

London Borough of Hackney
Scrutiny Panel
Municipal Year 2022/23
Date of Meeting Monday 24 April 2023

Minutes of the proceedings of
the Scrutiny Panel held at
Hackney Town Hall, Mare
Street, London E8 1EA

Chair	Councillor Margaret Gordon
Councillors in Attendance	Cllr Sophie Conway, Cllr Ben Hayhurst and Cllr Clare Potter
Councillor in Virtual Attendance	Cllr Clare Joseph
Officers In Attendance	Rickardo Hyatt (Group Director Climate, Homes and Economy), Kevin Keady (Head of Parking and Markets), Dawn Carter-McDonald (Director of Legal, Democratic and Electoral Services), Michael Benn (Senior Service Area Manager), Sonia Khan (Head of Policy and Strategic Delivery) and Jenny Zienau (Strategic Lead Change and Transformation)
Other People in Attendance	Cllr Binnie-Lubbock (Call-in Request Councillor), Cllr Simche Steinberger (Call-In Request Councillor), Cllr Robert Chapman (Cabinet Member for Finance, Insourcing and Customer Service), Cllr Carole Williams (Cabinet Member for Employment, Human Resources and Equalities), Cllr Fajana-Thomas (Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services) and Cllr Chris Kennedy (Cabinet Member for Health, Adult Social Care, Voluntary Sector and Culture)
Other People in Virtual Attendance:	Cllr Mete Coban (Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport), Cllr Caroline Woodley (Cabinet Member for Families, Parks and Leisure), Cllr Anntionette Bramble (Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People & Children's Social Care), Cllr Zoe Garbett (Call-In Request Councillor), Nicolette Nixon (HOPE at Morningside) and Jabez Lam (Hackney Chinese Community Services)
Officer Contact:	Tracey Anderson ☎ 0208 3563312 ✉ tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk

Councillor Margaret Gordon in the Chair

1 Apologies for Absence

1.1 The Chair updated those in attendance on the meeting etiquette and that the meeting was being recorded and livestreamed.

1.2 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Polly Billington and Cllr Clare Potter.

1.3 Cllr Clare Joseph was in virtual attendance.

1.4 Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Anntionette Bramble, Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People & Children's Social Care and Cllr Caroline Woodley, Cabinet Member for Families, Parks & Leisure.

2 Urgent Items / Order of Business

2.1 There were no urgent items, and the order of business was as set out in the agenda.

3 Declarations of Interest

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4 Poverty Reduction - Voluntary Sector Partners Update (19:05 -19:55)

4.1 The Chair opened the discussion by outlining that the administration had pledged in 2018 to "tackle poverty, including child poverty, as well as key inequalities in health, education and employment based on a solid understanding of the barriers and needs of our different communities, listening to their concerns and expanding the use of social value and co-design".

4.2 The need to address poverty in Hackney was also a repeated issue in the consultation for the Community Strategy 2018-2028, and tackling inequality and entrenched poverty was therefore identified as one of its key priorities. The ongoing focus on poverty reduction in the borough had also been amplified by the current cost of living crisis.

4.3 The Panel had received an update last year about the strategic framework outlining the Council's approach to poverty reduction, the aims, and objectives. The purpose of this discussion was to review how the Council's Poverty Reduction Strategic Framework was working in practice and how it had been embedded across council services. The Panel also sought to understand how the Council was working in partnership with key local stakeholders in the voluntary sector to meet the needs of residents.

4.4 To support this discussion, the Panel went on site visits to Woodberry Aid, Chicken Soup Shelter and Stamford Hill Community Centre, engaging with organisations that had been providing the following types of support:

- Community Shops
- Advice Providers
- Orthodox Jewish Organisations/Food Distribution

- Holistic Support
- Warm Hubs

4.5 Before beginning the discussion, the Chair thanked Council officers from the Policy and Strategic Delivery Team for supporting the site visits and the external guests in attendance at the meeting.

