

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION

**Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate
Street, ROTHERHAM.
S60 2TH**

**Date: Wednesday, 25th November,
2015**

Time: 1.30 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. To consider whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any part of the agenda.
2. To determine any item(s) the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered later in the agenda as a matter of urgency.
3. Apologies for absence
4. Declarations of Interest
5. Questions from members of the public and the press
6. Communications
7. Budget Proposals and Medium Term Financial Strategy - Waste, Roads and Enforcement (Pages 1 - 12)
8. Health Review on Waste
9. Rotherham Town Centre - Car Parking (Pages 13 - 22)
10. Task and Finish Groups - Update
11. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 14th October, 2015 (Pages 23 - 34)
12. Date and time of next meeting - Wednesday 20 January 2016 at 1.30 pm



Catherine A. Parkinson, Interim Director of Legal and Democratic Services

Improving Places Select Commission: membership: -

Councillors Atkin, Beck (Chairman), Buckley, Cutts, Godfrey, Gosling, Jepson, McNeely, Pickering, Smith, Reeder, Robinson, Rosling, C. Vines, Wallis, Whelbourn (Vice-Chairman), Whysall and Wyatt.

Co-opted members:- Mrs. L. Shears, Mr. P. Cahill and Mr. B. Walker.

Briefing paper for Improving Places Select Commission

25 November 2015

Budget Proposals and Medium Term Financial Strategy

Introduction

The Council is required to identify savings proposals and/or income generation opportunities to a minimum value of £41.083m over the three years 2016/17 to 2018/19 to deliver a sustainable Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). The budget proposals will, if supported, contribute to the Council setting its Council Tax and Revenue Budget for 2016/17 on 2nd March 2016.

Budget Scrutiny

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB) have been scrutinising the proposals across all Advisory Cabinet portfolios during a number of sessions. Each proposal has been discussed and questions asked of officers from each service area with regard to the implications and risks of the proposals. OSMB have fed back their responses to the proposals to officers and requested additional information for some proposals. Further budget scrutiny is taking place by OSMB on 26 November to ratify their comments and recommendations for submission to Commissioner Manzie.

For information the cover report regarding the savings proposals presented to OSMB with regard to the Waste, Roads and Enforcement portfolio is appended to this briefing (appendix B). This report sets out in more detail the implications, risks and mitigation of the proposals. The cover report refers to Appendix 1 which included savings proposals amounting to £1.289m over the three years from 2016/17 to 2018/19.

Referral to Improving Places

At OSMB it was agreed to forward a small number of the proposals from the Waste, Roads and Enforcement portfolio to the Improving Places Select Commission for further discussion in relation to the commission's scrutiny of the waste and enforcement agenda. This is to ensure that there is no discrepancy between the recommendations from the scrutiny review work and the savings proposals. The relevant proposals for discussion are attached at Appendix A.

Members of Improving Places are asked to consider the proposals in the context of their scrutiny review work and to feed in their comments through the Chair to OSMB on Thursday 26 November.

Briefing note: Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer janet.spurling@rotherham.gov.uk

Waste, Roads & Enforcement

Saving proposals for consideration

Commissioner Manzie's Decision Making Meeting 15th October 2015

Totals of portfolio savings enclosed:

2016/7 £,000	2017/18 £,000	2018/19 £,000	Total over 3 years £,000
772	279	238	1,289
FTE	FTE	FTE	FTE
10.5	4.5	1	16

In addition to the above savings EDS 23A will deliver a cost reduction of 50k in 2017/18 (this budget recurrently overspends)

Neighbourhoods & EDS

ASR REF NO: 19

CURRENT SERVICE SUMMARY (*Waste Treatment*)

Directorate:	EDS & Neighbourhoods	Brief description of service: Waste Treatment and Disposal covers the contractual arrangements for dealing with the treatment and disposal of domestic waste; the treatment of green waste, dealing with waste at our 4 Household Waste Recycling Centres; the haulage of skips from these sites, service costs for Recycling Banks; the disposal of special waste streams (hazardous clinical waste, asbestos) and the receipt of income from kerbside recycling operations and bring sites. Waste Services have a statutory duty and a duty of care to manage waste from Council operations and ensure that all the waste and recyclates produced are treated and disposed of through outlets that hold the relevant environmental permits.
Advisory Cabinet Portfolio:	Councillor Sims	
2015/16 Budget (£'000 Gross):	£1,180	
2015/16 Budget £'000 Income:	£579	
2015/16 Budget (£'000 Net):	£602	
2015/16 Budget FTE:	0 Included in Waste Coll. ASR	

SAVINGS PROPOSALS:

Ref:	Action	Impact Statement of proposals on Corporate priorities/Outcomes, Staff, Customers, Partners, Other Directorates/Services, Assets, initial equalities assessment, consultation requirements etc.	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	16/17 FTE	17/18 FTE	18/19 FTE	TOTAL £'000	TOTAL FTE
A	Dispose of carpets and mattresses through the Sub Regional Waste Plant	It is cheaper to dispose of mattresses and carpets through disposal rather than through recycling outlets. This will affect recycling performance by approximately 1.16% RAG Status - Green	105						105	
	TOTAL		105						105	

COMMENTS ON ABOVE PROPOSALS:

With the current pricing structure that we have in the Sub Regional Waste Plant for disposal of waste at Band 2 (£13.68 per tonne); from the economic perspective it is cheaper to undertake disposal than to attempt to increase recycling. The saving proposed relates to all the carpets and mattresses disposed of through the Councils four Household Waste Recycling Centres.

