

Council – 22 June 2017

COUNCILLORS' QUESTIONS

PART A – SUPPLEMENTARIES

1	<p>Councillors P M Black, C A Holley & L G Thomas How many incidents of fly tipping were recorded by the Council in 2015/2016 and 2016/2017 in the Cwmbwrla, Landore, Mynyddbach, Penderry and Cockett Wards.</p> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Environment Services The number of fly tipping incidents reported across Cwmbwrla, Landore, Mynyddbach, Penderry, and Cockett were 1355 in 15/16 and 1001 in 16/17.</p>
2	<p>Councillors E W Fitzgerald, S M Jones & K M Griffiths Will the Cabinet Member inform Council when Garngoch Civic Amenity site will be re-opening for black bag refuse.</p> <p>Response of Cabinet Member for Environment Services</p> <p>The Waste Commissioning Review approved by Cabinet in June 16 included for the conversion of Garngoch, Penlan, and Tir John HWRCs to Recycling Centres only, instead of site closures. This initiative was preferred as it both maximised recycling opportunities and encouraged recycling in the home by those residents who previously used the HWRCs to avoid recycling. WG led analysis showed that up to 70% of the waste being deposited in black bag skips was recyclable.</p> <p>The Review also included for an assessment of the impact of the HWRC changes prior to considering any further measures. Whilst a full year of data is not yet available, results to date show that the initiative has exceeded expectations with the amount of non-recyclable waste at the HWRCs reduced by 80%.</p> <p>The full assessment of the progress to date and options for residents in terms of maximising the amount of recycling from both black and green bags will be considered later in the year, after which Cabinet will consider all of the options going forward before making a decision.</p> <p>The aim remains to increase the rate of recycling and to make it as easy as possible to recycle as much as possible. This will include further consideration of the location and method of recycling as the review progresses.</p>
3	<p>Councillors I E Mann & P N May This question covers two aspects of the residents' parking service. <u>1. Extension of the duration of a temporary permit from one month to two months.</u> Uplands residents have expressed concern as to why this change was made and the manner by which it was implemented. The purpose of a temporary permit is to give a grace period to those who need time to get the correct documentation in order for their vehicle to apply for an annual permit. A common observation is that one month is more than enough time for someone to do this. Resident parking spaces can be at a premium in the Uplands ward and the</p>

perception is that extending duration of a temporary permit puts more pressure on available spaces. Please can the cabinet member answer the following questions:

- a. What consultation was carried out with residents before implementing the change.
- b. What was the evidential basis for making the change and please can the relevant numerical supporting data be published in the answer.
- c. Please can the cabinet member consider reverting the duration of the temporary permit back to a month.

2. Removal of the paper permit

Since the removal of the paper permit, feedback from Uplands residents has been that this has been a retrograde step. Observations include that wardens are spending more time to check individual vehicles by having to put details into their machines compared to quick visual checks.

Residents are also concerned that they can not see themselves who is and is not eligible to park in a bay and therefore now unable to challenge a motorist without a permit. Finally, residents have told us that they have seen that the absence of the paper permit encourages parking in bays by non-permit holders as they are no longer noticeable. These situations particularly affect overnight parking when there is little or no enforcement.

In a modern society residents often print off a variety of tickets after purchase online for events or travel. To protect against fraud these tickets often have bar codes or QR codes which can be quickly scanned.

In posing this question, we do appreciate that a small proportion of applicants would not have access to technology and would have to have their permits printed for them.

- a. How much of a saving (in pounds) has actually been made by removing the paper permit?
- b. Does the council have the capability to allow permits to be printed by the resident themselves on completion of a successful application.
- c. Would the cabinet member please consider looking into this as a way forward.