4.6 Representing London Borough of Hackney

- Cllr Chris Kennedy, Cabinet Member Health, Adult Social Care, Voluntary Sector and Culture
- Cllr Rob Chapman, Cabinet Member for Finance, Insourcing and Customer Service
- Cllr Caroline Woodley, Cabinet Member for Families, Parks & Leisure
- Cllr Carole Williams, Cabinet Member for Employment, Human Resources and Equalities
- Ian Williams, Group Director Finance & Resources
- Sonia Khan, Head of Policy and Strategic Delivery
- Jenny Zienau, Strategic Lead Change and Transformation

4.7 External Guest(s)

- Nicolette Nixon, HOPE at Morningside
- Jabez Lam, Hackney Chinese Community Services

4.8 The Chair invited the representative from HOPE at Morningside to give a short verbal presentation. The main points are highlighted below.

4.9 HOPE at Morningside was a youth and community charity based on Mornington Estate. It provided a range of services which include youth club activities, a food bank, a food hub, community lunches and exercise groups for the elderly.

4.10 It worked collaboratively with a range of voluntary and community sector organisations, and worked with relevant organisations and agencies to provide support on a range of issues from housing disrepair to domestic abuse. The pandemic in particular had proved useful in building these positive relationships.

4.11 Organisations like HOPE at Morningside benefited from having similar life experiences as many of the people that used its services, meaning that it could provide a comfortable space for local people to talk about their issues and seek help. In many circumstances there was a lack of trust between local people and agencies, and grassroots organisations could provide a useful brokerage role.

4.12 Resources and funding remained a challenge. Funding was more accessible during the pandemic, but resources had since been allocated elsewhere by local agencies. This was coupled with a continuing rise in the number of people reaching out for its services in recent years, particularly throughout the pandemic and the cost of living crisis. For example, it was receiving around 10 referrals per week for support with food.

4.13 The Chair then invited the representative from Hackney Chinese Community Services to give a short verbal presentation. The main points are highlighted below.

4.14 Hackney Chinese Community Services was a community organisation which was originally established over 30 years ago to serve the local Chinese community. Since

then, it had grown to support the wider East and South East Asian community in Hackney, providing services such as learning and education, health and wellbeing, youth activities and caring.

4.15 Its activities ranged from community lunches for the elderly, to singing, yoga and table tennis. It also provided advice services to local people, including support with communicating with relevant agencies. More recently it had been focused on supporting those who had fled from Hong Kong, for example by helping them find accommodation, schools or health services.

4.16 Another important aspect of its work had been in supporting those that had been victims of hate crimes, the prevalence of which had increased during and since the pandemic. This involved working closely with the Metropolitan Police to report incidences and provide support for victims where appropriate.

4.17 It received funding from the Council to provide advice services through its community centre on Ellington Road, and further funding from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities to provide support for local people from or with ties to Hong Kong. However, funding was often short term and the organisation often needed to look for alternative sources of long-term funding.

Questions, Answers and Discussion

4.18 *A Panel Member asked whether any wellbeing support was provided to staff and volunteers working with community groups to help them deal with the pressures of providing support services throughout the pandemic and cost of living crisis.*

4.19 The representative from HOPE at Morningside explained that people who worked and volunteered with them did so because they enjoyed supporting and giving opportunities to their local community, and doing so was mutually beneficial to all involved.

4.20 During the pandemic, peer support was provided by the Council which proved helpful for staff and volunteers in dealing with the various issues that may arise in their work. Whilst formal support had now stopped, staff and volunteers felt comfortable in contacting Council officers if further support and guidance was needed.

4.21 The representative from Hackney Chinese Community Services added that the Council and Greater London Authority had supported it with funding to improve its facilities, which had encouraged volunteers and allowed them to work effectively.

4.22 Hackney Chinese Community Services had also developed positive working relationships with many other community and voluntary organisations in the borough which allowed it signpost effectively when specific areas of concern arise.

4.23 *A Panel Member asked what the experience of community groups and organisations like HOPE at Morningside and Hackney Chinese Community Centre had been in accessing Hackney's Money Hub.*

4.24 The representative from HOPE at Morningside explained that whilst Hackney's Money Hub was particularly busy and inundated with referrals, its staff were helpful, collaborated with community groups and shared resources to ensure a wide impact.

4.25 The representative from Hackney Chinese Community Services added that the Money Hub's outreach workers were easy to work with and had provided financial support to those residents it worked with when needed.

4.26 The Group Director Finance & Resources explained that funding for the Money Hub had been secured via health partners. The Money Hub had two clear goals: improving access to discretionary and crisis funds, and improving benefits uptake in the borough.