ASR REF NO: 20 Waste Collection

CURRENT SERVICE SUMMARY (Waste Collection)

Directorate:	EDS & Neighbourhoods	Brief description of service: This is a borough wide service provide to every household Waste Management undertakes the provision of all waste collection services (Black Bin, Green Bin, Blue Box and Bag), bulky item collections, bin delivery and the management of the contract for four Household Waste Recycling Centres across the Borough. The Council has a Statutory Duty to collect Household Waste as defined in the Environmental protection Act 1990
Advisory Cabinet Portfolio:	Cllr Sims	
2015/16 Budget (£'000 Gross):	£5,223k	
2015/16 Budget £'000 Income:	£980k	
2015/16 Budget (£'000 Net):	£4,243k	
2015/16 Budget FTE:	122.6 including 12 staff posts	

SAVINGS PROPOSALS:

Ref:	Action	Impact Statement of proposals on Corporate priorities/Outcomes, Staff, Customers, Partners, Other Directorates/Services, Assets, initial equalities assessment, consultation requirements etc.	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	16/17 FTE	17/18 FTE	18/19 FTE	TOTAL £'000	TOTAL FTE
A	Rationalisation of the Staff Structure	Will meet the 15% requirement for staff savings; there would need to be a rationalisation across the Management Structure for the service, the loss of 2FTEs represents a 17% reduction in terms of management/supervisory posts; this may impact upon service resilience in terms of lost expertise, and in the knock-on to service performance . RAG Status: Amber	20	20	20	1.0	1.0	0	60	2.0
C	Fleet Renewal – Change the type of Vehicle used to support the kerbside collection of dry recyclables	The current fleet of vehicles have come to the end of their lease. It is considered that the type of vehicle used at present, be changed to a conventional split bodied refuse vehicle. This type of vehicle will speed up the operation and allow for a reduction in the fleet of one vehicle and crew. The Waste Management establishment would be reduced by 3 posts	164			3.0			164	3.0

Ref:	Action	Impact Statement of proposals on Corporate priorities/Outcomes, Staff, Customers, Partners, Other Directorates/Services, Assets, initial equalities assessment, consultation requirements etc.	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	16/17 FTE	17/18 FTE	18/19 FTE	TOTAL £'000	TOTAL FTE
		It is considered there would be no impact upon the delivery of the service to residents RAG Status: Amber								
G	Revert to an alternate week collection on domestic refuse at Christmas / New Year; we currently provide a weekly collection for the 10 days when the service is in a backlog situation	The Council currently provides a weekly collection of black bins over the Christmas / New Year period when the service is in backlog; this is a period of approximately 10 working days. It is considered that initially there would be an adverse public reaction as the frequency between collections would be extended at a time of year when the waste produced increases. It will take longer to get the service back on a regular collection frequency; however 3 Saturdays will be worked to assist in minimising the disruption in collection frequencies. It has been agreed that the Household Waste Recycling Centres will remain open on all days during the period that the service is in backlog. These sites will be closed on Christmas Day, Boxing Day and New Year's Day RAG Status: Amber	30						30	
TOTAL			214	20	20	4	1	0	254	5

COMMENTS ON ABOVE PROPOSALS:

Staffing reductions amount to 11% of the total establishment

CURRENT SERVICE SUMMARY (Winter Maintenance)

Directorate:	EDS & Neighbourhoods	Borough wide service Highway precautionary salting (gritting) is carried out only on roads important to the free flow of traffic i.e. principal roads, other well used classified roads, bus routes, and access roads to hospitals and fire stations. This is approximately 50% of the roads in Rotherham. During heavy snowfall additional teams from across Streetpride are utilised to clear snow from footways, routes to school, doctors, sheltered housing etc.
Advisory Cabinet Portfolio:	Cllr Sims	
2015/16 Budget (£'000 Gross):	£461,100	
2015/16 Budget £'000 Income:	£0	
2015/16 Budget (£'000 Net):	£461,100	
2015/16 Budget FTE:	49	

SAVINGS PROPOSALS:

Ref:	Action	Impact Statement of proposals on Corporate priorities/Outcomes, Staff, Customers, Partners, Other Directorates/Services, Assets, initial equalities assessment, consultation requirements etc	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	16/17 FTE	17/18 FTE	18/19 FTE	TOTAL £'000	TOTAL FTE
A	Reduce the number of vehicles required to grit the roads	<p>A review is to be carried out to identify if efficiencies can be made to route planning. It is anticipated that this could reduce the number of routes from 10 to 9, whilst still maintaining to salt the same length of highway.</p> <p>This would reduce the number of lorries and out-of-hours drivers required to deliver the service.</p> <p>The service operates a similar level of service as other SY Authorities.</p> <p>RAG Status: Red</p>	0	50	0	0	0	0	50	0
TOTAL			0	50	0	0	0	0	50	0

COMMENTS ON ABOVE PROPOSALS:

The above saving would only partially mitigate the existing recurrent pressure on this budget by £50k

The 2015/16 budget allocation for highway winter maintenance is £461,100. The average cost of providing the winter services, based on the average for the last 5 years is approximately £829,396.

YEAR 2 PROPOSAL DUE TO EXISTING CONTRACT HIRE ARRANGEMENTS

Summary Sheet

Council Report

Title: Budget 2016/17 and MTFS Progress Update

Is this a Key Decision and has it been included on the Forward Plan?

No

Strategic Director Approving Submission of the Report

Stuart Booth, Interim Strategic Director of Finance & Corporate Services

Report Author(s)

Pete Hudson, Chief Finance Manager

Ward(s) Affected

All

Executive Summary

This report recommends that Budget Savings Proposals of £1.289m for the period 2016/17 to 2018/19 in respect of the Advisory Cabinet Portfolio of Waste, Roads and Enforcement be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB).

Where savings proposals are supported in principle, detailed equalities impact assessments and/or consultation will be undertaken, as required.

The aim is to produce a draft Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) by November 2015, in line with the timescales included in the Corporate Improvement Plan

Recommendations

For Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to consider the proposals attached at Appendix 1 and provide any feedback they wish to make before it comes back for a final Commissioner decision.

List of Appendices Included

Appendix 1 - Advisory Cabinet Portfolio of Waste, Roads and Enforcement Savings Proposals

Background Papers

Budget 2016/17 and MTFS Progress Update Report to Commissioner Manzie's Decision making meeting – 23rd September 2015.

Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel

This report will be referred on to Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB)

Council Approval Required

Ultimately Full Council approval will be required for setting the 2016/17 Budget.