Response of the Cabinet Member for Environment Services

1. This was an operational decision based on complaints from residents about having to apply for an extension and to reduce workload for the authority. As it is not a Policy change there was no requirement to formally consult. I can also confirm that unfortunately numerical data is not held as to the number of complaints received

Under the previous rules all residents could get two month temporary permits. They would be initially issued with a temporary virtual permit and if their doc's were not returned they would have to come in or apply for a second, therefore, increasing workload and leading to poor customer service and unnecessary demand. As such the overall demand for permits shouldn't change and there would be no benefit in changing the rules to allowing a temporary permit to only run for one month

All residents living in areas where there are resident bays are subject to same application process.

	<p>2. The removal of the Paper permit has generally received positive reaction from residents and signals the council clear intent to remove unnecessary processes and move to a digital agenda like most modern businesses. It has also allowed the council to look for financial savings and operational efficiencies as the process generates approximately 7500 permits each year which is both time consuming and laborious to print.</p> <p>The permits were created by the Contact Centre and by becoming paperless it is now controlled by the Parking Processing Team as part of their normal duties which has allowed the transition from Paper format to electronic version without compromising the residents.</p> <p>These permits are now fully automated and the residents will be provided with an acknowledgement when the application is successful which will not produce a paper permit to be displayed in the car. This works in the same way as the abolition of the paper tax disc which is not required to be displayed for vehicle excise duty and universally accepted as a positive step forward.</p> <p>I appreciate that this is not an ideal solution for some people who would prefer to see the permit however efficiencies prevail and this is a faster, more efficient option for residents than previously.</p> <p>In answer to your question as a saving in pounds I am afraid that this has not been quantified, however, it is less staff intensive, no printing necessary, no postage required and stationery needed.</p> <p>With regards to the residents printing the Permits – This is not possible as the permit is an electronic format and the only item that could be printed would be the Acknowledgment of a successful application.</p> <p>Civil Enforcement Officers, at this moment in time do take extra time to check the permits, however a database has been created to identify vehicles that have a permit and those that do not so that the handheld devices will not require the CEO's to input the details as it will notify the CEO with an Audible alarm as the CEO passes the vehicle thus removing the need for any input to check the Permit situation.</p>
4	<p>Councillors P M Black, L G Thomas & C A Holley Will the Cabinet Member tell Council how many parking offence notices have been issued in the last 12 months to vehicles illegally parked in residents only parking bays.</p> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Environment Services Approximately 5150 PCNs were issued in RP bays during 2016 / 2017.</p>
5	<p>Councillors J W Jones, C L Philpott & A M Day Will he Cabinet Member inform Council how many lease agreements are in place and will be in place in the next six months for areas of Singleton Park.</p> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Culture, Tourism & Major Projects At the time of writing there is only one proposed lease agreement within Singleton Park between the Council and Swansea University relating to Swiss Cottage.</p>

	<p>Opportunities to work with community groups and public sector partners continue to be explored across the Council but there are no current plans for these arrangements to require any formal lease agreements.</p>
6	<p>Councillor K M Griffiths, E W Fitzgerald & D G Sullivan Will Labour be honouring their pledge to Pontarddulais residents with regard to the 3D pitch and the rolling road programme that they promised in their Manifesto, and if so when.</p> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Culture, Tourism & Major Projects The provision of 3G sports pitches will have a significant impact on the quality and quantity of sporting activity across Swansea. The first phase of publicly accessible 3G developments delivered by the Council at Morryston, Penyrheol and Cefn Hengoed are underway and there are ambitions to deliver a number of other such facilities. The council has made a forward commitment of £500k for future scheme as part of its capital budget and as each full size pitch will cost at least £1/2m, the Council will be actively seeking finances, including external sources of grant funding, to assist in this expansion following completion of this first phase.</p>
7	<p>Councillors A M Day, P M Black & C L Philpott Can the Cabinet Member tell Council what plans there are to change the ticket machines to accept the new £1 coins and what is the cost. We note that users of Council car parks that are manned will be able to change 'new for old' but can the Cabinet Member list the council car parks that are unmanned and the dates that the machines in each car park will be altered.</p> <p>Response of the Cabinet Member for Environment Services Advice from manufacturers was that replacement “validators” which are installed in the machines to accept the new £1 coins were not able to also accept the old coins hence it was about choosing the most appropriate time to switch over.</p> <p>However after challenge by many councils and users the manufacturers have recently confirmed they have found a solution so that the replacement validators can accept both new and old £1 coins until the latter cease to be legal tender</p> <p>Orders have now been placed to supply replacement validators for all pay and display, and pay on foot machines at a cost of £29,493. Installation will be carried out by council staff and subject to delivery we expect all machines to be upgraded by the end of July</p> <p>The council operates the following “Unmanned Car Parks:- East Burrows, Mariner Street, Paxton Street, Pockets Wharf, The Strand (Post Office), Trawler Road, Northampton Road, Oxford Street, Park Street East & West, Worcester Place, YMCA, Salubrious Place, Pell Street - surface, St Mary's, Waterfront / LC Oystermouth Road, The Dairy (Mumbles), The Quarry (Mumbles), Oystermouth Foreshore (Mumbles), Clyne, Southend, Bracelet Bay, Caswell Bay, Caswell Hill, Langland Bay, Port Eynon, Horton, Sketty Lane, The Baths, Knab Rock and St Helen's foreshore</p> <p>Over the half term holidays we have had cashiers in Caswell and Port Eynon to take payments.</p>