4.27 It was estimated that around £13 million a year was lost in unclaimed benefits in Hackney. The aim was to ensure around £1 million of this was claimed this year and, in the first six months, around £500,000 had been claimed.

4.28 A Panel Member asked for more information on the progress made in improving benefits uptake across the borough, and whether there were plans in place to sustain the early successes in this respect of the Money Hub.

4.29 The Group Director Finance & Resources explained that the Council was looking at the ways in which it could fund the Money Hub beyond the current period. Whilst the Council had recently approved its budget for 2023/24, and was in a difficult financial position, it did recognise the return on investment seen so far and would consider funding opportunities as they arose.

4.30 The Council was looking to continue to move around potential resources, and was successfully covering many of its costs through internal staff redeployments. It was also looking at other sources of non-current funding, for example the Household Support Fund which provided support to a wide range of local groups.

4.31 The Cabinet Member for Finance, Insourcing and Customer Service added that while the Council was committed to doing what it could to support people through the cost of living crisis, any help was provided against a backdrop of successive government policies which had strained the benefits system. For example, the recent removal of the Universal Credit uplift alone removed £35 million from the income of Hackney residents.

4.32 Improving benefits uptake and access to crisis and discretionary funds were vital to the poverty reduction agenda, and the Council was committed to finding ways to support it in future years. These were being undertaken not just by the Council, but in partnership with community groups and organisations across the borough.

4.33 The Head of Policy and Strategic Delivery added that conversations regarding funding for future years were live, and it was important to note the distinction to be made between the distribution of discretionary funds and supporting benefits uptake across the borough.

4.34 Whilst the Money Hub acted as a centralised single point of access for emergency funding, it did collaborate with community partners and other agencies and share resources so that it had a wider impact and value.

4.35 A Panel Member asked whether HOPE at Morningside had considered a community shop model to expand its work in relation to food poverty in the local community.

4.36 The representative from HOPE at Morningside explained that a community shop model was currently being explored and developed, with funding received from City Bridge. Whilst this would be more sustainable than a food bank in the longer term, it did not come without its challenges such as securing long term funding and sourcing affordable food.

4.37 A Panel Member asked whether the Council had considered offering employer-supported volunteering to enable its employees to take paid time off to volunteer during working hours.

4.38 The Head of Policy and Partnerships explained that it was a policy that the Council had looked at before, but instead opted to put more resources into identifying and communicating volunteering opportunities to its employees. For example, Volunteer Centre Hackney had recently come in to talk to employees about volunteering opportunities across the borough.

4.39 A Panel Member asked whether HOPE at Morningside and Hackney Chinese Community Services felt that improving benefits uptake across the borough and improving access to discretionary funds were the right priorities for the Council to support people through the cost of living crisis.

4.40 The representative from Hackney Chinese Community Service explained that a significant amount of the people that reached out for support needed help in accessing funding or benefits, and so the Money Hub was seen as a helpful response.

4.41 The representative from HOPE at Morningside added that in practice, benefits were not enough for many people in Hackney to live on. The financial support provided by the Council through discretionary funding was a huge financial relief for many, as well as the immediate relief of claiming those benefits they had missed out on.

4.42 A Panel Member asked whether HOPE at Morningside and Hackney Chinese Community Services had explored or been engaged in any community food growing opportunities, and what they thought about such initiatives as a means of alleviating food poverty.

4.43 The representative from Hackney Chinese Community Services explained that it grew its own food on a small scale, with some of the food grown being used for its lunch clubs. Once it had moved into its new premises in the next few months, it would look to grow more of its own food and possibly start food growing projects.

4.44 The representative from HOPE at Morningside added that growing its own food was difficult because it was primarily a youth club, and many of its youth activities were undertaken in its garden area. Moreover, it was not seen as an efficient way to provide food for the number of people it provided support to, as these would likely far outweigh the amount produced.

4.45 The Cabinet Member for Parks, Families and Leisure went on to say that the Council had relationships with food growing communities and there were ways to work together with other community groups to grow food, despite the difficulties in expanding this area of work due to a lack of land.

4.46 There were also a range of other opportunities for the Council to explore such as the provision of fair trade food, bulk purchasing, and supporting schools with plant based diets.

4.47 *A Panel Member asked for further information on the progress of the Council's task group which had been established to review food poverty affecting children in schools.*

4.48 The Head of Policy and Partnerships explained that the task group was set up by the Director for Education to look at ways to expand the free school meals offer in a financially sustainable way, for example through procurement and external funding opportunities.

