



Please reply to:

Contact: Gillian Scott
Service: Committee Services
Direct line: 01784 444243
E-mail: g.scott@spelthorne.gov.uk
Date: 9 March 2020

Notice of meeting

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date: Tuesday, 17 March 2020

Time: 7.00 pm

Place: Council Chamber, Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames

To: Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Councillors:

V.J. Leighton (Chairman)	S. Buttar	M. Gibson
N.J. Gething (Vice-Chairman)	J.H.J. Doerfel	L. E. Nichols
C.F. Barnard	J.T.F. Doran	R.J. Noble
C.L. Barratt	R.D. Dunn	D. Saliagopoulos
J.R. Boughtflower	T. Fidler	R.A. Smith-Ainsley

Councillors are reminded that the Gifts and Hospitality Declaration book will be available outside the meeting room for you to record any gifts or hospitality offered to you since the last Committee meeting.

Spelthorne Borough Council, Council Offices, Knowle Green

Staines-upon-Thames TW18 1XB

www.spelthorne.gov.uk customer.services@spelthorne.gov.uk Telephone 01784 451499

AGENDA

Description	Lead	Timings	Page Number.
<p>1. Apologies</p> <p>To receive any apologies for non-attendance.</p>		7.00 pm	
<p>2. Minutes</p> <p>To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2020 as a correct record.</p>	Chairman		5 - 10
<p>3. Disclosures of Interest</p> <p>To receive any disclosures of interest from councillors in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct for members.</p>			
<p>4. Call-in of Cabinet decisions</p> <p>No Cabinet decisions have been called in.</p>			
<p>5. Cabinet Forward Plan</p> <p>A copy of the latest Forward Plan is attached.</p> <p>If any members of the Committee have any issues they want to raise in relation to the Cabinet Forward Plan, please inform Terry Collier, Deputy Chief Executive, 24 hours in advance of the meeting with reasons for the request.</p>	Chairman	7.05 pm	11 - 16
<p>6. Knowle Green Estates Ltd Business Plan</p> <p>To receive the Cabinet response to the recommendation from this Committee arising from its consideration of the Knowle Green Estates Business Plan at its meeting held on 21 January 2020.</p> <p>To note the draft proposals in response to the Committee's recommendations.</p>	Cllr Harvey/ Howard Williams	7.10 pm	17 - 22
<p>7. Corporate Project Management</p> <p>To receive an update report on Corporate Project Management.</p>	Sandy Muirhead / Cllr Sexton	7.30 pm	23 - 88

Description	Lead	Timings	Page Number.
<p>8. Pavement Parking</p> <p>To note the report of the Parliamentary Transport Committee on the problems caused by pavement parking and recommendations to the government about possible solutions to the problem. Evidence submitted by Surrey County Council to the select committee, which has recommended some of that authority's proposed changes, is also attached.</p>		8.00 pm	89 - 136
<p>9. Overview and Scrutiny Statutory Guidance</p> <p>To consider a report on the new statutory guidance on Overview and Scrutiny.</p>	Terry Collier	8.30 pm	137 - 174
<p>10. Report from River Thames Task Group</p> <p>To receive a report on the work of the Task Group from the Lead member, Councillor Leighton.</p>	Chairman	9.00 pm	175 - 182
<p>11. Report from the Climate Change Working Group</p> <p>To receive a verbal report on the work of the Climate Change Working Group from the Lead member, Councillor Noble.</p>	Cllr Noble	9.10 pm	
<p>12. Report from the End of Life Celebration Centre Task Group</p> <p>To receive a verbal report on the work of the Task Group from the Lead member, Councillor Noble.</p>	Cllr Noble	9.20 pm	
<p>13. Report from the Clean Streets Task Group</p> <p>To receive a verbal report on the work of the Clean Streets Task Group from the Lead member, Councillor Gething.</p>	Cllr Gething	9.30 pm	
<p>14. Work Programme</p> <p>To review the work undertaken by the Committee this year and propose items for inclusion in the Committee's work programme for the next Municipal year.</p>	Chairman	9.35 pm	183 - 186

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
21 January 2020**

Present:

Councillor V.J. Leighton (Chairman)

Councillors:

J.H.J. Doerfel

T. Fidler

L. E. Nichols

J.T.F. Doran

N.J. Gething

R.J. Noble

R.D. Dunn

M. Gibson

Apologies: Councillors C.F. Barnard, C.L. Barratt and R.A. Smith-Ainsley

7/20 Election of Vice-Chairman

It was proposed by Councillor V.J. Leighton and seconded by Councillor R.J. Noble and agreed that Councillor N.J. Gething be appointed Vice Chairman for the remainder of the municipal year.

8/20 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2019 were approved as a correct record.

9/20 Disclosures of Interest

There were none.

10/20 Call-in of Cabinet decisions

No Cabinet decisions have been called in.

11/20 Cabinet Forward Plan

The Cabinet Forward Plan was noted.

12/20 Treasury Management half yearly report 2019/20

Members of the Committee had been requested to submit questions regarding the Treasury Management half-yearly report for 2019-20 in advance of the meeting. The questions and responses were circulated in advance of the meeting and are attached to these minutes.

It was requested that the timing of financial reports are considered when planning the programme of meetings in order that the reports are brought before the Committee within an appropriate timescale.

It was agreed to provide further detail in writing to the Committee after the meeting regarding:

1. The movement in long and short term borrowing shown in Table 2 of the report.
2. Information about how Knowle Green Estates Ltd investment would appear in the capital expenditure summary (Table 1 of the report).

The Chief Finance Officer offered to discuss separately individual concerns about the methodology used to calculate the dividend yield.

Resolved to note the report, subject to some concern about the values in the report. The Chief Finance Officer will report back to the Committee on the above points.

13/20 Houses in Multiple Occupation

The Committee received a report concerning Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO). The Planning Development Manager outlined the background to the report; the subject was previously scrutinised by the Committee in November 2018 following a change in legislation and an update requested for late 2019/early 2020.

The report had been prepared jointly by Planning and Environmental Health using data for the period October 2016 to September 2019, the two years preceding and the year following the new legislation coming into effect. The data showed that there was insufficient evidence at present to justify the introduction of Article 4 direction but HMOs would continue to be monitored by the Planning Enforcement and Environmental Health teams.

The Committee asked a range of questions and in response were advised:

- There were a number of reasons why some areas had a higher number of HMOs than others, generally it occurred in university towns or where the cost of rented property was very high. In Spelthorne the general tendency was for friends to rent a house together or through an agency. The number of HMOs in Spelthorne was very small in comparison to other areas.
- There was a cluster of HMOs around Ashford Town and Ashford North/Stanwell South, which was likely to be due to the size and type of properties.
- The new licensing regime had improved management and safety standards.
- Most complaints received related to noise and accumulation of rubbish.
- There had been an increase in enforcement action as a result of the legislative change. Information was gathered from many different sources and the approach used by the enforcement team would depend on the nature of the potential breach.

- There had been one case relating to modern day slavery, and three concerning possible illegal immigration.

Resolved to note the report.

14/20 Overview and Scrutiny Statutory Guidance

The Committee received the report relating to new statutory guidance on Overview and Scrutiny to ensure that the function is carried out effectively and agreed that further consideration needed to be given to this

Resolved to carry forward this item to the next meeting where suggestions for tangible actions can be considered.

15/20 Review of Knowle Green Estates Ltd

Resolved to move the exclusion of the Press and Public for the following item in view of the likely disclosure of exempt information within the meaning of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 and by the Local Government (Access to information) (Variation) Order 2006.

Terry Collier, Deputy Chief Executive, conveyed the apologies of Councillor A.J. Harman, as Chairman of the Board of Knowle Green Estates, who was unable to attend the meeting.

Howard Williams, Non-Executive Director of Knowle Green Estates Ltd (KGE), outlined the history of the company and why it was first established in 2016. Since the company's formation the Council's direction in relation to provision of housing had substantially changed and it was now envisaged that the role of KGE would be to manage most of the Council's residential assets, managing within the next few years tenancies of 500-600 properties.

The residential portfolio would include a range of types of rental properties. It was proposed that the Council would acquire and develop suitable sites before handing these over to KGE for management. The financial arrangements for the transfer of properties were broadly outlined.

The Committee were advised that the report to be presented to Cabinet also requested that a new company, Knowle Green Estates Group, is set up with facilities for limited liability partnerships (LLP) for risk and tax management purposes.

Members were also informed that the accounts had been independently audited and were now being reviewed by the Council's external auditors as part of the Council's consolidated accounts.

The Committee scrutinised the report in detail and raised a number of questions. In response to these they were advised:

- The structure of the group was still under consideration by Cabinet in the role of shareholder representative. No Special Purpose Vehicles (SPV) or LLPs have been set up.
- The board structure had been broadened to include two non-executive directors which would bring a wider range of experience to the company and provide safeguards for continuity purposes. It had recently been decided that the company secretary need not be an individual but appropriate members of the legal department.
- The company would take its direction from the Council as the sole shareholder.
- The company will not be able to purchase or dispose of assets without the permission of the Council. Furthermore they cannot source third party funding without the permission of the Council. There had been clear instructions from the shareholder that the intention was to retain the properties for ever and not sell them. If at any stage sales were considered necessary, the company would need Cabinet's (as the shareholder representative) agreement to do so. It was also confirmed that the company was not authorised to raise mortgages on the properties.
- The Council will complete the residential developments and incur costs from the PWLB or equivalent funding source. At the point of completion the property will be transferred to KGE; they will buy assets with a loan from the Council, interest from the company will be paid to the Council. This will be reflected in the Council accounts which will show a stream of interest receivable and the capital loan will be paid down.
- The 5 year Profit and Loss projection in the plan had been produced in conjunction with KGE's financial advisers. The model had been based on a set of assumptions with the risk profile varying according to the nature of the scheme. The projections will be kept under review and the company will continue to work with the financial advisers.
- KGE doesn't currently have any employees. Any work carried out for KGE by Council staff will be recorded and charged to the company. A detailed breakdown will be provided of the officers, how much time they have incurred and the costs to the company. This will be visible in both the company's and Council's accounting and will be scrutinised by auditors from both perspectives

Mr Williams offered to report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the work of the company on a regular basis, as required.

Concern was expressed that there may be insufficient or no affordable housing allocated to some developments. The Committee were informed that the shareholder's commitment to providing affordable housing was demonstrated by the fact that the first schemes have been 100% affordable as will the accommodation to be provided in the West Wing, Knowle Green. This was a key part of delivering accommodation to meet the needs of

residents. It was suggested that the Council should provide an indication of the split of tenure across all developments which could then be monitored and scrutinised.

It was proposed that there should be a mission statement, issued by the Council, setting out the purpose and aims of the company as this would assist in scrutinising and measuring the success of their work.

The Committee sought further clarification on the financial arrangements relating to asset valuation and the transfer of property at cost price and considered that the wording of the plan needing further refinement and clarity.

Resolved to recommend to Cabinet:

1. That the Business Plan for the Knowle Green Estates Group is presented alongside a mission statement or that a mission statement is subsequently developed identifying the purpose and aims of the Group.
2. The Committee believes that the process of asset valuation and transfer detailed in the Business Plan for the Knowle Green Estates Group requires further clarification.

It was agreed that an update would be provided to Overview and Scrutiny Committee at their next meeting in March 2020.

16/20 Work Programme

The Chairman provided an update on the work programme of the Committee. To avoid duplication of work, it was agreed that instead of considering the topic of renewable energy, the Committee would receive a report from the Leader's Climate Change task group at the next meeting and regular updates thereafter.

One of the items on the programme, to consider the need for a crematorium, had not yet been addressed. The Committee agreed to set up a task group consisting of Councillors Noble, Nichols and Richard Dunn to consider this. Councillor Noble requested that the issue is renamed 'Provision of a Celebration of Life Centre' rather than provision of a crematorium on the work programme.

Resolved to note the work programme.

This page is intentionally left blank

Spelthorne Borough Council

Cabinet Forward Plan and Key Decisions



This Forward Plan sets out the decisions which the Cabinet expects to take over the forthcoming months, and identifies those which are **Key Decisions**.

A **Key Decision** is a decision to be taken by the Cabinet which is either likely to result in significant expenditure or savings or to have significant effects on those living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the Borough.

The members of the Cabinet and their areas of responsibility are:

Cllr I.T.E. Harvey	Leader of the Council	Cllr.harvey@spelthorne.gov.uk
Cllr A.C. Harman	Deputy Leader and Finance	Cllr.harman@spelthorne.gov.uk
Cllr R.O. Barratt	Environment and Compliance	Cllr.barratt@spelthorne.gov.uk
Cllr A. Brar	Housing	Cllr.brar@spelthorne.gov.uk
Cllr. S. Buttar	Community Wellbeing	Cllr.buttar@spelthorne.gov.uk
Cllr H. Harvey	Investment Portfolio and Management, and Regeneration	Cllr.hharvey@spelthorne.gov.uk
Cllr O. Rybinski	Economic Development, Customer Service, Estates and Transport	Cllr.rybinski@spelthorne.gov.uk
Cllr J. Sexton	Corporate Management	Cllr.sexton@spelthorne.gov.uk
Cllr I. Beardsmore	Local Plan / Strategic Planning (excluding Heathrow expansion) <i>Note: to only contribute to Cabinet debate and vote on portfolio specific matters. Portfolio will expire upon approval of Local Plan.</i>	Cllr.beardsmore@spelthorne.gov.uk

Whilst the majority of the Cabinet's business at the meetings listed in this Plan will be open to the public and press, there will inevitably be some business to be considered which contains confidential, commercially sensitive or personal information.

This is formal notice under the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 that part of any of the Cabinet meetings listed below may be held in private where exempt and / or confidential information is due to be considered.

Representations regarding this should be made to committee.services@spelthorne.gov.uk

Published on 1 March

Please direct any enquiries about this Plan to the Principal Committee Manager, Gillian Scott, at the Council offices on 01784 444243 or e-mail g.scott@spelthorne.gov.uk

Spelthorne Borough Council

Cabinet Forward Plan and Key Decisions for 1 March 2020 to 30 June 2020

Anticipated earliest (or next) date of decision and decision maker	Matter for consideration	Key or non-Key Decision	Decision to be taken in Public or Private	Lead Officer/ Cabinet Member
Property and Investment Committee 16 03 2020	Riverside Arts Centre - lease To consider the renewal of the lease a the Riverside Arts Centre.	Non-Key Decision	Public	Jeremy Gidman, Asset Management Portfolio Holder for Investment Portfolio and Management and Regeneration
Property and Investment Committee 16 03 2020	Exempt report - Property Letting 'B' To consider the proposed letting 'B' at a Council owned property.	Non-Key Decision	Private	Katherine McIlroy, Property Manager Portfolio Holder for Investment Portfolio and Management and Regeneration
Property and Investment Committee 16 03 2020	Exempt report - Property Letting 'C' To consider the proposed letting 'C' at a Council owned property.	Non-Key Decision	Private	Katherine McIlroy, Property Manager Portfolio Holder for Investment Portfolio and Management and Regeneration
Property and Investment Committee 16 03 2020	Exempt report - Acquisition Z - key decision To consider the acquisition of a property.	Key Decision It is likely to result in the Council incurring expenditure above or making savings of up to £164,000	Private	Nick Cummings, Property and Development Manager Leader of the Council
Property and Investment Committee 16 03 2020	Exempt report - Acquisition AA - Key Decision To consider the acquisition of a Property.	Key Decision It is likely to result in the Council incurring expenditure above or making savings of up to £164,000	Private	Nick Cummings, Property and Development Manager Leader of the Council

Date of decision and decision maker	Matter for consideration	Key or non-Key Decision	Decision to be taken in Public or Private	Lead Officer/ Cabinet Member
Property and Investment Committee 16 03 2020	Exempt report - Acquisition AB - Key Decision To consider the acquisition of a Property	Key Decision It is likely to result in the Council incurring expenditure above or making savings of up to £164,000	Private	Nick Cummings, Property and Development Manager Leader of the Council
Property and Investment Committee 16 03 2020	Exempt report - Acquisition AC - Key Decision To consider the acquisition of a Property	Key Decision It is likely to result in the Council incurring expenditure above or making savings of up to £164,000	Private	Nick Cummings, Property and Development Manager Leader of the Council
Cabinet 25 03 2020	Asset Management Plan To consider a draft Asset Management Plan	Non-Key Decision	Public	Nick Cummings, Property and Development Manager Portfolio Holder for Investment Portfolio and Management and Regeneration
Cabinet 25 03 2020	Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2020-2025 To consider a report on a review of the Strategy.	Non-Key Decision	Public	David Birley, Housing Strategy and Policy Manager Portfolio Holder for Housing
Property and Investment Committee 30 03 2020	Exempt report - Property Letting 'D' To consider the proposed letting 'D' at a Council owned property.	Non-Key Decision	Private	Katherine McIlroy, Property Manager Leader of the Council
Property and Investment Committee 30 03 2020	Exempt report - Property Letting 'E' To consider the proposed letting 'E' at a Council owned property.	Non-Key Decision	Private	Katherine McIlroy, Property Manager Leader of the Council

Date of decision and decision maker	Matter for consideration	Key or non-Key Decision	Decision to be taken in Public or Private	Lead Officer/ Cabinet Member
Property and Investment Committee 30 03 2020	Exempt report - Property Letting 'F' To consider the proposed letting 'F' at a Council owned property.	Non-Key Decision	Private	Katherine McIlroy, Property Manager Portfolio Holder for Investment Portfolio and Management and Regeneration
Cabinet 20 05 2020	Corporate Plan Review To review the Corporate Plan and recommend it to Council for adoption.	Non-Key Decision	Public	Leader of the Council
Cabinet 20 05 2020	Health and Wellbeing Strategy This is a new Health and Wellbeing Strategy for 2020-2023	Non-Key Decision	Public	Lisa Stonehouse, Leisure Services Manager Portfolio Holder for Community Wellbeing
Cabinet 20 05 2020	Exempt report - Thameside House construction budget - Key Decision To consider an exempt report on the construction budget for Thameside House.	Key Decision It is likely to result in the Council incurring expenditure above or making savings of up to £164,000	Private	Richard Mortimer, Asset Management Contractor Leader of the Council
Cabinet 20 05 2020	Exempt report - Acquisition AD - Key Decision To consider the acquisition of a Property.	Key Decision It is likely to result in the Council incurring expenditure above or making savings of up to £164,000	Private	Nick Cummings, Property and Development Manager Leader of the Council

Date of decision and decision maker	Matter for consideration	Key or non-Key Decision	Decision to be taken in Public or Private	Lead Officer/ Cabinet Member
Cabinet 20 05 2020	Public Space Protection Order - Parks and Open Spaces To consider a proposal to make Public Space Protection Orders in the borough and to consult residents on the matter.	Non-Key Decision	Public	Karen Limmer, Interim Group Head of Corporate Governance Portfolio Holder for Environment and Compliance
Cabinet 20 05 2020	Sandbag Policy To consider and agree to a Sandbag Policy	Non-Key Decision	Public	Nick Moon, Risk and Resilience Manager Portfolio Holder for Corporate Management

Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 17 March 2020

Response from the Cabinet of 29 January 2020

Knowle Green Estates Business Plan

1. At its meeting held on 21 January 2020, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the draft Knowle Green Estates Business Plan ahead of its approval by the Cabinet.
2. Members raised a concern that they did not know the Council's requirements of Knowle Green Estates Ltd as the Council's housing delivery vehicle and therefore could not assess whether it was achieving its aims. They proposed the inclusion of a mission statement setting out the purpose and aims of the company as this would assist in scrutinising and measuring the success of its work.
3. The Committee sought further clarification on the financial arrangements relating to asset valuation and the transfer of property at cost price and considered that the wording of the plan needed further refinement and clarity.

The Committee recommended to Cabinet:

1. That the Business Plan for the Knowle Green Estates Group is presented alongside a mission statement or that a mission statement is subsequently developed identifying the purpose and aims of the Group.
 2. That the process of asset valuation and transfer detailed in the Business Plan for the Knowle Green Estates Group be subject to further clarification.
4. The Cabinet considered these recommendations at its meeting on 29 January 2020 during consideration of a report on the governance arrangements for Knowle Green Estates Ltd.
 5. The Leader responded to the recommendations, on behalf of the Cabinet, as follows:

Mission Statement

“As regards a mission statement for Knowle Green Estates Group Ltd – I can see how this will provide some assurances for members. I think the business plan makes it clear the direction of travel for the business, but I have no reservations to ask the Directors to consider their proposal for a mission statement and submit it to the Council. I think this will complement the Business Plan.

Asset valuation and transfers

I know that this is a live issue for the Directors because it fundamentally affects the financial appraisals for all the development sites.

I am also aware that the Council has taken some initial advice in this area. This has clarified that we do not need to transfer at full value where there is affordable housing and the Council is the sole proprietor of the Company. It is worth the Council and the Company developing a protocol on this for the future schemes and taking further advice on a revised protocol. As Shareholder Representative, I will discuss this with the Directors to see how such a protocol could be developed and how the approach can be clarified in the business plan.

Thank you for your recommendations which I propose to accept.”

6. Cabinet agreed to request the Directors of Knowle Green Estates Ltd to provide further information to Cabinet along the lines outlined by the Leader in his response to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommendations.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

17 March 2020



Title	Knowle Green Estates' Mission Statement and Business Plan		
Purpose of the report	To note		
Report Author	Terry Collier		
Cabinet Member	Councillor Tony Harman	Confidential	No
Corporate Priority	Housing		
Recommendations	To note the draft mission statement to be proposed to Cabinet and revision to the Knowle Green Estates Business Plan.		
Reason for Recommendation	To provide an opportunity for the Committee to comment on the response to the two recommendations made by the Committee on 21st January 2020		

1. Key issues

- 1.1 At the Committee's meeting on 21st January it received a report on Knowle Green Estates' (KGE) Business Plan. The Committee proposed that there should be a mission statement, agreed by the Council, setting out the purpose and aims of the company as this would assist in scrutinising and measuring the success of their work.
- 1.2 The Committee sought further clarification on the financial arrangements relating to asset valuation and the transfer of property at cost price and considered that the wording of the plan needing further refinement and clarity.
- 1.3 The Committee recommended to Cabinet:

That the Business Plan for the Knowle Green Estates Group is presented alongside a mission statement or that a mission statement is subsequently developed identifying the purpose and aims of the Group.

The Committee believes that the process of asset valuation and transfer detailed in the Business Plan for the Knowle Green Estates Group requires further clarification.

- 1.4 Cabinet accepted the above recommendations and asked Knowle Green to draft suggested text

2. Options analysis and proposal

- 2.1 With respect to a draft Mission statement the Directors have suggested the following key strapline

“With the Council and for the residents of Spelthorne, increasing the availability and quality of housing in our Borough. A property business with a commercial head and a social heart.”

- 2.2 KGE exists to contribute towards the delivery of the Council’s Housing Strategy objectives and in particular to help facilitate as much affordable rental housing (and keyworker) as possible.

- 2.3 With respect to Valuation, it is proposed that the wording in the Business Plan is amended to read

“On completion of construction and prior to occupation, the properties transfer to the KGE balance sheet at cost price (the cost to the Council of acquiring and developing the property): SBC as sole shareholder retains the asset value via its ownership of all KGE assets and is therefore at no financial disadvantage as a result of the cost-price transfer. In the event that the Council determines that the sale of the completed properties at their market value better supports the delivery of the Council’s Housing Strategy, the sale price from Council to Company will be determined by an independent market valuation commissioned by the Council.”

- 2.4 In order to seek to maximise the delivery of affordable housing units, whilst ensuring a viable business model for the company, some additional modelling is going to be undertaken to look at the impact of using alternative lower profit percentage assumptions (ie rather than 20%) for the purposes of Planning Applications financial viability submissions. It should be noted that it will continue to be the case that over and above affordable housing numbers granted as planning conditions, the Company in looking to support the Council’s housing strategy objectives, will seek to maximise affordable rental housing numbers, by agreeing additional affordable (or keyworker) numbers as long as they are operationally viable for the Company.

- 2.5 In combination with the above KGE will liaise with the Housing Options team to draw out from the Housing Strategy affordable housing targets which support the Council’s Housing Strategy and are financially viable for KGE to deliver.

3. Financial implications

- 3.1 As highlighted in 2.4 above additional modelling is being undertaken to evaluate financial implications for Knowle Green Estates and Spelthorne Borough Council with respect to applying different models for determining affordable housing levels.

4. Other considerations

- 4.1 An equality impact assessment will be undertaken.

5. Timetable for implementation

- 5.1 Following comments from Overview and Scrutiny the draft proposals on mission statement and the wording on valuation/transfer will be put to Cabinet for approval as the sole shareholder of the Company.

Background papers: Knowle Green Estates Business Plan

Appendices: There are none.

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

17 March 2020



Title	Corporate Project Management Report		
Purpose of the report	To note		
Report Author	Sandy Muirhead Group Head Commissioning and Transformation		
Cabinet Member	Councillor Joanne Sexton	Confidential	No
Corporate Priority	Financial Sustainability		
Recommendations	To note the report		
Reason for Recommendation	To allow Members to be updated on progress of projects and their outcomes across the Council		

1. Key issues

- 1.1 This report highlights the work of the Council on projects.
- 1.2 The Corporate Project Dashboard attached (Appendix 1) tracks progress of projects and work streams to fall in line with the Groups in place since May 2016 (Commissioning and Transformation / Community Well Being / Neighbourhood Services / Regeneration and Growth / Customer Relations / Finance), with the inclusion of those projects falling under a Corporate and/or 'miscellaneous' heading.
- 1.3 The council's focus continues on property acquisitions and housing projects, with the property acquisition portfolio being managed, controlled and reported through the 'Development and Investment Group' and the 'Investment and Property Group' – with the property project names, and high-level information being captured as part of the "Corporate Project Register" and "Corporate Project Dashboard" documents. A presentation of the risks associated with the 'Confidential' development projects shall be made in a 'Part 2' (Confidential) section of the meeting. This format has been used for the past two meetings. Should there be any revisions/improvements which may prove necessary, then Officers shall see to introduce those improvements for the next session. This includes consideration of future formats.

Moving forward the Group and Deputy Group Head Commissioning and Transformation (CTG) will continue to meet with all Group Heads to obtain their views on current and future needs in relation to projects. Project Managers also need to ensure they seek appropriate authorisations before progressing projects to ensure there is a business case and resources are in place to support the project. CTG will focus on performance to ensure that all

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 1 of 4.

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$\$jtb2pxk.docx

aspects of project work are captured to enable the Council to clearly demonstrate its achievements.

- 1.4 Projects need to ensure they continue to take account of the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR), Equality and Diversity impacts and where appropriate Privacy Impact Assessments, so as to comply with the necessary Governmental legislations.

GDPR considerations are now being discussed at more project meetings.

- 1.5 The Project Steering Group continue to meet and discuss individual projects in greater detail, particularly those with a red or amber status. Highlight reports continue to be produced on a regular basis by the majority of managers.

2. Corporate Projects

- 2.1 The projects being delivered across the Council continue to move Spelthorne forward on various areas to support delivery of the corporate priorities.
- 2.2 The project documentation is currently being modified to ensure projects at initiation have a clear business case and highlight Procurement, Legal, ICT Finance, Communications and GDPR requirements that will need supporting during the course of the project. This will assist with workload planning where projects cross several different services.

3. Financial implications

- 3.1 Projects should not be initiated unless there is a clear business case and funding stream in place. These should be indicated at the project planning stage and it is hoped there will be continuing support given for all the initial business case documentation to be completed thus allowing projects to be effectively reported on and monitored.
- 3.2 Project Management shall also include the Procurement Business Case document as appropriate.

4. Resource implications

- 4.1 As with the financial needs, resources must be given equal attention, with the appropriate departments and services being considered so that the appropriate and necessary skills can be made available so as to meet delivery deadlines.
- 4.2 Given the current structure, and working practices, of the Authority, prioritisation of workloads will prove crucial so as to engage key members of the delivery Team at the times conducive to meeting deadlines and fulfilling expectations.
- 4.3 Where resource availability is proving to be a risk with potential to threaten the agreed delivery date, then escalation for support must be considered.

5. Other considerations

- 5.1 Projects will need to address GDPR, equality and diversity issues together with those of sustainability, financial, social and environmental.
- 5.2 The introduction, and regular sitting, of the Project Steering Group (PSG) shall seek to further support each project by way of adherence to the current SBC project principles, recommended practices and processes. All of these shall serve to ensure that projects are managed in a manner conducive with focus to effective, efficient and controlled delivery. Risks and issues shall continue to alert the PSG of where additional consideration and support shall become necessary to review and address project priorities with those of corporate direction and needs.
- 5.3 In a bid to promote speedier submission of project documentation a new streamlined document (Project Brief and Business Case) covering the 'Project Summary', 'Project Initiation' and 'Business Case' requirements, has been produced and circulated for use.

Initial feedback on use of the document has proved to be very positive.

6. Timetable for implementation

- 6.1 Project governance shall now also seek the consideration and direction of the PSG and continue to be reported to MAT, Cabinet Briefing and Overview and Scrutiny every quarter.
- 6.2 The corporate project team will continue to meet and discuss individual projects in more detail particularly those with a red or amber status. Highlight reports underpin the project report hierarchy and will continue to be produced monthly by project managers.
- 6.3 It is envisaged that as the Groups provide greater support for this corporate requirement that the content and timing of the data input shall become more efficient thereby ensuring that the overall process, and its own requirements shall provide enhanced benefits.

This will include the maintenance of an accurate 'Corporate Project Register', which provides an up-to-date record of all project activity within the Authority. This shall enable opportunities for the necessary support to be provided to the project teams by way of a corporate assessment of budget, resource and man-power needs/availability and the appropriate prioritisation/reprioritisation on an ongoing basis. It is therefore imperative that the Group Heads impart their knowledge of project activity in their respective areas, in a timely manner, to those maintaining the corporate documentation.

- 6.4 It is appreciated that the current sourcing mechanisms (Highlight Reports) for obtaining Dashboard information from the Groups Heads/Project Managers has been 'cumbersome' but a more streamlined approach is now utilised to provide the necessary project information.
- 6.5 The revised design of the Corporate Project Dashboard is still being worked on to continue to improve the presentation of the project status information in a truly focussed format. This issue continues to be addressed by the Project Team.
- 6.6 The Group Head of Commissioning and Transformation has initiated a number of work streams which aim to manage the end-to-end delivery of any

project by introducing more effective and efficient methodologies. These include:-

- Project Governance
 - Project Steering Group responsibilities
 - Stage gates
 - Project Documentation - requirement
- Project Manager Training – In-house
- Project Reporting – automation
- Communication of projects / portfolio of projects

The Project Office, supported by the PSG and MAT, continue to consider opportunities to improve the Project reporting mechanisms and presentation formats based upon the needs and requirements of all the recipients of the data. Research into potential solutions is ongoing, and shall be reported upon in due course with the preferred option/s.