Exempt from the Press and Public

No

Title (Main Report)**1. Recommendations**

1.1 For Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to consider the proposals attached at **Appendix 1** and provide any feedback they wish to make before it comes back for a final Commissioner decision.

2. Background

2.1 This is the second of a series of reports containing budget savings proposals for the period 2016/17 to 2018/19 which if supported, will help deliver the Council's estimated minimum financial challenge of £41.083m over the next three financial years.

2.2 The savings contained at **Appendix 1** are specifically in relation to the Advisory Cabinet Portfolio of Waste, Roads and Enforcement.

3. Key Issues

3.1 The Council is required to identify savings proposals and or income generation opportunities to a minimum value of £41.083m over the three years 2016/17 to 2018/19 to deliver a sustainable Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS).

3.2 The savings proposals within the attached appendix amount to £1.289m over the three years 2016/17 to 2018/19 and if supported will impact on 16 full time equivalent (FTE) posts.

	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	3 Years
Value of Savings	£772k	£279k	£238k	£1,289k
Number of FTE posts affected	10.5	4.5	1.0	16.0

4. Options considered and recommended proposal

4.1 The savings proposals in Appendix 1 are recommended for formal consideration.

5. Consultation

5.1 The savings within **Appendix 1** are referred to OSMB for their consideration. Any comments or queries will be referred back to Commissioner Manzie before a “minded to” decision is made.

5.2 All saving proposals will be subject to consultation. The extent of the consultation required will vary by the nature of the proposal. Where proposals have limited impact on customers or partners then the consultation required can be scheduled as soon as possible to bring forward savings in year, where appropriate. The majority of green rated savings fall into this category across all portfolios. The main group affected are employees and the expectation is that managers have already started the discussions about the possible implications of the savings options with the staff concerned.

5.3 For amber and red rated proposals across all portfolios more detailed consultation will be required, for example, with service users and partners, as well as staff. In such cases, savings proposals where the consultation can take place as soon as possible will be identified to maximise the chances for the exercise to be completed before the end of the current financial year to deliver a full year saving from April 1st 2016. It should be noted however, that there will be more complex savings proposals that have been deferred, are part of a major programme, or have significant impacts on customers, staff and partners which will necessitate more detailed consultation. These proposals are being identified and managers will be advised individually on the options available to them in order for the correct consultation process to be worked up and started as quickly as possible.

6. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

6.1 These budget proposals will, if supported, contribute to the Council setting its Council Tax and Revenue Budget for 2016/17 on 2nd March 2016.

7. Financial and Procurement Implications

7.1 Addressing the financial challenge over the next three years is critical for the Council. These proposals, if supported, would contribute to delivering that challenge.

7.2 The financial implications of the proposals are set out in **Appendix 1**.

8. Legal Implications

8.1 In preparing its MTF5 and Budget, the Council must be mindful of the potential impact on service users. Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 in particular imposes an obligation on Members to have due regard to protecting and promoting the welfare and interests of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (such as: age; disability; gender re-assignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex and sexual orientation).

8.2 The Council is required to set its Council Tax, and in doing so set its 2016/17 budget, by no later than 10th March 2016.

8.3 Where appropriate, savings proposals will be subject to consultation with the public, partners, clients and employees.

9. Human Resources Implications

9.1 The Council currently employs 4,138 full time equivalents (5,760 people). Research shows that the best way of receiving information by any workforce is from their manager or team leader. However it is also important to give out consistent corporate messages. Regular Budget Bulletins to communicate the budget process to the workforce is in place and staff will continue to be appraised of decisions as they are taken and/or of timescales for decisions to be taken.

9.2 The savings proposals in Appendix 1 have a potential impact on 16 FTE posts over the next three years.

10. Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults

10.1 Not applicable

11 Equalities and Human Rights Implications

11.1 Detailed Equalities Assessments will be undertaken where there is a requirement to do so.

11.2 Where appropriate, savings proposals will be subject to consultation with the public, partners, clients and employees.

12. Implications for Partners and Other Directorates

12.1 These are contained within **Appendix 1**.

13. Risks and Mitigation

13.1 The Council has identified an estimated budget challenge of £41.083m over the next 3 years. It is imperative that the Council develops and implements a robust MTFs which is sustainable and aligned to the delivery of the Council's key objectives. Although Rotherham Council has a good record of delivering its budget and achieving planned savings, meeting the estimated financial challenge and delivering a balanced budget going forward means that the Council will have to deliver all of the identified savings and with limited margin for variability. Should savings options be rejected, alternatives will have to be identified if the Council is to set a balanced budget and remain within the statutory framework for managing its finances. This adds further potential risk to the budget process.

13.2 It is therefore essential that the Council identifies savings options to eliminate this estimated financial challenge whilst at the same time protecting, to the extent it can, the key services on which the public of Rotherham rely.

14. Accountable Officer(s)

Pete Hudson, Chief Finance Manager (for the report)

Strategic Directors, Assistant Directors and Budget Managers and Budget Holders for the delivery of supported savings proposals.

Approvals Obtained from:-

Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services:- Stuart Booth
Interim Director of Legal & Democratic Services:- Catherine Parkinson

This report is published on the Council's website or can be found at:-

<http://modern.gov.rotherham.gov.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?Categories=>

Summary Sheet

Council Report

Improving Places Select Commission 25 November 2015

Title

Preliminary Investigations into Car Parking in Rotherham Town Centre.

Is this a Key Decision and has it been included on the Forward Plan?

No

Strategic Director Approving Submission of the Report

N/A as the paper is a discussion paper for the Commission.

Report Author(s)

Christine Majer Scrutiny Officer, Resources
christine.majer@rotherham.gov.uk 01709 822738

Ward(s) Affected

Town Centre

Executive Summary

The purpose of this preliminary investigation, undertaken by Members as part of a Task & Finish Group, is:

- to provide recommendations to the Advisory Cabinet and to the Commissioners on car parking in the Town Centre.
- to provide information and recommendations to the Improving Places Select Commission to inform discussion on whether a detailed review is required.