4.49 Since the announcement that the Mayor of London would be funding universal free school meals for the 2023/24 academic year in primary schools, the task group had been accessing the implications and opportunities for local work which would complement this.

4.50 The Cabinet Member for Health, Adult Social Care, Voluntary Sector and Culture added that the funding from the Mayor of London would only last for the 2023/24 financial year, and funding would need to be identified by the Council if the offer was to stay in place for subsequent years.

4.51 The Cabinet Member for Parks, Families and Leisure went on to say that the funding for 2023/24 presented challenges as well as opportunities, as there was a risk that it would not cover the costs of the full range of dietary needs across the borough such as kosher and halal food.

Summing Up

4.52 The Chair thanked Panel Members for their questions and all witnesses for their responses and engagement with the scrutiny process.

4.53 It was explained that the Panel would reflect on the evidence heard, which would inform its ongoing work on the Council's efforts to alleviate poverty.

5 Call-in of an Executive Key Decision (19:55 - 20:55)

5.1 The Chair opened the item by explaining that a key element of the scrutiny function was to consider the call-in of decisions by the Executive, and that a call-in was requested on 3rd April 2023 by Cllr Binnie-Lubbock, supported by Cllrs Garbett, Levy, Papier and Steinberger.

5.2 The call-in related to the Executive Key Decision taken by Cabinet on 27th March 2023 relating to the introduction of parking charges for motorcycles.

5.3 The basis of the call-in request was that the decision maker did not take the decision in accordance with the principles set out in Article 13 (13.3).

5.4 The decision options available to the Panel were:

- 1) To take no further action, in which case the decision would take effect immediately;

- 2) To refer the decision back to Cabinet for reconsideration, setting out the nature of the Panel's concerns;
- 3) To refer the matter to Full Council if the Panel considers that its recommendations would have an impact on the Council's budget or policy framework.

5.5 Representing Call-in Request Councillors

- Cllr Alastair Binnie-Lubbock
- Cllr Zoe Garbett
- Cllr Simche Steinberger

5.6 Representing London Borough of Hackney Executive and Officers

- Cllr Mete Coban, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport
- Rickardo Hyatt, Group Director Climate, Homes and Economy
- Keven Keady, Head of Parking and Markets
- Michael Been, Senior Service Area Manager
- Dawn Carter-McDonald, Director of Legal, Democratic and Electoral Services

5.7 The Chair invited Cllr Binnie-Lubbock, as Lead Call-In Request Councillor, to give a short verbal presentation outlining the reasons for the call-in request and the alternative action being sought. The main points are highlighted below.

5.8 A petition asking the Council to reconsider its plans for motorcycle parking charges was presented to Full Council on 23rd November 2022. Subsequent to the petition some changes to the proposed motorcycle parking charges were introduced. However, the campaigners who brought the petition forward did not believe that those changes went far enough to address their concerns around proportionality or consider the full range of evidence or alternative measures available.

5.9 It was not clear that the measures proposed could be considered proportionate, as they disproportionately targeted a lower emission form of transport and may as a result push residents to use larger, more polluting and more congestion-causing vehicles. Many people who used motorcycles for work were also on the lower end of the income spectrum and it would be reasonable to assume the changes would disproportionately affect them.

5.10 The proposals committed to installing security features across the Council's 50 existing solo motorcycle bays at a cost of £152,000. However, other boroughs which only allow all-day motorcycle parking in solo motorcycle bays had around 300 such bays and if the Council were to expand commuting in each parking zone this would suggest a significant additional expenditure which had not yet been accounted for.

5.11 The proposals would also likely have a negative impact on the local economy, and in particular small businesses and gig workers that rely on motorcycles. For example, it may make it difficult for gig workers, particularly delivery riders and couriers, to take a break without incurring significant additional costs.

5.12 The charges would be unaffordable for the vast majority of motorcycle owners, and did not take into account the cost of owning, insuring, running and maintaining a motorcycle. The cost modelling indicated that motorcycle parking charges in Hackney would be 10 to 20 times higher than in Westminster or Islington, for example.

5.13 The decision did not consider the difference in emissions between motorcycles and cars, did not consider the possible impact of motorcycle users changing to modes to less desirable vehicles, nor did it consider particulate pollution which was lower on lighter vehicles due to less weighted tyre and brake wear.

