

NOTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD
TUESDAY 23 APRIL 2013

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford

PRESENT:

Councillors D G Wheeler (Chairman), R A Adair, Mrs S P Bailey, B Buschman, R M Jones, A MacInnes, S J Robinson, D V Smith, J A Stockwood

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillors S J Boote and Mrs M Stockwood.
G Jones CPU Manager, Nottinghamshire County Council

OFFICERS PRESENT:

B Knowles Leisure Contracts Manager
V Nightingale Senior Member Support Officer
D Swaine Executive Manager - Operations and Corporate Governance

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

There were no apologies for absence.

26. Declarations of Interest

There were none declared.

27. Notes of the Previous Meeting

The notes of the meeting held on Tuesday 19 February 2013 were accepted as a true record. Members noted the responses regarding the actions from that meeting.

With regard to Parkwood Leisure Councillor Jones stated that he had emailed the Executive Manager – Finance and Commercial, after sharing his suggestions with the Chairman, with a number of suggestions regarding the contract's Strategic Objectives. These Objectives were being considered by the Strategic Partnership Board and officers stated that an update would be included in the next annual report regarding the contract.

28. Civil Parking Enforcement Contract Update 2013

The Leisure Contracts Manager presented a report updating Members on the progress of the contract. He recognised that it was disappointing that both the on-street and off-street accounts were in deficit, however this was due largely to the increased costs for enforcement and the rise in costs of the Central Processing Unit (CPU). He explained that negotiations were taking place between the County Council and the districts regarding partnership agreement. Also a tendering exercise was due for the enforcement contract and it was anticipated that the costs would be reduced. The report indicated that this year the payover amount required to meet the deficit on both accounts

for Rushcliffe was estimated to be £2,105, however this might be reduced when the costs for the CPU were finalised. Mr Jones explained that the final costs would be calculated this week. He also stated that the CPU had won a contract to work for Lincolnshire councils which would also help to reduce costs. The Board was informed that for a largely rural area to have a break even position was considered, nationally, to be exceptional. Officers agreed to inform Members of the final calculations. Members were also reminded that the income from the Council's car parks were not included in the Contract's costs and were wholly retained by the Council. It was acknowledged that enforcement protected the revenue income from the car parks as it displaced cars from parking inappropriately, or in contravention of the controls in place.

The Leisure Contracts Manager explained that the figures in the report could only be considered as the position at that point in time as the process of issuing of PCN's and payment was continuous. In Rushcliffe the trend was to pay the fine at the discounted rate and not to appeal. With regard to appeals Members were informed that there was a three stage appeal process, which included informal appeals, a formal appeal stage and finally to a Traffic Penalty Tribunal. In respect of payments the Board was informed that it had been anticipated that the bailiff's service would recoup approximately 20% of the debts passed to them, however the return rate at present was 34%. Measuring outstanding debt was difficult as the debt was frozen at each stage of the appeal thus prolonging the length of time the appeal was in the process. It was recognised that some debts were more difficult to discharge but the evidence was clear that all debts were chased.

Following a question, officers explained that the charges for PCNs had remained at the 2008 rate. 75% of these were paid and of those 90% were paid at the discounted rate.

In respect of the partnership arrangement Members were informed that officers now had five years' experience of operating the contract and subsequently, where it was best to concentrate resources. When the contract had been initially set up a model had been used which had predicted that by the end of year four the contract would break even, however this had not been realised. Also initially the County Council had taken on board the set up costs for the CPU with the districts taking on responsibility for any deficits in the accounts. It was now felt, by the district councils, that the County Council should have some responsibility for any deficits on the on-street account, thus reducing the liability for the district councils. It was felt that the partnership approach was the most efficient method of delivery and officers were discussing options to accommodate all parties. Mr Jones explained that the districts had agreed a report which had just been presented to Nottinghamshire County Council and a response on the issue of responsibility for the on street account deficit was expected within a month. Officers agreed to inform Members of any changes to the contract when known.

With regard to the future enforcement contract from November 2013, the Board was informed that the Council had a number of hours to allocate to rounds where officers felt enforcement would be beneficial. These hours were flexible and could be changed to accommodate sporting and other seasonal events using the intelligent information available for officers to identify hotspots. It was anticipated that under the new contract the hourly rate would

be significantly reduced. This would be achieved by different working arrangements and the use of new technology. With the knowledge gained officers were aware of the areas where contraventions occurred and could programme these into the Civil Parking Officers schedules as a deterrent.

Officers stated that the aims of civil enforcement were to manage traffic and to ensure that people parked safely and in line with the regulations. The County Council had introduced more resident parking schemes which had been well received by residents. Following a question Mr Jones explained that any surplus from the on street account was, under current legislation, ring fenced for highways projects. The Board was informed that, following national lobbying, some local authorities were trialling enforcement actions on moving traffic, eg traffic in bus lanes and restricted access roads ie Central Avenue West Bridgford. It was noted that Central Avenue was a problem area in respect of moving traffic and officers were awaiting any changes to the legislation following these trials in order to identify areas where such contraventions could be enforced by local councils.

Following a question officers stated that the majority of parking regulation enforcement action took place in West Bridgford, however it was necessary that other areas were covered to ensure people were deterred from committing an offence and complied with the regulations.

Members queried the figures contained within the report regarding the accounts for the five years the contract had been operating. In response Officers explained that the figures were for the five years of the contract and that 20% of income from the outstanding PCNs was deducted from the deficit as this was expected to be recovered by the bailiffs. If the bailiffs continued to recoup more than the 20% this would be reflected in future accounts. When asked for a cost per PCN officers explained that as each PCN did not cost the same this was difficult to show.

With regard to the car parks in West Bridgford Members queried if spaces could be 'leased' to businesses, thereby increasing income at times when the car parks were not heavily utilised. The Executive Manager - Operations and Corporate Governance stated that within the four year plan there was a review of car parks where this issue and others of this type could be discussed and considered.

29. **Work Programme**

The Board considered its work programme and the timing of the presentations by external partners. The Leisure Contracts Manager had explained at the previous meeting that the work programme had not taken into account the various contract end of year. To ensure that the information given to Members was current and useful it was proposed to amend the programme accordingly, therefore

- Parkwood Leisure would be moved from February to November as their year ends on 31 July

- Glendale Golf from November to February as their year ends on 31 December
- Civil Parking Enforcement from April to June as their year ends on 31 March
- Carillion from June to April as their year ends on 31 December

30. Chairman's Remarks

As this was the last meeting of the municipal year the Chairman thanked Members, especially the Vice Chairman, and officers for their work during the year. The Chairman thanked officers for their hard work in producing high quality minutes.

The meeting closed at 8.15 pm.

Action Sheet

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD - TUESDAY 23 APRIL 2013

Minute Number	Actions	Officer Responsible
27. Notes of the Previous Meeting	Officers to ensure that an update on the Partnership Board's strategic objectives is contained within the next report in November	Leisure Contracts Manager
28. Civil Parking Enforcement Contract Update 2013	a) Officers to inform Members of the final deficit costs when confirmed by the CPU b) Officers to update Members on the negotiations between the districts and Nottinghamshire County Council regarding allocation of responsibility for the on street car parking account	Leisure Contracts Manager Leisure Contracts Manager
29. Work Programme	Officers to amend the work programme accordingly	Member Services