In the interim, the current reporting methods and documentation shall remain in place, whilst addressing the need to share project progress and current status.

So as to assist with the navigation within the “Corporate Project Dashboard – Project Detail” document, hyperlinks from the front page to the various project update pages.

The Reader will need to hover their cursor over the respective project on the ‘Portfolio of Projects’ page (page 1) and then simultaneously press ‘Ctrl’ and the left hand mouse key to move to the project detail page.

ICT are supporting the Project Reporting process and are working to produce a more automated method and E-Form mechanism to streamline the process by making it less time-consuming.

The fully functional roll-out of these changes are anticipated to be delivered by Spring 2020.

Background papers:

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Corporate Project Register

Appendix 2: Corporate Project Dashboard

Appendix 3: Corporate Project Dashboard – Project Detail

Project Categorisation	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Project Manager	Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Completed
<i>Priority Flagship</i>						
<i>Flagship</i>	Virtualise Audiocodes	Alistair Corkish	Roger Patterson	April 2020	May 2020	On target to be completed Feb 2020
	Office 365	Sandy Muirhead	Alistair Corkish	Sept 2019	2021	2021 is still the target date
	Sharepoint Development	Sandy Muirhead	Alistair Corkish	April 2020	2021	2021 is still the target date
	Replace Skype for Business - 'Teams'	Sandy Muirhead	Alistair Corkish	Sept 2020	2021	2021 is still the target date
<i>High</i>	Windows 10 roll-out and training	Alistair Corkish	Sarah George	July 2019	December 2019	Completed
	HFX Replacement	Sandy Muirhead	Alistair Corkish	April 2020	September 2020	Awating budget approval before commencement of project. More realistic target date is April 2021
	Security & Password Policies	Alistair Corkish	Roger Patterson	April 2019	April 2020	Completed
<i>Medium</i>	Main Reception Kiosk Install	Alistair Corkish	Jak Chauhan	June 2019	March 2020	On target for March 2020
	Astun to Cloud	Alistair Corkish	Chris Thompson	April 2019	October 2019	Completed
	i-Apply implementation	Alistair Corkish	Chris Thompson	April 2019	October 2019	
	Civica Migration to SQL server	Alistair Corkish	Sarah George	Sept 2019	May 2020	On target for May 2020
	Academy to 2012 platform/Ingres upgde	Alistair Corkish	Sarah George	Sept 2019	Nov 2019	Academy migration to 2012 complete. Ingres upgrade not yet released by Capita, so postponed.
	Ingres upgrade	Alistair Corkish	Sarah George	TBC	TBC	See above
	CIVICA Disposal Module	Sarah George	Faisal Qureshi	May 2019	Dec 2019	Target date is now May 2020 - being run in parallel with other Civica project
	UNIFORM Disposal Module	Alistair Corkish	Chris Thompson	June 2019	TBC	
	2008 R2 upgrades to 2016	Alistair Corkish	Chris Layte	April 2019	January 2020	Completed (except Sharepoint which will be done as part of O365)
<i>Service</i>	Move BT Lines to Gamma	Alistair Corkish	Sally Barrett	Oct 2019	May 2020	Completed except for CCTV lines managed by Runnymede and two broadband lines which will be disconnected once wifi is extended
	Meeting Room Tablets	Alistair Corkish	Andrew Prendergast	Oct 2019	Dec 2019	Completed (Although, awaiting 101 to be vacated before adding that room)

This page is intentionally left blank

The 'Current General Health' (column Z) provides an overview on the the project's status (as determined by MAT), in terms of progress, risks and issues. Additional supporting dialogue (covering Risks and Issues, *etc.*) shall be provided on an additional sheet covering the various projects.

Those projects shaded 'blue' have not responded to information requests for a status update, and therefore the information in the above table is from their submission in April 2019.

Those projects without a RAG Status are the newly added projects - which are yet to be initiated fully.

This page is intentionally left blank

Corporate Project Dashboard
March 2020

Portfolio of Projects:

Priority Flagship	Flagship	High	Medium	Service
Brexit	Root and Branch	GDPR – Steps to Compliance	Payment Allocation	Standardisation of Customer Forms
Spelthorne Leisure Centre	Office 365	EDRMS	Main Reception Kiosk Install	E-Form for Project Documentation
White House Redevelopment Phase I	Heathrow Launch Pad (Incubator)	Corporate Hybrid Printing	CIVICA Migration to SQL Server	Revamp of Intranet (Spelnet) *New Project*
Ceaser Court Phase I	Fordbridge Day Centre (Extension)	Rent Management and Homelessness System	Academy to 2012 / Ingres Upgrade	Multi-use Bins in Parks
Ceaser Court Phase II		LSVT (Large Scale Voluntary Transfer)	UNIFORM Disposal Module	Wetland Habitat Project
Waterfront Redevelopment of Staines		Replacement Phones	2008 R2 Upgrades to 2016	Refurbishment of Laleham Park Play Area
Ashford MSCP Redevelopment		Enforcement Agents	Property Management Software	Commercial Waste
Thameside House Redevelopment		Knowle Green Works/Project Claude	Land Registry – LA Migration *New Project*	Bartec for 'Refuse Enquiries'
Knowle Green West Wing Conversion		Laleham Park Pavilion		Enterprise (IDox)
Ashford Hospital Car Park		Staines Jetty		
Southern Light Railway (SLR)				
Harper House Redevelopment				
Oast House Redevelopment				

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 1 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

Project: Brexit

Category: Priority Flagship

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
To ensure Spelthorne Borough Council, its community and businesses are as prepared as possible, given the uncertainties of Brexit especially a “No Deal”.
Due to the ‘shifting’ dates for Brexit no firm Milestone/s can be set at this stage.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - No substantial activity last month (November ’19) as on hold due to 12th December ’19 General Election.
 - Conducted / progressed assessments of a number of Food Banks in the Borough so as to determine what assistance might be necessary for those financially impacted by Brexit. Donations from the Brexit funding can then be allocated.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
 - Risks:
 1. **Impact of ‘No Deal’ exit:-** Likelihood 2 x Impact 3 = **Risk Score: 6**
 - Issues:
 1. **Uncertainty of dates for exiting the EU.**
 2. **Election impact on Brexit Deal and associated timings.**
- **Budget Management:**

Item	Amount	Date and Comments
Approved Budget	£12,000	
Actual Spend to Date	£0.00	Budget spent
Projected Spend	TBC	
Variance From Agreed Budget	0%	

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
Plan in place.
- **Resources:**
Resource requirement and availability shall receive prioritisation once the dates and tasks for Brexit become more defined.
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
To be determined.
- **Comments:**
As we are currently in the immediate transition period we are still awaiting further understanding and direction.

[‘Portfolio of Projects’](#)

Project: Spelthorne Leisure Centre

Category: Priority Flagship

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
 - New facility with greater capacity to address the leisure needs of the residents of Spelthorne
 - Long term public health of residents
 - New facility addressing leisure needs of residents
 - Greater capacity with broader range of facilities
 - Fit for purpose
 - Future proofing for the growing population
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Concluded feasibility work and site review
 - Cabinet Member Presentation – Scheme proposals
 - Cabinet Approval to launch Public Consultation
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Public Consultation to run from 28 February to 25 March 2020
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

Risks:

Issues:
- **Budget Management:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Regular and on-going information sharing with:-

 - Management team
 - Councillors
 - Residents
 - Design Team

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis, and monthly updates are made to Cabinet.
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

CONFIDENTIAL
- **Comments:**

CONFIDENTIAL

Project: White House Redevelopment (Phase 1)

Category: Priority Flagship

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
 - To provide 27 single living hostel room and 4 studios for 'move on' purposes
 - To provide much needed hostel accommodation for homeless in the Borough
 - To meet the Council's obligations under the Homelessness Reduction Act
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Contract with Main Contractor completed
 - 'Pre-Commencement Conditions' information submitted and some conditions discharged
 - Hoarding and initial setting out works underway
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Discharge of Planning 'Pre-commencement' conditions
 - Piling to commence 9 March 2020
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

Risks:

Issues:
- **Budget Management:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Regular and on-going information sharing with:-

 - Management team
 - Councillors
 - Design Team
- **Resources:**
 - Asset Management / Property Development
 - Project Team
 - Legal
 - Procurement
 - Communications
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

CONFIDENTIAL
- **Comments:**

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

CONFIDENTIAL

Project: Ceaser Court Redevelopment Phase I

Category: Priority Flagship

RAG Status: Amber

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
 - To provide 55 x 1 and 2 bed apartments
 - To provide much needed housing in the Borough
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Brickwork and drainage work started early so as to mitigate delay from the steel order/delivery
 - Steelwork erection completed
 - Drainage channels completed
 - Partitioning has begun on ground and first floors
 - Window installation completed to ground, first and second floors
 - Utility trenches dug and water and gas connected
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Deck concreting and roof covering
 - Floor beam installation
 - Windows prepared
 - Partitioning to be completed ground, first and second floors
 - First fix to show flats
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

Risks:

Issues:
- **Budget Management:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Regular and on-going information sharing with:-

 - Management team
 - Councillors
 - Design Team

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis, and monthly updates are made to Cabinet.
- **Resources:**
 - Asset Management / Property Development
 - Project Team
 - Legal
 - Procurement
 - Communications
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

CONFIDENTIAL
- **Comments:**

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

CONFIDENTIAL

Project: Ceaser Court Redevelopment Phase II

Category: Priority Flagship

RAG Status: Amber

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
 - To provide 36 x 1 bedroom, 2 and 3 bedroom apartments plus community space
 - To provide much needed housing in the Borough
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Issued Tenders to 3 contractors
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Planning determination – targeting submission for April 2020 Planning Committee
 - ‘Mind-Tender’ interviews due on 14 February
 - Completion of ‘Pre-Tender’ enquiries
 - Completion of planning negotiations
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

Risks:

Issues:
- **Budget Management:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Regular and on-going information sharing with:-

 - Management team
 - Councillors
 - Design Team

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis, and monthly updates are made to Cabinet.
- **Resources:**
 - Asset Management / Property Development
 - Project Team
 - Legal
 - Procurement
 - Communications
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

CONFIDENTIAL
- **Comments:**

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

[‘Portfolio of Projects’](#)

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 6 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

CONFIDENTIAL

Project: Waterfront Redevelopment in Staines

Category: Priority Flagship

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
 - Regeneration of Staines-upon-Thames waterfront.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - First Round of interviews have been conducted.
 - Second Round of interviews have concluded.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Third and Fourth Round of interviews commence – 26 February 2020.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

Risks:

Issues:
- **Budget Management:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Regular and on-going information sharing with:-

 - Management team
 - Councillors
 - Design Team

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis, and monthly updates are made to Cabinet.
- **Resources:**
 - Asset Management / Property Development
 - Project Team
 - Legal
 - Procurement
 - Communications
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

CONFIDENTIAL
- **Comments:**

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

CONFIDENTIAL

Project: Ashford Multi-Storey Car Park (AMSCP)

Category: Priority Flagship

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
To provide a development scheme which shall include housing.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Consultations with Ward Councillors.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Progress with Feasibility Study to review viable options so as to inform Local Ward Councillors.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis
Risks:
Issues:
- **Budget Management:**
CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
Regular and on-going information sharing with:-
 - Management team
 - Councillors
 - Residents
 - Design Team
 - Construction Team

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis, and monthly updates are made to Cabinet.
- **Resources:**
Asset Management / Property Development
Project Team
Legal
Procurement
Communications
Enforcement
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
CONFIDENTIAL
- **Comments:**
Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

['Portfolio of Projects'](#)

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 8 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

CONFIDENTIAL

Project: Thameside House

Category: Priority Flagship

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
 - To provide much needed housing in the Borough
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Planning Application submitted – 01st November 2019
 - Waste strategy changed to underground bin storage
 - Registration – week commencing 10 February 2020
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Planning determination – target May 2020 Planning Committee.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

Risks:

Issues:
- **Budget Management:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Regular and on-going information sharing with:-

 - Management team
 - Councillors
 - Design Team

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis, and monthly updates are made to Cabinet.
- **Resources:**
 - Asset Management / Property Development
 - Project Team
 - Legal
 - Procurement
 - Communications
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

CONFIDENTIAL
- **Comments:**

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

CONFIDENTIAL

Project: Knowle Green Conversion – West Wing

Category: Priority Flagship

RAG Status: Amber

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
 - To provide 25 new apartments
 - To provide much needed housing in the Borough
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Lift A installation completed.
 - PV installation commenced.
 - Staircase demolition has commenced.
 - Delay to staircase.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Complete roof works including PVs.
 - Removal of 'northern' staircase.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

Risks:

Issues:
- **Budget Management:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Regular and on-going information sharing with:-

 - Management team
 - Councillors
 - Design Team

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis, and monthly updates are made to Cabinet.
- **Resources:**
 - Asset Management / Property Development
 - Project Team
 - Legal
 - Procurement
 - Communications
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

CONFIDENTIAL
- **Comments:**

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

CONFIDENTIAL

Project: Ashford Hospital Car Park

Category: Priority Flagship

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
 - Proposal to include 115 new homes
 - To provide much need housing in the Borough
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Vacant Possession of site obtained from NHS.
 - Main Contract Tender Enquiries answered.
 - Enabling tree works – Completed 4 January 2020
 - Enabling asbestos removal works completed.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Site hoarding to commence 10 February 2020
 - Targeting Planning Committee March 2020
 - Tender Returns – end of March 2020.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

Risks:

Issues:
- **Budget Management:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Regular and on-going information sharing with:-

 - Management Team
 - Councillors
 - Design team

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis, and monthly updates are made to Cabinet.
- **Resources:**
 - Asset Management / Property Development
 - Project Team
 - Legal
 - Procurement
 - Communications
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

CONFIDENTIAL
- **Comments:**

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

CONFIDENTIAL

Project: Southern Light Railway (SLR)

Category: Flagship

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**

The SLR will deliver a light rail route from Staines-upon-Thames to Heathrow airport. It can be delivered in advance of the expansion of the airport to provide a third runway. It will 'join up journeys' and provide a complementary service to that of heavy rail. There would be a connection with the main rail network at Staines –upon-Thames station (to provide a seamless journey from Central, south and west London as well as from the wider south east).

A light rail solution allows for additional stations to provide a new public transport interchange closer to the town centre, as well as a station close to the airport.

The scheme will run alongside an existing railway for part of the route and then immediately to the east of the M25, linking into T5 or the new terminal (and option to then link to CTA, other Terminals, Cargo etc.).

Key benefits include:-

- Connectivity to the airport from the south (including London and wider south east)
- 7 minutes to airport, every 6 minutes
- 24/7 connectivity to the airport for local residents (98% reliability)
- Act as a catalyst for further regeneration of the town centre 'Airport City'
- Park and Ride Parkway to help alleviate traffic closer to Stanwell Moor and Stanwell (Heathrow are proposing 25,000 space car park on the doorstep of these communities)
- Minimises impact on Staines Moor SSSI compared to a heavy rail solution

- **Progress Against Milestones:**

CONFIDENTIAL

- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

CONFIDENTIAL

- Risks:

- Issues:

- **Budget Management:**

CONFIDENTIAL

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

SBC key delivery partners:

Legal

Procurement

Comms

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis.

Project: Southern Light Railway (SLR) (cont'd.):

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 12 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

External key delivery partners:

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis.

- **Resources:**

Project Lead Daniel Mouawad

Staff resource Heather Morgan Group Head Regeneration and Growth
Michael Graham, Head of Corporate Governance
Ann Biggs, Strategic Planning Manager

External To be determined.

- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

Project start date Jan 2018

Anticipated completion 2023

- **Comments:**

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis.

*** New Project ***

CONFIDENTIAL

Project: Harper House Redevelopment

Category: Priority Flagship

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
 - To provide 20 units of emergency accommodation.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Bat license obtained.
 - Demolition started.
 - Party wall award completed.
 - Main contract completed.
 - Design Team novated.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Main work starts on site - March 2020.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

Risks:

Issues:
- **Budget Management:**

CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Regular and on-going information sharing with:-

 - Management Team
 - Councillors
 - Design team

Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis, and monthly updates are made to Cabinet.
- **Resources:**
 - Asset Management / Property Development
 - Project Team
 - Legal
 - Procurement
 - Communications
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

CONFIDENTIAL
- **Comments**

As this is a recently initiated project the documentation and updates are still being prepared. Therefore further information shall follow, else any queries can be directed to the Project Office in the first instance, or alternatively the Asset Management Team.

['Portfolio of Projects'](#)

Project: Oast House

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 14 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\r5yeroqa.docx

Category: Priority flagship

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
Provision of much needed housing within the Borough, along with the same of an 'arts space' facility.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Appointment of 'Design Team' – concluded 2019 for mobilise in January 2020.
 - Survey of Listed Building.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Jan/Feb – Parameter Analysis/optimize Feasibility Study.
 - March – Commence design development.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis
Risks:
Issues:
- **Budget Management:**
CONFIDENTIAL - Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis, and monthly updates are made to Cabinet.
- **Resources:**

- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
CONFIDENTIAL
- **Comments:**
Reported directly to Development Investment Group on a two weekly basis

['Portfolio of Projects'](#)

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 15 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

Project: Root and Branch Review

Category: Flagship

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**

To identify efficiencies and savings wherever feasible and improved processes to ensure the authority delivers its services in the most effective manner for the Council and residents. There are likely to be some 'cashable' savings, but, most are likely to be 'non-cashable'.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - End of 'Basic Discovery' – completed to schedule.
 - End of 'Phase 1 Discovery' ("Staff Impacting") – delayed due to capacity and engagement difficulties.
 - End of 'Phase 1 Discovery' ("Customer Impacting") – significantly delayed due to increased detail of discovery and engagement difficulties.
 - End of 'Phase 2 Discovery' – timescales reviewed with 8 month plan (from September 2019) on schedule.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Review of Project (internal) – from late April 2020
 - Presentation of R&B Project (May 2018-April 2020) outputs – in May 2020
 - Proposal for 'Annual Continuous Improvement Function for The Council' – for commencement in June 2020.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

Risks:

 1. **Lack of Officer resource in R&B Project:-** Likelihood 4 x Impact 5 = **Risk Score: 20**
 2. **Difficulty engaging with Staff:-** Likelihood 4 x Impact 5 = **Risk Score: 20**
 3. **Difficulty with Staff not being 'open':-** Likelihood 3 x Impact 4 = **Risk Score: 12**
 4. **Resistance to change/'Silo' working:-** Likelihood 3 x Impact 4 = **Risk Score: 12**
 5. **Loss of project focus due to breadth of task:-** Likelihood 3 x Impact 4 = **Risk Score: 12**
 6. **Outputs are insufficient for MAT/Cabinet:-** Likelihood 3 x Impact 4 = **Risk Score: 12**

Issues:
None offered.
- **Budget Management:**

Projects coming out of Root and Branch being costed and delivery plan being constructed to identify priority areas and any invest to save growth items which provide opportunities for efficiency savings.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Regular and on-going meetings with:-

 - Staff team and individual level
 - Management Team and Group Heads

Project: Root and Branch Review (cont'd:)

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 16 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

- Communication developed and issued on Spelnet together with IT tips - monthly updates on both IT tips and root and branch ideas and successes.
- **Resources:**
 - Delivery:

Business analyst for ICT started April and workload high. Resourcing – recruitment progressing to bring the Team numbers back to strength.
 - Post-delivery / Implementation:

Once have implementation plans likely to involve ICT solutions – availability of resource across the organisation likely to be a significant risk.
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

End of April 2020.
- **Comments:**

Project: Office 365 Upgrade

Category: Flagship

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**

The current Microsoft product is being replaced with the Office 365 product.
As Office 365 is a hosted product, the training programme, along with the actual roll-out, shall prove to be 'significant'.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Work has commenced with '3C' to set up 'Exchange' online.
 - One Test Box has been moved and is functioning successfully.
 - Voicemail has also been set up online and is working for the 'Test User'.
 - Work continues with Egress and Mailsafe to get their products working with our Office 365 environment before moving live users.
 - We hope to start moving users in the New Year. One issue is that
 - Most of ICT have Office 365 installed and are doing some testing on it's use (not a formal testing programme yet)
 - Requirement to recruit temporary Staff to assist with the remaining elements of the project – Skype for Business, Teams, SharePoint – cultural change etc.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

Risks:
Resource to deliver.

Issues:
Staff still on Exchange 2016 will need to log into Office 365 to see the calendars of those migrated, so we will be looking to move users across fairly quickly once the process has begun.
- **Budget Management:**
 - Budget requirement has been identified in time for 20/21 bids.
 - The 'Corporate Document Management Capital Budget is being used for this project and shall need to be 'Carried Forward'.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
- **Resources:**

Need trainers to be identified and in place when roll out commences – increasing ICT Staff numbers should assist with this.
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

2020 and fully operational by 2021.
- **Comments:**

Project: Heathrow Launch Pad (Incubator)

Category: Flagship

RAG Status: Red

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
 - The anticipated project completion date of September 2019 has not been realised due to ongoing issues with finalising a suitable location.
 - Following the council's purchase of the Summit Centre at Sunbury Cross it is now hoped that the incubator project will be housed in the lower ground floor area. Once finalised there will be the need for some minor alterations to the functional layout.
 - Although progress has been slower than envisaged it has provided time to research other incubator models and the introduction to CoTribe, who remain committed to the project.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Costings will need to be revisited once the venue is finalised.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

Risks:
The main risk to this project has been the change of locations, there have been 8 different locations identified for the incubator to date. However it is preferable to occupy premises owned by the Council rather than renting externally.

Issues:
- **Budget Management:**

Budget of £150K has been ring-fenced to cover initial life of the project from the business rate retention pilot.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Stakeholders have been kept up to date. Plans are in place to introduce key stakeholders to the space to ensure commitment to support the project. Meetings have taken place with both SETSquared (a global business incubator and accelerator) based at Surrey University and the Royal Holloway University to pick up on previous discussions.

Internally, meetings and conversations have taken place with:

 - ICT – who have provided a proposal for the installation and management of the ICT.
 - Asset Management who can assist with the preparations of the location to make it fit for purpose
 - Legal Services – who are managing the current negotiations with the Landlord.
 - Communications – who have been briefed to prepare a Communications plan.
- **Resources:**
- All resources have been identified and no issues are anticipated. The final plans cannot be drafted until we have access to the building and so full resource requirements are unclear. However, as previously stated, much work has been carried out previously when preparing for other locations, so a significant amount of knowledge has been built up, as well as contacts.
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
- Accessing and renting a space/building is key to the success of the incubator. Subject to no major delays with the finalising of the purchase of the building it is hoped that occupancy will take place in April 2020 in order for a time frame of September 2020 if not before, to be achieved.

Project: Heathrow Launch Pad (Incubator) (cont'd:)

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 19 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

- **Comments:**

- **The project had been given a 'Red' status due to:**

- Deadlines for milestones have been missed as the location for the incubator was withdrawn at a several separate locations. As soon as the an occupancy date is agreed, a delivery date will be confirmed but is expected to be no later than September 2020.
 - The project was in Red due to missing the deadlines, but now the deadline has now been re-set due to unforeseen circumstances.

Project: Fordbridge Day Centre (Extension)

Category: Flagship

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
Additional floor space for use by the Centre's visitors.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Planning Application approved – 5 February 2020
 - Design received.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Prepare and complete Tender Specification.
 - Tenders return and review.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

Risks:

 1. **Build cost inflation considerations:-** Likelihood 3 x Impact 3 = **Risk Score: 9**

Issues:

 1. Need to agree pedestrian access layout with highways officer.
 2. Full structural drawings not yet produced ~ which shall delay tendering the project.
- **Budget Management:**

Item	Amount	Date and Comments
Approved Budget	£130k	
Actual Spend to Date	£5.449k	
Projected Spend		
Variance From Agreed Budget	£124.551k	Unspent

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
Regular and on-going information sharing with:-
 - Management Team
 - Councillors
 - Design team
 - Contractors
 - Day Centre manager
- **Resources:**
 - Asset Management / Property Development
 - Project Team
 - Legal
 - Procurement
 - Communications
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
June 2020 – subject to Planning timelines
- **Comments:**

['Portfolio of Projects'](#)

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 21 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

Project: General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) Steps to Compliance

Category: High

RAG Status: Red

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**

To achieve compliance and avoid risks.

- **Progress Against Milestones:**

Many services have failed to meet the deadlines in the DP Compliance Plan for Services.

- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

Risks:

1. **IC fine following non-compliance:-** Likelihood: 3 x Impact: 5 = **Risk Score: 15**
2. **Further compensation claims following non-compliance:-** Likelihood: 4 x Impact: 5 = **Risk Score: 20**
3. **Reputational damage following non-compliance:-** Likelihood: 4 x Impact: 5 = **Risk Score: 20**
4. **Loss of Public confidence following non-compliance:-** Likelihood: 4 x Impact: 5 = **Risk Score: 20**

Issues:

1. Non-compliance with data protection legislation. Increased risk from 25 May 2018 when GDPR became enforceable.
2. Compensation claims following non-compliance.
3. Lack of engagement by many staff.
4. Despite support by MAT+ of the DP compliance plan for services; the original deadlines were not met and continue not to be met (despite reassurances at MAT+).
5. Failure of some staff to attend meetings.
6. Failure of some staff to complete work identified in Information Asset Register meetings.
7. Failure of many managers to comply with timelines for Data Protection Compliance Plan for services.

- **Budget Management:**

No budget.

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Regular and on-going information sharing with MAT+. Data protection compliance plan for services supported by MAT+.

- **Resources:**

All departments/staff who process personal data are involved however many staff view data protection as an “add on”. There are numerous flows of personal data into and out of the council across many services. Demonstrating compliance with the GDPR is only one of its manually-intensive requirements which has a significant impact on all departments. Some services have moved staff from other tasks in order to concentrate on data protection.

- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

It is difficult to anticipate a completion date. MAT+ agreed that the Compliance Plan for services is a priority.

Project: General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) Steps to Compliance (cont'd:)

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 22 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

- **Comments:**

Current status of the project: significantly behind schedule.

In November 2019 a German company received the first GDPR fine triggered by their non-compliance with data retention apparently due to their use of a software system that did not automatically delete obsolete information.

The case is important because there was no misuse of actual data but a breach of admin obligations under GDPR. Many SBC services are not complying with their retention periods, even in those areas that have software systems that are capable of deleting personal information that is outside of its retention period.

Project: Electronic Document and Records Management System (EDRMS)

Category: High

RAG Status: Green

• **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**

The main benefits of EDRMS are:

- Document security rules advised, implemented and adhered to (public and sensitive)
- Easier retrieval and linking of documentation
- Effective management of documents in relation to retention and destruction
- Reduction in paper usage and storage facilities
- Meeting GDPR requirements

Departments currently benefitting the most from the service:

- Building Control
- Planning
- Environmental Health
- Some work in relation to assets also undertaken

• **Progress Against Milestones:**

- Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Planning DM, Building Control, Leisure Services, Licencing and Pollution file scanning continues.
 - Knowledge sharing with Office Services has commenced, with relevant training being conducted.
 - Cemetery, Internment Forms, SPAN Alarm forms and DFG have all started in February 2020.
 - Planning Application submitted.
- Next period Key Activities:-
 - Continue with scanning requirements.

• **Identified Risks and Issues:**

Risks:

1. **Originals are destroyed before scanning:-** Likelihood: 3 x Impact: 4 = **Risk Score: 12**
2. **Data quality and retrieval time concerns:-** Likelihood: 2 x Impact: 5 = **Risk Score: 10**

Issues:

1. Space concerns – files and filing cabinets.
2. Data retrieval.
3. Data retrieval for FOI requirements.
4. Resource availability/priority of work.

• **Budget Management:**

Item	Amount	Date and Comments
Approved Budget	£61,200	
Actual Spend to Date	£13,284	
Projected Spend	£60,000	
Variance From Agreed Budget	TBA	Variance as a percentage (%)

Stakeholder Engagement:

Discussed at MAT, so the Group Heads are aware.

['Portfolio of Projects'](#)

Project: Electronic Data Resource Management System (EDRMS) (cont'd;)

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 24 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

- **Resources:**
One Team Member is now assisting with Planning DM projects.
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
Required actions and volume terms to be discussed on an on-going basis until all services requiring back scanning are project scoped.
- **Comments:**
 - Review of longer term scanning strategy [autumn/winter 2019/20](#)
 - Currently fully evaluating amount of material to be scanned with retention times allocated – if start with recent material may be able to remove and destroy older material as it goes past the retention period. Retention periods widely differ between departments from 6/7 years to indefinitely so each section will need to be evaluated separately.
 - The Council has a number of document management systems and need to evaluate whether those we have or a new one is the best long term solution for the Council.
 - The systems available do not easily ‘talk’ to each other, so which ever route new system focus on one, or two, will involve some expense.
 - It is likely Sharepoint will be utilised once Office 365 is implemented as it comes as part of the package. This will be a new version of Sharepoint as the current version becomes unsupported by 2020.

Project: Corporate Hybrid Printing

Category: High

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
Project hopes to deliver real, and substantial, savings in the Authority's printing, postage and advertising expenditure plus time efficiencies whereby staff will not have to "stuff" envelopes. Once the contract is in place be more effective in measuring outputs
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Agreement reached to seek a short term contract with a single supplier so as to glean additional information for the longer term service.
 - Business Case signed-off by Project Sponsor.
 - Project Plan seeks to commence with the Live/Pilot service by Summer 2020.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Specification document to seek Procurement sign-off.
 - Seek MAT approval to progress.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
Risks: Resource availability to deliver.
Issues: Obtaining all relevant data from services
- **Budget Management:**
To be advised.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
'Key Delivery Partners'
 - Legal / Procurement
 - ICT
 - Communications
 - Finance
 - Customer Services and Elections
- **Resources:**
Project managers allocated and taking forward with procurement staff.
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
June 2020.
- **Comments:**

['Portfolio of Projects'](#)

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 26 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\r5yeroqa.docx

**Project: Rent Management and Homelessness System Replacement Project –
Integra and CIVICA**

Category: High

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
 - Replacement of the client recording element of the Emergency Accommodation (Bed and Breakfast placements) monitoring system which is no longer fit for purpose and no longer supported, allowing for it to be decommissioned.
 - Replacement of the current Rent Assure Scheme (SRA) management processes (mainly spreadsheets) by a system developed within Civica to record and monitor all aspects of the 'people' (Landlord and tenant) element of the scheme in a more structured way.
 - Development and Roll out of an overnight interface between Locata (Housing management system) and Civica to automatically replicate/ update customer information entered into Locata within Civica hence negating the need to create customers and stop double entry in both systems. Also minimises risk of errors.
 - Introduction of a weekly interface between Integra and Academy Housing Benefits system to update client payments status
 - Development of a system of recording both B&B and SRA payments on Integra to include monitoring of rent account status and a series of debt management letters generated based on non-payment of rent.
 - Benefits include :
 - the improved ability to monitor and manage placements into accommodation in both areas;
 - the mitigation of risks around the software used being unfit for purpose or difficult to navigate;
 - negates the need to double enter financial information in 2 systems and the potential of errors occurring during this process;
 - better transparency and continuity between the Civica and Integra data held.