5.14 In summary the main reasons for the call-in request were:

- The disproportionate targeting of a lower emission form of transport, which was contrary to the Council's climate and air quality goals, and may lead to an increase in more polluting modes of transport;
- The misrepresentation of the context for the proposed charges, such as stating motorcycles emit higher levels of NOX and PM than cars, and their scale, suggesting most riders would pay £5 per month which only applied to <125cc vehicles who do not park outside of their homes;
- The changes acted contrary to the policy framework because they acted as a de facto ban on motorcycles with the proposals only permitting all-day parking in solo motorcycle bays despite almost all bays sited in the two high-demand parking zones;
- The changes were not wholly in accordance with the Council's budget because the possibility of installing additional solo motorcycle bays across the borough had not been factored into the proposals;
- The changes would not be in the interests of the borough's residents as riders were being asked to park in a way as to minimise parking space profile, despite paying the same price as a car to park, and there would be a possible negative impact on the local economy, small businesses and gig workers.

5.15 The Chair then invited the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to provide a response to the points raised. The main points are highlighted below.

5.16 The Council did not currently have any parking charges in place for motorcycles, which was contradictory to its commitment to ensuring that, across all forms of public transport, it had the right pricing incentives in place to encourage all motorists to choose active and sustainable travel over the use of private transport.

5.17 The Council undertook a detailed consultation on its proposals in 2020, which attracted over 4,000 respondents. It also undertook a consultation on its overarching Parking and Enforcement Plan in 2022, to which over 8,000 people responded.

5.18 The proposals were part of a wider drive to move towards an emissions-based charging model, which would incentivise sustainable choices and make pricing fairer so that motorcyclists would only be charged according to their emissions.

5.19 Since the proposals were agreed at Cabinet in February 2021, campaigners had expressed their concerns at some of the proposals. The Cabinet Member, along with the Mayor, therefore agreed to pause the implementation of the agreed plans in order to explore the issues raised and how the original proposals may be revised.

5.20 This led to three substantial changes to the proposals. Firstly, the proposals would now include a new hourly price and no maximum stay limits for motorcycle only bays. Secondly, charges for short stay parking in solo motorcycle bays would now be phased in over three years to provide time for riders to adapt to the changes. Lastly, electric motorcycles would benefit from discounted hourly parking charges to incentivise the uptake of zero emissions transport.

Monday 24 April 2023

5.21 The reasons outlined for the call-in request were generally misinformed. For example, there were some exemptions to the rules and pricing structure, for example for on-street residents, estate residents, businesses and visiting motorcycles. The Council had also been keen to listen to the feedback of residents, and had made significant alterations to the proposals in response.

5.22 The Chair then invited the Head of Parking and Markets and Senior Service Area Manager to provide a response to the points raised. The main points are highlighted below.

5.23 Part of the Council's wider overall climate objectives was to reduce CO2 emissions and improve air quality. In order to achieve this, it needed to have the right parking pricing structures in place to ensure residents were incentivised to walk, cycle or take public transport more often.

5.24 Historically, the Council's management of motorcycle parking had not been in line with these aims. This was largely as a result of practical challenges - there was no way for motorcycles to securely display a physical permit, voucher or parking session to a motorcycle.

5.25 Over recent years, however, the Council had rolled out e-permits, e-vouchers and pay by mobile, meaning that there were now practical solutions to display and secure vouchers and permits for a motorcycle.

5.26 The Council was confident that emissions-based charging would help reduce CO2 and improve air quality in the borough. Over the previous four years, emissions-based charging had helped to reduce diesel vehicle usage by a third.

5.27 It was recognised that, on average, motorcycles generally emit much lower levels of CO2 than other vehicles. Consequently, they would benefit from lower permit prices than the most polluting vehicles.

5.28 Historically, the Council had a flat rate short stay parking charge based on demand within an area. The highest charges would therefore often be in the south of the borough, with lower charges in other areas.

5.29 Since April 2023, there had been a new charging structure whereby short stay parking charges were based not only on demand within an area, but also on emissions with the most polluting vehicles being charged a pound an hour more than zero emissions vehicles.

