

Committee: Cabinet

Date: 18 January 2021

Wards: All

Subject: Reference from the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel – Emissions Based Charging

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment and Regeneration

Lead member: Councillor Aidan Mundy, Chair of the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Contact officer: Rosie Mckeever, Scrutiny Officer, 0208 545 4035

Recommendations:

-
1. The Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel recommends that Cabinet take into account its reference set out in paragraphs 2.11 to 2.19 below when making decisions on the Emissions Based Charges proposal.
-

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. At its meeting on 8 December 2020 the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel was asked to note the outcome of the consultation on the emissions based charging proposals and comment on the final proposals.
- 1.2. The Panel agreed to make a reference to Cabinet, as set out in paragraphs 2.11 to 2.19 below.

2 DETAILS

2.1. Scrutiny process

- 2.2. The Panel received a detailed report setting out background information, relevant data, consultation responses and impact assessments.
- 2.3. The Panel heard representations from the Residents Association of West Wimbledon and the Apostles Residents Association.
- 2.4. Full details of points made in the discussion will be published in the minutes of the meeting.

2.5. Scrutiny response

- 2.6. Councillor Daniel Holden raised a motion that recommended to Cabinet “This panel calls upon the Cabinet to abandon it’s proposed ‘Emissions Based Parking Charges’, due to the fact it discriminates against a small subsection of the population, of which whom the majority affected are in Raynes Park and Wimbledon”. This was seconded by Councillor David Dean. There were three votes in favour and five against. Motion fell.
- 2.7. Councillor Daniel Holden raised a motion that recommended to Cabinet “This panel requests the Cabinet to delay the implementation of the proposed ‘Emissions Based Parking Charges’ for 12 months (to begin no earlier than January 2022) to allow for sufficient time to alter the proposals to allow for suitable mitigations for the elderly and poorer residents of Merton to be worked up and incorporated prior to rollout of the policy. This is to lessen

the impact that a sudden change in charging regime would have on these specific groups of residents in particular”. The motion was seconded. There were three votes in favour and five against. Motion fell.

- 2.8. A motion proposing that Cabinet reconsiders the policy in its application to visitors e-permits and scratch cards (as summarised at paras 5.13–5.15 of the report), as the ‘mechanism’ envisaged to reduce the use of higher polluting vehicles (charging a resident based on the vehicle their visitor arrives in) seems diffuse and potentially ineffective. The motion was seconded. There were three votes in favour and five against. Motion fell.
- 2.9. A motion requesting that Cabinet consider a low mileage/low use discount or rebate, on the basis that it is the driving of vehicles that reduces air quality and increases carbon emissions. This would encourage less driving, and would particularly mitigate the impact of higher parking costs for those on low/fixed incomes who can’t afford to switch to newer and more environmentally friendly vehicles. The motion was seconded by Councillor Daniel Holden. There were two votes for, four votes against and two abstentions. Motion fell.
- 2.10. The Panel requests that, noting para 8.5 of the report, that Cabinet instead keep under review the assumptions made on the estimates of parking revenue raised, and that any increase in parking revenue be reported separately so that it can be more accurately be understood what additional surplus is linked to emissions based charging, with the aim that these monies be reinvested directly into the following measures: for the purposes of environmental improvement (as permitted under the 1984 Act); described at paras 7.3–7.11 of the report as well as others to financially incentivise residents to give up permits; and to support complementary sustainable transport schemes. There were three votes for and five against. Motion fell.
- 2.11. The Panel RESOLVED (six votes, two abstentions) to make the following reference to Cabinet;
- 2.12. “The Sustainable Communities Panel recommends that on implementation;
- 2.13. User feedback is collected
- 2.14. This feedback be made visible to the Sustainable Communities Panel at every meeting for a period of two years. Feedback should be provided at a high level with the ability to request further detail if needed.
- 2.15. After that period, that Cabinet utilise this feedback to test further improvements and/or enhancements to the parking scheme.
- 2.16. Furthermore the Panel RESOLVED (eight votes for, none against) that
- 2.17. The Panel calls on Cabinet to review the impact of Emissions Based Charging on air quality in the borough and that this policy also be reviewed after a two year period.
- 2.18. Additionally, the Panel RESOLVED (eight votes for, none against)
- 2.19. Request that Cabinet further expand upon their current reporting to show how the surplus money raised from parking revenue has been spent.

3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 3.1. None – Cabinet is required under the council’s constitution to receive, consider and respond to references from overview and scrutiny.

4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

- 4.1. Invitations to provide submissions to the Panel were sent to a wide range of residents’ associations and local community organisations.

5 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1. None for the purpose of this report.

6 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1. Cabinet is required under the council’s constitution to receive, consider and respond to references from overview and scrutiny. The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 requires Cabinet to respond to reports and recommendations made by scrutiny committees within two months of written notice being given.

7 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1. There are no human rights, equalities and community cohesion implications as a result of this report.

8 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. There are no crime and disorder implications as a result of this report.

9 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1. There are no risk management and health and safety implications as a result of this report.

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

- None

11 BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

This page is intentionally left blank