- **Progress Against Milestones:**

A revised timeline project plan was produced in September 2019 amalgamating the two projects. Target dates are to start parallel running in December and go live in Feb 2020. Milestone dates have been issued to the Project Board and development team.

On track to deliver the Homelessness System replacement by the end of March 2020.

**Project: Rent Management and Homelessness System Replacement Project –
Integra and CIVICA (cont'd:)**

Milestone	Owner	Due
Complete data cleansing on B&B (incl. write off/refunds)	ES	End October
Develop script and upload cleansed data to SL	JH	End Nov
Update current B&B system with cleansed data	ES	End Nov
Test and sign off e-form development	ES	End October
Develop scripts to generate escalation letters in SL	JH	Mid Nov
Agree operating procedures for parallel running financial elements	ES/JH	End Nov
Agree and develop suite of monitoring reports and alerts	ES/JH	End Nov
Start Parallel Running	ES/JH	Start Dec
SOFT Go Live		Start Feb
CIVICA		
Set up Civica with all properties and clients	LSF	Complete
Complete B&B letter templates on Civica	LSF	End Nov
Map and agree Civica & Locata processes	LSF	End Nov
Start Parallel Running	ES/JH	Start Dec
SOFT Go Live		Start Feb

• **Identified Risks and Issues:**

Risks:

1. **Reconciliation of Integra and B&B systems for parallel running:-** Likelihood 3 x Impact 4 = **Risk Score: 12**
2. **All element being ready on time for parallel running:-** Likelihood 3 x Impact 3 = **Risk Score: 9**
3. **Resource availability to deliver project requirements:-** Likelihood 4 x Impact 4 = **Risk Score: 16**

Issues:

None recorded.

**Project: Rent Management and Homelessness System Replacement Project –
Integra and CIVICA (cont'd: -)**

- **Budget Management:**

Project on budget. There have been no change control items affecting costs. To date all of the known costs have been paid. There is no residual budget for this project.

Item	Amount	Date and Comments
Approved Budget	£22.5K	
Actual Spend to Date	£22.5K	Budget spent
Projected Spend		
Variance From Agreed Budget		0%

Civica module – cost £17.5K, (Paid)

Locata interface development cost £7.5K (Paid)

Ad hoc expenses for training - £500 (Paid)

Integra development work – FOC – Sourced internally

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Regular fortnightly development sub team meetings are scheduled for the duration of the project. Monthly Project Board meetings are also scheduled. Both meetings include representatives from Housing, Finance, and ICT. In addition the head of Commissioning and Transformation attends the project board meetings.

Legal, Procurement and Comms have no input into the delivery of this project at this point in time.

Updates have been provided to staff through team meetings and training sessions.

- **Resources:**

Additional resource to help Housing in the delivery of the project has been agreed. A resource from Finance has been identified to work alongside Housing until the end of the year for 2 days per week and an additional temporary resource is due to be recruited to assist with the financial administration tasks.

- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

Full roll out of the project is anticipated to be by the end of the 2019/20 financial year.

- **Comments:**

Project: Large Scale Voluntary Transfer (LSVT) Update

Category: High

RAG Status: Amber

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
Changes needed to the current LSVT ensure a legal basis for ongoing increased supply of former Airways Housing Units and any new builds since LSVT date.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
LSVT changes have been agreed in principle with A2D and with both organisations. Legal teams to finalise. Legal requested to follow up in November and December
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
Risks:
Failure to update the LSVT may disadvantage Spelthorne with reference to Housing nominations from A2Dominion ongoing.
Issues:
- **Budget Management:**
There is no cost associated with the project to update the LSVT agreement. Ongoing 'Legal Services' costs.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
A2D are the main stakeholders. They are fully engaged with the process.
- **Resources:**
There is still some legal input from both sides to progress the LSVT and the Search Moves contracts. Spelthorne Legal Services are actively chasing.
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
February 2020
- **Comments:**
Please note this was agreed some years ago. The issues in principle have been agreed between the two parties, however the legal teams (A2D and SBC) need to finalise.
This is taking a long time and we are over time.

Project: Replacement of Mitel/LiquidVoice Phone Systems

Category: High

RAG Status: Amber

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
Provide better customer experience allow for 1 number and automatic routing to departments. Integrated email routing facility. Customer service skilling and in built CRM history. Allow for add on such as live chat. Give Customer Services Greater control on managing front end options. Allow for phone calls to be routed for home working.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
Project has been restarted following procurement process being taken over by Legal Services meaning the tender process shall have to be re-initiated. Specification has been agreed and site visits have been undertaken band costing received. Integration with existing systems has been confirmed.
Went to Tender on 15th August 2019.
6 bidders were confirmed – after scoring shortlist of 3 were invited to interview stage on 12th November.
Award letter sent to Netcall on the 21st November
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
Risks:
Disaster Recovery considerations to be fully understood and risks mitigated.
Issues:
- **Budget Management:**
Expenditure is anticipated to be in the £50,000 - £90,000 range as the ultimate delivery shall be dependent upon our module selection/use it is anticipated that a phased install will allow for costs to be spread.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
ICT, Customer Relations, Procurement/Legal and the various service lines as necessary.
- **Resources:**
ICT (delivery) and general Staff for training.
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
End of 2019 / early 2020 though this shall be very much dependent upon resource availability during the delivery phase.
- **Comments:**
The telephony comes with a CRM (Customer Relations Management) system, and it may lead to the discontinuation of the Civica version which will be evaluated prior to implementation.

Contract negotiations are ongoing.

['Portfolio of Projects'](#)

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 31 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

Project: Enforcement Agents

Category: High

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
Commenced June 2019.
Discussions are underway with Procurement and Legal as to a one year 'collaboration' trial period in advance of a potential 'Joint Venture agreement.
Provision of an 'in-house' enforcement service is to be considered alongside the option/potential to extend that service Surrey-wide.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
Risks:
Issues:
- **Budget Management:**
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
To be declared.
- **Comments:**
Joint Venture considerations currently being pursued.

Project: Knowle Green Works/Project Claude

Category: High

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
To provide modern and fit-for-purpose facilities by conducting the:-
 - Refurbishment of WCs and showers
 - Creation of new disabled toilets and showers
 - Refurbishment of the Social Club and kitchen
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Delayed appointment of contractor and delayed start on site.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Tender Review and appointments for kitchenette, toilets and washrooms.
 - Design review for the Social Club
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

Risks:

 1. **Contractor timeframe problems:-** Likelihood 3 x Impact 3 = **Risk Score: 9**
 2. **Design Approval:-** Likelihood 3 x Impact 4 = **Risk Score: 12**
 3. **Staff inconvenience:-** Likelihood 5 x Impact 3 = **Risk Score: 15**

Issues:

 1. Management’s approval of budget for Social Club works.
- **Budget Management:**

Item	Amount	Date and Comments
Approved Budget	£184,000	
Actual Spend to Date		
Projected Spend		
Variance From Agreed Budget		

The £184k figure is for the toilet refurbishments only. The work for the Social Club is to be tendered separately.

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
Plan in place and being progressed.
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
Summer 2020
- **Comments:**

Project: Laleham Park Pavilion

Category: High

RAG Status: Red

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
 - To provide seasonal catering facility and reduce Health & Safety risks by the demolition of a redundant pavilion building
 - Provision of new toilet facilities.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Delay in Planning submission, due to presence of bats identified.
 - Planning Determination – October 2019.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Obtaining planning consent, to then enable the application of the European Protected Species License.
 - Tender of Contracts.

- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

Confidential

Risks:

Issues:

- **Budget Management:**

Item	Amount	Date and Comments
Approved Budget	£250K	
Actual Spend to Date	£25K	
Projected Spend		
Variance From Agreed Budget		Possible early overspend on Architect fees due to reappointment

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Regular and on-going information sharing with:-

 - Management Team
 - Councillors
 - Design team
 - Contractors
- **Resources:**
 - Asset Management / Property Development
 - Project Team
 - Legal
 - Procurement
 - Communications
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

May 2020 – subject to Protected Species license issue.
- **Comments:**

Anticipated completion date is subject to Planning and Ecology surveys being processed as quickly as possible.

['Portfolio of Projects'](#)

Project: Staines Jetty

Category: High

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**

To provide jetty facilities at a key strategic point upon the River Thames within the Borough. Activity to help deliver the long desired aim to make more of the River Thames as one of Spelthorne's key assets, to encourage visitors and support the visitor economy
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Contractor appointed.
 - Consent obtained from the EA for an 'Accommodation Licence'.
 - Planning Application submitted
 - The Planning Department have requested that several issues be addressed.
 - To go before the March 2020 Planning Committee.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Progress ecological assessment – in relation to plant and water-life.
 - Submit Planning Application – early January 2020.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
 - Risks:
 1. Realistic management of expectations (dates). This has now been addressed with a new date which there is every confidence that it will be achieved on or before that date. The major risk to the timescale is the possibility of prolonged inclement weather where the river is flooding. A plan of realistic timescales for delivery of this project has been developed and agreed with the contractor. Slippage should only occur if the winter weather is very wet and river levels are too high to carry out construction of the jetty
 2. The cost of the project is likely to increase by a few thousand pounds due to the ecological inspections, architect drawings of the site and to build a gate for the jetty that was not included in the original contract. However, additional funding has been identified via Neighbourhood Services.
 - Issues:
 1. Difficulties experienced whilst identifying skill set requirements, of local businesses, to conduct the necessary work. Limited availability of suitable local providers for this type of work. This is no longer an issue as the contract has been awarded and signed.
- **Budget Management:**

The River Thames Task Group, chaired by Cllr Leighton have been awarded £25k by the Leader to promote the river. This is the funding which would be used for this project. Meetings have been held with the contractor and the expectation is that this £25k funding will meet the design and build costs.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Councillors
MAT
Legal
Procurement
Environment Agency

Project: Staines Jetty (cont'd:)

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 35 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

- **Resources:**
River Thames Task Group
Economic Development Manager
Neighbourhood Services
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
The physical construction of the jetty is underway and this project is on course for a grand opening on 3rd April.
- **Comments:**
The River Thames Task Group meets on a regular basis and members of the group will be updated accordingly.

Project: Payment Allocation

Category: Medium

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Summary of Findings and Recommendation has been written.
 - Website improvements have been made ~ Capita changes are underway.
 - Improvements have been made to Invoice and Invoice timings.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Obtain the response to the Summary
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
 - Risks:
 - Issues:
- **Budget Management:**
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
- **Comments:**

This project may close due to other priorities..

Project: Main Reception Kiosk Install

Category: Medium

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
To provide electronic access to SBC's service for Members of the Public whilst attending in Main Reception at Knowle Green.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Commenced 'Tender Process' – quotes from three companies.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
Risks:
Issues:
- **Budget Management:**

Item	Amount	Date and Comments
Approved Budget	£12K	
Actual Spend to Date	£0	
Projected Spend	£12k	
Variance From Agreed Budget		0%

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
March 2020
- **Comments:**

Project: CIVICA Migration to SQL Server

Category: Medium

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Allocated space on the new server to receive the migrated data.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Contact CIVICA to start migration work.
 - Ongoing monitoring of data migration.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
 - Risks:
 - Issues:
- **Budget Management:**

No information supplied.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Plan to be prepared and implemented.
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
- **Comments:**

Project: Academy to 2012 / Ingres Upgrade

Category: Medium

RAG Status: Red

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Capita completed work to migrate the servers in Test
 - Testing carried out by ICT and System Administrators.
 - Migration work completed – weekend of 30 November 2019.
 - All scripts, integrations, printers and client machines updated.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Complete project.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
 - Risks:
 - Issues:
- **Budget Management:**

No information supplied.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Plan to be prepared and implemented.
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
- **Comments:**

Academy Migration to 2012 complete, however, Capita have not yet released the 'Ingres' upgrade, so the delivery is postponed.

Project: UNIFORM Disposal Module

Category: Medium

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Rule Creation and Testing by Environmental Health
 - Building Control - Test rule setup – awaiting feedback from dept.
 - Estates Management - Test rule setup – awaiting feedback from dept.
 - Street Naming & Numbering - Test rule setup – awaiting feedback from dept.
 - Planning - Test rule setup – awaiting feedback from dept.
 - Licensing - Test rule setup – awaiting feedback from dept.
 - Housing - Test rule setup – awaiting feedback from dept.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

Risks:

 1. **Non take up by Departments:-** Likelihood 4 x Impact 4 = **Risk Score: 16**

Issues:

 1. **Non take up by Departments.**
- **Budget Management:**

Item	Amount	Date and Comments
Approved Budget	£1k	
Actual Spend to Date	£750	
Projected Spend		
Variance From Agreed Budget		

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
- **Comments:**

['Portfolio of Projects'](#)

Project: 2008 R2 Upgrades to 2016

Category: Medium

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
 - Risks:
 - Issues:
- **Budget Management:**
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

Completed – except for Sharepoint which shall be progressed as part of the Office365 project.
- **Comments:**

Project: Property Management Software

Category: Medium

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
The Property Management Software is essential for the effective management of the Council's assets.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - Data entry:-
 - All properties
 - Property types
 - Property unit codes
 - Leases:-
 - Investment property entries continue
 - Municipal properties are about 50% entered via MOJO (Bluebox front-end).
 - E-Discussions with Dwellant about this product – implementation now on hold.
 - Technical training day completed.
 - Property Manager providing 'quality assurance'.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Bank account decision to be made – wish appropriate signatories.
 - Dwellant implementation and training.
 - Continue with 'quality assurance'.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
 - Risks:
 1. **GDPR data considerations:-** Likelihood: 1 x Impact: 5= **Risk Score: 5**
 - Issues:
 1. E-mail considerations.
 2. Bank Account concerns/considerations.
 3. Interface with Integra requirement.
 4. Lack of clarity as to roles and responsibilities.
 5. GDPR privacy requirement in contract.
 6. Lack of resource/capacity/availability.
 7. Lack of skillset (ICT) – for Test Plans.
 8. Lack of skillset (general technical).
 9. No parallel running opportunities.
 10. Data Loss.
 11. System integrity – confidence within Finance/Sales Ledger.
 12. Process concerns.

Project: Property Management Software (cont'd:)

- **Budget Management:**

Item	Amount	Date and Comments
Approved Budget	£226k	over 4 years including initial consultancy
Actual Spend to Date		
Projected Spend		
Variance From Agreed Budget		

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

The following departments have all been consulted in drafting the Business Requirements Document; ICT, Legal, Finance and Audit.
Fortnightly meetings are conducted.

- **Resources:**

- Fully resourced.

- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

September to December for uploading and migrating the data. Objective to run a rent raising exercise for the February month's rent charges and Go Live on 1st April 2020.

- **Comments:**

Project: Land Registry – LA Migration

Category: Medium

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
 - Risks:
 - Issues:
- **Budget Management:**
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
- **Comments:**

Project: Standardisation of Customer Forms

Category: Service

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
 - The forms shall have a ‘standard look and feel’
 - The information gleaned shall be current and relevant
 - Version control shall be incorporated – including timestamps
 - A central repository shall hold the completed forms
 - The forms which are converted into E-Forms will improve the ‘customer journey’ and reduce errors in data collection
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - 3 x Business Rates forms updated.
 - All updated forms published to customer website in a ‘downloadable’ format.
 - 2 x E-forms developed by ICT and have been approved by the Business Rates Manager.
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Continuation of review, development and updating of Customer Service forms and converting them into E-Forms.

- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

Risks:

1. **Teams availability:-** Likelihood: 5 x Impact: 2= **Risk Score: 10**
Mitigation:- Commence work with other Teams who are available
2. **Development time slippage:-** Likelihood: 4 x Impact: 4 = **Risk Score: 16**
Mitigation:- Ensure work with available Team/s continue to mitigate for lost time
3. **Legislation considerations:-** Likelihood: 3 x Impact: 2 = **Risk Score: 6**
4. **Variance/increase in number of forms causing increase in project delivery timescale/s:-** Likelihood: 3 x Impact: 3 = **Risk Score: 9**
5. **Corporate decision to use an alternative solution: -** Likelihood 3 x Impact 5 = **Risk Score: 15**

Issues:

None identified

- **Budget Management:**

Item	Amount	Date and Comments
Approved Budget	£12,500	
Actual Spend to Date	£450	
Projected Spend		
Variance From Agreed Budget	0%	

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
Communication Plan in place and being followed.
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
- **Comments:**

[‘Portfolio of Projects’](#)

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 46 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

Project: E-Form for Project Documentation

Category: Service

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
To deliver a more streamlined and 'user friendly' approach to gleaning and gathering data with the introduction of a more automated process.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last Period Key Achievements:-
 - Introduction of the 'Project Initiation Documentation and Highlight Report' xls document.
 - Next Period Key Activities:-
 - To build on the documentation requirements and incorporate them into a structure which can be supported by the E-form mechanisms.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
Risks:
Issues:
- **Budget Management:**
No budget associations.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
Ongoing and in consultation with the Group Heads as processes are being rolled out.
- **Resources:**
ICT
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
Spring 2020.
- **Comments:**

['Portfolio of Projects'](#)

***** New Project *****

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 47 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

Project: Revamp of Intranet (Spelnet)

Category: Service

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
 - Risks:
 - Issues:
- **Budget Management:**
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
- **Comments:**

Meeting in March with iGoss (Supplier) shall determine delivery dates.

['Portfolio of Projects'](#)

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 48 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

Project: Multi-use Bins in Parks

Category: Service

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
 - Potentially an annual saving due to a change in supplier
 - Staff time for other duties increased due to less bins to service
 - No loss of facilities for members of the public using the parks
 - Less “Clutter “ in parks with duplicated furniture
 - The level of dog bag usage is significantly reduced
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Lammas Park trial – Complete
 - Plan developed for parks across the borough
 - Installation of bins and signage has commenced at the first park (Littleton)
 - Survey work complete at 9 sites
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
None currently identified.
Risks:
Issues:
- **Budget Management:**
Figures to be provided for next report.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
Key Delivery Partners (ICT, Legal Services, Procurement and Communications) have been consulted with involvement of only the Communications Team being deemed as being required for delivery of this project.
- **Resources:**
 - Installation of new furniture and removal of redundant bins will be undertaken by in house staff.
 - Cost of external contractor to carry out this work was found to be excessive.
- **Start and Anticipated Dates:**

Started	To Commence	Completed
Woodthorpe Rd. Rec. – Mar. '19*	Studios Rd.	Lammas Park – Nov. '18
Stanwell Moor Rec. – Mar. '19*	Splash Meadow	Littleton Rec. – Feb. '19*
Shepperton Rec. – Mar. '19*	Groveley Rec.	
Staines Park – Mar. '19*	Alexandra Rd. Rec.	
Bishop Duppas Park – Mar. '19*	Kenyngton Manor Rec.	
Russell Rd. – Mar. '19*	Nuthatch Close	
Long Lane – Mar. '19*	Russell Rd.	
Feltham Hill Rd. Rec. – Mar. '19*	Greenfield Rec.	
Woodlands Parade – Mar. '19*	Manor Park	
	Clockhouse Rec.	
	Fordbridge Park	

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 49 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

	Fordbridge North	
	Moormede	
	Halliford Green (by Goat)	
	Cedars Rec.	
	Sunbury Park	
	Rivermead Island	
	Lower Hampton Rd.	
	Flowerpot Green	
	Old Bathing Station	
	Halliford Park	
	Donkey Meadow	
	Littleton Green	
	Manor Farm Avenue	
	Woodthorpe Rec.	
	Hetherington Rec.	
	Catlin Crescent	
	Hengrove Rec.	
	Village Park	
	Staines Riverside	
	Birch Green	

Nb. Sites marked with an asterisk (*) are those which have undergone surveys.

- **Comments:**
 - Following the trial at Lammas Park, there has been no negative feedback received.
 - Survey work has been completed at the first 9 sites on the list
 - Orders placed for new furniture
 - Bases completed at Littleton, awaiting delivery of bins
 - Littleton Rec now completed.
 - We have no dedicated budget for the installation of new furniture and are reliant on staff carrying out this on overtime.
 - Other pressures have resulted in a delay in carrying out this work.
 - We have now sourced quotations from external contractors to carry out this work.
 - We are using the most advantageous of quotes received.
 - Anticipate completion of Long Lane Rec and Woodthorpe Rec by mid-September.

Project: Wetland Habitat Project

Category: Service

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
The project chiefly encompasses the restoration of the river Ash (approx. 300m) section south of Bronzefield prison, this will provide a varied flow and an increase in habitat value. Seasonal ponds will also be created to provide riparian habitat. It was originally hoped that a looped walk could be created incorporating the existing pond to the rear of the prison, but this might not be achievable, instead a walkway will be created to the east of the pond, still creating a circular path (River Ash walk).

- Ecological enhancement
- Increased recreational value

- **Progress Against Milestones:**

- **Last Period Key Achievements:**

- Tender for detail specification of works via – contractor attained.

- **Next Period Key Activities:**

- Stakeholder agreement with final detail design.

- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

Risks:

Issues:

- **Budget Management:**

Item	Amount	Date and Comments
Approved Budget	£23k	Capital funding
External Funding	£58,490	
Total Funding	£81,490	
Actual Spend to Date	£	Budget spent
Projected Spend		
Variance From Agreed Budget		0%

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

- **Resources:**

- **Anticipated Completion Date:**

The Project Delivery date has now shifted to between September and November 2020.

- **Comments:**

Project: Refurbishment of Laleham Park Play Area

Category: Service

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
Neighbourhood Services are responsible for the management of all Council owned play areas within Spelthorne. This play area has been installed for a long period of time and is in need of refurbishment
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Two tenders were received in January 2019
 - Both tenders were not quite right for the area
 - Will work with Asset Management to review what is going to be installed and then work out the requirement for the area.

- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
Risks: Installing equipment in the correct season.
Issues:

- **Budget Management:**

Item	Amount	Date and Comments
Approved Budget	£60,000	
Actual Spend to Date		
Projected Spend		
Variance From Agreed Budget		

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
- **Resources:**
Key Delivery Partners include:-
 - Asset Management
 - Finance
 - Legal
 - Communications
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
Currently 'ongoing' due to research in the latest equipment becoming available.
- **Comments:**
Project withdrawn/paused whilst Asset Management progress with work to the pavilion. When that work is completed this project shall be reassessed.

Project: Commercial Waste

Category: Service

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
Risks:
Issues:
- **Budget Management:**

Item	Amount	Date and Comments
Approved Budget		£450,000 anticipated spend.
Actual Spend to Date		
Projected Spend		
Variance From Agreed Budget		

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
Awaiting Cabinet approval for project commencement.
- **Comments:**

Project: Bartec for 'Refuse Enquiries'

Category: Service

RAG Status: Amber

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
Those identified thus far include:-
 - Time and Cost savings
 - Reduction in calls to the service
 - Improved all-round Customer experience
 - Reduction in paper process/usage
 - In Depot reporting/analysis
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
The relevant Project Documentation is currently being prepared.
 - **Last Period Key Achievements:**
 - Confirmation (from ICT) that the API is installed and active.
 - **Next Period Key Activities:**
 - Define process flows and sign-off
 - Bartec development of API ~ if required.
 - Spelthorne's building and development of the E-Form.
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
Risks:
 - 1. **Software:-** Likelihood 3 x Impact 4 = **Risk Score: 12**Issues:
 - 1. **Project timeframe/delivery delay.**
- **Budget Management:**
To be confirmed.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
To be confirmed.
- **Comments:**

Project: Enterprise Project – iDOX (Planning)

Category: Service

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**

Improved processes by the use of workload reports to identify red/amber/green status of target dates. Listing officer workload priorities to assist with allocation of cases and management of officer workload to help with achieving target dates for determination. Greater use of electronic systems and consultations to enable working towards being paper lite. This will help to improve workload monitoring, achieve greater accuracy and efficiency and assist in meeting Government Performance Targets.
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
 - Last period Key Achievements:-
 - New process set up for 'Authorisation of Decisions' via Uniform.
 - All acknowledgements, site notices, Public Speaking letters and statutory consultees set to be E-mailed directly from Uniform and stored in EDRMS.
 - All invalid letters to be generated directly from Uniform and stored in EDRMS.
 - Delegated Report generated from Uniform (as a Word document to allow track changes by Authorising Officer).
 - Decision Notices generated directly from Uniform and E-mailed to Agent (or printed if no E-mail address).
 - Next period Key Activities:-
 - Continue testing DM and ENF Mobile Apps.
 - Develop Enterprise – 3 Days IDOX consultancy booked
 - Standard Templates and Processes to be set up within Uniform Enforcement Module
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**

Risks:

 - Sufficient planning staff resources and ICT resources available with the required skills.
 - Availability of IDOX Consultancy for Planning and Enforcement Audits has affected the projected completion dates of the project.
 - Sufficient Budget.

Issues:

 - **Budget Management:**

Within existing budgets and on track.
 - **Stakeholder Engagement:**

Engagement with planning staff, ICT and IDOX Consultants.
 - **Resources:**

Planning staff, ICT support and IDOX Consultants.
 - **Anticipated Completion Date:**

The project started in December 2017 and it is anticipated will be completed by November 2019.
 - **Comments:**

['Portfolio of Projects'](#)

Thursday, 05 March 2020

Page 55 of 56

E:\moderngov\Data\AgendaItemDocs\6\6\9\AI00009966\\$r5yeroqa.docx

Project: BLANK

Category: Service

RAG Status: Green

- **Benefits Identified and Anticipated Delivery to Target:**
- **Progress Against Milestones:**
- **Identified Risks and Issues:**
 - Risks:
 - Issues:
- **Budget Management:**
- **Stakeholder Engagement:**
- **Resources:**
- **Anticipated Completion Date:**
- **Comments:**

['Portfolio of Projects'](#)



House of Commons
Transport Committee

Pavement parking

Thirteenth Report of Session 2017–19

*Report, together with formal minutes relating
to the report*

*Ordered by the House of Commons
to be printed 5 September 2019*

HC 1982

Published on 9 September 2019
by authority of the House of Commons

Transport Committee

The Transport Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Department for Transport and its associated public bodies.

Current membership

[Lilian Greenwood MP](#) (*Labour, Nottingham South*) (Chair)

[Jack Brereton MP](#) (*Conservative, Stoke-on-Trent South*)

[Ruth Cadbury MP](#) (*Labour, Brentford and Isleworth*)

[Robert Courts MP](#) (*Conservative, Witney*)

[Ronnie Cowan MP](#) (*Scottish National Party, Inverclyde*)

[Steve Double MP](#) (*Conservative, St Austell and Newquay*)

[Paul Girvan MP](#) (*Democratic Unionist Party, South Antrim*)

[Huw Merriman MP](#) (*Conservative, Bexhill and Battle*)

[Grahame Morris MP](#) (*Labour, Easington*)

[Graham Stringer MP](#) (*Labour, Blackley and Broughton*)

[Daniel Zeichner MP](#) (*Labour, Cambridge*)

Powers

The committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

© Parliamentary Copyright House of Commons 2019. This publication may be reproduced under the terms of the Open Parliament Licence, which is published at www.parliament.uk/copyright.

Committee reports are published on the Committee's website at www.parliament.uk/transcom and in print by Order of the House.

Evidence relating to this report is published on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Gordon Clarke (Committee Clerk), Ed Faulkner (Second Clerk), Louise Butcher (Senior Committee Specialist), Nerys Davies (Committee Specialist), Deborah Courtney (Senior Committee Assistant), Michelle Owens, (Committee Assistant), Estelle Currie (Senior Media Officer) and Oliver Florence (Media Officer).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Transport Committee, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 3266; the Committee's email address is transcom@parliament.uk.

You can follow the Committee on Twitter using [@CommonsTrans](#)

Contents

Summary	3
1 Introduction	5
2 Legislation and enforcement	7
Parking enforcement	7
Pavement parking and Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs)	8
Engineering measures	9
Legislation and Government action	9
Situation elsewhere in Great Britain	11
3 Effect on people	13
4 Solutions	16
Education and awareness of drivers	16
Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) and pavement parking	17
Enforcement	20
Obstruction	22
5 A nationwide ban	24
Conclusions and recommendations	25
Formal minutes	28
Witnesses	29
Published written evidence	30
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	42

Summary

The extent and impacts of pavement parking affect many communities. People with mobility difficulties or visual impairments and people who care for others are particular groups who are adversely affected by pavement parking. Action from the Government to tackle the problem of pavement parking has been slow and has not improved people's day-to-day lives.

Pavement—as opposed to 'on-street'—parking happens when a vehicle is partially or wholly parked on the pavement or footpath. It is not a criminal offence to park on the pavement—apart from Heavy Goods Vehicles—however it is a criminal offence to drive on to the pavement, whether there is an intention to park or not.

In 2015 the UK Government promised to look into the issue of pavement parking in England. It ran consultations and roundtables and held internal reviews, but this has not led to any actions that have made a difference to the public's experience of pavement parking. The Government needs to draw conclusions rapidly from the work it has undertaken, publish its proposals and take action.

Pavement parking can have a considerable impact on people's lives and their ability to safely leave their homes. We have received evidence from people with both visual and mobility impairments, and those who care for others—including children—about how they are affected by pavement parking. People are at risk of social isolation if they feel unable to leave their homes safely or are physically prevented from doing so. While pavement parking can be a necessity in some areas, it should not be allowed to happen where it has a significant adverse impact on people's lives.

We are deeply concerned about the Government's failure to act on this issue, despite long-standing promises to do so. We appreciate that this is a thorny problem that may be difficult to resolve to the satisfaction of all, but the Government's inaction has left communities blighted by unsightly and obstructive pavement parking and individuals afraid or unable to leave their homes or safely navigate the streets. Scotland is currently legislating for a national ban, while London took action to tackle this issue forty-five years ago.¹ The Government must act to improve the situation in the rest of England and it must do so quickly.

