

**Resident Scrutiny Meeting – Parking
Thursday 19 November 2020 via Zoom**

Welcome & Apologies

In attendance:

Kirsten de Keyser (KDK), Lia Voutourides (LV), Derek Sheppard (DS), Dympna Ihekuna(DI), Raquel Solomon (RS), Natasha Greenaway (NG) and Ellen Perrier (EP)

Left Group:

Seun A Ilenda (SL) and Lee Charlton (LC)

Tpas Staff:

Sam Goodwin (SG)

Origin Staff:

Andreia Vieira (AV) - Resident Engagement Coordinator

Peter Butler (PB) - Business Development Manager

Jacqui Jirapure (JJ) - Neighbourhood Team Manager

1) Introduction

SG – Introduction of the meeting and of everyone in the group. Discussed the actions from last meeting, went through all 5 actions and confirmed with AV & PB that these had been completed.

2) Background of complaint

LV – Summarised the background of the parking complaint. Details of this complaint will also be emailed to residents by LV.

3) Terms of Reference & clarify roles & responsibilities

SG – Confirmed that as per the terms of reference we would not be taking minutes of the meetings, we would only be making notes of the actions going forward.

PB – Confirmed the reason for this is due to the group being a task and finish group and only needing the actions to be noted.

EP – Explained that she would like the minutes to be done for these meetings as it is sometimes hard to keep up with what is being said and is another format for residents to keep up to date on what was said/agreed at the meeting.

LV, DS, DI, RS, NG & EP – Agreed that they would like the meetings minuted.

KDK – Does not agree that minutes are needed, believes action points would have been sufficient, but accepted the majority vote.

NG – Suggested we record the meeting.

SG – Confirmed with everyone present at the meeting if they would want to be recorded, recording would then be deleted once minutes have been put together and sent out to all. SG to confirm if she has the function to record on her zoom. Everyone present consented to being recorded, or switching of camera if preferred during recording.

4) Overview of traditional scrutiny

SG – SG described traditional scrutiny:

1. Identifying what to review, use performance information, satisfaction information and complaints information to identify the service area for scrutiny.
2. Scope the review: agree the scope of the review and project plan with timelines, agree and request information needed for the review, request a presentation from the head of service for the area being reviewed.
3. Desktop Review: review information provided to establish how the service should be delivered, researching other organisations.
4. Carry out the reality checks these could include: interviewing staff, contractors and residents, carrying out surveys of residents either by telephone, email, face to face or using a package such as survey monkey, work shadowing with staff or contractors, mystery shopping, holding focus groups with residents, site visits.
5. Draft Report: agree findings and recommendations, produce draft report, forward copy of report to Head of Service.
6. Challenge Meeting: Head of service provides a written response to the findings and recommendations, a Challenge meeting is held with the Head of Service to talk through their written response.

7. Finalise Report: following the challenge meeting the group needs to decide if they are happy with their report or if they wish to amend, final report submitted to the Board, agree action plan for agreed recommendations with head of service.

8. Communicate / publicise Findings and Recommendations: publicise report and action plan.

9. Track and review: monitor and review the action plan on a six-monthly basis.

LV – Has done research on what traditional scrutiny is and has attended training by TPAS. Everyone in the group should be sent the YouTube video to be aware if they want it. Thinks that everyone in the group should be in communication with one another outside of meetings.

KDK – Would it fall to the group members to organise meetings with each other?

SG – Either a Chair would organise it or SG would be happy to send the Zoom invite once a date and time is confirmed.

LV – Has seen TPAS training that she would like to attend and that would benefit the group, how do we book on to these and who would cover the cost?

SG – Confirmed that residents should email the community development inbox to facilitate this.

5) Communication - between residents, staff and TPAS facilitator

AV – Confirmed that two members of the group had not opted into their email address being shared amongst the group and so a way around this would be for AV to set up email addresses for them on Gmail, email them the details and they then change their passwords. AV will email these two residents outside of meeting to confirm if they want this set up. We acknowledge the importance of residents being in communication outside of the meetings. Reminded group members they can email SG directly if they wish to discuss the scrutiny with her.

DS & LV – Confirmed they had set up a WhatsApp group for the scrutiny group.