5.30 The Council had listened to feedback from campaigners and made some amendments to the proposals, as previously highlighted. These included a new hourly price and no maximum stay limits for motorcycle only bays, the phasing in of charges for short stay parking in solo motorcycle bays over three years and discounted hourly parking charges for electric motorcycles.

5.31 The implementation of charges for motorcycle parking supported a number of the Council's strategic objectives and policies, including the Sustainable Transport Plan, the Parking and Enforcement Plan and Air Quality Action Plan.

5.32 The proposals were firmly in line with the Council's budgetary considerations, with the setup and development costs to be contained within existing resources, and the aim for it to be self-funding going forward from the income being generated.

5.33 Whilst additional solo motorcycle bays across the borough would be considered if demand increased, it was deemed unlikely that the introduction of charges would lead to a significant increase compared to existing levels. Historically, the vast majority of demand has been in the south of the borough where bays were already in place.

5.34 The Council consulted with courier and delivery riders to understand the impact of the proposals to pay to park. Courier and delivery riders often need to set down to deliver or collect items within a small window of time, and as such a 20 minute exemption around Dalston had already been added and solo motorcycle pay and display areas around town centres would continue to be monitored.

5.35 Free parking in solo motorcycle bays for commuters was considered and rejected, as it would encourage commuting and would not incentivise active travel methods such as walking and cycling and the use of public transport. Discounted hourly parking charges for electric motorcycles were put in place.

Questions, Answers and Discussion

5.26 *A Panel Member asked whether there were any mechanisms in place for the Council to review the effectiveness of the proposals should they be implemented.*

5.37 The Senior Service Area Manager explained that parking fees and charges were reviewed on an annual basis. If implemented, the proposals would also be monitored closely over the implementation period to ascertain whether any tweaks would be needed, as well as whether any additional solo motorcycle bays would be needed in response to increased demand.

5.38 *A Panel Member asked for clarification on the figures quoted in the call-in request which stated that, where provision for all-day motorcycle exists in zone A and B, charges would amount to £2,300 over a year for a commuter.*

5.39 The Lead Call-In Request Councillor explained that campaigners had reached the figure based on a ten hour stay over 20 days a month, rather than the eight hour stay estimated by the Council. This was to acknowledge that some commuters would be parked for longer than the average work day as they would need time to lock up and change and may not always finish on time.

5.40 The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport responded by adding that campaigners had been consulted on the proposed charges extensively and several changes to the proposals had been made since, for example around discounted hourly parking charges for electric motorcycles.

5.41 *A Panel Member asked whether those councillors who had requested the call-in agreed with the principle of emissions-based parking charges, in which lower emissions motorcycles would benefit from a larger discount than other motorcycles and more polluting vehicles.*

5.42 The Lead Call-In Request Councillor explained that the estimated monthly costs of short stay parking in solo motorcycle bays did not take into account the additional

costs associated with running a motorcycle, only the parking charges themselves, which would make them considerably higher.

5.43 The estimated monthly costs of short stay parking in solo motorcycle bays would simply be unaffordable to the majority of commuters, despite motorcycles being a legitimate commuting mode of transportation and far less emitting than larger vehicles. Many people who used motorcycles for work were on the lower end of the income spectrum and the proposals would disproportionately impact them.

5.44 Motorcycles were being disproportionately targeted by the proposals. The Council had stated a policy ambition of reducing short stay vehicle parking by 30%, yet it expected that the proposals would reduce motorcycle short stay parking by 70%. This did not amount to a sensible hierarchy of road users, as motorcycles were smaller, lighter, less congestion causing and damaging in other ways than CO2 emissions.

5.46 The Senior Service Area Manager responded by adding that the Council believed the risk of motorcycle riders moving to more polluting modes of transport was low, because it had maximum four hour stay restrictions in place for cars. Also, many commuters chose to use motorcycles because they were able to sift through traffic in a manner which was not possible in cars.

5.47 In terms of encouraging people to use motorcycles over cars and larger vehicles, it was more desirable for the Council to incentivise people to choose active and sustainable travel over the use of private transport altogether in order to reduce CO2 emissions and improve air quality.

5.48 A Panel Member asked for further information on the modelling which had been undertaken by the Council in terms of the expected level of income and expenditure from the proposals.

5.49 The Senior Service Area Manager explained that modelling had estimated that the introduction of parking charging for motorcycles would result in income of circa £260,000 per annum following a phased implementation.