Some people are unaware that driving on the pavement is illegal. Some people are not aware of the detrimental effect pavement parking can have. It is the responsibility of the Government to run an awareness campaign around the illegality of driving on the pavement and the negative impacts of pavement parking.

Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are a way that local authorities can tackle congestion, manage traffic flows and restrict parking, including pavement parking. Currently there is a legal requirement to advertise any TRO in a local print newspaper. Newspaper advertising may not be effective in spreading this information widely and is costly for a local authority. The Government should remove the onerous requirement of newspaper advertising from the TRO process. We recognise the importance of providing support for local newspapers but, if the Government wishes to do this, it should be done directly,

¹ There has been a general ban on pavement parking in London since 1974. For more information see paragraph 17.

not indirectly through the TRO process. However, it is vital that people are aware of proposed TROs and the local authority must put in place effective mechanisms for consulting with their local communities.

Enforcement of the law is the most effective deterrent against pavement parking. It is not always clear who is responsible for taking enforcement action when a vehicle is parked on the pavement, as it depends on the circumstances. We encourage the Government to produce good practice guidance for local authorities and police forces on enforcement, and publicise who is responsible for enforcing which offences to the public.

The police can fine people for obstruction of the highway, which includes cars parked on the pavement that impede pedestrians. Currently there is not a clear legal definition of obstruction as it is not an easy thing to define in law. The police have priorities about what they enforce. Obstructive pavement parking is not a high police priority. Obstructive parking could be enforced by local authorities, in most cases they already have parking enforcement staff in place and want to enforce. We recommend that a new civil offence of obstructive pavement parking is created, and enforcement become the responsibility of local authorities.

We recommend that in the long term a ban on pavement parking is put in place across England, outside London, with a new process for exempting areas from the ban that is not as expensive or complicated as the current TRO process. We recognise that this is not something that can happen quickly, and so recommend a full consultation with local authorities about how to make this process easier and cheaper.

1 Introduction

1. Drivers want, and often need, to park near their homes or places of work. Sometimes the only way to do this and maintain access for emergency vehicles, buses and refuse lorries is to park partly or wholly on the pavement.² Pavement parking can make it difficult or impossible for pedestrians to walk safely on the pavement. We decided to look into what the Government can do to address these issues.

2. During the inquiry we received 430 pieces of written evidence, held two evidence sessions and a public engagement event in Bexhill-on-Sea. We are grateful to everyone who contributed to the inquiry.³ Our thanks also go to the UK Parliament Education and Engagement team.

3. The Department for Transport gave us a breakdown of parking offences, if an offence is criminal or civil and who can enforce these offences:

Table 1: Table of parking offences by scenario

Scenario	Criminal or civil offence	Who enforces it
Parking a vehicle on a pavement; the remaining pavement is clearly wide enough for pedestrians to pass; the street is not subject to any parking restrictions	No offence or contravention <i>note 1</i>	No enforcement action
Parking a vehicle on a pavement; the pavement is clearly blocked and pedestrians are forced onto the carriageway; the street is not subject to any parking restrictions	An obstruction offence may be being committed in this case	Police service
Parking a vehicle on a pavement; the remaining pavement is clearly wide enough for pedestrians to use; the street is subject to parking restrictions (eg. yellow lines)	Civil contravention (contravention code 01 -parked where restricted during restricted hours) <i>note 2</i>	Local authority <i>note 3</i>
Parking a car or motorbike on a pavement; the pavement is entirely blocked and pedestrians are forced onto the carriageway; the street is subject to parking restrictions (eg. yellow lines)	Civil contravention (contravention code 01– parking where restricted during prescribed hours) A separate obstruction offence may also be being committed. <i>note 2</i>	Police service for the obstruction offence; local authority for the contravention of parking restrictions <i>note 3</i>

² Adrian Wilkinson ([PPA0063](#)), Alliance of British Drivers ([PPA0185](#))

³ A list of witnesses the Committee took evidence from, and written evidence submitted to the Committee, is printed in this report. Written evidence and transcripts of oral evidence are available on the Committee's website.

Scenario	Criminal or civil offence	Who enforces it
Parking an HGV weighing more than 7.5t on a pavement to carry out unload that could not have been performed from the carriageway, on a road that is not subject to any parking restrictions	No offence or contravention <i>note 1</i>	No enforcement action
Parking an HGV weighing more than 7.5t on the pavement; regardless of the width of the pavement or whether the street is subject to any parking restrictions	Civil contravention (Contravention code 61 - A heavy commercial vehicle wholly or partly parked on a footway, verge or land between two carriageways)	Local authority <i>note 3</i>
Parking an HGV weighing more than 7.5t on the pavement for the purposes of loading/unloading which could not be satisfactorily performed if the vehicle was parked elsewhere, where the street is not subject to loading/unloading restrictions (eg. yellow kerb blips)	No offence or contravention <i>note 1</i>	No enforcement action
Parking a HGV weighing more than 7.5 on the pavement for the purposes of loading/unloading, where that street is subject to loading/unloading restrictions	This would be a civil contravention (contravention code 02–parked loading/unloaded in a restricted street where waiting and loading/unloading restrictions are in force) <i>note 2</i>	Local authority <i>note 3</i>
Parking a vehicle on the footway and/or verge, where that street is subject to a prohibition of footway and/or verge parking (a TRO banning pavement parking)	This would be a civil contravention, regardless of the type of vehicle or whether a criminal obstruction is taking place (contravention code 62 - <i>note 2</i>	Local authority <i>note 3</i>

Note 1: It is unlikely that an offence or contravention is occurring in these circumstances as a general rule of thumb, but some may argue that an obstruction offence is being committed; the Department understands that police services are generally likely to apply discretion towards obstruction offences and are unlikely to issue FPNs unless there is a clear and unambiguous obstruction, so any enforcement is likely to depend on the specifics of that particular case.

Note 2: Even where a Traffic Regulation Order imposes a civil contravention for parking on pavements, an obstruction offence may still be committed as these offences exist under separate legislation and are enforced only by police services. In practical terms, however, police services are unlikely to issue FPNs for low-level obstruction offences if the vehicle can be dealt with by the local authority as a routine parking contravention.

Note 3: This assumes that the local authority has taken on civil parking enforcement powers. If that local authority has not been designated as a civil enforcement area, the police service will remain responsible for enforcing all parking offences.

Source: Department for Transport ([PPA0233](#))

2 Legislation and enforcement

4. Given current levels of car ownership, pavement parking is inevitable in some areas. In many towns and cities in England housing is Georgian, Victorian or Edwardian. These houses were built before the advent of mass motoring, do not benefit from off-street parking spaces, and since they were built many have been converted into houses in multiple occupation (HMOs). As a result there are often not enough parking spaces for the people that live in them, whether residents' parking schemes are in place or not.⁴ This is not only a problem with older housing: one in twenty of the submissions we received highlighted that new developments do not have enough parking space for the people who live there and their visitors—in some cases this is the result of deliberate planning decisions to discourage car use.

5. The extent and impact of pavement parking vary from place to place. There are many reasons for this, for example:

- Towns, cities and villages have narrow streets;
- New developments not being built with wide enough roads or pavements, or any pavements at all;
- Drivers follow the lead of other people parking on the pavement;
- Drivers may not be aware of the consequences of their actions;
- The police and local authorities have different roles with enforcement. Not everyone will be aware of these different roles;
- Enforcement of offences does not take place;
- Local authorities have the power to ban pavement parking but may not have the means to ban or enforce these restrictions; and
- The nations of Great Britain⁵ are at different points with bans around pavement parking.

Parking enforcement

6. Local authorities and the police have different responsibilities for the enforcement of parking offences, as outlined in chapter 1. Most parking offences in England were decriminalised in 1995, when local authorities were given powers to implement, manage and enforce parking restrictions, for example yellow lines and clearways. Around 95% of local authorities⁶ have taken up civil enforcement powers.⁷ In those areas where they have not, parking enforcement remains a criminal matter for the police to enforce. In 2008 the law was substantially updated and amended⁸ and is now generally called civil parking enforcement (CPE). It is enforced by Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) who are employed by the local authority.

4 Kevin Harper (PPA0210), Nichola Harrison (PPA0270)

5 The position in Northern Ireland is the same as that in England outside London, for more information see: NI Direct, [Parking enforcement](#) [accessed 27 August 2019].

6 Department for Transport, [List of areas in England designated as a Civil Enforcement Area \(CEA\) for the purposes of enforcing parking contraventions](#), 9 January 2018

7 HC Deb, 4 December 2015, [col 654](#) Commons Chamber

8 By the Traffic Management Act 2004, [Part 6](#). The secondary legislation came into force on 31 March 2008.

7. Parking on double yellow lines—on-street parking⁹—and parking in contravention of a scheme—residents’ parking—are civil offences for which local authorities can issue a penalty. Where these schemes or markings are in place, someone parking on a double yellow line and with any wheels on the pavement, can be issued a penalty by a CEO for the on-street offence. The penalty will be issued for parking on yellow lines, not parking on the pavement. The police can issue fines to people who are seen to drive onto a pavement or if parking is obstructing the highway.¹⁰ Where there are no on-street restrictions, only the police can issue fines for the criminal offence of obstruction, including on the pavement.¹¹

8. In 2016, the then Transport Committee noted in their report on road traffic law enforcement¹² that roads police numbers had been falling for years. As a result, there are only limited numbers of officers available to spot illegal obstructive pavement parking and issue fines. Traffic wardens—who used to assist the police in this work—were abolished in England and Wales from 1 December 2018.¹³ PCSOs (Police Community Support Officers) are now able to use police powers to enforce the offence of obstruction, explained further in chapter 4 below.

9. It is not always clear to the public, motorists and sometimes police and local authorities who is responsible for enforcing which offence. Some local authorities¹⁴ have a memorandum of understanding with their local police about enforcement policy to make it clear which offences should be issued a penalty—by the council—or a fine—by the police.

Pavement parking and Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs)

10. Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are the only way local highway authorities—county and unitary councils in England—can ban pavement parking in specific areas. TROs are used to tackle congestion, manage traffic flows and implement parking restrictions.¹⁵ There are three different types of TRO:

- Permanent orders—these include consultation periods, the right to object and for objections to be heard, can take time and be expensive;
- Experimental orders—these generally lead to permanent orders but allow for a flexible approach as minor changes can be made easily; and
- Temporary orders—these cannot be converted into permanent orders.

9 Yellow lines are for the whole of the highway and include the pavement.

10 This includes pavements. For more details please see the House of Commons Library note, [Pavement and on-street parking in England](#) chapter 2.

11 There are a number of statutes and regulations that allow proceedings to be brought for obstructing the highway. For more details please see the House of Commons Library note, [Pavement and on-street parking in England](#) chapter 2.

12 Transport Committee, Second report of the session 2015–16, [Road Traffic Law Enforcement](#), HC518

13 This was as a result of the Policing and Crime Act 2017, [section 46](#).

14 Norfolk County Council and Norwich City Council ([PPA0353](#)), Devon County Council ([PPA0234](#)), City of York Council ([PPA0182](#))

15 These can be made under Parts I and IV of the [Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984](#).

11. Commonly a TRO is made to introduce residents' parking schemes, controlled parking zones or changes to on-street parking, for example yellow lines. These have an indirect effect on the enforcement of restrictions on pavement parking. Due to the cost of a local authority putting a TRO in place very few TROs are made to solely address pavement parking.

Engineering measures

12. Engineering measures—such as railings, plant pots or bike racks—can be used to stop people parking on pavements. However, these solutions may not always be appropriate or feasible.¹⁶ They can add to street clutter and negatively impact those with visual or mobility impairments. The Government's 1993 traffic advisory leaflet on pavement parking encourages the use of engineering measures to stop pavement parking.¹⁷ This conflicts with the desire of successive Governments to minimise street clutter.¹⁸ Any local authority considering engineering measures to inhibit pavement parking must judge whether any measure would create as much of a physical barrier for those with visual or mobility impairments as the vehicles parked on the pavement.

Legislation and Government action

13. In 2015, Simon Hoare MP introduced the Pavement Parking (Protection of Vulnerable Pedestrians) Bill.¹⁹ At the end of the Second Reading debate in December 2015 Mr Hoare withdrew the Bill after securing from the then Minister, Andrew Jones MP, a commitment to convene a roundtable in 2016 to discuss pavement parking and “examine more closely the legal and financial implications of an alternative regime, and the likely impacts on local authorities”.²⁰ The roundtable took place in March 2016,²¹ during which the time and cost for putting TROs in place was identified as a major factor affecting the enforcement of restrictions on pavement parking. The then Minister said that he was “considering how best to address the general improvement of the TRO-making process”.²²

16 Department for Transport ([PPA0233](#)), para 37

17 These are outlined in Traffic Advisory Leaflet 4/93, [pavement parking](#), December 1993.

18 [PQ 59474](#) on Road Signs and Markings, 13 January 2017; Manual for Streets 1 provides advice on reducing clutter, see: Department for Transport, [Manual for Streets 1](#), 29 March 2007, page 58, paragraph 5.10.

19 [Pavement Parking \(Protection of Vulnerable Pedestrians\) Bill](#) [Bill 16 (2015–16)]. This was a Private Member's Bill, which provided a framework for local authorities in England and Wales to consult on and subsequently to ban pavement parking across wide areas, subject to certain exemptions to be set out by the Secretary of State in secondary legislation and guidance.

20 HC Deb, 4 December 2015, [cols 659–60](#)

21 [PQ 37550](#) on Parking: Pedestrian Areas, 19 May 2016

22 [PQ 49804](#) on Parking: Pedestrian Areas, 26 October 2016

14. In April 2017 Andrew Jones said that he planned “to launch a survey in Summer 2017 in order to gather evidence about the current situation, the costs and timescales for processing TROs, and information about options for change”.²³ The survey was put back to autumn 2017.²⁴ Anthony Ferguson, Deputy Director of Traffic and Technology at the Department for Transport told us that the survey was ultimately “absorbed into a different piece of work”:

It evolved into something different, which was a piece of work we did looking at TROs as part of a discovery project around what data is held by local authorities. TROs are potentially a very fertile source of data and information about the road environment. The survey was picked up in that project, which ran for three months from the very end of 2017 to the beginning of 2018. That piece of work, which was a very extensive discovery project, led to the recent TRO discovery project that we launched at the end of last year and is just coming to a conclusion. That is what happened. It evolved into something slightly larger.²⁵

15. In March 2018 the Minister who succeeded Andrew Jones, Jesse Norman MP, said that the Department for Transport had been considering the scope for improving the TRO process and as a result was:

... undertaking a broader piece of work to gather evidence on the issue of pavement parking including how it is addressed in current regulation. We expect to be able to draw conclusions later this year.²⁶

However, by November 2018 the Government’s position remained that it was “in the process of gathering evidence on the problems posed by vehicles parking on pavements, the effectiveness of current regulation, and the case for change”.²⁷ Jesse Norman said that the Department for Transport had held meetings with a range of stakeholders, including accessibility campaigners, local authority managers, and motoring associations, with the intention of completing this evidence gathering by the end of 2018.²⁸

16. Most recently, on 15 April 2019 the then Minister said that the Department for Transport was still “considering the findings of its internal review on the issue of pavement parking, and will be announcing a decision in the coming months”.²⁹ The TRO discovery project—funded by the Department for Transport, and that is feeding into the Department’s internal review—reported to the Department on 30 August 2019.³⁰

23 [PQ 71396](#) on Parking: Pedestrian Areas, 24 April 2017

24 [PQ 4827](#) on Parking: Pedestrian Areas, 20 July 2017

25 [Q134](#)

26 [PQ 133316](#) on Parking: Pedestrian Areas, 26 March 2018

27 [PQ 191412](#) on Parking: Pedestrian Areas, 19 November 2018

28 [PQ 242828](#) on Parking: Pedestrian Areas, 15 April 2019

29 [PQ 242828](#) on Parking: Pedestrian Areas, 15 April 2019

30 GeoPlace, [TRO discovery Summary report](#), 30 August 2019

Situation elsewhere in Great Britain

London

17. Since 1974 there has been a general ban on pavement parking in London.³¹ A London highway authority—a London Borough Council or Transport for London—may suspend the pavement parking ban in specific circumstances and for specific areas of road by passing a resolution³² or issuing a notice.

18. Spencer Palmer, Director of Transport and Mobility at London Councils, told us that exemptions from the pavement parking ban in London do not require the use of TROs:

For exemptions to the footway parking ban in London, there is a more informal process. There has to be a resolution of the council, [...] but there will be a more informal consultation process [than a TRO] to propose a series of exemptions in a particular street or streets and seek residents' views.³³

19. Exemptions from the London pavement parking ban do not require advertising in a print newspaper, though typically a highway authority will take other steps to raise public awareness. Spencer Palmer from London Councils told us:

Although you are not obligated to advertise in a local paper, as you do for other traffic orders, typically you would write to every resident, business and premises in the street concerned. You might want to put up street notices as well, to pick up people who use the street but do not necessarily live or work there ...³⁴

The TRO process is still followed in London for other restrictions, but not for exemptions from the pavement parking ban.³⁵

Scotland

20. The Scotland Act 2016³⁶ devolved competence over on-street parking to the Scottish Parliament.³⁷ Part 4 of the Transport (Scotland) Bill,³⁸ currently going through the Scottish Parliament, includes a clause that would ban pavement parking across Scotland. The Bill completed Stage 2 on 26 June 2019. The ban would apply to any stationary vehicle with one or more of its wheels (or part of them) on the pavement. This includes when the engine is running, or the driver is present. The Bill also provides for exemptions from

31 Provided for under the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974, [section 15](#).

32 For a resolution to be passed or a notice to be issued the highway authority must: "take such steps as are necessary to secure the placing on or near the road or footpath, or the part thereof, to which the resolution or notice relates of such traffic signs in such position as they consider requisite". Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974, [section 15](#), subsections (5) and (6).

33 [Q45](#)

34 [Q52](#)

35 [Q45](#)

36 Scotland Act 2016, [Section 43](#)

37 This followed years of confusion and debate; for full details see: Scottish Parliament Information Centre (SPICe), [Transport \(Scotland\) Bill: Pavement Parking and Double Parking](#), 30 October 2018, page 8.

38 [Transport \(Scotland\) Bill](#) [Scottish Parliament]

the national ban, which will be set out in Directions by Scottish Ministers.³⁹ Any local authority seeking to apply an exemption would be required to erect road signs indicating that a footway was the subject of an exemption order.⁴⁰

Wales

21. The legal position regarding pavement parking in Wales is unclear.⁴¹ The competencies covering this have not been tested. The National Assembly for Wales Economy, Infrastructure and Skills Committee report; *Post Legislative Scrutiny of the Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013*,⁴² recommended that the Welsh Government work regionally with police and local authorities to agree innovative ways to tackle pavement parking, including changing driver behaviour and raising awareness of its impacts. The Welsh Government accepted this in principle.⁴³ On 4 July 2019 at the Active Travel conference in Cardiff the Deputy First Minister announced that the Welsh Government intends to convene an expert group to explore ways of clamping down more widely on illegal parking, including pavement parking, across Wales.⁴⁴

39 Not yet published

40 SPICe, [Transport \(Scotland\) Bill: Pavement Parking and Double Parking](#), 30 October 2018

41 Wales Act 2017 [Schedule 7](#) does not go into detail.

42 Economy, Infrastructure and Skills Committee [Welsh Assembly], [Post Legislative Scrutiny of the Active Travel \(Wales\) Act 2013](#), June 2018

43 Government response to Economy, Infrastructure and Skills Committee [Welsh Assembly], [Post Legislative Scrutiny of the Active Travel \(Wales\) Act 2013](#), June 2018, page 10

44 Welsh Government, [Welsh Government to take action against pavement parking](#), 4 July 2019

3 Effect on people

22. Pavement parking effects everyone, but some are more adversely affected than others. These groups include:

- a) People who have visual impairments;
- b) People who are neurodiverse;
- c) People who use mobility aids to get around; and
- d) People with prams and pushchairs or walking with children.

23. Many of the difficulties experienced are due to the way pavement parking reduces the useable width of the pavement. People who rely on a mobility aid, such as a stick, walking frame, mobility scooter or wheelchair, may be impeded or find the pavement impassable. People with a visual impairment may need support from a carer while walking or use a long cane or guide dog. At the engagement event we held in Bexhill-on-Sea we heard that effective use of a long cane is impossible if the available pavement is too narrow. In Bexhill-on-Sea we also heard how people had been injured when they were forced to squeeze through spaces that were too narrow because of vehicles parked on pavements.

24. Some people with visual impairments use guide dogs. When faced with a hazard the guide dog is trained to stop, but the user of the guide dog does not necessarily know why they have stopped. On our walk around Bexhill-on-Sea we were accompanied by a guide dog user and saw first-hand the difficulties they face. When a guide dog has stopped unexpectedly their user has to think why the dog has stopped and what danger they are facing, before deciding what action to take. A vehicle parked on the pavement might force a guide dog user and their dog to step out into the road.⁴⁵

25. Another issue with pavement parking, particularly for those with a visual impairment, is its lack of predictability. Chris Theobald from Guide Dogs told us that people get to know their local areas and certain obstructions are expected or appear routinely. For example, street furniture, when it is bin collection day or where there are advertising boards outside shops. He went on to explain that “pavement parking could crop up anywhere essentially. That can really add to people’s nervousness about stepping out independently”.⁴⁶

26. Many pavements are not built to take the weight of vehicles and can result in trip hazards. Pavements become cracked and uneven creating an unpredictable surface as well as damage to kerbs and grass verges. Councils bear the costs of these repairs.⁴⁷ As noted in our July 2019 report on local roads funding and maintenance,⁴⁸ there has been historic, long-term underfunding to properly maintain the local road network, including pavements. Councils should not have to bear the unnecessary extra costs associated with having to repair pavements damaged by persistent pavement parking.

45 Miss Lisa Boocock ([PPA0021](#)), Mr George Hogman ([PPA0078](#)), Simon Daws ([PPA0218](#)), Guide Dogs ([PPA0350](#))

46 [Q18](#) [Chris Theobald]

47 The East Riding of Yorkshire Council ([PPA0069](#)), Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council ([PPA0235](#)), Telford & Wrekin Council ([PPA0281](#)), West Midlands Combined Authority (Transport for West Midlands) ([PPA0336](#)), Southend-on-Sea Borough Council ([PPA0338](#)), St Helens Council ([PPA0342](#)), Surrey County Council ([PPA0347](#)), Northumberland County Council ([PPA0348](#)), Sheffield City Council ([PPA0349](#)), Mid Sussex District Council ([PPA0395](#))

48 Transport Committee, Tenth report of the session 2017–19, [Local roads funding and maintenance: filling the gap](#), HC1486

27. We heard how pavement parking can make some people so afraid that they do not leave their home and how this can increase the risk of social isolation. Living Streets, the walking charity, surveyed its members about the impact pavement parking has on their daily lives. Social isolation was highlighted as an issue by some of the 4,000 people who responded. One person said:

My disabled sister is now housebound in the area we were born and bred in because of selfish parking [...] It became impossible for me to take my elderly mother for a walk around the block, physically supported, because there wasn't enough room left for 2 people to walk side-by-side.⁴⁹

28. Parking over dropped kerbs restricts the ability of people using wheelchairs and mobility scooters to leave their homes. When drivers park over dropped kerbs people who use these mobility aids are unable to go out, have to complete their journeys in a different and sometimes longer way, put themselves in danger in the path of vehicles or have to abandon their journey and return home.⁵⁰

29. The evidence we received clearly shows that, in some areas, pavement parking and damage to pavements is causing loneliness.⁵¹ In October 2018 the Government published a loneliness strategy.⁵² It states that the Government is “committed to long-lasting action to tackle the problem of loneliness”.⁵³

30. Another group who are affected by pavement parking are people who have babies or young children. They may use prams or pushchairs or need to walk directly alongside their children.⁵⁴ The width of the pavement can put these young and vulnerable pedestrians at risk. Mrs Susan Lyons, a member of the public, told us that with a double buggy it can be difficult to get around. She said: “the lives of me and my children were at greater risk of being hit by a car on the road, than they would have been on a pavement”.⁵⁵ Emily Steadman, a member of the public, who faces pavement parking issues outside her children’s school told us:

[Pavement parking] not only makes walking down the pavement extremely unpleasant [...] cars driving on and off the pavement create a hazard for small children who can't easily be seen from the wheel of a car. I have had a number of terrifying occasions where my children have very nearly been hit by a car coming on or off the pavement as they've run along.⁵⁶

-
- 49 Living Streets-additional written evidence ([PPA0438](#))
- 50 Dana O'Connor ([PPA0036](#)), Terence Fleming ([PPA0041](#)), Mr Richard Toulson ([PPA0044](#)), Alan Woodard ([PPA0045](#)), Steven Gibson ([PPA0052](#)), Mr Steve Hatton ([PPA0065](#)), Mr Leslie Phillips ([PPA0087](#)), Dr Barbara Lucas ([PPA0103](#)), Mr D M ([PPA0132](#)), Mr Morris Steel ([PPA0142](#)), Mrs Lisa Ainsworth-Barnes ([PPA0201](#)), Mrs Alison Morgan ([PPA0211](#)), Mr Eddie Clark ([PPA0269](#)), National Rheumatoid Arthritis Society ([PPA0280](#)), Arthur Ward ([PPA0357](#)), Mr Douglas Campbell ([PPA0402](#)), Mr Gordon Guest ([PPA0404](#))
- 51 Bristol Walking Alliance ([PPA0060](#)), Mr D M ([PPA0132](#)), Green Councillors' Group, Bristol City Council ([PPA0220](#)), National Rheumatoid Arthritis Society ([PPA0280](#)), Birmingham and Black Country Sight Loss Councils ([PPA0318](#)), Oxfordshire County Council Public Health ([PPA0346](#)), Guide Dogs ([PPA0350](#)), NFBUK ([PPA0359](#)), Leicester Disabled People's Access Group ([PPA0364](#)), Mr Robin Kenworthy ([PPA0375](#)), Living Streets ([PPA0399](#)), Living Streets-additional written evidence ([PPA0438](#))
- 52 HM Government, [A connected society, A strategy for tackling loneliness – laying the foundations for change](#), 15 October 2018
- 53 HM Government, [A connected society: a strategy for tackling loneliness](#), 15 October 2018
- 54 [Q10](#)
- 55 Mrs Susan Lyons ([PPA0048](#))
- 56 Mrs Emily Steadman ([PPA0323](#))

31. The Department for Transport recognise in their evidence that pavement parking “can cause serious problems for pedestrians, and particularly for people in wheelchairs or with visual impairments, and those with prams or pushchairs”.⁵⁷ Michael Ellis MP, the then Minister of State for Transport with responsibility for parking, told us that the Department was “seeking to make progress on the issue of pavement parking”.⁵⁸

32. Pavement parking affects everyone who uses the pavement. Pavement parking puts pedestrians in danger when they are forced to move into the road to get around a vehicle or where there are trip hazards due to damage to the pavement. People with mobility or visual impairments, as well as those who care for others, are disproportionately affected. It exacerbates, and is a cause of, social isolation and loneliness for people who feel unable to safely leave their homes or are physically prevented from doing so by pavement parking. We find it profoundly regrettable that the Government has taken so long to take any action to deal with this issue. There have been no concrete actions to tackle pavement parking and improve people’s daily lives. We recognise that the Government has to balance the needs of drivers and pedestrians. *We recommend that the Government commits to tackling pavement parking as part of its Loneliness Strategy. We recommend that the Government swiftly learns the lessons from the work being done in other areas of Great Britain.* We will be watching the actions of Scotland and Wales around pavement parking with interest.

57 Department for Transport ([PPA0233](#)) para 5

58 [Q158](#)

4 Solutions

Education and awareness of drivers

33. Driving onto the pavement is illegal and, in almost all cases, vehicles parked on the pavement will have been driven onto the pavement in breach of this law. It is unclear how widespread public awareness is of this offence.

34. Some evidence suggests drivers may do something even when they know it breaks the rules. Chris Theobald from Guide Dogs told us that a 2017 YouGov survey found that 55% of drivers had considered the impact of pavement parking on people with visual impairments but did it regardless.⁵⁹ Ian Taylor from the Alliance of British Drivers (ABD) said the majority of its members are aware of the rules but “as regards to practice, and what people think that they can get away with, because there has not been much actual enforcement where it is not allowed, people tend to do it”.⁶⁰ Drivers can be unaware that it is illegal to drive on the pavement, are unaware of the implications of pavement parking, or do know but park on the pavement anyway because the threat of enforcement is low.

35. The issue of being able to get away with an offence because it is not enforced is an important one. Michael Ellis MP, the then Minister, acknowledged this when he told us “Many people feel that it is something that they are allowed to do, or they are in some doubt about whether they are allowed to do it and think that the rules may not be enforced [...] it is not clear to every road user where the parameters are and how they apply”.⁶¹

36. In the UK, once you have passed your driving test there is no compulsory re-testing.⁶² A driver is expected to keep up-to-date with any changes to the Highway Code, but this is not checked or recorded.⁶³ To date the Government has never run a campaign to increase public awareness that driving onto the pavement is illegal or to raise awareness of the negative effects of pavement parking.⁶⁴ We welcomed comments from Michael Ellis that this would change. He said:

... pavement parking is quite a visual image. I would have thought that a marketing campaign would be able to address it in quite a straightforward way and, hopefully, facilitate change. We are seeking to do that right now [...] we would engage professionals to look at how we best relay the message to people that pavement parking is dangerous. It causes damage, loss and injury, and we know that it can cause death, and we want to address those issues.⁶⁵

59 [Q2](#) [Chris Theobald]

60 [Q7](#)

61 [Q127](#)

62 Except in the case of retesting following a driving ban or in some cases of medical withdrawal of a driving licence.

63 This largely only manifests in the event of a driving offence being committed - ignorance of the law is not a defence. Similarly, there is no offence of disobeying the Highway Code per se, but failure to observe its advice can constitute evidence of carelessness, or in extreme cases even dangerous driving.

