

**Email notification sent to the Monitoring Officer from Cllr Blinnie-Lubbock  
Cosigned by Councillors Garbett, Levy, Steinberger and Papier.**

**Call in**

I would like to call-in the recent decision CHE S179 Motorcycles parking permit for the reasons set out below:

**10.1 i. The decision-maker did not take the decision in accordance with the principles set out in Article 13.2;**

**- 13.3 All decisions of the Council will be made in accordance with the following principles:**

**i) Proportionally (i.e. that action should be proportionate to the desired outcome);**

- The Council has a policy ambition of reducing short stay vehicle parking by 30%, however the Council expects these proposals to result in a 70% reduction in motorcycle short stay parking. This disproportionate targeting and projected reduction of a lower emission form of transport is contrary to the Council's climate and air quality goals. This does not maintain a sensible hierarchy of road users and PTWs are much less large, heavy, congestion causing and damaging in other ways than just CO2 emissions. Many people who use PTWs for work are on the lower end of the income spectrum and this would disproportionately impact them.

**iv) A presumption in favour of openness;**

- Council communications have repeatedly misrepresented the context for the charges, erroneously stating that motorcycles emit higher levels of NOX and PM than cars.
- Council communications have repeatedly misrepresented the scale of the charges, for example;
- Suggesting that most riders would pay £5 per month - in fact this applies only to residents with <125cc PTWs who never park outside their home zone
- Stating that most PTWs would pay 7-10 times less than the most polluting vehicles - this is misleading since most cars will also pay many times less than the 'most polluting'
- The cabinet member referenced a figure of 6p per hour for short stay parking - in fact this applies only in the first year and only in the area around Homerton Hospital, and most riders would instead pay £1 per hour, context which was not supplied.

**v) Clarity of aims and desired outcomes;**

- The Council states the policy is intended to improve air quality and reduce climate change, however no quantitative evidence has been presented to demonstrate that the policy will achieve this, and no adequate monitoring has been proposed to demonstrate retrospectively the policy's success or failure.

**10.1 ii. The decision-maker acted contrary to the policy framework;**

- The Mayor and Cabinet have been clear that they do not intend to ban commuting by motorcycle. However the proposals only permit all-day parking in solo motorcycle bays and over half of Hackney's parking zones have no solo motorcycle bays. In fact, almost all bays are sited in the 2 'high demand' parking zones. Motorcycle commuting will be effectively banned in every other zone.
- In zones A & B where provision for all-day motorcycle parking exists, the charges would amount to £2,300 over a year for a commuter. This is 23 times higher than is charged in Westminster. This will be unaffordable for the vast majority and therefore effectively represent a ban, as shown by the Council's prediction that the charges will lead to a 70% reduction in motorcycle parking. Motorcycles are a legitimate commuting mode, as recognised by the Council. It is therefore not reasonable to ban commuting by motorcycle.

**10.1 iii. The decision-maker acted not wholly in accordance with the Council's budget;**

- In order to address the issue of motorcycle commuting being banned across the majority of the Borough, the Cllr responsible has indicated an intention to install additional solo motorcycle bays around the Borough. This has not been budgeted for within the proposals
- The proposals commit to installing security features in the Council's 50 existing solo motorcycle bays, at a cost of £152,000. However other neighbouring Boroughs which only allow all-day motorcycle parking in solo motorcycle bays each have around 300 such bays. If Hackney were to follow through with the commitment to allow commuting in every zone this would suggest £900,000 expenditure up front, rather than the £152,000 budgeted for.

**10.1 iv. The decision-maker failed to consider relevant evidence when taking a decision;**

- The decision did not present evidence about the difference in emissions between PTWs and cars. Nor did it consider the possible impact of PTW users changing modes to less desirable vehicles in a hierarchy of transport modes. Nor did it consider particulate pollution which is lower on lighter vehicles due to less weight-related tire and brake wear. Possible impacts on the local economy have not been extensively considered.

**10.1 v. The decision would not be in the interests of the borough's residents and a preferable alternative decision could be adopted.**

- The report to Cabinet indicates that motorcyclists will be asked to park in such a way as to minimise parking space profile, however no accounting for this is made in the prices. Motorcyclists could reasonably assume that if they are paying the same as a car to park they would be allowed to park in such a way as to occupy a full car space. This would reduce the space available for other users, contrary to the Council's aim of reducing kerbside space used for parking. If a motorbike occupies 1/8th of a car parking space would it not be reasonable to have the charge be 1/8 of the charge a car in the same emission band?
- The borough's residents would not be well served by any negative impact on the local economy and small businesses that rely on PTWs that these proposals may cause.
- The alternative options considered do not include any other price point other than 'free parking'. This is a major oversight given that there already exist established models for motorcycle parking charges, for example in Westminster, Lewisham and Islington, which cost 10-20 times less than the Council proposes.