5.50 Indicative costs were set out in the proposals where they could be quantified, which mainly related to the installation of secure parking hoops. The cost of implementing lockable motorcycle hoops based on the existing bays was estimated at £152,000.

5.51 The initial consultation, setup and development costs will be contained within existing resources, with the aim of it being self funding going forward from the income being generated.

5.52 A Panel Member asked what the Council knew about the characteristics of the people that were commuting into the borough on motorcycles each day and using short stay parking whilst there.

5.53 The Senior Service Area Manager explained that commuting by motorcycle was largely constrained to the south of the borough near to the City of London. It was estimated that around 0.25-0.5% of people working in Hackney each day were travelling by motorcycle, and as such the proposals would not have a demonstrable impact on the wider economy.

5.54 The Lead Call-In Request Councillor responded by adding that the Equalities Impact Assessment undertaken had not considered the particular impact on ethnicity as a characteristic, especially in regard to courier and delivery riders.

5.55 A Panel Member asked for further clarification on what the anticipated costs of the proposals were estimated to be for motorcycle riders working in the gig economy, and in particular couriers and delivery riders.

5.56 The Senior Service Area Manager explained that if you were a Hackney resident you would need to purchase a valid resident permit for your motorcycle, the majority of which would fall into the lower charging bands of between £65 to £75 per year.

5.57 It was recognised that courier and delivery riders would often need to set down to deliver or collect items within small time scales. There were statutory exemptions in place across a number of parking spaces for loading/unloading (where loading or waiting was not prohibited).

5.58 A Panel Member asked whether the Council had undertaken any research into how long motorcycle riders would on average be parked in solo motorcycle bays per day.

5.59 The Senior Service Area Manager explained that the majority of the demand for solo motorcycle bays was for the average work day which was around 8 hours. Courier and delivery riders could also park for much shorter durations and extend the session if needed using pay by mobile.

5.60 A Panel Member asked for further clarification on whether the Council considered replicating other London Borough models for motorcycle parking charges, for example those implemented in Westminster or Islington.

5.61 The Senior Service Area Manager explained that the Council did not consider moving to the Westminster or Islington models for motorcycle parking charges as it felt that they were insufficient to bring about the change it wanted to see in regard to residents shifting towards walking, cycling and the use of public transport.

5.62 The Call-In Request Councillor asked whether the Council felt that the estimated fall in the number of non-residential motorcycles parking in solo motorcycle bays (70% by Year 3) was proportional to the Council's wider aim to reduce short stay parking for all modes by 30%.

5.63 The Senior Service Area Manager explained that the aim to reduce short stay parking for all modes by 30% should be considered within the wider hierarchy of parking use. The vast majority of short stay parking demand in the borough was from visitors, and the demand from commuters was comparatively low.

5.64 The 70% fall in the number of non-residential motorcycles parking in solo motorcycle bays by Year 3 was an estimate given to model the income received from the introduction of charges for motorcycling parking, rather than a goal by which the Council would measure itself.

5.65 *A Panel Member asked how the Council planned to engage with those affected by the proposals going forward, particularly in terms of communicating the proposed changes and measuring their impact on local people.*

5.66 The Senior Service Area Manager explained that, should the proposals be implemented, the Council would be able to establish a profile of who was using motorcycle parking, where they were parking and for how long. It would then look to understand how that demand had changed over time, which would be monitored closely over the three year implementation period.

Closing Remarks

5.67 The Chair then invited the Lead Call-In Councillor to make any closing remarks.

5.68 The proposals for short stay parking were unaffordable for the vast majority of commuters, and only permitted all-day parking in solo motorcycle bays, which were present in less than half of Hackney's parking zones. The proposals therefore effectively represented a ban on commuting by motorcycle.

5.69 The proposals disproportionately targeted motorcycle riders, with an estimated 70% reduction in short stay motorcycle parking over a three period compared to 30% target for all transport modes. The proposals therefore did not maintain a sensible hierarchy of road users.

5.70 The Equalities Impact Assessment undertaken in relation to the proposals had not considered the particular impact on ethnicity as a characteristic, especially in regard to courier and delivery riders.

5.71 Whilst recognising that private transport contributes to poor air quality, the specific impact that the proposals would have on air quality within the borough had not been made clear. The proposals also failed to acknowledge that some commuters would be parked for longer than the average work day as they would need time to lock up and change and may not always finish on time.