64 [Q177](#)

65 [Q179](#)

However, we are concerned that Mr Ellis qualified this answer when he told us that “of course, budgets are finite and decisions have to be made. One has to look at where the most harm is being done and try to address those areas”.⁶⁶ In a follow up letter to the Committee the Minister said that he would give “further consideration” to an awareness campaign about the difficulties caused by pavement parking.⁶⁷

37. We welcome the then Minister’s comments recognising how dangerous pavement parking can be and committing to consider a public awareness campaign on the issue. However, this does not go far enough. We are concerned that there is no real urgency in the Department for Transport to develop a campaign or to find a budget to fund it. A public awareness campaign will not solve the problem of pavement parking by itself, but it is a necessary part of any effort to curtail the incidence of pavement parking. It may reduce the number of people who knowingly break the law and change the behaviour of those who do not know and drive onto a pavement, or are unaware of the effect it has on other people. We recommend that the Department for Transport plan, fund and deploy a national awareness campaign to highlight that driving onto the pavement is illegal, and to show the negative consequences of pavement parking for pedestrians including older people, disabled people and children. This campaign should highlight the physical dangers involved in pavement parking; how it can cause social isolation; and aim to reduce the instances of pavement parking.

Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) and pavement parking

38. As described above, a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is a tool that local authorities can use to place restrictions on traffic in their areas, including banning pavement parking in a specific area.⁶⁸ There is an extensive network of TROs in place across the country. However, these tend to be for widespread on-street parking restrictions, limiting the movements of heavy goods vehicles and other traffic management purposes. Living Streets found that from 2016-2018 37% of local authorities had put TROs in place to restrict pavement parking.⁶⁹

39. We heard that there are several reasons why some councils are not using TROs to ban pavement parking in whole or part in their local areas. Simon Botterill from Sheffield City Council told us that the process is archaic: “We have a very dense legal system. In this day and age, we ought to be able to move more quickly on the processes and update our data faster and publish it. With the processes we have it is very difficult to move into the modern world”.⁷⁰ The TRO discovery project funded by the Department for Transport encouraged the Department to address this issue, and the project report stated that the Department was commencing a 16-week legislative review of Traffic Regulation Order legislation.

66 [Q180](#)

67 [Letter received 10 July 2019 from Michael Ellis MP, Minister of State, Department for Transport](#)

68 These can be made under Parts I and IV of the [Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984](#).

69 Living Streets ([PPA0399](#)), page 17; 38 of 103 local authorities who responded to Living Streets’ 2018 freedom of information request put pavement parking TROs in place between 2016 and 2018.

70 [Q46](#)

40. Each TRO requires a consultation to allow people to object to a proposal. Tim Young, from Norfolk County Council, told us that TROs can be straightforward if there are no objections, however “If you get into a dialogue with local residents or stakeholder groups, it becomes very resource intensive for a local authority”.⁷¹

41. Making a TRO can be a time consuming and expensive process.⁷² TROs are required by law to be advertised in a local newspaper with significant circulation.⁷³ PATROL (Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London) told us this can cost up to £1,000.⁷⁴ Simon Botterill told us that one recent advert cost £3,000.⁷⁵ Surrey County Council said that they spend approximately £75,000 per year on advertising parking restriction notices alone.⁷⁶ Tim Young from Norfolk County Council told us that the majority of the cost of making a TRO comes from the advertising requirements.⁷⁷

42. The Department for Transport has previously looked at removing the requirement to advertise in a newspaper. In 2011 an Impact Assessment was published. It had the policy aim to “remove the burdensome regulation [...] by removing the duty to advertise TROs in local newspapers”.⁷⁸ However, following public consultation in 2012 the Government concluded that withdrawing the requirement to advertise could undermine the local newspaper industry and as a result decided against any change.⁷⁹

43. Since the requirement to advertise in a print newspaper was first introduced in 1986⁸⁰ the way people consume local news has changed. Print circulation for UK local and regional newspapers more than halved in the decade to 2017—from 63.4 million to 31.4 million.⁸¹ According to research by Oxford’s Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, only one person in ten now reads a regional or local printed paper every week.⁸² Michael Ellis MP, the then Minister of State for Transport, told us that he wanted to “make sure that we continue our duty of ensuring that, when TROs are passed by a local authority, they are seen by as wide a range of people as possible”.⁸³ The Government funded TRO discovery project reported that “Road users who responded to a Transport Focus survey told us that there are 8 methods that would better meet their needs for communication changes about the network than an official notice in the local paper” and that “only 7% of road users find out about plans for road network changes through an official notice

71 [Q40](#)

72 Mayor of Greater Manchester and Greater Manchester Cycling and Walking Commissioner ([PPA0418](#)), Northumberland County Council ([PPA0348](#)), Surrey County Council ([PPA0347](#)), Hertfordshire County Council ([PPA0321](#)), PATROL (Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London) ([PPA0334](#)), Liverpool City Council ([PPA0309](#)), Cambridgeshire County Council ([PPA0285](#)), Brighton & Hove City Council ([PPA0278](#)), Durham County Council ([PPA0261](#)), Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council ([PPA0235](#)), Devon County Council ([PPA0234](#)), The East Riding of Yorkshire Council ([PPA0069](#)), East Hampshire District Council ([PPA0032](#))

73 Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (SI 1996/2489) as amended, [Regulation 7](#)

74 PATROL (Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London) ([PPA0334](#))

75 [Q44](#)

76 Surrey County Council ([PPA0347](#))

77 [Q42](#)

78 Department for Transport, [Traffic Orders - Deregulating Publicity Requirements](#), 22 August 2011, page 1

79 HC Deb 7 February 2013, [col 427](#) Westminster Hall

80 The Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations ([SI 1986/179](#)). This requirement was renewed and revised in 1989—The Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations ([SI 1989/1120](#))—and most recently in 1996—Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 ([SI 1996/2489](#)).

81 Mediatique report for Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport, [Overview of recent dynamics in the UK press market](#), April 2018

82 Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, [Digital News Report 2018](#), pp62–63

83 [Q142](#) [Michael Ellis]

in the local paper.”⁸⁴ Simon Botterill said that Sheffield City Council go beyond their statutory duty and generally post street notices and send letters to those affected by any TRO proposals. He told us that Sheffield does this “because it does not believe that the press offers that level of distribution of information to people”.⁸⁵

44. The TRO process can be difficult. Although local authorities can use these powers to ban pavement parking, there is little information on how widely they are used. If the TRO process was made easier and cheaper it would incentivise more local authorities to use these powers. We recommend that the Government bring forward proposals to reform the TRO process—to make it cheaper and easier for local authorities to use—and bring forward any required secondary legislation, if necessary, by spring 2020.

45. We believe that public consultation and the right of local people and businesses to object to any change that would have a material impact on their lives is an important part of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process and must be retained. However, the TRO process has an onerous and outdated provision requiring advertisement in a local newspaper. It is vital that people who are affected by a TRO have time to object. Given the seismic changes to news consumption since these provisions were enacted, this imperfectly meets the policy objective of letting as many people as possible who may be affected know about a TRO. We recognise the importance of providing support for local newspapers, but if the Government wishes to do this, it should be done directly, not indirectly through the TRO process. The local authority is best placed to know how to communicate with the community it serves. People can only object if they are informed. Removing the requirement to advertise in a local newspaper would make the TRO process cheaper for local authorities and increase the likelihood of them using TROs to enact pavement parking bans. We recommend that the Government abolish the requirement to advertise TROs in a local newspaper. It should replace this with a requirement for the local authority to maximise the reach of its advertising to the largest number of people by whatever media would best achieve this. The Government should commit to achieving this by spring 2020: it should be delivered alongside the wider reforms to TROs recommended above.

84 GeoPlace, [TRO discovery Summary report](#), 30 August 2019, p22

85 [Q70](#)

Enforcement

46. The Committee received many pieces of evidence outlining examples of members of the public reporting issues relating to pavement parking being passed from the local authority to the police and back again.⁸⁶ Crispin Blunt MP told us “I have contacted the Surrey County Council, Reigate & Banstead Council and the Police, each one passing the problem on to the other, with the result of course that no one takes any action”.⁸⁷

47. The police and local authorities have limited resources to enforce pavement parking restrictions. The Police and Crime Commissioner for Devon and Cornwall told us that “there is little appetite for enforcement. The issue of resources [...] is clearly a key reason for this”.⁸⁸ The then Minister recognised that this was a problem but said that ultimately “it is about priorities and choices about what gets enforced”.⁸⁹

48. We heard evidence that some local authorities have submitted requests to the Department for Transport to decriminalise parking so they are able to enforce parking restrictions laid out in TROs. We understand that at least one local authority has been informed that the legislative process for doing this would be delayed due to the Parliamentary timetable for the UK exiting the European Union. We have heard that East Sussex County Council, as part of its parking decriminalisation submission for the area in and around Bexhill-on-Sea, where we saw ample evidence of a lack of parking enforcement by the police, had been given a provisional date by the Department for Transport for mid-2020, but due to resourcing issues within the Department we understand that this has been moved towards the end of 2020.

49. Areas which have not had their parking enforcement decriminalised lack the resources to ensure adequate parking enforcement. This can blight communities and encourages anti-social parking behaviour, such as pavement parking. We saw numerous examples of this anti-social behaviour during our visit to Bexhill-on-Sea. The then Minister, Michael Ellis MP, assured us that the application from East Sussex would be considered with haste. *The Department for Transport must not drag its feet, citing external or resourcing issues, and must act now to meet the requests of local authorities to decriminalise pavement parking enforcement.*

86 Miss Lisa Boockock ([PPA0021](#)), Mrs Anna Langley ([PPA0028](#)), Chris Garbett ([PPA0051](#)), J Ardron ([PPA0056](#)), Bristol Walking Alliance ([PPA0060](#)), Pedestrian Liberation ([PPA0061](#)), The East Riding of Yorkshire Council ([PPA0069](#)), CycleSheffield ([PPA0077](#)), Graham Turnbull ([PPA0082](#)), Mr Mike Parker ([PPA0114](#)), Mr Anthony Keith Marquis ([PPA0127](#)), Mr Jerry Cullum ([PPA0134](#)), Mr Morris Steel ([PPA0142](#)), Mr Neil Meadows ([PPA0149](#)), Mr James Burton ([PPA0177](#)), Jamie Wood ([PPA0194](#)), Green Councillors' Group, Bristol City Council ([PPA0220](#)), Mrs Laurence Pinturault ([PPA0251](#)), Matthew Wilson ([PPA0254](#)), Andrew Foxcroft ([PPA0274](#)), Crispin Blunt MP ([PPA0276](#)), Mr Mark Kemp ([PPA0306](#)), Birmingham and Black Country Sight Loss Councils ([PPA0318](#)), PATROL (Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London) ([PPA0334](#)), Mr Steve Hamilton ([PPA0337](#)), Mr Andrew Barclay ([PPA0341](#)), Northumberland County Council ([PPA0348](#)), Guide Dogs ([PPA0350](#)), Mr S.J. Eastwood, Snr. ([PPA0351](#)), Ms Deborah Watson ([PPA0362](#)), Cycle Basingstoke ([PPA0370](#)), Mr William McKinnon ([PPA0372](#)), Mr Tim Pickering ([PPA0386](#)), Dr Martin Parretti ([PPA0396](#)), Mr Jeremy Varns ([PPA0412](#)), Chris Maxim ([PPA0419](#)), Living Streets-additional written evidence ([PPA0438](#))

87 Crispin Blunt MP ([PPA0276](#))

88 Police and Crime Commissioner for Devon and Cornwall ([PPA0422](#))

89 [Q172](#) [Michael Ellis]

50. As set out in Chapter 2, above, to make the enforcement responsibilities of councils and the police clearer some local authorities⁹⁰ have agreed a memorandum of understanding with their local police about enforcement policy. In Norfolk, the memorandum states that “If a wheelchair or child’s buggy can pass a vehicle parked on the footway then no enforcement action [by the police] will take place”.⁹¹

51. The Committee received examples of good practice and suggestions for different types of enforcement and community initiatives to discourage pavement parking. Sadly, not all of these have proved to be sustainable. City of York Council said that they have tried leafleting cars when they do not allow sufficient space for a wheelchair or pushchair to pass by.⁹² Charnwood Borough Council told us it had run a campaign that gave a single point of contact to whom the public could report incidents of pavement parking where there was less than one metre to get past. There were clear instructions and the public were informed what constituted an offence. This was a joint initiative with the police but did not last: “in 2016 the Police felt they could not offer the resource to deal with these cases anymore. As a result, customers were passed to the council who have no powers where there are no signs and lines”.⁹³

52. The Police and Crime Commissioner for Devon and Cornwall told the Committee that there is widespread confusion and dissatisfaction with enforcement of pavement parking.⁹⁴ The Government admitted in its evidence that the different enforcement roles of the police and local authorities are sometimes not clear.⁹⁵ The then Minister, Michael Ellis MP, noted that “clearly, parking violations of any sort are not a high priority for the police”.⁹⁶

53. As pavement parking can have such a detrimental impact on the lives of millions of people, including vulnerable road users, the only effective deterrent to parking illegally on the pavement is robust enforcement. We recognise that police and local authority budgets are tight. However, both must do more to make it clear to everyone who has enforcement responsibility and commit to doing that enforcement where resources permit. This could be made easier with consistent messaging. We recommend that the Government undertake actions to ensure that local authorities and police forces have access to the correct information about who enforces which offences and they are clear about their responsibilities. They should also commit to publicise to the general public who enforces which offences as part of the public awareness campaign we recommended above.

90 Norfolk County Council and Norwich City Council ([PPA0353](#)), Devon County Council ([PPA0234](#)), City of York Council ([PPA0182](#))

91 Norfolk County Council and Norwich City Council ([PPA0353](#))

92 City of York Council ([PPA0182](#))

93 Charnwood Borough Council ([PPA0282](#))

94 Police and Crime Commissioner for Devon and Cornwall ([PPA0422](#))

95 Department for Transport ([PPA0233](#)), para 44

96 [Q173](#)

Obstruction

54. Most people understand that restricting the width of the pavement can cause an obstruction. The then Minister, Michael Ellis MP, said that “most of us would recognise when a vehicle is parked in such a way that it obstructs lawful road users”.⁹⁷ We have been given different views on what is an acceptable width for pedestrians to be able to use the pavement. Ian Taylor from the Alliance of British Drivers (ABD) said that 1.2 metres would be acceptable.⁹⁸ The Department for Transport’s inclusive mobility guidance says that, where possible, the width of a pavement should be 2 metres.⁹⁹

55. Local authorities, including those in London, would like a clear legal definition of obstruction. Spencer Palmer from London Councils said that the crucial questions are “when is an obstruction an obstruction and what is the clear width you need?”.¹⁰⁰ Lincolnshire County Council said they would “welcome updated statutory guidance” on the matter.¹⁰¹

56. Some local authorities would like obstruction decriminalised so that the offence can be enforced by local authorities, rather than the police.¹⁰² York City Council told us this change would take pressure off the police.¹⁰³ PATROL (Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London) have called for the Government to “add highway obstruction by a stationary vehicle to the list of contraventions for which civil enforcement applies”.¹⁰⁴ Louise Hutchinson from PATROL told us that local authorities want to share these powers with the police.¹⁰⁵

57. Before obstruction could be decriminalised it would have to be clearly defined in statute. Defining obstruction is likely to be difficult. The standard textbook, Wilkinson’s Road Traffic Offences,¹⁰⁶ has 12 densely-packed paragraphs explaining the degree and definition of ‘obstruction’ as it has been defined in caselaw over the past 100 years. Much turns on the question of “intent” in the current offences—e.g. whether obstructive parking is “wilful” or has been “caused” or “permitted”. The Minister of State for Transport, Michael Ellis MP, told us that “The use of the words “obstructing” or “obstruction” is known to law, and, with work, no doubt we could come to an agreement about what amounts to obstruction”.¹⁰⁷

58. Enforcement of parking offences is not a priority for the police. We believe that creating a new civil offence of obstructive pavement parking would take some burden from the police and allow for better, more consistent enforcement. It is important that enforcement sits with the body most able to enforce it: the evidence points to local authorities being that body, and in general they seem to want these powers. This would

97 [Q176](#)

98 [Q11](#)

99 Department for Transport, [Inclusive Mobility](#), 15 December 2005, Para 3.1

100 [Q54](#)

101 Lincolnshire County Council ([PPA0304](#))

102 The East Riding of Yorkshire Council ([PPA0069](#)), City of York Council ([PPA0182](#)), Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council ([PPA0235](#)), Brighton & Hove City Council ([PPA0278](#)), Surrey County Council ([PPA0347](#))

103 City of York Council ([PPA0182](#))

104 PATROL (Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London) ([PPA0334](#)); Traffic Management Act 2004 [schedule 7](#), Part 1

105 [Q60](#)

106 Kevin McCormac (General editor), Wilkinson’s Road Traffic Offences, 28th edition (London 2017), paras 6–210 to 6–221

107 [Q174](#)

take time to accomplish. A new offence would have to be defined in law before local authorities could assume the relevant enforcement powers. *We recommend that the Government consult on a new offence of obstructive pavement parking, with a view to making such an offence subject to civil enforcement under the Traffic Management Act 2004 and introducing the relevant legislation by summer 2020.*

5 A nationwide ban

59. We were struck by the amount of evidence we received about the impact of pavement parking on people’s daily lives and the depth of feeling there was about how this one activity can harm people’s everyday lives.¹⁰⁸ There were concerns, if a nationwide ban on pavement parking were to be implemented, about local authorities being able to make exemptions to best suit their local circumstances. There were also concerns raised in the evidence about street clutter,¹⁰⁹ cost¹¹⁰ and difficulty of exempting specific areas from a pavement parking ban.¹¹¹ However, this must be balanced against the serious negative consequences that pavement parking has on some of the most vulnerable in our society. We recognise that a nationwide ban on pavement parking would have an impact on some drivers who live on narrow residential streets with limited off-street parking and need their cars to get around.

60. The then Minister, Michael Ellis MP, told us that if the TRO process were used to make exemptions to a ban it would cost “at least £1,000 per street”.¹¹² He had not considered modelling any exemption order process on that used in London for more than 40 years, which is cheaper and simpler than a TRO—see Chapter 2, above.¹¹³ The then Minister said that in his view the option to do nothing was “not necessarily a bad option”.¹¹⁴ We disagree.

61. We recommend that, in the long term, the Government legislate for a nationwide ban on pavement parking across England, outside London. The legislation should give the Secretary of State for Transport powers to make secondary legislation setting out exemptions that local authorities can make from a nationwide ban. We recommend that the Government include in the legislation a provision for a new exemption order process based on the London model. The specific nature of those exemptions should only be determined following public consultation and the full involvement of local authorities across England. It should include a full impact assessment to weigh the resource implications to local authorities of different options. The enforcement of this ban should lie with local authorities and not the police who do not have time to enforce parking offences.

62. A public information campaign surrounding this work will help the public understand where they can park, the effects of pavement parking and where to report these offences. We recognise that this fundamental change cannot happen overnight, but the Government must commit to legislating on this issue before the end of this Parliament. In the meantime, we have set out some short- and medium-term options that could be delivered before a ban was in place.

108 41% of the evidence received supported a total ban on pavement parking.

109 Northumberland County Council ([PPA0348](#))

110 Devon County Council ([PPA0234](#))

111 Durham County Council ([PPA0261](#))

112 [Q165](#)

113 [Q170](#)

114 [Q159](#)

Conclusions and recommendations

Effect on people

1. Pavement parking affects everyone who uses the pavement. Pavement parking puts pedestrians in danger when they are forced to move into the road to get around a vehicle or where there are trip hazards due to damage to the pavement. People with mobility or visual impairments, as well as those who care for others, are disproportionately affected. It exacerbates, and is a cause of, social isolation and loneliness for people who feel unable to safely leave their homes or are physically prevented from doing so by pavement parking. We find it profoundly regrettable that the Government has taken so long to take any action to deal with this issue. There have been no concrete actions to tackle pavement parking and improve people's daily lives. We recognise that the Government has to balance the needs of drivers and pedestrians. We recommend that the Government commits to tackling pavement parking as part of its Loneliness Strategy. *We recommend that the Government commits to tackling pavement parking as part of its Loneliness Strategy. We recommend that the Government swiftly learns the lessons from the work being done in other areas of Great Britain.* (Paragraph 32)

Solutions

2. We welcome the then Minister's comments recognising how dangerous pavement parking can be and committing to consider a public awareness campaign on the issue. However, this does not go far enough. We are concerned that there is no real urgency in the Department for Transport to develop a campaign or to find a budget to fund it. A public awareness campaign will not solve the problem of pavement parking by itself, but it is a necessary part of any effort to curtail the incidence of pavement parking. It may reduce the number of people who knowingly break the law and change the behaviour of those who do not know and drive onto a pavement, or are unaware of the effect it has on other people. *We recommend that the Department for Transport plan, fund and deploy a national awareness campaign to highlight that driving onto the pavement is illegal, and to show the negative consequences of pavement parking for pedestrians including older people, disabled people and children. This campaign should highlight the physical dangers involved in pavement parking; how it can cause social isolation; and aim to reduce the instances of pavement parking.* (Paragraph 37)
3. The TRO process can be difficult. Although local authorities can use these powers to ban pavement parking, there is little information on how widely they are used. If the TRO process was made easier and cheaper it would incentivise more local authorities to use these powers. *We recommend that the Government bring forward proposals to reform the TRO process—to make it cheaper and easier for local authorities to use—and bring forward any required secondary legislation, if necessary, by spring 2020.* (Paragraph 44)

4. We believe that public consultation and the right of local people and businesses to object to any change that would have a material impact on their lives is an important part of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process and must be retained. However, the TRO process has an onerous and outdated provision requiring advertisement in a local newspaper. It is vital that people who are affected by a TRO have time to object. Given the seismic changes to news consumption since these provisions were enacted, this imperfectly meets the policy objective of letting as many people as possible who may be affected know about a TRO. We recognise the importance of providing support for local newspapers, but if the Government wishes to do this, it should be done directly, not indirectly through the TRO process. The local authority is best placed to know how to communicate with the community it serves. People can only object if they are informed. Removing the requirement to advertise in a local newspaper would make the TRO process cheaper for local authorities and increase the likelihood of them using TROs to enact pavement parking bans. *We recommend that the Government abolish the requirement to advertise TROs in a local newspaper. It should replace this with a requirement for the local authority to maximise the reach of its advertising to the largest number of people by whatever media would best achieve this. The Government should commit to achieving this by spring 2020: it should be delivered alongside the wider reforms to TROs recommended above.* (Paragraph 45)
5. Areas which have not had their parking enforcement decriminalised lack the resources to ensure adequate parking enforcement. This can blight communities and encourages anti-social parking behaviour, such as pavement parking. We saw numerous examples of this anti-social behaviour during our visit to Bexhill-on-Sea. The then Minister, Michael Ellis MP, assured us that the application from East Sussex would be considered with haste. *The Department for Transport must not drag its feet, citing external or resourcing issues, and must act now to meet the requests of local authorities to decriminalise pavement parking enforcement.* (Paragraph 49)
6. As pavement parking can have such a detrimental impact on the lives of millions of people, including vulnerable road users, the only effective deterrent to parking illegally on the pavement is robust enforcement. We recognise that police and local authority budgets are tight. However, both must do more to make it clear to everyone who has enforcement responsibility and commit to doing that enforcement where resources permit. This could be made easier with consistent messaging. *We recommend that the Government undertake actions to ensure that local authorities and police forces have access to the correct information about who enforces which offences and they are clear about their responsibilities. They should also commit to publicise to the general public who enforces which offences as part of the public awareness campaign we recommended above.* (Paragraph 53)

7. Enforcement of parking offences is not a priority for the police. We believe that creating a new civil offence of obstructive pavement parking would take some burden from the police and allow for better, more consistent enforcement. It is important that enforcement sits with the body most able to enforce it: the evidence points to local authorities being that body, and in general they seem to want these powers. This would take time to accomplish. A new offence would have to be defined in law before local authorities could assume the relevant enforcement powers. *We recommend that the Government consult on a new offence of obstructive pavement parking, with a view to making such an offence subject to civil enforcement under the Traffic Management Act 2004 and introducing the relevant legislation by summer 2020.* (Paragraph 58)

A nationwide ban

8. *We recommend that, in the long term, the Government legislate for a nationwide ban on pavement parking across England, outside London. The legislation should give the Secretary of State for Transport powers to make secondary legislation setting out exemptions that local authorities can make from a nationwide ban. We recommend that the Government include in the legislation a provision for a new exemption order process based on the London model. The specific nature of those exemptions should only be determined following public consultation and the full involvement of local authorities across England. It should include a full impact assessment to weigh the resource implications to local authorities of different options. The enforcement of this ban should lie with local authorities and not the police who do not have time to enforce parking offences.* (Paragraph 61)
9. *A public information campaign surrounding this work will help the public understand where they can park, the effects of pavement parking and where to report these offences. We recognise that this fundamental change cannot happen overnight, but the Government must commit to legislating on this issue before the end of this Parliament. In the meantime, we have set out some short- and medium-term options that could be delivered before a ban was in place.* (Paragraph 62)

Formal minutes

Thursday 5 September 2019

Members present:

Lilian Greenwood, in the Chair

Ruth Cadbury

Daniel Zeichner

Huw Merriman

Draft Report (*Pavement parking*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 62 read and agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Thirteenth Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134.

[Adjourned till Wednesday 16 October at 9.15am

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Wednesday 19 June 2019

Dr Rachel Lee, Policy and Research Coordinator, Living Streets, **Ian Taylor**, Director, Alliance of British Drivers, and **Chris Theobald**, Public Affairs Manager, Guide Dogs, **Simon Botterill**, Transport and Traffic, Design and Delivery Manager, Sheffield City Council, **Louise Hutchinson**, Director, PATROL, **Spencer Palmer**, Director, Transport and Mobility, London Councils, and **Tim Young**, Project Engineer (Policy and Performance), Norfolk County Council

[Q1–123](#)

Wednesday 3 July 2019

Michael Ellis MP, Minister of State, and **Anthony Ferguson**, Deputy Director, Traffic and Technology, Department for Transport

[Q124–186](#)

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

PPA numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

- 1 Brian Abbott ([PPA0046](#))
- 2 Simon Abbott ([PPA0135](#))
- 3 Jason Adams ([PPA0223](#))
- 4 Mr Nigel Ainsworth-Barnes ([PPA0145](#))
- 5 Mrs Lisa Ainsworth-Barnes ([PPA0201](#))
- 6 Colin Aldworth ([PPA0017](#))
- 7 Miss Ann Allen ([PPA0066](#))
- 8 Alliance of British Drivers ([PPA0185](#))
- 9 Altrincham and Bowdon Civic Society ([PPA0397](#))
- 10 Mark Annand ([PPA0003](#))
- 11 Anonymous - written evidence ([PPA0429](#))
- 12 J Ardron ([PPA0056](#))
- 13 Ms Helen Armitage ([PPA0246](#))
- 14 Automobile Association ([PPA0340](#))
- 15 Mr William Baer ([PPA0016](#))
- 16 Mrs Alison Baldock ([PPA0202](#))
- 17 Mr Andrew Barclay ([PPA0341](#))
- 18 Mr Chris Barker ([PPA0083](#))
- 19 Mrs Kim Barnettson ([PPA0073](#))
- 20 Katharine Barnett ([PPA0209](#))
- 21 Mrs Lorraine Barter ([PPA0047](#))
- 22 Mr David Beacham ([PPA0094](#))
- 23 Mr Philip Benstead ([PPA0067](#))
- 24 Mrs Amie Berkovitch ([PPA0240](#))
- 25 Ms Henrietta Bewley ([PPA0119](#))
- 26 Ms Frances Bibby ([PPA0019](#))
- 27 Mr Paul Biggs ([PPA0273](#))
- 28 Birmingham and Black Country Sight Loss Councils ([PPA0318](#))
- 29 Birmingham City Council and West Midlands Police ([PPA0424](#))
- 30 Mr Paul Blomfield ([PPA0248](#))
- 31 Mr Harry Bloomfield ([PPA0090](#))
- 32 Mr Christopher Bloor ([PPA0107](#))
- 33 Crispin Blunt MP ([PPA0276](#))

- 34 Ian Bonner ([PPA0225](#))
- 35 Miss Lisa Boocock ([PPA0021](#))
- 36 Mr Graham Bounds ([PPA0287](#))
- 37 Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council ([PPA0235](#))
- 38 Mr Colin Bousfield ([PPA0425](#))
- 39 Mr William Bramhill ([PPA0258](#))
- 40 Mr R Bravery ([PPA0250](#))
- 41 Ms Alison Brice ([PPA0302](#))
- 42 Grant Bright ([PPA0109](#))
- 43 Brighton & Hove City Council ([PPA0278](#))
- 44 Bristol Walking Alliance ([PPA0060](#))
- 45 British Parking Association ([PPA0374](#))
- 46 British Polio Fellowship ([PPA0434](#))
- 47 Mr Mark Brough ([PPA0242](#))
- 48 Mia Buckley ([PPA0035](#))
- 49 Mr Malcolm Buller ([PPA0289](#))
- 50 Mr Julian Burke ([PPA0363](#))
- 51 J Burtenshaw ([PPA0355](#))
- 52 Mr James Burton ([PPA0177](#))
- 53 Mr Daniel Cahoon ([PPA0259](#))
- 54 Cambridgeshire County Council ([PPA0285](#))
- 55 Camcycle ([PPA0262](#))
- 56 Campaign for Better Transport West & North Yorkshire Branch ([PPA0263](#))
- 57 Mr Douglas Campbell ([PPA0402](#))
- 58 Emily Carey ([PPA0381](#))
- 59 Claire Castell ([PPA0383](#))
- 60 Peter Caunter ([PPA0204](#))
- 61 Centara Neighbourhood Association ([PPA0409](#))
- 62 Mr Matt Chambers ([PPA0392](#))
- 63 Anthony Chapman ([PPA0167](#))
- 64 Mr Nick Chapman ([PPA0027](#))
- 65 Charnwood Borough Council ([PPA0282](#))
- 66 Chaseley Trust ([PPA0426](#))
- 67 CIHT ([PPA0387](#))
- 68 City of York Council ([PPA0182](#))
- 69 Mr Eddie Clark ([PPA0269](#))
- 70 Mr Philip Cleverley ([PPA0428](#)) and ([PPA0441](#))
- 71 Cllr Jack Cousens and Cllr Michael Westbrook ([PPA0227](#))