A range of differing priorities across the various Council departments meant formulating a clear line on parking provision was difficult and currently no overall written policy for car parking is in place.

Recommendations

That the Improving Places Select Commission receives the preliminary findings on Car Parking in Rotherham Town Centre and accepts the recommendations identified in the attached report.

List of Appendices Included

Appendix 1 Preliminary Investigations into Car Parking in Rotherham Town Centre

Background Papers

N/A

Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel

No

Council Approval Required

No

Exempt from the Press and Public

No

Title Preliminary Investigations into Car Parking in Rotherham Town Centre

1. Recommendations

- 1.1 **That the Improving Places Select Commission receives the preliminary findings on car parking in Rotherham Town Centre and accepts the recommendations identified in the attached report.**

2. Background

- 2.1 The purpose of this preliminary investigation is to provide recommendations to the Advisory Cabinet and to the Commissioners on car parking in the Town Centre. The anticipated outcome from this report is to provide information and recommendations to the Improving Places Select Commission to inform a discussion on whether a detailed review is required.
- 2.2 It is part of a series of reviews being undertaken by Members of Improving Places Select Commission.
- 2.3 Town centre parking charges (and enforcement activity) generate significant income for the Council. They also have the potential to deter shoppers and visitors to the town centre, particularly in light of increasing alternative out-of-town retail sites offering free car parking.

3. Key Issues

- 3.1 Section 3 in the appendix sets the context for the review work including the impact of parking charges for encouraging sustainable transport and of parking charges and the local economy, especially for town centre and out of town retailing, showing the complexity of the issue.

4. Options considered and recommended proposal

- 4.1 Section 4 in Appendix 1 sets out the key findings from this initial work from the task and finish group.

5. Consultation

- 5.1 Parking decisions historically have been informed by a range of information available to officers. Previous consultation includes a 2012 shopper survey which indicated that town centre customers had little issue with the quantity of parking or the cost of parking and its location. There is also regular two way contact with local businesses.

6. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

6.1 This will depend on the response to the recommendations in the main report by the Commission.

7. Financial and Procurement Implications

7.1 None at this stage but any future changes to parking policy and provision could impact upon income generation and the local economy.

8. Legal Implications

8.1 N/A

9. Human Resources Implications

9.1 N/A

10. Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults

10.1 Nothing specific at this stage but general safety and road safety links in with transport and parking policies.

11. Equalities and Human Rights Implications

11.1 None at this stage but parking policies need to take account of equality protected characteristics, such as meeting the needs of disabled people.

12. Implications for Partners and Other Directorates

12.1 As indicated above parking policy impacts on other policy areas.

13. Risks and Mitigation

13.1 None at this stage.

14. Accountable Officer(s)

Christine Majer – Scrutiny Officer Ext 22738.

christine.majer@rotherham.gov.uk

Martin Beard – Parking Services Manager Ext 22929

martin.beard@rotherham.gov.uk

Approvals Obtained from:-

Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services:- N/A

Director of Legal Services:- N/A

Head of Procurement (if appropriate):- N/A

This report is published on the Council's website or can be found at:-

<http://moderngov.rotherham.gov.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?Categories=>

Appendix 1

Improving Places – Preliminary Investigations

Rotherham Town Centre – Car Parking.

	Page
Contents	
Why Members wanted to undertake this work	1
Methodology	1
Background	2
Findings	3
Recommendations	5
Thanks	6
Background papers	6

1 Why Members wanted to undertake this work

- 1.1 The purpose of this preliminary investigation is to provide recommendations to the Advisory Cabinet and to the Commissioners on car parking in the Town Centre. The anticipated outcome from this report is to provide information and recommendations to the Improving Places Select Commission to inform a discussion on whether a detailed review is required.
- 1.2 It is part of a series of reviews being undertaken by Members of Improving Places Select Commission.
- 1.3 Town centre parking charges (and enforcement activity) generate significant income for the Council. They also have the potential to deter shoppers and visitors to the town centre, particularly in light of increasing alternative out-of-town retail sites offering free car parking
- 1.4 The Task and Finish Group have undertaken a preliminary investigation into the issues surrounding the town centre car parking charging and enforcement policies, to determine the future scope and benefits of an in-depth scrutiny review.
- 1.5 A sub group of Task & Finish Group 3 was established in August 2015 consisting of the following people

Cllr Jon Rosling	Chair
Cllr Glyn Whelbourn	
Cllr Rose McNeely	
Cllr Dave Pickering	
Mr Brian Walker	Co-optee Member
Dianne Thomas	Advisor from Local Government Association and Centre from Public Scrutiny.
Chris Majer	Scrutiny Officer.

2 Methodology

- 2.1 This piece of work involved meeting with the Parking Services Manager who provided answers to questions asked on the subject along with providing written information.

- 2.2 The lines of questioning were identified with the assistance of the Centre for Public Scrutiny Consultant Dianne Thomas and are based on the lines of enquiries of reviews elsewhere.

3 Background

- 3.1 Since the development of Parkgate Retail World and Meadowhall Shopping Centre, Rotherham as a place to shop has struggled to attract shoppers into the Town Centre. One of the main reasons for this is both have the facility to provide free car parking on site, although the impact of this has not been proved.
- 3.2 The formulation of a Car Parking Policy is difficult due to the focus of other current policies the Council may be supporting at any one time. For example the Transportation Policy promoted the use of public transport along with encouraging employees to cycle to work, which resulted in incrementally higher car parking charges for longer stay parking activities.
- 3.3 The local economy and businesses located in the Town Centre area require increased levels of footfall and a lower or free parking tariff may help Rotherham Town Centre compete with outlying shopping centres.
- 3.4 The recent developments on what were previously Market Street Car Parks and the relocation of Tesco Supermarket from Forge Island site, illustrates the fluid nature of car parking provision in the town.

