections in the interests of simplifying the application process to make the permit scheme clearer while making better use of technology, and covering the management and administrative costs of the scheme; and
- ii. determine that the Traffic Regulation Order should be made with the following amendments:
 - a) the first Resident Permit to be offered free of charge in pay and display schemes only, excluding Tynemouth TM2;
 - b) the cost of the Residents' Visitor Permit to be reduced to £25.00; and
 - c) the option of temporary virtual Vouchers for Residents to be deleted.

8. Reasons for the Decision(s)

Option 1 was chosen in the interests of simplifying the application process to make the permit scheme clearer while making better use of technology, and covering the management and administrative costs of the scheme.

9. Date Decision Made

1 May 2018

10. Is this decision subject to call-in and if so expiry date of call-in period

Yes, the call-in period expires at 5.00pm on 9 May 2018

11. Date of Publication

1 May 2018

12. Implementation Date (if decision not called in)

After 5.00pm on 9 May 2018



North Tyneside Council

**Request to call-in
A decision made by
cabinet/cabinet member**

SUBJECT: PARKING PERMITS

DATE OF DECISION: 1st MAY 2018

REASONS FOR REQUESTING CALL-IN:

(Call-In can only be used where it is considered that the decision maker has not followed the principles of decision making set out in Article 13 of the Constitution or breaches the Council's approved budget and policy framework. With this in mind, please explain your reasons for requesting a call-in).

The Forward Plan was updated on 27th April 2018 (Environment, Housing & Leisure Section) to add that the Cabinet Member would consider the implementation of changes to the parking permit system & set aside objections. The Report recommending alterations to the TLO was dated 1st May 2018, yet on 30th April 2018 the Labour candidate in Whitley Bay ward, Cllr. M. Hall, a Cabinet Member issued a leaflet with "my promise" that "there should be no charge for the first Resident's Permit ... the proposed charge for a visitor permit should be halved from £50 to £25," promises which accord with the changes in the Report.

The decision made does not accord with the presumption in favour of openness as required in Article 13(i) ~~as~~ all elected members were not advised of the changes, & even those in wards affected were not notified or consulted. There was thus no due consideration either.

(ii) the "justification" for the proposed increases was the need to raise money to pay for the permit schemes; now such money will not be raised, no explanation has been provided of where the funding will come from.

Signatures – this form must be signed by 3 non-executive Members of the Council

Signature

J.A. Wallace

A. Austin

P. Mason

Print Name Here

J.A. WALLACE

A. AUSTIN

P. MASON

Received by: *D Brown*

Date: *4 May 2018*

Reference Number: *01/17-18*

Once completed this form must be presented to the Head of Law & Governance within 5 working days of the date of the decision notice

Overview, Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee
CALL IN GUIDANCE NOTE

1. Introduction

Call in is essentially a process that operates as a safety net to ensure that decisions taken by the Cabinet are properly made. The Constitution has rules around the type of decisions that are made and how they are made. The call in process can only be used where it is felt that a decision has been taken where one of the following rules has not been complied with:

- a) Decisions of the Executive must comply with the principles of decision making set out in Article 13 of the Constitution.
- b) Only full Council can make final decisions on the content of the major plans and strategies that are included in the Budget and Policy Framework. Similarly, only the full Council can make decisions on changes to these plans and strategies except in circumstances where the Council has specifically delegated the power to make particular changes; for example to the Elected Mayor, the Cabinet or an officer of the Council.

This note provides the Overview and Scrutiny Committee with guidance on these rules in relation to comply with the principles of decision making set out in Article 13 of the Constitution and the options available to it when Executive decisions have been called in.

2. Complying with Article 13 of the Constitution

The Council's Constitution provides that a decision of the Executive may be called in where any 3 non Cabinet members who have requested the call in believe the decision does not comply with the principles of decision making set out in Article 13 of the Constitution.

The relevant provisions of Article 13(4) read as follows:-

All decisions made in the name of the Council will be made in accordance with the following principles:

- a) Proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome).

For example, the level of resources which are deployed to implement a decision should be proportionate to the likely impact of that decision.

- b) Consideration of professional advice from officers.

This does not mean that officer advice must always be followed. However, where advice has been offered and it is not followed the reason for not following the professional advice must be justified and recorded.

- c) Due consultation.

It is expected that consultation will form part of the Authority's decision making process. This does not mean that consultation must take place on every decision. The level of consultation required will be appropriate to the nature of the matter under consideration. The views of those likely to be affected by a decision should be sought wherever possible.

d) Consideration of the legal and financial implications.

This means that the legal consequences and financial implications of any decision must be considered and recorded.

e) A presumption in favour of openness.

The process through which all decisions are taken must reflect the Authority's commitment to open government and the Access to Information Rules of Procedure (see Part 4.11).

f) Consideration of available options and outlining reasons for decisions.

Decision makers should ensure that they are able to consider all reasonable and available options in respect of any decision they are to make. In doing so they must clearly explain why they have chosen one particular option and give reasons for rejecting others and this must be included in the formal record of their decision.

g) Respect for human rights.

All decisions must demonstrate that consideration has been given to any human rights implications under the Human Rights Act 1998 and follow the principles of natural justice. Consideration must also be given to any other principles or duties in associated areas which may in future arise.

h) Equality and Diversity.

Decision makers must have regard to the likely effect of the decision on individuals depending on age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation in accordance with the equality duty placed on public bodies by the Equalities Act 2010.

i) Crime and Disorder.

Decision makers must have regard to the likely impact of the decision on crime and disorder in the area, including anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment and the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances in its area in accordance with the duty placed on the Authority by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

j) Environment and Sustainability.

Consideration must be given to whether the decision will contribute to sustainable development i.e. development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

k) Risk Management.

Decision makers must ensure the Authority's risk management processes have been applied to the matter and that any risks have been documented and will be appropriately managed.

l) Purposes of the Constitution.

Decision makers should have regard to the purposes of the Constitution set out in Article 1.

Options available to the Overview, Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee

The Overview, Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee will consider the request and the Committee may only make the following decisions:

- a) to reject all or part of the request on the grounds that the alleged failure of the Cabinet Member to comply with the principles of decision making as set out in Article 13 or the Budget and Policy Framework has either not been proven, or any such failure is outweighed by the need to proceed with the decision. In such cases the Committee may, if it wishes, make appropriate recommendations to the Cabinet Member;
- b) to accept all or part of the request and (1) where the failure relates to the principles of decision making, refer the matter back to the Cabinet Member identifying the failure and the action needed to address this; or (2) where the failure relates to the Budget and Policy Framework, refer the matter to Council for consideration.

Where a decision has been referred back to the Cabinet Member by the Overview, Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on the grounds of failure to comply with Article 13 Decision Making, the Cabinet Member must reconsider its decision within 10 working days and ensure that its decision adheres to these principles. Following this the decision will be regarded as final, cannot be subject to any further call in and may be implemented immediately.

3. Meeting Procedure

Whilst the Constitution does not prescribe any procedures to be followed by the committee in hearing call ins, the following order has become the normal and recommended practice over the years.

1. Introduction of item by Democratic Support Officer, including confirmation that the request has been validated by the Chief Executive.
2. Presentation by one of signatories of the request to call-in the decision setting out the reasons for the request.
3. Questions from Members of the Committee to the signatories.

4. Response to the request by the relevant Cabinet Member, supported by relevant officers.
5. Questions from Members of the Committee to the Cabinet Member or Officers.
6. Summing up by the signatories.
7. Summing up by the Cabinet member or officers.
8. Consideration of the call-in and decision making.