- 72 Mr John Clunan ([PPA0150](#))
- 73 Mr David Cockayne ([PPA0367](#))
- 74 Ms Georgina Collins ([PPA0099](#))
- 75 Confederation of Passenger Transport ([PPA0413](#))
- 76 Congleton Town Council ([PPA0358](#))
- 77 Mr Graham Cook ([PPA0096](#))
- 78 Mr Jonathan Coombs ([PPA0139](#))
- 79 Patrick Corden ([PPA0401](#))
- 80 Ms Alison Crampin ([PPA0442](#))
- 81 Mrs Sandra Crawford ([PPA0023](#))
- 82 CrossGates Watch Residents Association ([PPA0256](#))
- 83 Mr Richard Crowe ([PPA0191](#))
- 84 Mr Jerry Cullum ([PPA0134](#))
- 85 Cumbria County Council ([PPA0156](#))
- 86 Cycle Basingstoke ([PPA0370](#))
- 87 CycleSheffield ([PPA0077](#))
- 88 Cyclox, the voice of cycling in Oxford ([PPA0329](#))
- 89 Matthew Davies ([PPA0054](#))
- 90 Mrs Gail Davies ([PPA0175](#))
- 91 Stephen Davies ([PPA0124](#))
- 92 Simon Daws ([PPA0218](#))
- 93 Mrs EJ De Villiers ([PPA0398](#))
- 94 Daniel Demmel ([PPA0009](#))
- 95 Mr Karl Denning ([PPA0388](#))
- 96 Department for Transport ([PPA0233](#))
- 97 Mr Jeff Derham ([PPA0122](#))
- 98 Devon County Council ([PPA0234](#))
- 99 Mr Paul Dick ([PPA0076](#))
- 100 Dr J P Dickinson ([PPA0160](#))
- 101 Mr Ian Dinwiddie ([PPA0146](#))
- 102 Disability Sheffield ([PPA0315](#))
- 103 Disabled Motoring UK ([PPA0277](#))
- 104 Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee (DPTAC) ([PPA0333](#))
- 105 Dr Philip Dixon-Phillips ([PPA0174](#))
- 106 Paul Docherty ([PPA0152](#))
- 107 Robert Dodgson ([PPA0444](#))
- 108 Mr Thomas Donoghue ([PPA0058](#))
- 109 Kevin Doyle ([PPA0292](#))

- 110 Dr Tim Jones, Oxford Brookes University ([PPA0245](#))
- 111 Paul Drake-Davis ([PPA0079](#))
- 112 Mr Roy Driver ([PPA0008](#))
- 113 Mr Christopher Dubois ([PPA0029](#))
- 114 Mrs Helen Dudden ([PPA0171](#))
- 115 Mrs Heidi Duffy MBE ([PPA0343](#))
- 116 Clive Durdle ([PPA0199](#))
- 117 Durham County Council ([PPA0261](#))
- 118 East Hampshire District Council ([PPA0032](#))
- 119 The East Riding of Yorkshire Council ([PPA0069](#))
- 120 Mr S.J. Eastwood Snr ([PPA0351](#))
- 121 Mr David Eldridge ([PPA0115](#))
- 122 Mr Geoffrey Entwistle ([PPA0283](#))
- 123 Mr Joaquin Espasandin ([PPA0249](#))
- 124 Dr Martin Evans ([PPA0022](#))
- 125 Mr John Evans ([PPA0130](#))
- 126 Eynsford Parish Council ([PPA0417](#))
- 127 Mr James Filmer ([PPA0219](#))
- 128 Mr Stephen Filson ([PPA0361](#))
- 129 Mr Brian Finney ([PPA0180](#))
- 130 Mr Andrew Fisher ([PPA0317](#))
- 131 Terence Fleming ([PPA0041](#))
- 132 Vicky Ford MP ([PPA0443](#))
- 133 Neil Fortescue ([PPA0020](#))
- 134 Mr David Fossey ([PPA0143](#))
- 135 Andrew Foxcroft ([PPA0274](#))
- 136 Mrs Claire Franklin ([PPA0070](#))
- 137 Ms Christine Franklin ([PPA0108](#))
- 138 Professor Keith Frayn ([PPA0178](#))
- 139 Freight Transport Association ([PPA0190](#))
- 140 Cllr Leigh Frost ([PPA0430](#))
- 141 Jack Frost ([PPA0378](#))
- 142 Mr Ajay Gandhi ([PPA0157](#))
- 143 Chris Garbett ([PPA0051](#))
- 144 Professor Ann Gates ([PPA0264](#))
- 145 Gatley Runners ([PPA0050](#))
- 146 Mr Stuart Gee ([PPA0049](#))
- 147 Stephen George ([PPA0215](#))

- 148 Mike Gibson ([PPA0013](#))
- 149 Steven Gibson ([PPA0052](#))
- 150 Mr James Gilbert ([PPA0314](#))
- 151 Mr Ian Gill ([PPA0393](#))
- 152 Mrs Joanna Gilmour ([PPA0421](#))
- 153 Mr Richard Gilyead ([PPA0005](#))
- 154 Peter Gleaves ([PPA0004](#))
- 155 Paul Gordon ([PPA0095](#))
- 156 Mrs Georgina Grant ([PPA0053](#))
- 157 Dr Edward Gray ([PPA0088](#))
- 158 Green Councillors' Group, Bristol City Council ([PPA0220](#))
- 159 Mr Roger Grosvenor ([PPA0187](#))
- 160 Mr Gordon Guest ([PPA0404](#))
- 161 Guide Dogs ([PPA0350](#))
- 162 Richard Gutteridge MSc ([PPA0039](#))
- 163 Mr Stephen Hackney ([PPA0104](#))
- 164 Mr Peter Hall ([PPA0253](#))
- 165 Mr Paul Hamblin ([PPA0075](#))
- 166 Mr Steve Hamilton ([PPA0337](#))
- 167 David Hancock ([PPA0380](#))
- 168 Mr Toby Harling ([PPA0208](#))
- 169 Kevin Harper ([PPA0210](#))
- 170 Mr Charles Harper ([PPA0339](#))
- 171 Nichola Harrison ([PPA0270](#))
- 172 Mrs Julia Harvey ([PPA0217](#))
- 173 Mr Gordon Hathaway ([PPA0420](#))
- 174 Mr Steve Hatton ([PPA0065](#))
- 175 Dr Damien Herron ([PPA0312](#))
- 176 Hertfordshire County Council ([PPA0321](#))
- 177 JE Hewitt ([PPA0238](#))
- 178 Bob Hey ([PPA0037](#))
- 179 Mr Geoff Heyes ([PPA0138](#))
- 180 Mr Malcolm Heymer ([PPA0188](#))
- 181 Mr Roger Hinton ([PPA0100](#))
- 182 Dr Alan Hobson ([PPA0195](#))
- 183 Mr Guy Hodgson ([PPA0026](#))
- 184 Mr Guy Hodgson ([PPA0141](#))
- 185 Mr John Hogg ([PPA0299](#))

- 186 Mr George Hogman ([PPA0078](#))
- 187 Dr Frank Holland ([PPA0091](#))
- 188 Tony Holmes ([PPA0158](#))
- 189 Holy Trinity Amenity Group ([PPA0382](#))
- 190 Dr Emma Hooper ([PPA0110](#))
- 191 Horton Parish Council ([PPA0440](#))
- 192 Mr Paul Hudson ([PPA0236](#))
- 193 Hull Access Improvement Group ([PPA0328](#))
- 194 Mr Peter Hutchinson ([PPA0268](#))
- 195 IAM RoadSmart ([PPA0320](#))
- 196 Mrs Ann Illingworth ([PPA0125](#))
- 197 Mr Richard Ingham ([PPA0213](#))
- 198 Institute of Highway Engineers ([PPA0303](#))
- 199 Mrs Terry Jackson ([PPA0414](#))
- 200 Anne Jarvis ([PPA0148](#))
- 201 Tom Jeffs ([PPA0001](#))
- 202 Miss Sandra Jell ([PPA0390](#))
- 203 Mrs Stephanie Jenkins ([PPA0030](#))
- 204 Mr Andrew Johnson ([PPA0102](#))
- 205 Mr Julian Jones ([PPA0356](#))
- 206 Tim Kasoar ([PPA0271](#))
- 207 Mr Gavin Keir ([PPA0012](#))
- 208 Mr Mark Kemp ([PPA0306](#))
- 209 Mr Robin Kenworthy ([PPA0375](#)) and ([PPA0437](#))
- 210 Mr Iain Kernaghan ([PPA0345](#))
- 211 Gary Kingsbury ([PPA0241](#))
- 212 Mr John Kirk ([PPA0011](#))
- 213 Mike Knight ([PPA0006](#))
- 214 Knighton Access Group ([PPA0298](#))
- 215 Jennifer Kosarew ([PPA0068](#))
- 216 Dr Stefan Kruczkowski ([PPA0410](#))
- 217 L Brown Associates Ltd ([PPA0025](#))
- 218 L Brown Associates Ltd ([PPA0116](#))
- 219 Ms R Lack ([PPA0113](#))
- 220 Ms Susan Langford ([PPA0207](#))
- 221 Mrs Anna Langley ([PPA0028](#))
- 222 Mr Clifford Lantaff ([PPA0371](#))
- 223 Larcombe, Ward Councillor Ewan ([PPA0327](#))

- 224 Eleanor's Story Neild Larry ([PPA0291](#))
- 225 Mr Clifford Lee ([PPA0062](#))
- 226 John Leech ([PPA0040](#))
- 227 Mrs Hilary Leeves ([PPA0394](#))
- 228 Leicester Disabled People's Access Group ([PPA0364](#))
- 229 Mr Robert C Leigh ([PPA0097](#))
- 230 Dr Nick Leimu-Brown ([PPA0112](#))
- 231 Jamie Lenton ([PPA0300](#))
- 232 Miss Linette Leslie ([PPA0057](#))
- 233 Lewisham Living Streets Group ([PPA0377](#))
- 234 Lincolnshire County Council ([PPA0304](#))
- 235 Garin Linnington ([PPA0154](#))
- 236 Mr Steve Little ([PPA0064](#))
- 237 Liverpool City Council ([PPA0309](#))
- 238 Living Streets ([PPA0399](#))
- 239 Living Streets-additional written evidence ([PPA0438](#))
- 240 Daniel Lodge ([PPA0325](#))
- 241 Daniel Lodge ([PPA0368](#))
- 242 London Councils ([PPA0427](#))
- 243 London TravelWatch ([PPA0131](#))
- 244 Dr Barbara Lucas ([PPA0103](#))
- 245 Helen Lynn ([PPA0260](#))
- 246 Mrs Susan Lyons ([PPA0048](#))
- 247 M, Mr D ([PPA0132](#))
- 248 Tom MacFaul ([PPA0071](#))
- 249 Mrs Janet Macintosh ([PPA0129](#))
- 250 Mr Ben Magee ([PPA0120](#))
- 251 Mr Robert Maggs ([PPA0176](#))
- 252 Manor Park & Hempstead Fields Residents' Association ([PPA0183](#))
- 253 Dr Paul Marchant ([PPA0272](#))
- 254 Mr Barry Marchant ([PPA0117](#))
- 255 Marden Parish Council ([PPA0265](#))
- 256 Mrs Gia Margolis ([PPA0330](#))
- 257 Mr Pete Marks ([PPA0205](#))
- 258 Mr Anthony Keith Marquis ([PPA0127](#))
- 259 Fred Mason ([PPA0092](#))
- 260 Arabella Maude ([PPA0405](#))
- 261 Chris Maxim ([PPA0419](#))

- 262 Mayor of Greater Manchester and Greater Manchester Cycling and Walking Commissioner ([PPA0418](#))
- 263 Mr Terry Mcardle ([PPA0010](#))
- 264 Mr Donald McArthur ([PPA0106](#))
- 265 Mrs Maureen McBain ([PPA0411](#))
- 266 Mr Chris McGrath ([PPA0059](#))
- 267 Mr William McKinnon ([PPA0372](#))
- 268 Mr Neil Meadows ([PPA0149](#))
- 269 Pieter Meiring ([PPA0310](#))
- 270 Mr James Metcalfe ([PPA0407](#))
- 271 Mid Sussex District Council ([PPA0395](#))
- 272 Miss Rosy Moore ([PPA0128](#))
- 273 Mr Peter Moore ([PPA0322](#))
- 274 Mr Wayne Moore ([PPA0014](#))
- 275 Michael Moorhouse ([PPA0137](#))
- 276 Mrs Alison Morgan ([PPA0211](#))
- 277 Ms Emily Wolfe and Simon Margetts ([PPA0173](#))
- 278 Paul Murphy ([PPA0085](#))
- 279 Alan Myers ([PPA0038](#))
- 280 National Rheumatoid Arthritis Society ([PPA0280](#))
- 281 Neighbourhood Watch-Buckinghamshire ([PPA0224](#))
- 282 Mr Graham Newman ([PPA0159](#))
- 283 NFBUK ([PPA0359](#))
- 284 John Nock ([PPA0203](#))
- 285 Norfolk County Council and Norwich City Council ([PPA0353](#))
- 286 North Essex Parking Partnership - Colchester Borough Council ([PPA0222](#))
- 287 Northumberland County Council ([PPA0348](#))
- 288 Northumbria Police and Crime Commissioner ([PPA0389](#))
- 289 Connor O'Dana ([PPA0036](#))
- 290 Mr Keith O'Leary ([PPA0184](#))
- 291 Donald O'Neal ([PPA0168](#))
- 292 Older People's Advisory Group, Ageing Better in Camden ([PPA0406](#))
- 293 Ms Jayn Oliff ([PPA0170](#))
- 294 Oxford Pedestrians Association ([PPA0200](#))
- 295 Oxfordshire County Council Public Health ([PPA0346](#))
- 296 Mr Neil Oxley ([PPA0214](#))
- 297 P Whitfield Consulting ([PPA0212](#))
- 298 Mr William Pannell ([PPA0121](#))

- 299 Mr Mike Parker ([PPA0114](#))
- 300 John Parkin ([PPA0074](#))
- 301 Dr Martin Parretti ([PPA0396](#))
- 302 PATROL (Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London) ([PPA0334](#))
- 303 PATROL-additional written evidence ([PPA0439](#))
- 304 Mr Dudley Peacham ([PPA0379](#))
- 305 Pedestrian Liberation ([PPA0061](#))
- 306 Nicola Pemberton ([PPA0391](#))
- 307 Pembrokeshire Access Group ([PPA0018](#))
- 308 Mr Leslie Phillips ([PPA0087](#))
- 309 Mr Tim Pickering ([PPA0386](#))
- 310 Mr Tad Piesakowski ([PPA0257](#))
- 311 Mrs Laurence Pinturault ([PPA0251](#))
- 312 David Pitman ([PPA0033](#))
- 313 Mr Andrew Plumridge ([PPA0098](#))
- 314 Mr Matthew Polaine ([PPA0400](#))
- 315 Police and Crime Commissioner for Devon and Cornwall ([PPA0422](#))
- 316 Joseph Pontin ([PPA0007](#))
- 317 Robin Potter ([PPA0408](#))
- 318 Susan Potter ([PPA0055](#))
- 319 Dr Georgia Powell ([PPA0031](#))
- 320 RAC Motoring Services ([PPA0243](#))
- 321 Martin Rathfelder ([PPA0080](#))
- 322 Mr Anthony Reed ([PPA0081](#))
- 323 Fiona Reid ([PPA0166](#))
- 324 Mr Stefan Resner ([PPA0105](#))
- 325 Mrs Tina Riches ([PPA0193](#))
- 326 Gillian Risbridger ([PPA0164](#))
- 327 Mr Simon Roberts ([PPA0186](#))
- 328 Mrs Amanda Robertson ([PPA0319](#))
- 329 Ms Janice Robertson ([PPA0247](#))
- 330 Rollercoaster Records ([PPA0140](#))
- 331 The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA) ([PPA0226](#))
- 332 Mr Robert Rudd ([PPA0198](#))
- 333 Reverend Andy Salmon ([PPA0313](#))
- 334 Mr Malcolm Savage ([PPA0123](#))
- 335 Keith Searing ([PPA0284](#))
- 336 Sheffield City Council ([PPA0349](#))

- 337 Mr Alan Shepherd ([PPA0216](#))
- 338 Cllr Mandie Shilton Godwin ([PPA0089](#))
- 339 Oliver Shipp ([PPA0376](#))
- 340 Mr David Short ([PPA0084](#))
- 341 Cllr Margaret Smidowicz ([PPA0301](#))
- 342 Mr David Smith ([PPA0181](#))
- 343 Peter Smith ([PPA0286](#))
- 344 Dr Mark Smithson ([PPA0161](#))
- 345 Southend-on-Sea Borough Council ([PPA0338](#))
- 346 Mr Graham Southern ([PPA0101](#))
- 347 Miss Victoria Sowter ([PPA0244](#))
- 348 SPACE for Gosforth ([PPA0255](#))
- 349 Mr Robbie Spence ([PPA0266](#))
- 350 St Helens Council ([PPA0342](#))
- 351 Dr Eleanor Standen ([PPA0147](#))
- 352 Staplehurst Parish Council ([PPA0144](#))
- 353 Mrs Emily Steadman ([PPA0323](#))
- 354 Mr Morris Steel ([PPA0142](#))
- 355 Mr Dene Stevens ([PPA0352](#))
- 356 Mrs Liz Straw ([PPA0093](#))
- 357 Ms Lynne Strutt ([PPA0189](#))
- 358 Mr Martin Stubbs ([PPA0086](#))
- 359 Mrs Jacqueline Stubbs ([PPA0415](#))
- 360 Surrey County Council ([PPA0347](#))
- 361 Sustainable Uttlesford ([PPA0111](#))
- 362 Sustrans ([PPA0311](#))
- 363 Sustrans / Bexhill Wheelers ([PPA0403](#))
- 364 Ms Susan Tanner ([PPA0151](#))
- 365 Sam Tate ([PPA0369](#))
- 366 Mrs Petrina Tatnall ([PPA0163](#))
- 367 Telford & Wrekin Council ([PPA0281](#))
- 368 Lee Tempest ([PPA0043](#))
- 369 Andrew Tett ([PPA0290](#))
- 370 The Thaxted Society ([PPA0423](#))
- 371 Stephen Thomas ([PPA0335](#))
- 372 Ms Angela Thomson ([PPA0373](#))
- 373 Mr John Tilly ([PPA0432](#))
- 374 Mr David Tingay ([PPA0305](#))

- 375 Professor Christopher Todd ([PPA0288](#))
- 376 Mr Frank Tompson ([PPA0169](#))
- 377 Mr Richard Toulson ([PPA0044](#))
- 378 Graham Turnbull ([PPA0082](#))
- 379 Peter Turner ([PPA0118](#))
- 380 Tyne and Wear Public Transport Users Group ([PPA0326](#))
- 381 UKactive/Champion for Physical Activity for Birmingham ([PPA0192](#))
- 382 Mr Jeremy Varns ([PPA0412](#))
- 383 Ms Marie Veron Armitage ([PPA0162](#))
- 384 Mrs Anne Vladar ([PPA0360](#))
- 385 W, J Ms ([PPA0072](#))
- 386 Walk Ride Heatons ([PPA0294](#))
- 387 Walking and Cycling Alliance ([PPA0332](#))
- 388 WalkRide Chorlton ([PPA0206](#))
- 389 WalkRide GM ([PPA0252](#))
- 390 Arthur Ward ([PPA0357](#))
- 391 WaterColour Management Company Ltd. ([PPA0228](#))
- 392 Ms Deborah Watson ([PPA0362](#))
- 393 West Midlands Combined Authority (Transport for West Midlands) ([PPA0336](#))
- 394 The West of England Centre for Inclusive Living (WECIL) ([PPA0275](#))
- 395 Ms Susan Westlake ([PPA0179](#))
- 396 Professor John Whitelegg ([PPA0196](#))
- 397 Whittaker Lane Residents Group ([PPA0279](#))
- 398 Mr Nickoli Wilde ([PPA0165](#))
- 399 Adrian Wilkinson ([PPA0063](#))
- 400 Clive Wilkinson ([PPA0155](#))
- 401 Charlie Williams ([PPA0015](#))
- 402 Mr Owen Williams ([PPA0197](#))
- 403 Mr Richard Williams ([PPA0237](#))
- 404 Mr Martin Williamson ([PPA0002](#))
- 405 Matthew Wilson ([PPA0254](#))
- 406 Wirral Council ([PPA0344](#))
- 407 Wirral Pedestrians Association ([PPA0293](#))
- 408 Jamie Wood ([PPA0194](#))
- 409 Lesley Wood ([PPA0042](#))
- 410 Alan Woodard ([PPA0045](#))
- 411 Woolmer Green Parish Council ([PPA0230](#))
- 412 Worthing Green Party ([PPA0308](#))

- 413 Wraysbury Parish Council ([PPA0324](#))
- 414 Jim Wren ([PPA0136](#))
- 415 Janet Wright ([PPA0232](#))
- 416 Mr Simon Yapp ([PPA0126](#))
- 417 John Yardley ([PPA0221](#))
- 418 Mr Wolf Simpson ([PPA0331](#))
- 419 Chris Owen ([PPA0384](#))
- 420 Ms Ann-Marie Cousins ([PPA0445](#))
- 421 Mr Callum McFadzean Hassall ([PPA0446](#))
- 422 Mr Geoff Pullin ([PPA0447](#))
- 423 PATROL and Traffic Penalty Tribunal ([PPA0448](#))
- 424 Cllr Mike Taylor ([PPA0450](#))
- 425 Mrs Andrea Stoddart ([PPA0451](#))
- 426 Mr Stuart O'Dell ([PPA0452](#))
- 427 Gareth Lloyd ([PPA0453](#))
- 428 Mythchett, Frimley Green & Deepcut Society ([PPA0454](#))

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the [publications page](#) of the Committee's website. The reference number of the Government's response to each Report is printed in brackets after the HC printing number.

Session 2017–19

First Report	Community transport and the Department for Transport's proposed consultation	HC 480 (HC 832)
Second Report	Improving air quality	HC 433 (HC 1149)
Third Report	Airports National Policy Statement	HC 548 (Cm 9624)
Fourth Report	Rail Infrastructure investment	HC 582 (HC 1557)
Fifth Report	Intercity East Coast rail franchise	HC 891 (HC 1729)
Sixth Report	Appointment of the Chair of the Office of Rail and Road	HC 1510 (HC 1859)
Seventh Report	Rail timetable changes: May 2018	HC 1163 (HC 1939)
Eighth Report	Mobility as a Service	HC 590 (HC 1984)
Ninth Report	Bus services in England outside London	HC 1425
Tenth Report	Local roads funding and maintenance: filling the gap	HC 1486
Eleventh Report	Active travel: increasing levels of walking and cycling in England	HC 1487
Twelfth Report	Road safety: driving while using a mobile phone	HC 2329
First Special Report	Vauxhall Zafira fires: Government Response to the Committee's Tenth Report of Session 2016–17	HC 516
Second Special Report	Community transport and the Department for Transport's proposed consultation: Government Response to the Committee's First Report of Session 2017–19	HC 832
Third Special Report	Improving air quality: Government Response to the Committee's Second Report of Session 2017–19	HC 1149
Fourth Special Report	Rail infrastructure investment: Government and Office of Rail and Road Responses to the Committee's Fourth Report of Session 2017–19	HC 1557
Fifth Special Report	Intercity East Coast franchise: Government Response to the Committee's Fifth Report of Session 2017–19	HC 1729
Sixth Special Report	Appointment of the Chair of the Office of Rail and Road: Government Response to the Committee's Sixth Report	HC 1859
Seventh Special Report	Rail timetable changes: Government and Office of Rail and Road Responses to the Committee's Seventh Report	HC 1939
Eighth Special Report	Mobility as a Service: Government Response to the Committee's Eighth Report	HC 1984

Submission to the Transport Select Committee by Surrey County Council

14 May 2019

The impact of pavement parking:

We know it causes problems for people to get along the footway safely, however we don't have data about number of complaints specifically or analysis of frequency/severity of problems.

Car ownership and housing density is increasing in Surrey. In many towns there is not enough parking space on streets, many of which were laid out before the car was invented. The lack of road space combined with infill development increases pressure to park on footways and verges. As a county council we spend approximately £300,000 per year managing parking restrictions and we have a countywide programme to tackle dangerous and obstructive parking but this might be done on a smaller scale if footway parking were prohibited.

Parking on footways and verges causes damage to the surface (and also potentially to utility company apparatus underneath) leading to additional maintenance costs and general degradation of the street scene / environment. This gives rise to complaints and residents often put logs/rocks/posts and other obstructions on verges to protect them.

Historically, when we have received complaints about footway or verge parking and obstruction in busy pedestrian areas we have installed bollards or other street furniture to prevent it. This can be expensive on a large scale, we estimate an annual spend of approximately £75,000 each year on this activity.

There are many residential streets with little off road parking where resident's cars are parked in almost every conceivable space on the road, footway or verge. Many residents rely on cars in areas less well served by public transport so managing this situation can be challenging, removing parking space quite often just causes displacement (usually somewhere less suitable)

It is not unusual for incidents and complaints over pavement parking to be associated with the areas near to schools at school journey times. This can impede journeys to school by those walking and scooting and can make travel by these modes less attractive and convenient. It can be especially problematical if it results in school children and parents having to walk or scoot in the road, or if the parked vehicle obscures visibility between different road users. If these problems deter more walking and scooting, and lead to more car use, then this results in more congestion, more air pollution, and is worse for the health of school children.

There is often confusion amongst the public regarding who enforces footway parking, particularly as parking in front of a dropped kerb is decriminalised under Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) but parking so to block footways is not.

Current Practice

Surrey Police have powers to tackle obstruction on the highway including the footway. They do respond to serious obstructive parking problems but their policing priorities often mean 'routine' footway parking issues do not receive attention.

Current legislation (TSRGD 2016) allows us to prohibit or allow footway parking with the introduction of a TRO. We can also introduce waiting restrictions that apply to the back of the highway (verge or footway) to achieve the same effect but this means it is not possible to park on the road either.

It is challenging to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in an area where footway parking has been taking place for a long time. The most severe problems take place where residents have little/no off street parking, on a narrow road with high housing density. To ban parking in these circumstances is politically very challenging as parking capacity is reduced by ~50% and therefore such proposals are unpopular with the overwhelming majority of residents.

In some circumstances a permit parking scheme or CPZ may alleviate pressure by removing non resident parkers but in most cases the problems are worst in the evenings and overnight when only residents are home.

We have implemented two footway/verge parking bans in Surrey since the DfT relaxed the relevant signing regulations in 2011. Both schemes were introduced in Epsom and Ewell Borough over relatively small areas (about 6 streets each) and had to be signed at the boundaries with repeater signs at regular intervals. The combined cost of the traffic orders and signs for each scheme was about £5000 and covered a tiny percentage of the overall urban/residential area in Surrey. It would be prohibitively expensive to expand this type of restriction over large areas using the current TRO legislation and in the process greatly increase sign clutter.

Note: Local Authorities are still required to place a statutory notice in the local paper (usually twice) when promoting TRO's. We spend approximately £75,000 per year on parking restriction notices alone, despite concerted efforts to reduce this in recent years. We encourage feedback and objections to proposals via our web pages and always ask respondents how they came to find out about the planned restrictions. Generally 1% say they saw a notice in the local paper, the remainder from a letter/street notice/web or neighbour.

Surrey operates a 'parking review' process whereby we assess complaints and comments about parking issues in each borough every year. This picks up parking related safety and obstruction problems and we decide at a local level whether to introduce restrictions that may be needed. We tend to tackle persistent and dangerous footway obstruction in this process.

A 'national' blanket ban on footway and verge parking would create huge problems for many towns and villages in Surrey that are currently largely unrestricted. Many vehicles would be displaced and I expect obstruction of the highway rather than the footway would become more widespread.

Surrey County Council has a "Road Safety Outside Schools Policy" which sets out a process of how we respond to concerns over road safety near schools. This includes a site visit to assess the perceived problems and to develop highway solutions where possible. If pavement parking is an issue then options such as bollards and other parking controls can be considered, but this can be expensive and not always feasible. For the reasons described above enforcement can be problematical.

SCC recommendations to the committee

1. It doesn't seem practical/cost effective to introduce large scale pavement/verge parking bans as currently allowed by the TSRGD 2016. The cost of traffic orders and

signs would be prohibitive, particularly in locations where there may only be pavement parking by 'one or two' individuals

2. If a 'blanket ban' on pavement parking were to be introduced, our authority would come under huge pressure to introduce schemes that re-permit pavement parking (as in London) which would require a significant resource to implement and maintain at a time of severely reduced budgets, so the legislation would need to be supported by extra funding from central government.
3. It seems unlikely that pursuing such blanket schemes would be of greater benefit (from a safety perspective for example) than the schemes we're currently promoting with the resources at our disposal.
4. **From our perspective, the most effective approach would be to enable obstruction of the footway to be penalised as a civil matter under CPE, allowing us to take enforcement action against the main problems caused by pavement parking without the need for costly TROs and signage. This would also stop the police from being asked to divert resources to deal with the problem, although they could retain the powers to take action if necessary.**
5. **If councils had powers to enforce footway obstruction we could devise our own enforcement policies that might include considerations such as:**
 - **Setting a minimum width of footway that must be kept clear before obstruction was caused.**
 - **Taking into account traffic and pedestrian movement and the road hierarchy**
 - **A safety assessment of streets where footway parking was the norm to guide enforcement practice.**
 - **Publicity to inform highway users and residents and potentially issuing warnings for a first offence.**
- 6 **Contraventions of any new footway obstruction offence should be at the higher PCN level, currently £70 in Surrey.**
- 7 **Camera enforcement of footway obstruction should be permitted in areas where a prohibition by TRO is in place or elsewhere within 500m of a school during the operational hours of the school keep clear.**

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

17 March 2020



Title	Statutory Guidance on Overview and Scrutiny in Local Authorities		
Purpose of the report	To note		
Report Author	Gillian Scott, Principal Committee Manager		
Cabinet Member	Not applicable	Confidential	No
Corporate Priority	This item is not in the current list of Corporate priorities but still requires a Cabinet decision		
Recommendations	<p>The Committee is asked to review the new statutory guidance on Overview and Scrutiny (attached as Appendix 1) with a view to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Noting the policies, practice, and approaches detailed within the statutory guidance; 2) Identifying any changes to current practice as a result of the guidance that can be directly implemented by the Committee; or by way of recommendation to Cabinet for any matters outside the Committee's remit. 		
Reason for recommendation	Statutory guidance on Overview and Scrutiny has been published in May 2019 to ensure that local authorities carry out their Overview and Scrutiny functions effectively.		

1. Key issues

- 1.1 On 7 May 2019 the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government published the document, 'Statutory Guidance for Local Authorities on Overview and Scrutiny'. The new guidance seeks to clarify the role and benefits of scrutiny to local authorities, taking into account the significant changes to scrutiny since the previous guidance was published in 2006.
- 1.2 The statutory O&S guidance includes a number of policies and practices authorities should adopt or should consider adopting when deciding how to carry out their overview and scrutiny functions. The council 'must have regard' to the guidance but is not required to follow it in every detail.
- 1.3 Although it is statutory guidance, it is non-prescriptive and distinctly light-touch. It maintains that individual local authorities are best placed to decide how scrutiny should work within their own political structures. As such, individual local authorities are invited to determine whether to implement the policies and practices featured in the guidance.