5.72 The decision should therefore be referred back to Cabinet for reconsideration, setting out concerns of the disproportionality of the costs to motorcycle users, and Cabinet should reconsider the matter and look to other London Boroughs such as Westminster or Islington for best practice.

5.73 The Chair then invited Cllr Simche Steinberger, as one of the Call-In Councillors, to make any closing remarks.

5.74 There were various concerns regarding the Equalities Impact Assessment undertaken in relation to the proposals. These included the disproportionate impact of the proposals on those on the lower end of the income spectrum, and the impact that the proposals may have on the characteristic of religion/belief (including non-belief).

5.75 Finally, the Chair invited the Lead Member for Environment and Transport to make any closing remarks.

5.76 The implementation of the proposals would support a number of the Council's policies and plans, including the Sustainable Transport Plan, the Parking and Enforcement Plan and Air Quality Action Plan, and the proposals were part of a long

standing commitment to ensuring that incentives were in place to encourage residents to choose active and sustainable travel over private transport.

5.77 The implementation of the agreed plans were paused in order to explore the issues raised by campaigners and see how the original proposals may be revised. This led to three substantial changes to the proposals, namely around a new hourly price and no maximum stay limits for motorcycle only bays, charges for short stay parking in solo motorcycle bays being phased in over three years, and discounted hourly parking charges for electric motorcycles.

5.78 Should the proposals be implemented, the Council would soon thereafter go out to statutory consultation. Following feedback from this consultation, a more detailed Equalities Impact Assessment would be completed and actions would be taken if issues were to arise that needed addressing.

Summing Up & Decision

5.79 The Chair explained that the meeting would be adjourned for a short period whilst the Panel deliberated over the evidence heard at the meeting.

5.80 The meeting was then reopened by the Chair, at which point the Panel **RESOLVED** to implement the guillotine procedure and extend the time of the meeting to no later than 10:30pm.

5.80 As a result of the previous discussion it was then **RESOLVED** that the Panel recommended that no further action was taken, at which point the decision was deemed to be confirmed and took effect immediately following the meeting.

5.81 N.B. Cllr Clare Joseph did not participate in the vote as she attended online.

5.82 In summarising the reasons for the decision, Panel Members made the following key points:

- There had been extensive long-term consultation and engagement with residents and key stakeholders, and the feedback received from this engagement had led to significant changes to the proposals.
- An Equalities Impact Assessment for the proposals had been undertaken, and there was a commitment to undertake another should the proposals be implemented and the statutory consultation period commenced.
- Parking fees and charges were reviewed on an annual basis and, if implemented, the proposals would be monitored closely over the implementation period to ascertain whether any tweaks were needed.
- The implementation of the proposals would support a number of the Council's policies and plans, including the Sustainable Transport Plan, the Parking and Enforcement Plan and Air Quality Action Plan.
- The proposals were in line with the Council's budgetary considerations, with the setup and development costs to be contained within existing resources, and the aim for it to be self-funding going forward from the income being generated.
- An emissions based charging structure would incentivise a reduction of vehicle emissions which all forms of road transport, including motorcycles, contributed to, and it would be cheaper to travel by public transport than to travel by motorcycle.

6 Council Tax Reduction Scheme Review Scrutiny Panel Task and Finish Group Draft Report (20:55 - 21:05)

6.1 The draft Council Tax Reduction Scheme Review Task and Finish Group report was presented.

6.2 The Panel RESOLVED to agree the Council Tax Reduction Scheme Review Task and Finish Group report.

7 Net Zero Scrutiny Panel Draft Report (21:05 - 21:15)

7.1 The draft Net Zero Scrutiny Panel report was presented.

7.2 The Panel RESOLVED to agree the Net Zero Scrutiny Panel report.

8 Minutes of the Meeting (21:15 - 21:20)

8.1 The draft minutes of the previous meeting held on 20th February 2023 were presented.

8.2 The Panel RESOLVED to agree the draft minutes as an accurate record.

9 Scrutiny Panel Work Programme 2022/2023 (21:20 - 21:25)

9.1 The Chair referred to the Commission's work programme for the 2022/23 municipal year.

9.2 Members noted the work programme.

10 Any Other Business

10.1 None.

Duration of the meeting: 7pm – 10.10pm