4 Findings

- 4.1 The most surprising feature in the committee's discussion with the officer concerned was that the authority had no current written policy on parking provision. However, work is ongoing to formulate such a policy and this process involves consideration being given to the contribution parking provision makes to the local economy and the Council's overall Transportation Policy.
- 4.2 A report is due to be delivered to Commissioners in December 2015 which will make recommendations on tariff changes to achieve savings as well as a free Saturday parking offer.
- 4.3 The officer explained that a range of differing priorities across different departments meant formulating a clear line on parking provision was difficult. The Authority does, however, have a robust parking

enforcement policy and has had notable success in tackling Blue Badge fraud.

- 4.4 Parking decisions historically have been informed by a range of information available to officers. Amongst these are a 2012 shopper survey which featured questions on parking (although the officer acknowledged this was not the main focus of the survey); and regular two way contact with businesses through a number of forums and also through business lobbying.
- 4.5 The shopper survey from 2012 indicated that town centre customers had little issue with the quantity of parking or the cost of parking and its location. There is a range of parking at various locations around the town centre although the future availability of some of these sites, such as Forge Island, is uncertain.
- 4.6 As well as a range of locations there are a variety of charges and maximum stay restrictions in force at different sites. These range from 30 minute short stays at various sites, up to three hours at Forge Island (this was extended after business lobbying) and several sites which facilitate all day parking.
- 4.7 One aspect that did come out of the shopper survey was that parking was not necessarily the single issue that prevented people from wanting to come into Rotherham. Other reasons, such as the choice of shopping outlets, were cited – though it should be noted that this survey was conducted three years ago and that there have been significant developments in the Town Centre offer since then, particularly along High Street.
- 4.8 The group questioned the effect of free parking on Town Centre activity and was told that car park usage had increased when seasonal free parking was on offer; and that sites offering free parking had a high take up. That would imply that free parking leads to increased activity in the Town Centre, however one has to consider that the increased trade may be down to other factors i.e. seasonal trade. It was a difficult issue to assess scientifically and there were limited like for like situations in other towns locally. Barnsley local authority has a free Saturday parking offer, however Doncaster does not.
- 4.9 The officer did accept that free parking “probably” would increase economic activity and could be a positive that would benefit the town. However, he and the group felt that any move to free parking – even on a localised scale – would have to be very carefully monitored and

managed and be left in place for a some significant time in order to assess its genuine effectiveness. It should also be recognised that an “across the board” free parking offer would result in the annual surplus which is currently generated by the Parking Service being reduced from its current level of approximately £400,000 to a deficit of approximately £500,000.

- 4.10 The concept of a Business Improvement District was discussed – whereby businesses pay a premium to help towards the cost of things such as street cleaning and car parking. There is reportedly some work being done on this type of initiative elsewhere. It was highlighted that free parking was not an answer in itself – that it required a range of incentives.

5 Recommendations

- 5.1 There is scope for further considerable work, over a longer period, on the issue of parking in the Town Centre. Much of this work is currently ongoing and the report to Commissioners in December will address some of the issues raised in this report.
- 5.2 There is a need to unify the various strands of approach and practice into a coherent policy on parking that reflects the different priorities of differing sections and which can provide some consistency of approach over time for officers on the matters of provision, charges and siting as well as enforcement. Any future group work should focus on the development of such a policy.
- 5.3 The authority should continue to take representations from local traders about parking in the Town Centre through existing forums; however this information should also be allied with up to date and regularly revised information from customers who use the Town Centre for shopping. Past practice has been governed by anecdotal information or out of date surveys. It needs a more thorough and scientific approach.
- 5.4 With that in mind, any free parking offer ought to be extended and carefully monitored to assess its impact in terms of increased trade and Town Centre usage. Since the review started, it has been agreed that the offer of free parking on Forge Island has now been made permanent.

- 5.5 The Members of Improving Places Select Commission should decide how best these outcomes can be measured to ensure they are consistently monitored over the long term.
- 5.6 The group may also wish to look at the feasibility of re-opening areas currently closed to traffic under the pedestrianisation of the Town Centre many years ago.
- 5.7 Further research into the feasibility of introducing a Business Improvement District into the Town Centre should be undertaken. It is part of a series of reviews being undertaken by Members of Improving Places Select Commission.
- 5.8 The results of this review and any subsequent findings should be incorporated into the Arup Masterplan for the Town Centre.

6 Thanks

- 6.1 On behalf of the members of the Task and Finish Group, the Chairman, Cllr Jon Rosling would like to thank the Parking Services Manager, Martin Beard for his co-operation in this review.

7 Background papers

- 7.1 Civil Parking Enforcement Policy
- 7.2 Environment & Development Service Cabinet Member for Waste and Environment meeting on 20th October 2014
- 7.3 Environment & Development Service report to Directorate Management Team meeting on 24th July 2015 :- Forge Island Car Park Financial and Statistical Report.

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
Wednesday, 14th October, 2015

Present:- Councillor Beck (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Buckley, Cutts, Godfrey, Jepson, McNeely, Pickering, Reeder, C. Vines, Whelbourn, Whysall and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Gosling and Wallis and from co-opted member Mrs. L. Shears.

18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

19. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

20. COMMUNICATIONS

Waste Management Task and Finish Group

Councillor Godfrey, Chair of the Task and Finish Group, reported that the Group had met three times with a further meeting planned shortly. A visit to North Yorkshire was planned to take place to look at their household waste disposal and policies they have in relation to charging for certain types of waste. It was hoped to pull together a report before the end of the year. A meeting was to take place the following week with the British Heart Foundation to discuss a possible partnership in relation to the bulky goods service.

Christine Majer, Policy Officer, also reported that the Group had been invited to a meeting on 20th October with representatives of the Local Government Association and those carrying out the Health Checks on the Waste Service.

21. HIGHWAY ASSET MANAGEMENT POLICY, STRATEGY AND PLAN 2015-2021

Colin Knight, Highway Network Manager, presented the Council's Highways Asset Management Policy, Strategy and revised Highway Asset Management Plan (HAMP) for the period 2015-2021.

The Chairman drew attention to the fact that the Policy had been considered by Commissioner Manzie and was to be considered at the 21st October Council meeting. Assurances had been given that any recommendations made by the Select Commission would be conveyed to officers and Commissioners and raised at the Council meeting.