- 1.4 Although parts of the guidance are focussed on the wider culture of the organisation towards scrutiny, and as such are beyond the remit of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to directly determine, other sections provide more practical advice. Where the guidance makes practical recommendations, the Committee needs to consider how it wishes those to be implemented. The areas within the remit of the Committee to implement are highlighted in this report.
- 1.5 The guidance identifies effective scrutiny using six themes: culture, resourcing, selection of committee members, powers to access information, planning of work programmes, and evidence sessions.
- 1.6 The key content of the six themes is summarised below in sections 2 - 6 and the full report is attached at Appendix 1. Limited comment is offered.

2. Culture

2.1 The guidance acknowledges that the organisational culture within a local authority is a key determinant of the success or failure of O&S, and emphasises the importance of councillors in setting an environment for effective scrutiny.

2.2 The guidance lists a range of suggested mechanisms to help establish a strong organisational culture supportive of the role of scrutiny. These are:

a) Recognising scrutiny's legal and democratic legitimacy

The need for all councillors and officers to understand the importance and legitimacy of scrutiny, particularly its role as a check and balance on the Cabinet.

b) Identifying a clear role and focus

The guidance advocates scrutiny having a clearly defined role within the organisation and one that is focussed on providing value.

It is emphasised that there needs to be a clear division of responsibilities between the scrutiny and audit functions

c) Ensuring early and regular engagement between the executive and scrutiny

The guidance suggests there should be early and regular discussions between scrutiny and the Cabinet, especially about the future work programme of the Cabinet.

d) Managing disagreement

The guidance suggests that it is the job of the Cabinet and scrutiny to work together to reduce the risk of the Cabinet disagreeing with the findings or recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC). To achieve this, the development of a protocol is suggested to manage instances when the Cabinet disagrees with OSC recommendations.

e) Providing the necessary support

The guidance recognises that determining the level of support available for Scrutiny is a matter for individual authorities, but it does highlight that appropriate support should be given to allow Scrutiny Members to access information required to fulfil their duties.

f) Ensuring impartial advice from officers

The guidance re-confirms the need for all officers to be able to give impartial advice to OSCs to help ensure effective scrutiny.

g) Communicating scrutiny's role and purpose to the wider authority

The guidance notes that scrutiny can lack support and recognition due to a lack of awareness within a local authority about its role.

h) Maintaining the interest of full Council in the work of Scrutiny

The guidance notes the importance of the wider membership of the Council being kept informed of the work of scrutiny. The suggested mechanism for this is through submitting OSC reports and recommendations to full Council rather than solely to the Cabinet.

i) Communicating scrutiny's role to the public

The guidance recommends scrutiny has a profile in the wider community and suggests engaging the Council's communications officers to help with this.

j) Ensuring scrutiny members are supported in having an independent mind-set

The guidance notes the potential difficulties for O&S councillors in having to scrutinise colleagues and their need for an independent mind-set.

- 2.3 Many parts of the above are outside of the remit of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to directly influence. As such the Committee should consider highlighting these recommendations to the Cabinet.

3. Resourcing

- 3.1 The guidance suggests the resource allocated to scrutiny is fundamental in determining how effective the function is, before noting it is a matter for each local authority to decide.
- 3.2 Currently, the Council does not have a dedicated scrutiny officer post or a scrutiny budget for external advice and expertise. It is supported by the Deputy Chief Executive, Terry Collier.
- 3.3 This section of the guidance is also beyond the remit of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to directly influence.

4. Selecting Committee Members

- 4.1 The guidance notes how important the councillors serving on OSCs are to the effective functioning of scrutiny. The guidance emphasises the need to consider experience, expertise, interests, ability to act impartially, ability to work as part of a group, and capacity to serve when selecting councillors to serve on OSCs.
- 4.2 The selection of Scrutiny Members at this Council is by the respective political groups and as such beyond the direct control of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 4.3 The guidance recognises the importance and influence the role of Chairman has in the success of scrutiny. A suggestion is made for taking a vote by secret ballot as a method for selecting a scrutiny Chairman, but it is made clear that each local authority can choose the best method for their circumstances.

- 4.4 The guidance recommends that an induction and ongoing training are provided for scrutiny councillors to enable them to carry out their roles effectively.
- 4.5 The Council offers induction training and ongoing skills training to councillors, usually facilitated by Mark Palmer from South East Employers. All the training he has delivered to date has been well received by councillors and additional sessions on aspects of overview and scrutiny are envisaged for the forthcoming year. In addition, councillors are able to attend external O&S training courses (for example, with the Centre for Public Scrutiny and the Local Government Association).

5. Power to Access Information

- 5.1 The guidance notes the legal powers of an OSC to access information in order to do its job effectively. The guidance suggests a number of considerations for scrutiny when seeking information from external organisations, including the need to explain the purpose of scrutiny, the benefits of an informal approach, how to encourage compliance with the request, and who best to approach.
- 5.2 Spelthorne Borough Council has framed its approach to external organisations on a case by case basis and has historically experienced positive responses to providing documentation and appearing before its Committee.

6. Planning Work

- 6.1 The guidance stresses the importance of focusing on items that can make a tangible difference and having a long term plan, but one flexible enough to accommodate urgent, short term issues that arise.
- 6.2 The guidance suggests a variety of sources can inform the O&S work programme, including the public, partner organisations, the Cabinet and senior officers. In consulting with the public it does highlight that a formal consultation on scrutiny may be less successful than individual councillors having conversations with groups and individuals in their local communities.
- 6.3 The guidance also recommends approaches to shortlisting topics should ensure that the items chosen are ones in which scrutiny can add value.
- 6.4 At Spelthorne Borough Council, the O&S work programme is considered regularly and agreed formally by the OSC. Topics are shortlisted with reference to a standard criteria selection tool for assessing their significance for and value to our communities.
- 6.5 The Committee may wish to consider who else should be consulted in developing its work programme and how this could be accomplished.
- 6.6 The guidance suggests a number of ways to scrutinise topics, including as a single item on an agenda, a single item meeting, short or long-term task and finish groups, and a standing panel.
- 6.7 In the past year at Spelthorne, the majority of topics for O&S have been scrutinised as individual items on an agenda, a larger topic (Heathrow expansion) has involved a dedicated meeting, and more complex issues have already been identified as pieces of work for task groups next year.

7. Evidence Sessions

- 7.1 The guidance notes that evidence sessions are a key way for OSCs to inform their work and that they require effective planning. In particular it is recommended that consideration is given to setting overall objectives for each session and the types of questions that need to be asked to achieve these objectives.
- 7.2 Prior to each OSC meeting at Spelthorne Borough Council, a pre-meeting is held with the Chairman for discussing each agenda item and for question-planning. Given the importance of effective planning, the Committee might consider whether the current system of pre-meetings with the Chair allows this to be accomplished or whether other mechanisms should be considered.
- 7.3 In developing recommendations from the evidence sessions the guidance advocates the need for them to be evidence based and SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timed). The guidance also suggests that a maximum of six to eight recommendations per topic should be sufficient to ensure that a focussed response is received.

8. Next Steps

- 8.1 There are areas within the guidance, such as work programming and evidence sessions that relate specifically to processes within the control of the Committee.
- 8.2 As such the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to give consideration to its current processes and whether any changes are required as a result of the guidance.
- 8.3 Any changes that the Committee identifies in relation to other matters covered in the guidance will need to be dealt with by way of a recommendation to Cabinet.

Background papers: There are none

Appendices:

Appendix 1 – Statutory Guidance on Overview and Scrutiny in Local and Combined Authorities, May 2019.

This page is intentionally left blank



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

Statutory Guidance on Overview and Scrutiny in Local and Combined Authorities



© Crown copyright, 2019

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/>

This document/publication is also available on our website at www.gov.uk/mhclg

If you have any enquiries regarding this document/publication, complete the form at <http://forms.communities.gov.uk/> or write to us at:

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF
Telephone: 030 3444 0000

For all our latest news and updates follow us on Twitter: <https://twitter.com/mhclg>

May 2019

ISBN: 978-1-4098-5458-6

Contents

Ministerial Foreword	4
About this Guidance	5
1. Introduction and Context	7
2. Culture	8
3. Resourcing	13
4. Selecting Committee Members	15
5. Power to Access Information	18
6. Planning Work	21
7. Evidence Sessions	25
Annex 1: Illustrative Scenario – Creating an Executive-Scrutiny Protocol	27
Annex 2: Illustrative Scenario – Engaging Independent Technical Advisers	28
Annex 3: Illustrative Scenario – Approaching an External Organisation to Appear before a Committee	30

Ministerial Foreword

The role that overview and scrutiny can play in holding an authority's decision-makers to account makes it fundamentally important to the successful functioning of local democracy. Effective scrutiny helps secure the efficient delivery of public services and drives improvements within the authority itself. Conversely, poor scrutiny can be indicative of wider governance, leadership and service failure.

It is vital that councils and combined authorities know the purpose of scrutiny, what effective scrutiny looks like, how to conduct it and the benefits it can bring. This guidance aims to increase understanding in all four areas.

In writing this guidance, my department has taken close note of the House of Commons Select Committee report of December 2017, as well as the written and oral evidence supplied to that Committee. We have also consulted individuals and organisations with practical involvement in conducting, researching and supporting scrutiny.

It is clear from speaking to these practitioners that local and combined authorities with effective overview and scrutiny arrangements in place share certain key traits, the most important being a strong organisational culture. Authorities who welcome challenge and recognise the value scrutiny can bring reap the benefits. But this depends on strong commitment from the top - from senior members as well as senior officials.

Crucially, this guidance recognises that authorities have democratic mandates and are ultimately accountable to their electorates, and that authorities themselves are best-placed to know which scrutiny arrangements are most appropriate for their own individual circumstances.

I would, however, strongly urge all councils to cast a critical eye over their existing arrangements and, above all, ensure they embed a culture that allows overview and scrutiny to flourish.



A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Rishi Sunak'.

Rishi Sunak MP
Minister for Local Government

About this Guidance

Who the guidance is for

This document is aimed at local authorities and combined authorities in England to help them carry out their overview and scrutiny functions effectively. In particular, it provides advice for senior leaders, members of overview and scrutiny committees, and support officers.

Aim of the guidance

This guidance seeks to ensure local authorities and combined authorities are aware of the purpose of overview and scrutiny, what effective scrutiny looks like, how to conduct it effectively and the benefits it can bring.

As such, it includes a number of policies and practices authorities should adopt or should consider adopting when deciding how to carry out their overview and scrutiny functions.

The guidance recognises that authorities approach scrutiny in different ways and have different processes and procedures in place, and that what might work well for one authority might not work well in another.

The hypothetical scenarios contained in the annexes to this guidance have been included for illustrative purposes, and are intended to provoke thought and discussion rather than serve as a 'best' way to approach the relevant issues.

While the guidance sets out some of the key legal requirements, it does not seek to replicate legislation.

Status of the guidance

This is statutory guidance from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. Local authorities and combined authorities must have regard to it when exercising their functions. The phrase 'must have regard', when used in this context, does not mean that the sections of statutory guidance have to be followed in every detail, but that they should be followed unless there is a good reason not to in a particular case.

Not every authority is required to appoint a scrutiny committee. This guidance applies to those authorities who have such a committee in place, whether they are required to or not.

This guidance has been issued under section 9Q of the Local Government Act 2000 and under paragraph 2(9) of Schedule 5A to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, which requires authorities to have regard to this guidance. In addition, authorities may have regard to other material they might choose to consider, including that issued by the Centre for Public Scrutiny, when exercising their overview and scrutiny functions.

Terminology

Unless 'overview' is specifically mentioned, the term 'scrutiny' refers to both overview and scrutiny.¹

Where the term 'authority' is used, it refers to both local authorities and combined authorities.

Where the term 'scrutiny committee' is used, it refers to an overview and scrutiny committee and any of its sub-committees. As the legislation refers throughout to powers conferred on scrutiny committees, that is the wording used in this guidance. However, the guidance should be seen as applying equally to work undertaken in informal task and finish groups, commissioned by formal committees.

Where the term 'executive' is used, it refers to executive members.

For combined authorities, references to the 'executive' or 'cabinet' should be interpreted as relating to the mayor (where applicable) and all the authority members.

For authorities operating committee rather than executive arrangements, references to the executive or Cabinet should be interpreted as relating to councillors in leadership positions.

Expiry or review date

This guidance will be kept under review and updated as necessary.

¹ A distinction is often drawn between 'overview' which focuses on the development of policy, and 'scrutiny' which looks at decisions that have been made or are about to be made to ensure they are fit for purpose.

1. Introduction and Context

1. Overview and scrutiny committees were introduced in 2000 as part of new executive governance arrangements to ensure that members of an authority who were not part of the executive could hold the executive to account for the decisions and actions that affect their communities.
2. Overview and scrutiny committees have statutory powers² to scrutinise decisions the executive is planning to take, those it plans to implement, and those that have already been taken/implemented. Recommendations following scrutiny enable improvements to be made to policies and how they are implemented. Overview and scrutiny committees can also play a valuable role in developing policy.

Effective overview and scrutiny should:

- Provide constructive 'critical friend' challenge;
- Amplify the voices and concerns of the public;
- Be led by independent people who take responsibility for their role; and
- Drive improvement in public services.

3. The requirement for local authorities in England to establish overview and scrutiny committees is set out in sections 9F to 9FI of the Local Government Act 2000 as amended by the Localism Act 2011.
4. The Localism Act 2011 amended the Local Government Act 2000 to allow councils to revert to a non-executive form of governance - the 'committee system'. Councils who adopt the committee system are not required to have overview and scrutiny but may do so if they wish. The legislation has been strengthened and updated since 2000, most recently to reflect new governance arrangements with combined authorities. Requirements for combined authorities are set out in Schedule 5A to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.
5. Current overview and scrutiny legislation recognises that authorities are democratically-elected bodies who are best-placed to determine which overview and scrutiny arrangements best suit their own individual needs, and so gives them a great degree of flexibility to decide which arrangements to adopt.
6. In producing this guidance, the Government fully recognises both authorities' democratic mandate and that the nature of local government has changed in recent years, with, for example, the creation of combined authorities, and councils increasingly delivering key services in partnership with other organisations or outsourcing them entirely.

² Section 9F of the Local Government Act 2000; paragraph 1 of Schedule 5A to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

2. Culture

7. The prevailing organisational culture, behaviours and attitudes of an authority will largely determine whether its scrutiny function succeeds or fails.
8. While everyone in an authority can play a role in creating an environment conducive to effective scrutiny, it is important that this is led and owned by members, given their role in setting and maintaining the culture of an authority.
9. Creating a strong organisational culture supports scrutiny work that can add real value by, for example, improving policy-making and the efficient delivery of public services. In contrast, low levels of support for and engagement with the scrutiny function often lead to poor quality and ill-focused work that serves to reinforce the perception that it is of little worth or relevance.
10. Members and senior officers should note that the performance of the scrutiny function is not just of interest to the authority itself. Its effectiveness, or lack thereof, is often considered by external bodies such as regulators and inspectors, and highlighted in public reports, including best value inspection reports. Failures in scrutiny can therefore help to create a negative public image of the work of an authority as a whole.

How to establish a strong organisational culture

11. Authorities can establish a strong organisational culture by:

- a) **Recognising scrutiny's legal and democratic legitimacy** – all members and officers should recognise and appreciate the importance and legitimacy the scrutiny function is afforded by the law. It was created to act as a check and balance on the executive and is a statutory requirement for all authorities operating executive arrangements and for combined authorities.

Councillors have a unique legitimacy derived from their being democratically elected. The insights that they can bring by having this close connection to local people are part of what gives scrutiny its value.

- b) **Identifying a clear role and focus** – authorities should take steps to ensure scrutiny has a clear role and focus within the organisation, i.e. a niche within which it can clearly demonstrate it adds value. Therefore, prioritisation is necessary to ensure the scrutiny function concentrates on delivering work that is of genuine value and relevance to the work of the wider authority – this is one of the most challenging parts of scrutiny, and a critical element to get right if it is to be recognised as a strategic function of the authority (see chapter 6).

Authorities should ensure a clear division of responsibilities between the scrutiny function and the audit function. While it is appropriate for scrutiny to pay due regard to the authority's financial position, this will need to happen in the context of the formal audit role. The authority's section 151 officer should advise scrutiny on how to manage this dynamic.

While scrutiny has no role in the investigation or oversight of the authority's whistleblowing arrangements, the findings of independent whistleblowing investigations might be of interest to scrutiny committees as they consider their wider implications. Members should always follow the authority's constitution and associated Monitoring Officer directions on the matter. Further guidance on whistleblowing can be found at:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/415175/bis-15-200-whistleblowing-guidance-for-employers-and-code-of-practice.pdf.

- c) **Ensuring early and regular engagement between the executive and scrutiny** – authorities should ensure early and regular discussion takes place between scrutiny and the executive, especially regarding the latter's future work programme. Authorities should, though, be mindful of their distinct roles:

In particular:

- The executive should not try to exercise control over the work of the scrutiny committee. This could be direct, e.g. by purporting to 'order' scrutiny to look at, or not look at, certain issues, or indirect, e.g. through the use of the whip or as a tool of political patronage, and the committee itself should remember its statutory purpose when carrying out its work. All members and officers should consider the role the scrutiny committee plays to be that of a 'critical friend' not a de facto 'opposition'. Scrutiny chairs have a particular role to play in establishing the profile and nature of their committee (see chapter 4); and
- The chair of the scrutiny committee should determine the nature and extent of an executive member's participation in a scrutiny committee meeting, and in any informal scrutiny task group meeting.

- d) **Managing disagreement** – effective scrutiny involves looking at issues that can be politically contentious. It is therefore inevitable that, at times, an executive will disagree with the findings or recommendations of a scrutiny committee.

It is the job of both the executive and scrutiny to work together to reduce the risk of this happening, and authorities should take steps to predict, identify and act on disagreement.

One way in which this can be done is via an 'executive-scrutiny protocol' (see annex 1) which can help define the relationship between the two and mitigate any differences of opinion before they manifest themselves in unhelpful and unproductive ways. The benefit of this approach is that it provides a framework for disagreement and debate, and a way to manage it when it happens. Often,

the value of such a protocol lies in the dialogue that underpins its preparation. It is important that these protocols are reviewed on a regular basis.

Scrutiny committees do have the power to 'call in' decisions, i.e. ask the executive to reconsider them before they are implemented, but should not view it as a substitute for early involvement in the decision-making process or as a party-political tool.

- e) **Providing the necessary support** – while the level of resource allocated to scrutiny is for each authority to decide for itself, when determining resources an authority should consider the purpose of scrutiny as set out in legislation and the specific role and remit of the authority's own scrutiny committee(s), and the scrutiny function as a whole.

Support should also be given by members and senior officers to scrutiny committees and their support staff to access information held by the authority and facilitate discussions with representatives of external bodies (see chapter 5).

- f) **Ensuring impartial advice from officers** – authorities, particularly senior officers, should ensure all officers are free to provide impartial advice to scrutiny committees. This is fundamental to effective scrutiny. Of particular importance is the role played by 'statutory officers' – the monitoring officer, the section 151 officer and the head of paid service, and where relevant the statutory scrutiny officer. These individuals have a particular role in ensuring that timely, relevant and high-quality advice is provided to scrutiny.
- g) **Communicating scrutiny's role and purpose to the wider authority** – the scrutiny function can often lack support and recognition within an authority because there is a lack of awareness among both members and officers about the specific role it plays, which individuals are involved and its relevance to the authority's wider work. Authorities should, therefore, take steps to ensure all members and officers are made aware of the role the scrutiny committee plays in the organisation, its value and the outcomes it can deliver, the powers it has, its membership and, if appropriate, the identity of those providing officer support.
- h) **Maintaining the interest of full Council in the work of the scrutiny committee** – part of communicating scrutiny's role and purpose to the wider authority should happen through the formal, public role of full Council – particularly given that scrutiny will undertake valuable work to highlight challenging issues that an authority will be facing and subjects that will be a focus of full Council's work. Authorities should therefore take steps to ensure full Council is informed of the work the scrutiny committee is doing.

One way in which this can be done is by reports and recommendations being submitted to full Council rather than solely to the executive. Scrutiny should decide when it would be appropriate to submit reports for wider debate in this way, taking into account the relevance of reports to full Council business, as well as full Council's capacity to consider and respond in a timely manner. Such

reports would supplement the annual report to full Council on scrutiny's activities and raise awareness of ongoing work.

In order to maintain awareness of scrutiny at the Combined Authority and provoke dialogue and discussion of its impact, the business of scrutiny should be reported to the Combined Authority board or to the chairs of the relevant scrutiny committees of constituent and non-constituent authorities, or both. At those chairs' discretion, particular Combined Authority scrutiny outcomes, and what they might mean for each individual area, could be either discussed by scrutiny in committee or referred to full Council of the constituent authorities.

- i) **Communicating scrutiny's role to the public** – authorities should ensure scrutiny has a profile in the wider community. Consideration should be given to how and when to engage the authority's communications officers, and any other relevant channels, to understand how to get that message across. This will usually require engagement early on in the work programming process (see chapter 6).
- j) **Ensuring scrutiny members are supported in having an independent mindset** – formal committee meetings provide a vital opportunity for scrutiny members to question the executive and officers.

Inevitably, some committee members will come from the same political party as a member they are scrutinising and might well have a long-standing personal, or familial, relationship with them (see paragraph 25).

Scrutiny members should bear in mind, however, that adopting an independent mind-set is fundamental to carrying out their work effectively. In practice, this is likely to require scrutiny chairs working proactively to identify any potentially contentious issues and plan how to manage them.

Directly-elected mayoral systems

12. A strong organisational culture that supports scrutiny work is particularly important in authorities with a directly-elected mayor to ensure there are the checks and balances to maintain a robust democratic system. Mayoral systems offer the opportunity for greater public accountability and stronger governance, but there have also been incidents that highlight the importance of creating and maintaining a culture that puts scrutiny at the heart of its operations.
13. Authorities with a directly-elected mayor should ensure that scrutiny committees are well-resourced, are able to recruit high-calibre members and that their scrutiny functions pay particular attention to issues surrounding:
 - rights of access to documents by the press, public and councillors;
 - transparent and fully recorded decision-making processes, especially avoiding decisions by 'unofficial' committees or working groups;
 - delegated decisions by the Mayor;
 - whistleblowing protections for both staff and councillors; and
 - powers of Full Council, where applicable, to question and review.

14. Authorities with a directly-elected mayor should note that mayors are required by law to attend overview and scrutiny committee sessions when asked to do so (see paragraph 44).

3. Resourcing

15. The resource an authority allocates to the scrutiny function plays a pivotal role in determining how successful that function is and therefore the value it can add to the work of the authority.
16. Ultimately it is up to each authority to decide on the resource it provides, but every authority should recognise that creating and sustaining an effective scrutiny function requires them to allocate resources to it.
17. Authorities should also recognise that support for scrutiny committees, task groups and other activities is not solely about budgets and provision of officer time, although these are clearly extremely important elements. Effective support is also about the ways in which the wider authority engages with those who carry out the scrutiny function (both members and officers).

When deciding on the level of resource to allocate to the scrutiny function, the factors an authority should consider include:

- Scrutiny's legal powers and responsibilities;
- The particular role and remit scrutiny will play in the authority;
- The training requirements of scrutiny members and support officers, particularly the support needed to ask effective questions of the executive and other key partners, and make effective recommendations;
- The need for ad hoc external support where expertise does not exist in the council;
- Effectively-resourced scrutiny has been shown to add value to the work of authorities, improving their ability to meet the needs of local people; and
- Effectively-resourced scrutiny can help policy formulation and so minimise the need for call-in of executive decisions.

Statutory scrutiny officers

18. Combined authorities, upper and single tier authorities are required to designate a statutory scrutiny officer,³ someone whose role is to:
 - promote the role of the authority's scrutiny committee;
 - provide support to the scrutiny committee and its members; and
 - provide support and guidance to members and officers relating to the functions of the scrutiny committee.

³ Section 9FB of the Local Government Act 2000; article 9 of the Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017

19. Authorities not required by law to appoint such an officer should consider whether doing so would be appropriate for their specific local needs.

Officer resource models

20. Authorities are free to decide for themselves which wider officer support model best suits their individual circumstances, though generally they adopt one or a mix of the following:

- Committee – officers are drawn from specific policy or service areas;
- Integrated – officers are drawn from the corporate centre and also service the executive; and
- Specialist – officers are dedicated to scrutiny.

21. Each model has its merits – the committee model provides service-specific expertise; the integrated model facilitates closer and earlier scrutiny involvement in policy formation and alignment of corporate work programmes; and the specialist model is structurally independent from those areas it scrutinises.

22. Authorities should ensure that, whatever model they employ, officers tasked with providing scrutiny support are able to provide impartial advice. This might require consideration of the need to build safeguards into the way that support is provided. The nature of these safeguards will differ according to the specific role scrutiny plays in the organisation.

4. Selecting Committee Members

23. Selecting the right members to serve on scrutiny committees is essential if those committees are to function effectively. Where a committee is made up of members who have the necessary skills and commitment, it is far more likely to be taken seriously by the wider authority.
24. While there are proportionality requirements that must be met,⁴ the selection of the chair and other committee members is for each authority to decide for itself. Guidance for combined authorities on this issue has been produced by the Centre for Public Scrutiny⁵.

Members invariably have different skill-sets. What an authority must consider when forming a committee is that, as a group, it possesses the requisite expertise, commitment and ability to act impartially to fulfil its functions.

25. Authorities are reminded that members of the executive cannot be members of a scrutiny committee.⁶ Authorities should take care to ensure that, as a minimum, members holding less formal executive positions, e.g. as Cabinet assistants, do not sit on scrutinising committees looking at portfolios to which those roles relate. Authorities should articulate in their constitutions how conflicts of interest, including familial links (see also paragraph 31), between executive and scrutiny responsibilities should be managed, including where members stand down from the executive and move to a scrutiny role, and vice-versa.
26. Members or substitute members of a combined authority must not be members of its overview and scrutiny committee.⁷ This includes the Mayor in Mayoral Combined Authorities. It is advised that Deputy Mayors for Policing and Crime are also not members of the combined authority's overview and scrutiny committee.

Selecting individual committee members

27. When selecting individual members to serve on scrutiny committees, an authority should consider a member's experience, expertise, interests, ability to act impartially, ability to work as part of a group, and capacity to serve.

⁴ See, for example, regulation 11 of the Local Authorities (Committee System) (England) Regulations 2012 (S.I. 2012/1020) and article 4 of the Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017 (S.I. 2017/68).

⁵ See pages 15-18 of 'Overview and scrutiny in combined authorities: a plain English guide': <https://www.cfps.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Overview-and-scrutiny-in-combined-authorities-a-plain-english-guide.pdf>

⁶ Section 9FA(3) of the Local Government Act 2000.

⁷ 2(3) of Schedule 5A to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009

28. Authorities should not take into account a member's perceived level of support for or opposition to a particular political party (notwithstanding the wider legal requirement for proportionality referred to in paragraph 24).

Selecting a chair

29. The Chair plays a leadership role on a scrutiny committee as they are largely responsible for establishing its profile, influence and ways of working.

30. The attributes authorities should and should not take into account when selecting individual committee members (see paragraphs 27 and 28) also apply to the selection of the Chair, but the Chair should also possess the ability to lead and build a sense of teamwork and consensus among committee members.

Chairs should pay special attention to the need to guard the committee's independence. Importantly, however, they should take care to avoid the committee being, and being viewed as, a de facto opposition to the executive.

31. Given their pre-eminent role on the scrutiny committee, it is strongly recommended that the Chair not preside over scrutiny of their relatives⁸. Combined authorities should note the legal requirements that apply to them where the Chair is an independent person⁹.

32. The method for selecting a Chair is for each authority to decide for itself, however every authority should consider taking a vote by secret ballot. Combined Authorities should be aware of the legal requirements regarding the party affiliation of their scrutiny committee Chair¹⁰.

Training for committee members

33. Authorities should ensure committee members are offered induction when they take up their role and ongoing training so they can carry out their responsibilities effectively. Authorities should pay attention to the need to ensure committee members are aware of their legal powers, and how to prepare for and ask relevant questions at scrutiny sessions.

34. When deciding on training requirements for committee members, authorities should consider taking advantage of opportunities offered by external providers in the sector.

Co-option and technical advice

35. While members and their support officers will often have significant local insight and an understanding of local people and their needs, the provision of outside expertise can be invaluable.

⁸ A definition of 'relative' can be found at section 28(10) of the Localism Act 2011.

⁹ See article 5(2) of the Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017 (S.I. 2017/68).

¹⁰ Article 5(6) of the Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017.

36. There are two principal ways to procure this:

- Co-option – formal co-option is provided for in legislation¹¹. Authorities must establish a co-option scheme to determine how individuals will be co-opted onto committees; and
- Technical advisers – depending on the subject matter, independent local experts might exist who can provide advice and assistance in evaluating evidence (see annex 2).

¹¹ Section 9FA(4) Local Government Act 2000

5. Power to Access Information

37. A scrutiny committee needs access to relevant information the authority holds, and to receive it in good time, if it is to do its job effectively.
38. This need is recognised in law, with members of scrutiny committees enjoying powers to access information¹². In particular, regulations give enhanced powers to a scrutiny member to access exempt or confidential information. This is in addition to existing rights for councillors to have access to information to perform their duties, including common law rights to request information and rights to request information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.
39. When considering what information scrutiny needs in order to carry out its work, scrutiny members and the executive should consider scrutiny's role and the legal rights that committees and their individual members have, as well as their need to receive timely and accurate information to carry out their duties effectively.
40. Scrutiny members should have access to a regularly available source of key information about the management of the authority – particularly on performance, management and risk. Where this information exists, and scrutiny members are given support to understand it, the potential for what officers might consider unfocused and unproductive requests is reduced as members will be able to frame their requests from a more informed position.
41. Officers should speak to scrutiny members to ensure they understand the reasons why information is needed, thereby making the authority better able to provide information that is relevant and timely, as well as ensuring that the authority complies with legal requirements.

While each request for information should be judged on its individual merits, authorities should adopt a default position of sharing the information they hold, on request, with scrutiny committee members.

