

**Scrutiny Parking review Follow up meeting  
Thursday 18 March 2021 via Zoom**

**Welcome & Apologies**

**In attendance:**

Kirsten de Keyser (KDK), Lia Voutourides (LV), Derek Sheppard (DS), Raquel Solomon (RS), Natasha Greenaway (NG).

**Tpas Staff:**

Sam Goodwin (SG)

**Origin Staff:**

Carol Williams (CW) – Director of Operations  
Cherish Hill (CH) - Resident Engagement Coordinator  
Peter Butler (PB) - Business Development Manager

CW - Thanked the group for agreeing to meet again following the Customer Services Committee response to the recent Parking Policy Scrutiny review. Proposed to go through the recommendations one by one together. All agreed.

CW – Trying to gather what we need adding or changing in the current policy for improvement. I agree that one size does not fit all. CW read out recommendation 4 - *If residents of any sites want parking controls parking should be free to them and their visitors. If a third-party Management Company is to be involved it should only be one which has met with thorough approval with the following companies (BPA, AOS, ATA) and allows for recourse to appeals via POPLA.* Please can you elaborate and help me understand what the recommendation is asking us.

RS – For example where I live there are 32 flats and 16 spaces. Everyone that had a car paid a charge in their Service Charge and now we also have permits. Should go back to just having cost within our service charge and not have the two charges. There is nowhere for visitors to park and there is no flexibility.

CW – Where there is limited parking, the question is managing this, so it is fair. I agree that clarifying what is included in the Service charges is important. If there are only 16 spaces where can visitors park. R – Only half the spaces are being used as not everyone has a car.

NG – There has been parking management imposed in my area and it is just not needed. How can we answer this question?

CW – Volunteering to be part of the Scrutiny group includes making recommendations that we can implement and helping us understand how it can improve services.

DS – There are different levels of parking. There is one permit per unit and when there is an appeal Origin should be favorable towards residents' case. Everyone should have equal say and equal right to park. Appeals should go to an independent party via Poplar.

KDK – The parking policy is not fit for purpose. It's not just re tendering or taking it in house.

DS – Where the companies are in the same building then there is a conflict of interest. Reputable companies will use poplar.

LV – Origin should be involved with appeals. I know someone that purchased a permit 2 weeks before enforcement date. Rather than going to appeals process, they could have gone straight to Origin as it is extenuating circumstances. We cannot have a blanket policy, and this is the reason we wanted to go back to before the policy. Also, because there is no evidence of a proper consultation. There are areas where residents want permits and, in the survey, we did 2 estates challenged parking controls and succeeded. Why do we go from an issue with parking straight to parking enforcement 365 days a year? Why not try signs first as this has worked in other areas? Gill Martins have nowhere to park and park in resident spaces and repairs are sometimes not carried out as they have nowhere to park. Origin seems quick to take our money, but the parking spaces are inadequate anyway.

CW – We need to look at Estate Plans and how we can work more locally on estates. One of the recommendations was to not see this as a source of income. If we provide parking spaces, there will need to be charges in service charge for example.

LV – Is this not already included?

CW – It will be different for different estates but there will be costs associated with painting lines and signs for example.

KDK – In 2017 there were still parking charges when we looked at income, Origin makes about 6k per year from this. If it causes complaints and issues, is the 6k worth it?

CW – Need to review the charging mechanisms, be it a charge included in service charge or even an annual one-off payment.

LV – It didn't make sense how the money was spent. Charging residents should be the last resort.

CW – There needs to be a real focus on what each estate wants.

LV – gave an example of a disable resident who needs flexibility for her children to park as they take it in turns to see her. This shows how parking policy needs to consider case by case.

CW – yes and policy should be about tackling nonresidents parking in our areas.

CW summarised the meeting so far:

- Policy should be about protecting residents parking sites

- Bringing flexibility to the policy and look at the different reasons residents need visitors for example
- Look at how to charge on a site by site basis
- Look at the appeals process and ensure it falls in line with no conflict of interests

KDK – We did a survey and asked what data Origin would use.

CW – Have had a conversation with Peter and we are looking at previous data we had gathered and to use the survey responses you received. Then look at Estate plans - say there are 60 sites, 20 need parking controls, 20 do not need anything and the middle 20 we do not know enough about. I propose we start with this middle group. The question is how quickly we can consult. We will pull a plan together to do this consultation.

LV – Do not think you should use our data as the questions were not clear enough to bring useful responses.

RS – Each area needs to be assessed on its own merits.

CW – Can you remember what areas did say there was an issue with parking and charges?

LV – Watermill Lane and Dalrimpool Close did.

RS – Would you not start with the smaller areas first?

DS – In my experience when surveys are completed you get a low response. I think this should be down to the Neighbourhood Managers to collate. Minimum response should be 50%

LV – The questions need to be very clear.

CW – I think a blended consultation approach should be taken. A mixture of meetings, door knocking and online.

LV – Also telephone.

DS - Need more than one option.

CW – Will come up with a consultation strategy for every area that is agreed with that group of residents so some areas may be 25% other 35%.

LV – Where Jane lived who now sits on CSC, her permit faded from the sun and had to pay local authority to replace it. It's not her fault it naturally faded; it should be replaced free.

CW – Origin should be a voice for residents to go to the council to consider replacing permits for free.

LV – Feel like as a social landlord we should be supported.

DS – If you lose it yeah you need to pay for another one but if it fades then it is not your fault. Or if you are disabled and you forget your permit/pass then you should have a chance to prove you have one before being charged.

CW – Summarised points taking away from the meeting:

- Look at where parking area by area
- Working with poplar and ensuring appeals are fair
- Looking at the different locations and where to consult first
- To work with Spotlight in monitoring the actions from the recommendations
- Be flexible on the consultation methods
- More emphasis on protecting parking areas for our residents
- Key estate plans

LV – What about the recommendation where the group can carry on for 12 months.

CW asked for SG view on the group continuing for a further 12 months.

SG – I am glad we had this meeting as CW is trying to work with you to clarify the recommendations to go back to CSC. Sounds like we have agreed a consultation timetable is needed which Carol will produce and will be shared with you. The only recommendation not agreed is the one proposing to move back to pre-2017. T&Fs normally carry out the review and do their report with recommendations and then their role is over and they disband and that another group would normally take responsibility for monitoring the implementations of the agreed recommendations every 6 months e.g. Spotlight.

CW - Not all members of the group are members of Spotlight, I do not see a problem with the group continuing to meet every 6 months for the next year to monitor the implementation of the recommendations.

LV – Feel like the Task and Finish approach was rushed. This process was not our decision.

LV – My area put a complaint in about the parking enforcement proposals and did a petition together and we did that as a community. Feel like there is no consideration to the first recommendation.

CW – I will do a table at the end of this process. Not changing any of the recommendations but adding a column that elaborates on them with the outcomes of this discussion. Peter is going to go back to the original data from pre 2017 and put it all together.

Scrutiny thanked Origin for the gift cards for being part of the review. CH – Confirmed that members who attended 3 or more meetings received £50 as advertised and other members received £20 as a thank you for attending 1 or 2 meetings.

CW – Would like it noted that the incentive is to be reviewed.

**Action:**

CH and SG to write minutes from the meeting and send back to CW to then be able to work on the management response by Friday 2<sup>nd</sup> April. This will be shared with Scrutiny afterwards.

CW – Thanked everyone for their time this evening.