Members received the following powerpoint presentation:-

Highway Maintenance Background

- The Council was responsible for maintaining 700 miles of roads and 1,300 miles of footways/PROW
- The highways network was the Council's single biggest asset with a value of around £1.72b (gross replacement value)
- The Authority's approach to highway maintenance was based on two principles:-
 - Primary objective was to keep Rotherham's roads and footways in a safe condition and to nationally recognised standard
 - Carry out programmed maintenance works as cost effectively as possible (not necessarily works on roads that are in the worst condition)
- A deteriorating network means an increasing amount of funding is spent on reactive maintenance (potholes).

Assets and Performance Management

Asset Type	Quantity	Estimated Gross Replacement Cost (£M)	Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) (£M)
Carriageways	712 miles (1,143 km)	£1,257M	£1,202M
Footways	1,052 miles (1,689 km)	£219M	£192M
Drainage	45,500 chambers, gullies etc. and 35 km of drainage pipes/chambers	Included in carriageway costs	Included in carriageway costs
Street Lighting/Furniture	35,216 street lights columns	£73M	£67M
Structures	185 structures – bridges, culverts and underpasses	£164m	£157m
Traffic Systems	107 traffic signalised junctions and pedestrian crossings	£14M	£6M
	Total Cost	£1.726b	£1.630b

Highway Asset Condition

Road Classification	RMBC (2013/14)	National Average (2013/14)
Principle – A Roads (In 2008 extra £5M Capital funding injected to improve road network)	3%	4%
Non-Principal – B & C Roads (an extra £3M investment over 3 years)	7%	8%
Unclassified – U Roads (estate roads) (Capital investment in 2015/16 and 2016/17 of £5M to address the deterioration)	21%	18%
Footways	25%	Not available

Policy – Sets out what we want to achieve and links to the Corporate Vision over the medium to long term.

- We believe good asset management is fundamental in enabling RMBC to effectively deliver highway services to achieve our long term corporate priorities
- It will enable informed decisions to be made about investment and maintenance funding
- Resources can then be targeted at where they are most effective
- Enable the identification and management of risk associated with our statutory duty to manage and maintain

Strategy - Outlines the approach to managing highway infrastructure

- Corporate objective – to keep highways safe and well maintained
- Departmental priorities – to national average condition
- Asset Management Policy
- Asset Management Strategy
- Highway Asset Management Plans
- Rotherham’s Highway Asset Management Plan
 - Good data management (inventory)
 - Levels of Service and Performance Management
 - Asset Lifecycle Planning
 - Risk Management
 - Works Programmes

Outcomes

- To provide safe highway network for all our users
- Improve customer satisfaction
- Maximise the funding to repair as much of highway network as possible
- Reduce the number of properties at risk of flooding
- Reduce our energy consumption

Highway Lifecycle Planning

- The impact of early intervention treatments (such as surface dressing) can return the carriageway to an almost new condition
- Lifecycle planning used to develop investment strategies to deliver an agreed level of performance or, where funding becomes constrained, a prediction of the effect of particular funding scenarios on the levels of served that can be delivered
- Enabled Services to be delivered as effectively as possible allowing a clear and logical allocation of resources to those areas which would contribute most to the overall objectives and priorities of the Council and allow an assessment to be made of the residual risk

Decision Making Process

- Taking into consider asset condition, safety lifestyle cost, stakeholder interest and how supports Corporate objectives
- By the use of robust evidence-based decision making processes, the Department was able to optimise assets by the appropriate prioritisation of work within the available funding
- Potential for schemes to be co-ordinated across asset groups – alignment of schemes within the works programmes was key to optimising available funding
- Highway Asset Managers regularly met to review works programmes for each of the assets groups. Locations that appeared near to the top of more than one of the priority lists were to be considered as to whether a joined up scheme may be feasible

Long Term Maintenance Investments

- To bring the unclassified network (estate roads) up to national average or better requires a total investment of £15M
- Priority to carry out timely maintenance before the road was in poor condition
- If roads in an amber condition were targeted there would be a 4-5% reduction in these roads that required significant work
- If the £5M was used on the worst roads, red condition, this would approximately treat 18km. If the funding is targeted at amber condition roads over a 2 years period 4 times that length would be treated
- DfT Local Highways Maintenance Capital Block Funding (LTP) and recognition of following good asset management principles.
- If good asset management principles are not adhered to then the highway condition will continue to deteriorate at an accelerated rate
- The number of potholes would increase as would the spending on reactive maintenance:-

Spend on Reactive Work (potholes)

Year	Number	Cost (000's)	Cost/Defect
2008/09	12,000	243	£20
2014/15	34,000	435	£12

Additionally the number of third party claims would potentially increase

Discussion ensued on the presentation with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Members now had a greater awareness of the condition of the road network and the challenges the Service faced. Over 54 schemes would be delivered this year which had been suggested by Members. Sessions had also been run where Members had been invited out to meet the Highway Inspectors to see what was involved in “the day of the life of a Highway Inspector”
- Intensive weather events had identified significant flooding risks and the capacity of the highway drains to deal with such events. The Authority worked closely with Yorkshire Water on the capacity of their systems and capability of our gullies etc. Investment had also recently been made in telematics which would record whether a gully was blocked, half full or clear, enabling the gully cleaning schedule to be prioritised accordingly
- Members found the weekly traffic delay report very helpful although there were sometimes issues with the road signage not being removed as efficiently as they should. It would also be helpful if a monthly schedule could be provided on which roads were to be treated appreciating that there may be events that overtook planned works. It would be looked to be included on the website so it could be accessed at any point
- The unclassified roads programme required an extra £10M to the £5M Capital funding and there was currently no possibility of that coming from any other source(DfT), £3.6M has been received in 2015/16 as part of the DfT annual LTP settlement. A submission would be made to the Council Capital pot for the £10m funding. This would bring the unclassified network to the national average condition. It was noted that when a level of performance is reached for the highway network it then requires £6.5m every year to maintain the roads at that level
- The Council’s approach to highway maintenance, as endorsed at the Members’ workshop in May, 2015, is to priorities roads in an amber condition as well as picking up several kilometres of “red” roads. If successful in the bid for funding and the extra £10M secured, this would address all the red roads to a level that would achieve national average condition