42. The law recognises that there might be instances where it is legitimate for an authority to withhold information and places a requirement on the executive to provide the scrutiny committee with a written statement setting out its reasons for that decision¹³. However, members of the executive and senior officers should take particular care to avoid refusing requests, or limiting the information they provide, for reasons of party political or reputational expediency.

¹² Regulation 17 - Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012; article 10 Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017.

¹³ Regulation 17(4) – Local Government (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012; article 10(4) Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017.

Before an authority takes a decision not to share information it holds, it should give serious consideration to whether that information could be shared in closed session.

43. Regulations already stipulate a timeframe for executives to comply with requests from a scrutiny member¹⁴. When agreeing to such requests, authorities should:

- consider whether seeking clarification from the information requester could help better target the request; and
- Ensure the information is supplied in a format appropriate to the recipient's needs.

44. Committees should be aware of their legal power to require members of the executive and officers to attend before them to answer questions¹⁵. It is the duty of members and officers to comply with such requests.¹⁶

Seeking information from external organisations

45. Scrutiny members should also consider the need to supplement any authority-held information they receive with information and intelligence that might be available from other sources, and should note in particular their statutory powers to access information from certain external organisations.

46. When asking an external organisation to provide documentation or appear before it, and where that organisation is not legally obliged to do either (see annex 3), scrutiny committees should consider the following:

- a) **The need to explain the purpose of scrutiny** – the organisation being approached might have little or no awareness of the committee's work, or of an authority's scrutiny function more generally, and so might be reluctant to comply with any request;
- b) **The benefits of an informal approach** – individuals from external organisations can have fixed perceptions of what an evidence session entails and may be unwilling to subject themselves to detailed public scrutiny if they believe it could reflect badly on them or their employer. Making an informal approach can help reassure an organisation of the aims of the committee, the type of information being sought and the manner in which the evidence session would be conducted;

¹⁴ Regulation 17(2) – Local Government (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012; article 10(2) Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017.

¹⁵ Section 9FA(8) of the Local Government Act 2000; paragraph 2(6) of Schedule 5A to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

¹⁶ Section 9FA(9) of the Local Government Act 2000; paragraph 2(7) of Schedule 5A to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

- c) **How to encourage compliance with the request** – scrutiny committees will want to frame their approach on a case by case basis. For contentious issues, committees might want to emphasise the opportunity their request gives the organisation to ‘set the record straight’ in a public setting; and
- d) **Who to approach** – a committee might instinctively want to ask the Chief Executive or Managing Director of an organisation to appear at an evidence session, however it could be more beneficial to engage front-line staff when seeking operational-level detail rather than senior executives who might only be able to talk in more general terms. When making a request to a specific individual, the committee should consider the type of information it is seeking, the nature of the organisation in question and the authority’s pre-existing relationship with it.

Following ‘the Council Pound’

Scrutiny committees will often have a keen interest in ‘following the council pound’, i.e. scrutinising organisations that receive public funding to deliver goods and services.

Authorities should recognise the legitimacy of this interest and, where relevant, consider the need to provide assistance to scrutiny members and their support staff to obtain information from organisations the council has contracted to deliver services. In particular, when agreeing contracts with these bodies, authorities should consider whether it would be appropriate to include a *requirement* for them to supply information to or appear before scrutiny committees.

6. Planning Work

47. Effective scrutiny should have a defined impact on the ground, with the committee making recommendations that will make a tangible difference to the work of the authority. To have this kind of impact, scrutiny committees need to plan their work programme, i.e. draw up a long-term agenda and consider making it flexible enough to accommodate any urgent, short-term issues that might arise during the year.
48. Authorities with multiple scrutiny committees sometimes have a separate work programme for each committee. Where this happens, consideration should be given to how to co-ordinate the various committees' work to make best use of the total resources available.

Being clear about scrutiny's role

49. Scrutiny works best when it has a clear role and function. This provides focus and direction. While scrutiny has the power to look at anything which affects 'the area, or the area's inhabitants', authorities will often find it difficult to support a scrutiny function that carries out generalised oversight across the wide range of issues experienced by local people, particularly in the context of partnership working. Prioritisation is necessary, which means that there might be things that, despite being important, scrutiny will not be able to look at.
50. Different overall roles could include having a focus on risk, the authority's finances, or on the way the authority works with its partners.
51. Applying this focus does not mean that certain subjects are 'off limits'. It is more about looking at topics and deciding whether their relative importance justifies the positive impact scrutiny's further involvement could bring.
52. When thinking about scrutiny's focus, members should be supported by key senior officers. The statutory scrutiny officer, if an authority has one, will need to take a leading role in supporting members to clarify the role and function of scrutiny, and championing that role once agreed.

Who to speak to

53. Evidence will need to be gathered to inform the work programming process. This will ensure that it looks at the right topics, in the right way and at the right time. Gathering evidence requires conversations with:
 - *The public* – it is likely that formal 'consultation' with the public on the scrutiny work programme will be ineffective. Asking individual scrutiny members to have conversations with individuals and groups in their own local areas can work better. Insights gained from the public through individual pieces of scrutiny work can be fed back into the work programming process. Listening to and participating in conversations in places where local people come together, including in online forums, can help authorities engage people on their own terms and yield more positive results.

Authorities should consider how their communications officers can help scrutiny engage with the public, and how wider internal expertise and local knowledge from both members and officers might make a contribution.

- *The authority's partners* – relationships with other partners should not be limited to evidence-gathering to support individual reviews or agenda items. A range of partners are likely to have insights that will prove useful:
 - Public sector partners (like the NHS and community safety partners, over which scrutiny has specific legal powers);
 - Voluntary sector partners;
 - Contractors and commissioning partners (including partners in joint ventures and authority-owned companies);
 - In parished areas, town, community and parish councils;
 - Neighbouring principal councils (both in two-tier and unitary areas);
 - Cross-authority bodies and organisations, such as Local Enterprise Partnerships¹⁷; and
 - Others with a stake and interest in the local area – large local employers, for example.

- *The executive* – a principal partner in discussions on the work programme should be the executive (and senior officers). The executive should not direct scrutiny's work (see chapter 2), but conversations will help scrutiny members better understand how their work can be designed to align with the best opportunities to influence the authority's wider work.

Information sources

54. Scrutiny will need access to relevant information to inform its work programme. The type of information will depend on the specific role and function scrutiny plays within the authority, but might include:

- Performance information from across the authority and its partners;
- Finance and risk information from across the authority and its partners;
- Corporate complaints information, and aggregated information from political groups about the subject matter of members' surgeries;
- Business cases and options appraisals (and other planning information) for forthcoming major decisions. This information will be of particular use for pre-decision scrutiny; and
- Reports and recommendations issued by relevant ombudsmen, especially the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman.

¹⁷ Authorities should ensure they have appropriate arrangements in place to ensure the effective democratic scrutiny of Local Enterprise Partnerships' investment decisions.

As committees can meet in closed session, commercial confidentiality should not preclude the sharing of information. Authorities should note, however, that the default for meetings should be that they are held in public (see 2014 guidance on '*Open and accountable local government*':

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/343182/140812_Openness_Guide.pdf).

55. Scrutiny members should consider keeping this information under regular review. It is likely to be easier to do this outside committee, rather than bringing such information to committee 'to note', or to provide an update, as a matter of course.

Shortlisting topics

Approaches to shortlisting topics should reflect scrutiny's overall role in the authority. This will require the development of bespoke, local solutions, however when considering whether an item should be included in the work programme, the kind of questions a scrutiny committee should consider might include:

- Do we understand the benefits scrutiny would bring to this issue?
- How could we best carry out work on this subject?
- What would be the best outcome of this work?
- How would this work engage with the activity of the executive and other decision-makers, including partners?

56. Some authorities use scoring systems to evaluate and rank work programme proposals. If these are used to provoke discussion and debate, based on evidence, about what priorities should be, they can be a useful tool. Others take a looser approach. Whichever method is adopted, a committee should be able to justify how and why a decision has been taken to include certain issues and not others.

57. Scrutiny members should accept that shortlisting can be difficult; scrutiny committees have finite resources and deciding how these are best allocated is tough. They should understand that, if work programming is robust and effective, there might well be issues that they want to look at that nonetheless are not selected.

Carrying out work

58. Selected topics can be scrutinised in several ways, including:

- a) **As a single item on a committee agenda** – this often presents a limited opportunity for effective scrutiny, but may be appropriate for some issues or where the committee wants to maintain a formal watching brief over a given issue;
- b) **At a single meeting** – which could be a committee meeting or something less formal. This can provide an opportunity to have a single public meeting about a

given subject, or to have a meeting at which evidence is taken from a number of witnesses;

- c) **At a task and finish review of two or three meetings** – short, sharp scrutiny reviews are likely to be most effective even for complex topics. Properly focused, they ensure members can swiftly reach conclusions and make recommendations, perhaps over the course of a couple of months or less;
- d) **Via a longer-term task and finish review** – the ‘traditional’ task and finish model – with perhaps six or seven meetings spread over a number of months – is still appropriate when scrutiny needs to dig into a complex topic in significant detail. However, the resource implications of such work, and its length, can make it unattractive for all but the most complex matters; and
- e) **By establishing a ‘standing panel’** – this falls short of establishing a whole new committee but may reflect a necessity to keep a watching brief over a critical local issue, especially where members feel they need to convene regularly to carry out that oversight. Again, the resource implications of this approach means that it will be rarely used.

7. Evidence Sessions

59. Evidence sessions are a key way in which scrutiny committees inform their work. They might happen at formal committee, in less formal 'task and finish' groups or at standalone sessions.

Good preparation is a vital part of conducting effective evidence sessions. Members should have a clear idea of what the committee hopes to get out of each session and appreciate that success will depend on their ability to work together on the day.

How to plan

60. Effective planning does not necessarily involve a large number of pre-meetings, the development of complex scopes or the drafting of questioning plans. It is more often about setting overall objectives and then considering what type of questions (and the way in which they are asked) can best elicit the information the committee is seeking. This applies as much to individual agenda items as it does for longer evidence sessions – there should always be consideration in advance of what scrutiny is trying to get out of a particular evidence session.

Chairs play a vital role in leading discussions on objective-setting and ensuring all members are aware of the specific role each will play during the evidence session.

61. As far as possible there should be consensus among scrutiny members about the objective of an evidence session before it starts. It is important to recognise that members have different perspectives on certain issues, and so might not share the objectives for a session that are ultimately adopted. Where this happens, the Chair will need to be aware of this divergence of views and bear it in mind when planning the evidence session.
62. Effective planning should mean that at the end of a session it is relatively straightforward for the chair to draw together themes and highlight the key findings. It is unlikely that the committee will be able to develop and agree recommendations immediately, but, unless the session is part of a wider inquiry, enough evidence should have been gathered to allow the chair to set a clear direction.
63. After an evidence session, the committee might wish to hold a short 'wash-up' meeting to review whether their objectives were met and lessons could be learned for future sessions.

Developing recommendations

64. The development and agreement of recommendations is often an iterative process. It will usually be appropriate for this to be done only by members, assisted by co-optees where relevant. When deciding on recommendations, however, members should have due regard to advice received from officers, particularly the Monitoring Officer.

65. The drafting of reports is usually, but not always, carried out by officers, directed by members.

66. Authorities draft reports and recommendations in a number of ways, but there are normally three stages:

- i. the development of a 'heads of report' – a document setting out general findings that members can then discuss as they consider the overall structure and focus of the report and its recommendations;
- ii. the development of those findings, which will set out some areas on which recommendations might be made; and
- iii. the drafting of the full report.

67. Recommendations should be evidence-based and SMART, i.e. specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timed. Where appropriate, committees may wish to consider sharing them in draft with interested parties.

68. Committees should bear in mind that often six to eight recommendations are sufficient to enable the authority to focus its response, although there may be specific circumstances in which more might be appropriate.

Sharing draft recommendations with executive members should not provide an opportunity for them to revise or block recommendations before they are made. It should, however, provide an opportunity for errors to be identified and corrected, and for a more general sense-check.

Annex 1: Illustrative Scenario – Creating an Executive-Scrutiny Protocol

An executive-scrutiny protocol can deal with the practical expectations of scrutiny committee members and the executive, as well as the cultural dynamics.

Workshops with scrutiny members, senior officers and Cabinet can be helpful to inform the drafting of a protocol. An external facilitator can help bring an independent perspective.

Councils should consider how to adopt a protocol, e.g. formal agreement at scrutiny committee and Cabinet, then formal integration into the Council's constitution at the next Annual General Meeting.

The protocol, as agreed, may contain sections on:

- The way scrutiny will go about developing its work programme (including the ways in which senior officers and Cabinet members will be kept informed);
- The way in which senior officers and Cabinet will keep scrutiny informed of the outlines of major decisions as they are developed, to allow for discussion of scrutiny's potential involvement in policy development. This involves the building in of safeguards to mitigate risks around the sharing of sensitive information with scrutiny members;
- A strengthening and expansion of existing parts of the code of conduct that relate to behaviour in formal meetings, and in informal meetings;
- Specification of the nature and form of responses that scrutiny can expect when it makes recommendations to the executive, when it makes requests to the executive for information, and when it makes requests that Cabinet members or senior officers attend meetings; and
- Confirmation of the role of the statutory scrutiny officer, and Monitoring Officer, in overseeing compliance with the protocol, and ensuring that it is used to support the wider aim of supporting and promoting a culture of scrutiny, with matters relating to the protocol's success being reported to full Council through the scrutiny Annual Report.

Annex 2: Illustrative Scenario – Engaging Independent Technical Advisers

This example demonstrates how one Council's executive and scrutiny committee worked together to scope a role and then appoint an independent adviser on transforming social care commissioning. Their considerations and process may be helpful and applicable in other similar scenarios.

Major care contracts were coming to an end and the Council took the opportunity to review whether to continue with its existing strategic commissioning framework, or take a different approach – potentially insourcing certain elements.

The relevant Director was concerned about the Council's reliance on a very small number of large providers. The Director therefore approached the Scrutiny and Governance Manager to talk through the potential role scrutiny could play as the Council considered these changes.

The Scrutiny Chair wanted to look at this issue in some depth, but recognised its complexity could make it difficult for her committee to engage – she was concerned it would not be able to do the issue justice. The Director offered support from his own officer team, but the Chair considered this approach to be beset by risks around the independence of the process.

She talked to the Director about securing independent advice. He was worried that an independent adviser could come with preconceived ideas and would not understand the Council's context and objectives. The Scrutiny Chair was concerned that independent advice could end up leading to scrutiny members being passive, relying on an adviser to do their thinking for them. They agreed that some form of independent assistance would be valuable, but that how it was provided and managed should be carefully thought out.

With the assistance of the Governance and Scrutiny Manager, the Scrutiny Chair approached local universities and Further Education institutions to identify an appropriate individual. The approach was clear – it set out the precise role expected of the adviser, and explained the scrutiny process itself. Because members wanted to focus on the risks of market failure, and felt more confident on substantive social care matters, the approach was directed at those with a specialism in economics and business administration. The Council's search was proactive – the assistance of the service department was drawn on to make direct approaches to particular individuals who could carry out this role.

It was agreed to make a small budget available to act as a 'per diem' to support an adviser; academics were approached in the first instance as the Council felt able to make a case that an educational institution would provide this support for free as part of its commitment to Corporate Social Responsibility.

Three individuals were identified from the Council's proactive search. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the committee had an informal discussion with each – not so much to establish their skills and expertise (which had already been assessed) but to give a sense about

their 'fit' with scrutiny's objectives and their political nous in understanding the environment in which they would operate, and to satisfy themselves that they will apply themselves even-handedly to the task. The Director sat in on this process but played no part in who was ultimately selected.

The independent advice provided by the selected individual gave the Scrutiny Committee a more comprehensive understanding of the issue and meant it was able to offer informed advice on the merits of putting in place a new strategic commissioning framework.

Annex 3: Illustrative Scenario – Approaching an External Organisation to Appear before a Committee

This example shows how one council ensured a productive scrutiny meeting, involving a private company and the public. Lessons may be drawn and apply to other similar scenarios.

Concerns had been expressed by user groups, and the public at large, about the reliability of the local bus service. The Scrutiny Chair wanted to question the bus company in a public evidence session but knew that she had no power to compel it to attend. Previous attempts to engage it had been unsuccessful; the company was not hostile, but said it had its own ways of engaging the public.

The Monitoring Officer approached the company's regional PR manager, but he expressed concern that the session would end in a 'bunfight'. He also explained the company had put their improvement plan in the public domain, and felt a big council meeting would exacerbate tensions.

Other councillors had strong views about the company – one thought the committee should tell the company it would be empty-chaired if it refused to attend. The Scrutiny Chair was sympathetic to this, but thought such an approach would not lead to any improvements.

The Scrutiny Chair was keen to make progress, but it was difficult to find the right person to speak to at the company, so she asked council officers and local transport advocacy groups for advice. Speaking to those people also gave her a better sense of what scrutiny's role might be.

When she finally spoke to the company's network manager, she explained the situation and suggested they work together to consider how the meeting could be productive for the Council, the company and local people. In particular, this provided her with an opportunity to explain scrutiny and its role. The network manager remained sceptical but was reassured that they could work together to ensure that the meeting would not be an 'ambush'. He agreed in principle to attend and also provide information to support the Committee's work beforehand.

Discussions continued in the four weeks leading up to the Committee meeting. The Scrutiny Chair was conscious that while she had to work with the company to ensure that the meeting was constructive – and secure their attendance – it could not be a whitewash, and other members and the public would demand a hard edge to the discussions.

The scrutiny committee agreed that the meeting would provide a space for the company to provide context to the problems local people are experiencing, but that this would be preceded by a space on the agenda for the Chair, Vice-chair, and representatives from two local transport advocacy groups to set out their concerns. The company were sent in

advance a summary of the general areas on which members were likely to ask questions, to ensure that those questions could be addressed at the meeting.

Finally, provision was made for public questions and debate. Those attending the meeting were invited to discuss with each other the principal issues they wanted the meeting to cover. A short, facilitated discussion in the room led by the Chair highlighted the key issues, and the Chair then put those points to the company representatives.

At the end of the meeting, the public asked questions of the bus company representative in a 20-minute plenary item.

The meeting was fractious, but the planning carried out to prepare for this – by channelling issues through discussion and using the Chair to mediate the questioning – made things easier. Some attendees were initially frustrated by this structure, but the company representative was more open and less defensive than might otherwise have been the case.

The meeting also motivated the company to revise its communications plan to become more responsive to this kind of challenge, part of which involved a commitment to feed back to the scrutiny committee on the recommendations it made on the night.

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

17 March 2020



Title	River Thames Task Group		
Purpose of the report	To note		
Report Author	Jackie Taylor Group Head of Neighbourhood Services		
Cabinet Member	Councillor Richard Barratt	Confidential	No
Corporate Priority	Economic Development		
Recommendations	The committee are asked to note the actions and achievements of the River Thames Task Group (RTTG)		
Reason for Recommendation	Not applicable		

1. Key issues

- 1.1 The River Thames Task Group (**RTTG**) was set up in September 2018 to improve and enhance access and activities for Spelthorne's prime 12 mile border on the Thames.
- 1.2 The task group aims to achieve this by working practically with river-users, partners and the community. To this end the committee's membership includes people from river interest groups, businesses and other relevant organisations and individuals who share a common interest in the river.
- 1.3 The task group aims to inspire, motivate and deliver short, medium and long term improvements along the river, engaging with the community through practical participation and by engendering a local sense of ownership and responsibility.
- 1.4 The Thames has a great deal to offer - from daily boat trips to simply wandering along its banks and enjoying its tranquil scenery. The locks enjoy a deserved reputation for attractively maintained gardens including those at Penton Hook, Chertsey, Shepperton and Sunbury.

Many of Spelthorne's attractive parks and open spaces are also situated beside the river, and include:

- Lammas Recreation Ground, Staines
- Laleham Park, Laleham
- Shepperton Tow Path, Shepperton
- Manor Park, Shepperton
- Riverside walks in Sunbury

- 1.5 In October 2019 a river boat event took place which enabled over 40 passengers including residents, river groups, river users, councillors, MOP and officers on a trip from Staines through to Sunbury. This gave those not used to seeing Spelthorne from the river a better understanding of what river users see when travelling on the Thames through the borough.
- 1.6 This trip further enhanced the general view that the Thames had a lot to offer especially in Spelthorne and the borough needed to take more advantage of the asset. It was evident that our riverbank is of a very high standard and whilst there wasn't a lot that needed attention in terms of green maintenance we need to be sure that it remains at this standard.
- 1.7 The task group has developed a series of short, medium and long term tasks and improvements (**Appendix 1**) which it hopes to achieve within the lifecycle of the task group. To aid and move these ambitions and aspirations into positive actions the Council have provided the task group with a budget of £25k for 2018/19 and a further £25k for 2019/20.
- 1.8 The main aims of the task group are to:
- Deliver practical projects with tangible outcomes and benefits
 - Achieve effective community engagement by working directly with local communities and neighbourhoods
 - Working with key partners to help deliver achievable outcomes
 - To attract more people to the Borough and therefore increase the level of spend with our local businesses
- 1.9 A number of projects (**Appendix 1**) which have already been delivered include:

Improvements to the area around Shepperton Lock

- Improved parking surfaces
- Lining for parking spaces to increase parking capacity
- Refurbishment of lock toilets
- Improved waste facilities for residents and river users
- Provision of outdoor water fountain
- Removal of redundant and damaged fencing
- Cutting back of greenery to improve parking areas
- Reduce traffic speed
- Better use of road space

Mapping out areas of responsibility

- Identify areas of responsibility along the riverbank in Spelthorne
- Produce maps of all areas

River safety

- Upgrade life-saving stations along the river
- Increase staff awareness of how to use equipment

- Equip various officers with throw lines for use in an emergency

Increase public awareness of the RTTG

- A new web page has been developed at <https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/article/17565/The-River-Thames>

River clean up

- Land and river areas have been cleared of litter and dumping in Staines
- by volunteers

Engage with Thames Landscape Strategy (TLS)

- SBC is now a member of the strategy
- Officers and members have attended various group meetings
- Work is being undertaken on vegetation clearance along the river in Sunbury and Shepperton
- The TLS can provide expertise and funding opportunities pertinent to the future RTTG plans

New passenger jetty in Memorial Gardens Staines upon Thames

- A new passenger jetty has been procured and is due for completion in March 2020
- Engaged with potential suppliers of passenger boat ferries

New and improved signage along the river

- Sought sponsorship from various local companies for the new signs
- Improve no mooring signs along the river

Other projects being explored as part of the RTTG include

- Provide assistance for the project to provide electric hire boats at the Lammas
- Improve access for the disabled along Kings Lawn
- Seek a base for the Sunbury skiff & punting club
- Work with the visitor economy group to produce new maps of the river and its surroundings
- Protect and improve wharf areas
- New passenger ferry services between Spelthorne & Elmbridge
- Identify additional mooring locations
- Research options for management of existing and any proposed new mooring sites along the Thames in Spelthorne
- Working with neighbouring boroughs on a public space protection order (PSPO) for the river

Options analysis and proposal

1.10 There are 2 options

Option 1 (preferred)

To continue with current programme of projects and work towards achieving the mission statement of the RTTG

Option 2

Complete projects already underway but then close the RTTG with no further ambitions or aims being achieved

2. Financial implications

- 2.1 The task group has already been provided with a budget of £25k for 18/19 & £25k for 19/20.

3. Other considerations

- 3.1 The RTTG has at all stages considered the Equality, Diversity and Sustainability of the projects it undertakes some examples are as follows:-

Equality

The RTTG are aware of the limited access along the river for disabled river users and are actively working towards finding a solution to enable those with very limited walking ability to be able to disembark at Kings Lawn in Sunbury

Diversity

Access to the river for many is not possible for many different reasons, the jetty in Staines upon Thames and the electric boat project at the Lammas will give residents and visitors the opportunity to be more diverse in their leisure and work activities

Sustainability

It has already been established that the Thames has much more to offer for residents, visitors and businesses in the borough. Working with the visitor economy group we aim to make river users more aware of the offering behind the river in terms of shopping, eateries and general leisure and business opportunities.

4. Timetable for implementation

- 4.1 The RTTG is already working on a number of projects and will continue to do so until either the task group is brought to an end or all projects have reached their final agreed outcome.

Background papers:

Appendices: Appendix 1

River Thames Task Group (RTTG)
Chair: Cllr Vivienne Leighton

updated 18 February 2020

Councillor members	Co-opted members	SBC Officers
Cllr Vivienne Leighton SBC CHAIR (VL)	Neil Huntingford (NH)	Emma Yates- ADMINISTRATOR (EY)
Cllr Colin Barnard SBC VICE-CHAIR (CB)	Chris Murdoch (CM)	Keith McGroary- ECONOMINMIC DEVELOPMENT (KM)
Cllr Michele Gibson SBC (MG)	Chris Manners (CM1)	Jackie Taylor NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES (JT)
Cllr Helen Harvey SBC (HH)		Mark Rachwal NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES (MR)
Cllr Sandra Dunn SBC (SD)		Sabena Sims NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES (SS)
County Cllr Richard Walsh SCC (RW)		Sarah Keenan LEGAL SERVICES (SK)

Mission statement

Improve and enhance access and activities along the river Thames which runs through Spelthorne.

The task group seeks to inspire, motivate and deliver short, medium and long-term improvements along the river, engaging with the community through practical participation and by engendering local sense of ownership and responsibility.

Our main aims are:

- Delivering practical projects with tangible outcomes and benefits
- Achieving effective community engagement by working directly with local communities and neighbourhoods
- Working with key partners to help deliver achievable outcomes

To deliver these outcomes in the short term we will focus on:

- Supporting improvements in Sunbury working towards making it a visitor destination.
- Improve visitor access and facilities to enable better use of the river in Shepperton
- Develop access to and from the river Thames in Staines upon Thames to increase economic opportunities

Projects that are nearing completion or have already been delivered are:

- Refurbishment of Shepperton Lock public facility including toilets, new signage, new roof and enhanced refuse facilities.
- Installation of “throw lines” along the entire stretch of the Thames in Spelthorne
- Improved parking areas and parking spaces, river side of the Towpath Shepperton

Short, Medium & Long term proposals

Short term	Aim
New passenger boat jetty in Staines upon Thames	Provide a new jetty in Memorial Gardens creating a boat bus stop used by different passenger boat providers
New & improved signage to be supported by sponsors	Seek sponsorship to install new signage welcoming boat users to our key towns and improve mooring signage at all existing mooring sites.
Improvements to the appearance of Shepperton lock	Formalise parking arrangements roadside, better use of road space for pedestrians, reduce traffic speed
Engagement with the Thames Landscape strategy	Encourage the Thames Landscape Strategy to work on the Spelthorne side of the river Thames
Spend to budget the allocation for 18/19 & 19/20	Make appropriate use of budgets allocated for 18/19 £25k and 19/20 £25k. Producing tangible outcomes as a result of the spend
Map out areas of responsibility	Produce maps for ownership and responsibility of the river bank in Spelthorne
Map out slip ways & provide new signage	Produce maps for slip ways along the river bank in Spelthorne and improve, replace signage where appropriate
Shepperton Lock waste disposal area	Improve access and use of waste disposal area at Shepperton Lock for residents of Hamhaugh Island & river users
Shepperton lock drinking fountain	Install new drinking fountain at Shepperton Lock
Create a web page for RTTG	Create a new web page on the SBC web site detailing the mission statement for the RTTG and its task group activities

Medium term	Aim
Provide additional mooring locations	Review current mooring locations and seek new sites where appropriate which would need to be included in by laws
Protect and improve Wharf areas	Identify map out and promote the wharves currently within Spelthorne
Create a new passenger ferry service between Spelthorne & Elmbridge	Create a new passenger boat ferry that links Sunbury Riverside with Walton Riverside
Engage with river users, both river and land based	Carry out an exercise (potential Survey Monkey) to engage with river users and establish thoughts views & ideas
Assist with proposals to develop access to electric boats	Work with a potential supplier at the Lammas to develop proposals to create a floating pontoon with the provision of publicly rented electric boats
Various river groups	Create a quick view of the various river users group to create a better understanding for all of which group aims to deliver what

Long term	Aim
Provide additional passenger boat routes	Linking Shepperton, Sunbury & Staines as well as locations out of borough along the river
Pedestrian bridge linking Sunbury to Walton over the Thames	Resurrect and review options to create a footbridge over the river Thames in Sunbury linking with Walton on the other side of the river

This page is intentionally left blank

Review of Work undertaken by Overview and Scrutiny in 2019-20

Meeting date	Topic
July 2019	The role of Overview and Scrutiny
	Treasury Management Annual Report 2018/19
	Capital and revenue outturn 2017/18
	Project Management update
September 2019 Extraordinary	SBC's Policy stance on Heathrow expansion
September 2019	Review of Community Safety
	SW Rail update
	Project Management update
November 2019	Access to Healthcare in Spelthorne
	Capital Strategy update
	Budget Issues 2019/20 to 2020/21 presentation
	Housing and Homelessness Prevention Strategies
	Capital and Revenue Monitoring Q2
January 2020	Houses in Multiple Occupation – Article 4 Direction
	Review of Knowle Green Estates Ltd
	Treasury Management half-yearly report
March 2020	Pavement Parking
	Overview and Scrutiny Statutory Guidance
	Reports from Task Groups:
	River Thames
	Climate Change
	End of Life Celebration Centre
Project Management update	

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2019-2020

Date of Meeting	ISSUE	Lead Officer	Objectives
17 March 2020	1. Minutes	Chairman	To agree the minutes of the previous meeting.
	2. Capital and Revenue Monitoring Q3 and projected outturn	Laurence Woolven / Cllr Harman	These reports will be circulated under separate cover for members' information.
	3. Climate Change Working Group	Sandy Muirhead/Cllr Barratt	To receive a report on the work of the Task Group.
	4. Pavement parking		To consider measures to deal with pavement parking in the Borough.
	5. Report from River Thames TG	Chairman	To receive a report from the Chairman of the River Thames Task Group on its work.
	6. Corporate Project Management	Sandy Muirhead/Cllr Sexton	To receive an update on the status of current Council projects.
	7. O&S Statutory Guidance	Terry Collier	To receive a report on the new O&S Guidance
	8. Work Programme and Cabinet Forward Plan	Chairman / Terry Collier	To note the proposed work programme and consider issues of interest for the future work programme from the Cabinet Forward Plan.

Other topics for future inclusion in Work Programme

- Surrey County Council cuts - How to facilitate shared ownership of the impact on the Borough and especially the impact on the voluntary sector.
- Fire Service operation post reduction in Stations – September/November 2020
- Review of Off-Peak Parking in Staines – November 2020

This page is intentionally left blank