PART B – NO SUPPLEMENTARIES

8 Councillors A M Day, C A Holley & M H Jones

At the last full Council the report on Welsh medium education stated that there is surplus capacity in the secondary sector. Will the responsible Cabinet Member:

- a. Give the surplus capacity for the secondary sector for each of the last 10 academic years;
- b. For each school in the secondary sector, state the number and percentage of surplus places for each, and separately for 11-16 year olds and 16-18 year olds;
- c. Give the projected number and percentage of surplus places in each secondary school for each of the next 5 years;
- d. Tell Council what the approximate cost of 23.7% surplus places is to the authority;
- e. Tell Council what target number of surplus places the Cabinet Member is setting and when will this target be achieved;
- f. Indicate what action is being and will be taken to address the current number of surplus places;
- g. State how stakeholders are being involved in the process of addressing surplus places in the secondary sector;
- h. Commit to reporting to Council every six months on progress on reducing the number of surplus places.

Response of the Cabinet Member for Children, Education & Lifelong Learning

I refer to the written responses and appendices in answer to questions about surplus places provided at Council meetings of:

4 November 2014 (Cllrs Day, M Jones, L Thomas)

25 June 2015 (Cllrs Day, Holley, L Thomas)

28 January 2016 (Cllrs Day, Holley, Philpott)

5 December 2016 (Cllrs Day, Black, Philpott)

20 April 2017 (Cllrs Day, M Jones, Hollley)

The attached table provides the surplus capacity for the last 10 years. It is not possible to separate 11-16 and 16-18 year olds as the capacity figures are not calculated in this way. The table also provides the latest projected number and percentage of surplus places for the period until 2023.

As Council is already aware there is a growth in pupils educated through the medium of Welsh and that provision is being made to meet the growing demand in both the primary and secondary sector.

Since the current number of places are required to meet anticipated future pupil numbers, and the vast majority of schools delegated funding reflects the actual number of pupils educated, the cost to the authority of such short term surplus places is modest. There is no adequate nor accepted basis for estimating such costs. Nor for providing a cash value to the enrichment activity and personalised support schools offer by utilising all available space. The frequency of visits by Kirsty Williams, the Welsh Government Minister for Education, other AMs and the Children's Commissioner for Wales suggest that Swansea schools are making profitable use of capacity.

	<p>As I have said in my previous answers there is a national guideline figure of 10% on average in relation to the level of surplus places generally considered appropriate to enable parental preferences and pupil numbers to be effectively managed through the admissions processes.</p> <p>Stakeholders have been fully involved in the development of the current WESP and will continue to be engaged as the Council continues to plan strategically for the future of education in the City and County of Swansea.</p>