- There was currently no single major maintenance projects prepared at the moment. However, bids totalling £12M had been submitted to the DfT last year for maintenance works on Rotherham's strategic network and bridge structures but had unfortunately not been successful. Feedback from the DfT had revealed that if the Authority had increased its minimum funding requirement (was submitted as 10%), the chances of success would increase. Discussions were taking place with regard to considerations for submissions for the second round of funding but more would be known once the assessment criteria for LTP funding comes out in November
- If the highways were maintained there would be a decrease in the number of potholes. The multi-hog served a good purpose and was very useful in estate type roads where it could be used with minimum traffic management. The national cost for repairing a pothole was approximately £54; in Rotherham it cost £13. There were no criteria set against the average cost so the Authority had asked a specific question to APSE as to the cost for plant, labour and materials to enable a true comparison to be made. On average, the national cost was 30-40% more than Rotherham's. There were very few repeat potholes but was more the case of one developing adjacent to the original
- Engagement had been carried out with key stakeholders on the Strategy for managing Rotherham's highway assets. Those that had responded had endorsed the process regarding prioritisation of works and the Policy and Strategy. A presentation had also been made to the Council's Learning from Customers Forum about the prioritisation of the works. However, there was genuine concern that members of public would feel that the worst roads were not being dealt with and it was important to get communication and information out to Members to share with members of the public at surgeries
- There was an action plan attached to the Asset Management Plan which would be reported to Councillors and Commissioners. It was imperative that the complete document was prepared and endorsed by Council for 2015/21 as part of the submission for DfT LTP funding. As part of the annual update, an Executive Summary would be prepared
- With regard to pothole cost against quality, the services that delivered highway maintenance had been reorganised into one team in 2010/11 which had brought about efficiencies. There were also different types of materials and close working with a local asphalt provider to develop materials. Like all authorities, there would be reports of potholes not lasting/stable but there was not a significant number. The Highways Delivery Team Manager had been requested to keep a record of all reports and also quality check the work carried out

- Some of the highways in the Highways three year work programme appeared twice as they were phased for engineering and financial reasons
- The Authority's Street Lighting Team often did the design and build for new developments so that it could control what lighting was provided
- A number of concerns had been raised at the recent Commissioners' Roadshows highlighting that highways were seen as a priority to members of the public. They would be fed into the budget setting process this year and into the Capital budget process
- The Highway Works Programme mid-term review was planned for the following week. There would be a session for Members in February/March, 2016, regarding the prioritisation and where the best value for money for the available budget

The Chairman stated that the Select Commission would be interested in the Strategy's performance management going forward as well as a number of the Key Performance Indicators being relevant to the Commission's area of work. Once live and in operation, the Select Commission would wish an annual update on progress, any issues/areas of concern.

Colin Knight reported that there was criteria associated with the LTP funding of 3 different levels:-

Level 1 - the Authority will not receive all the available funding

Level 2 - the Authority will receive full funding for a period of time

Level 3 - was a stretched target and the Authority will be striving to achieve this over the coming years.

Resolved:- (1) That Highways Asset Management Policy, Strategy and revised Highways Asset Management Plan (HAMP) 2015-2021 be endorsed.

(2) That as part of the annual update, an executive summary be produced for the Select Commission.

22. ROTHERHAM TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Tom Finnegan-Smith, Transportation Highways and Project Manager, presented the draft Rotherham Transport Strategy which outlined the proposed strategic approach to the provision and management of transport and transport infrastructure in Rotherham.

The following powerpoint presentation as given:-

Why do we need a Transport Strategy

- Lots of policy documents both national and regional
- Need to know how Policy relates to Rotherham
- The Strategy captures interaction with other disciplines such as land use planning, air quality, health and regeneration
- Within this framework, a Strategy is needed to prevent a piecemeal approach to projects
- Based on the evidence of the need and challenges faced, it sets out priorities and informs decisions

The Role of Transportation in supporting Rotherham's Economic Growth

- Government have reinforced the key role that effective and efficient Transportation and Highway networks have on Economic Growth

How Transportation has fed into the development of the growth plan for City Region and Rotherham's Growth Plan

- International, national transport and land planning policy and law
- Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy (2011-2026) and Local Transport Plan
- Local Plan Core Strategy (local planning and land use)
- Sheffield City Regional Strategic Economic Plan (Growth Plan)
- Rotherham Corporate Plan and Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- Rotherham Growth Plan
- Transport and highways projects in Rotherham

Rotherham's Transport Strategy 2015-2026

By 2028 Rotherham will

- Enjoy sustainable growth – new development will be based on compact mixed use centres focussed on high quality public transport
- Be a connected place – people and places are connected by an integrated, safe and efficient transport network
- Make sustainable travel choices – walking, cycling and public transport are a normal part of daily travel

Challenges

- Economic growth
- Car dependency
- Physical inactivity
- Energy and climate change
- Traffic congestion
- Less funding

Objectives

- Integrated transport and land use – to support well designed new development that reduces the need to travel and is accessible to everyone by frequent public transport, walking and cycling
- Public transport (bus, tram and train) – to improve the public transport network so it provides an alternative to the private car
- Active transport network – to make the transport network safe and

- attractive for walking and cycling
- Travel behaviour change – to reduce car dependency and increase levels of walking, cycling, car share and public transport use
- Roads and freight – to develop and manage an efficient road network for the movement of people and goods that can be shared by everyone
- Safer roads – to make the transport network safe for everyone

