



St Edmundsbury  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

# B139

## Cabinet 28 July 2010

### West Suffolk House Joint Committee: 23 July 2010 (Aug10/03)

*(The following is a summary of the recommendations to and decisions taken by the Joint Committee. This is for information only and no decisions are required by the Cabinet.)*

*Cabinet Members: Cllrs Sara Mildmay-White  
and David Ray*

#### 1. Car Parking to the Front of West Suffolk House (Report B132)

**RESOLVED:- That,**

- (1) monitoring of abuses to the car park located to the front of West Suffolk House be undertaken over the next three months; and**
- (2) if significant levels of abuse continue, then Option (a), as detailed in Section 3.1 of Report B132, be implemented.**

Car parking is currently provided for visitors and disabled staff to West Suffolk House at the front of the offices. In addition, staff and Members are allowed to park for up to one hour in order to attend short meetings etc.

However, these guidelines have been ignored by certain members of staff with the resultant effect that until recently, almost every day there is insufficient car parking available for members of the public.

At the Borough Council's full Council meeting on 29 June 2010, Councillor Nettleton gave notice under paragraph 12.1 of the Council Procedure Rules of a motion, which specifically related to car parking at the front of West Suffolk House, and this was detailed in Report B132. In accordance with the Constitution, the Mayor had determined that the matter should be referred to the appropriate forum for consideration, which is the West Suffolk House Joint Committee.

In order to resolve this issue, and ensure sufficient car parking for visitors, three options were considered by the Joint Committee, which were:-

- (a) install a ticket machine and obtain a Road Traffic Order, which would enable penalty Excess Charge Notices (ECNs) to be issued to staff that exceeded the permitted hour;

- (b) ban staff from parking in the front car park altogether, as proposed by Councillor Nettleton; or
- (c) install a barrier, which would mean that all staff and visitors would have to communicate with the Facilities Management office via intercom to gain access. Staff could be allowed to park for up to one hour as at present but persistent violators would be banned.

Further details in respect of the implications of introducing any of the above options were contained in the report.

A process has recently been introduced whereby offenders have been reported to their respective Corporate Directors, which has resulted in a marked improvement in compliance. If the current trend continues, this approach will largely resolve the issue.

The Joint Committee considered that the proposals contained within Councillor Nettleton's motion, and whilst they may resolve the matter, are considered a last resort because their implementation could impact on the efficient delivery of services. It is not considered appropriate to 'name and shame', staff, as this is not an action that is included in the Council's disciplinary procedure nor is it currently undertaken for any other misdemeanours. Instead, the issuing of ECNs will present a financial incentive for staff to adhere to the guidelines and thus avoid what is, in effect, a fine.

Whilst the officers had recommended monitoring the process of reporting offenders to their Corporate Directors for a period of two months before implementing Option (a), the Joint Committee considered this period should be extended to three months to obtain a more accurate reflection of potential compliance/abuse, as many staff took leave in August.