Themes and Actions

- To focus new development along key public transport corridors and in places adjacent to existing shops and services
- To develop high quality accessible public places (centres)
- To improve rail services and access to stations and to ensure SCR is served by high speed rail
- To improve connectivity between major settlements
- To develop public transport that connects people to jobs and training
- To improve safety on public transport
- To work with operators to keep fares affordable
- To develop high quality, connected cycling and walking networks
- Connecting and completing the existing active transport network
- Connecting with public transport
- Connecting colleges and schools
- Connecting our urban centres
- To encourage active travel especially to address local obesity and inactivity problems, encourage schools to adopt active travel projects and create a lasting legacy from LSTF projects
- To provide information and travel advice for the users of all modes of transport
- To improve surface access to international gateways
- To reduce the amount of productive time lost on the strategic and local road network and to improve its resilience and reliability
- To ensure networks are well maintained
- To promote efficient and sustainable means of freight distribution
- To work to improve the efficiency of vehicles and reduce carbon emissions and to improve air quality especially in designated areas
- To apply parking policies to promote efficient car use, while remaining sensitive to the vulnerability of local economics
- To encourage safe road use and reduce casualties on our roads
- To focus safety efforts on vulnerable groups
- To work with the Police to enforce traffic laws

Outcomes

- To support economic growth and develop a resilient transport system
- Reduce emissions and protect our natural environment
- To maximise safety on a more 'active' transport network
- To enhance a social inclusion and health through a more equitable transport system

Changing face of funding

- Sheffield City Regional Growth Plan
This is a strategic bidding document to the Local Growth Fund
- Rotherham Transport Strategy and Growth Plan
- Local Growth Fund (2015-16)
Major scheme funding
40% top-slice LTP IT block
LSTF
DfT are providing £1.1b of the £1.3b Capital element of LGF for 2015/16
- Local Funding (with SY influence)
CIL and S106
S278
Residual LTP IT Block
LTP Maintenance
DfT Competitive funds
DfT Partnering funds
Capital investment
- The Strategy will no longer be delivered solely through an annual programme of Transportation and Highways grant funded schemes and initiatives. The influence of Devolution on our future funding and transport infrastructure is likely to be significant

Discussion ensued on the presentation with the following issues raised/clarified;-

- The Council had 4/5 designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs), areas defined as having a reading over a certain threshold in terms of air quality emissions. Such issues were monitored across South Yorkshire with an external provider doing some of the work and an Environmental Officer. The reasons for having poor air quality would be considered together with potential mitigations to bring the areas out of being an AQMA some of which included public transport providers and bus operators around cleaner technology for their vehicles. There was no one solution but making public transport attractive would help. Work was taking place with Highways England regarding the poor air quality near to the M1 motorway in Brinsworth, Tinsley and Blackburn particularly given the development of the smart motorway
- A review of the bus network had been undertaken last Summer in the run up to the launch of the Rotherham Voluntary Bus Partnership. At that time work had taken place with SYPTE and the main bus operators that were engaged in the Partnership to review the network and try and agree a network that effectively tried to link to communities as best it could given that the operators were commercial operators and would take business decisions based on whether they thought a route could be sustained. For those routes/communities that the operators did not wish to serve there was

a secondary criteria for the PTE and their bus tendered services i.e. the ones that filled in the gaps either in total or for periods of the day where a private operator did not want to run a route. There may well be smaller communities that did not meet the criteria for the provision of a tendered service. Whilst certain communities have seen the overall number of services reduced and therefore the range of destinations reduced the aim of the network review was to ensure that communities were still provided with a service, from which passengers could interchange between services to get them to their ultimate destination.

- It had been in the media about a possible new railway station in the Parkgate area of Rotherham. This had come from a recent study undertaken by the SYPTE which had looked at the rail service that was provided at Rotherham Central Station and whether that service provision could be improved with better links to a wider range of destinations and more frequent service. Although the Station itself had been refurbished recently the services that served the Station remained as they were before. Tram train was a key part of that provision but the study had effectively highlighted the constraints of additional services serving Rotherham Central Station were as a result of the Station not being on the mainline. Due to this, there were issues around the delays that train companies would experience by travelling off and onto the mainline and due to the alignment of the track serving Rotherham Central the slow line speeds. A range of options had been considered to find a solution but they were not considered to be value for money and would mean re-aligning the main line through the Central Station which was not cost effective. For Rotherham to have an enhanced connection and higher quality destinations would require a new mainline station
- The Tram Train project has been delayed until early 2017. The tram train vehicles themselves were on their way to South Yorkshire with the first ones arriving in December, 2015. The delay was as a result of programming/project management of the scheme; Network Rail had been challenged to come back from a position of delay and the revised timescale now stated 2017. Colleagues from the PTE were working predominantly on that project and had had a number of issues and discussions with Network Rail. The vehicles would be used along the Yellow tram route between Sheffield and Meadowhall but would not connect with the heavy rail route until 2017. An order under the Transport and Rail Act 1992 was required and Network Rail had submitted this to the Secretary of State for Transport on the 13 March 2015.
- Funding for work around sustainable travel, including the promotion of the car sharing initiative, came from the current Local Sustainable Travel Fund which would finish on 31st March, 2016. The cessation of funding would leave a gap and a problem in terms of continuing much of that activity. One of the benefits of the Fund, and South Yorkshire

was very successful being the only metropolitan area that received the total funding sought (approximately £35M), was that it was not all Capital funding but Revenue funding to promote other forms of transport and the car club was not a capital scheme. Although it was accepted that the scheme in its own right could be more successful than it was there without funding it would not go ahead at all

- There were a number of charging points for electric vehicles. There was a free rapid charging point in the Drummond Street car park and on the Waverley AMP. The funding for such facilities was via the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, however, the vehicles were still expensive to purchase/lease. The Authority was keen to do more in terms of electric vehicles as it was with other emerging technologies i.e. the recent launch of hydrogen refuelling station at Waverley AMP
- Acknowledgement that it was an opportunity to look at wider rail provision and integration in terms of bus and rail particularly in the southern part of the Borough where the rail service was extremely well used. Car parking should also be included in any consultation

Resolved:- (1) That the draft Transport Strategy 2015-2026 be noted.

(2) That a report be submitted on air quality in the Borough.

23. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 2ND SEPTEMBER, 2015

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 2nd September, 2015, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

24. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That a further meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission be held on 25th November, 2015, commencing at 1.30 p.m.