AV – Origin would not be involved in promoting the two members to join this WhatsApp group, once the email addresses have been set up they can confirm with the two residents if they would like to be added.

6) Consultation results

SG – Confirmed that all group members had been sent the results in chart form and in excel form for the open-ended questions. SG presented her screen with results. SG went through questions individually.

LV – The questions were not thought out properly. Question two does not factor in all residents.

KDK – Question three, believes the open-ended questions resolve any queries we may have to this question.

LV – Does not agree with question three, for example if anyone on her estate answered no to question two, they could have also responded yes to question three as they experienced paying for parking.

NG – Believed question 4 is too broad, as some residents will have issues on their block/road.

LV – There could have been follow up questions added as when you read the comments, the responses do not add up. Not all questions apply to all residents.

LV - Question six can indicate a rejection of parking all together. Question seven, does not remember discussing this and believes it is a misleading question as it has many options to it such as outsourcing and free parking. On the open-ended questions where it says 'no issues' it doesn't show they need parking control. Not only DS being managed by outsourcing, King Edward is covered by Octavia?

PB – Confirm why King Edward are on the survey if they are managed by Octavia? JJ answered in the chat, King Edward Court is managed by Octavia-it is a large block and we just have a few properties within the block and Octavia act as managing agent and manage the car park there, so we have no control of car parking at this site.

NG – Looking at the results, it is very difficult to look at the parking issues. For example, inner London is different to outer London. Can't have the same procedures across the board, it is different for each block. There needs to be more of a methodical way and not a blanket one rule for all.

LV – Agrees with NG that we need to deal with each estate separately. There are residents adhering to requirements but still having issues with their parking.

RS – Each estate needs to be assessed on its own merit. There are no visitor permits where she lives. Paying for parking charges and paying for parking in service charge is unfair.

EG – Left meeting.

KDK – The replies need to be put into groups. There is a problem with Origin and the outsourcers, Origin need to have better relationships with them. Three times as many people had no problems with parking, but this should not dismiss those with issues. Suggested that the staff who manages the outsourcers should attend the next meeting.

SG – Asked JJ to confirm what parking looked like before the parking policy was rolled out in 2017.

JJ – We only had parking enforcement in place where people wanted it. For example, in areas next to tube stations.

SG – If this is wanted, why don't we go back to how it was before the parking policy was rolled out in 2017.

DI – In chat: I think if it is possible to return to how things were previously and then focus on details for those who need parking enforcement - cost, space allocation, ticketing, penalties that could be the focus of this group. There has to a semi-personalised touch to parking restrictions if/when applied.

SG – PB at the last meeting said that Origin were not making a profit from parking. We can acknowledge that Origin are doing a bad job at managing parking.

LV – Would like a cost breakdown to be on next agenda as she does not understand the breakdown and has a few questions around this.

JJ – In chat: There is a cost for the permits, so Origin must pay the parking enforcement contractor for the permits we also have to cover administration costs eg postage for permits.

NG – Before 2017 and the parking policy there was only a small fee for those who wanted parking

7) Next steps – What does the group want to do next?

SG – What are the next steps, what would you like to do? Would you like to go back to how it was before parking policy was enforced? We need to avoid going round in circles and come to an agreement.

NG – Want's to go back to how it was before 2017. The places that want parking need to have a consultation.

LV – Agrees that it should go back to how it was and there are issues outside of parking that also need to be addressed.

RS – There should not be a cost to parking, it needs to be tailored to each estate.

DS – We cannot have everyone under the same umbrella. Each block should have its own rules. Believes Origin should be involved in communications with PCM to support residents.

KDK – If we are going back to how it was in 2017, are we dropping scrutiny? We can't ignore the residents who don't have issues with parking, they will have issues with going back to how it was in 2017.

SG – To confirm we should go back to what we had before parking policy was rolled out in 2017, and any estate who has issues with parking should be consulted separately? Will it be the role of this group to review the blocks individually, if so, you cannot review your own due to conflict of interest?

LV – It is not the case that everyone is happy with parking control, many variants. The ones that have parking need to be reviewed.

SG – Are we having another meeting? If so, what will be the aim?

NG – 2017 parking charges need to be suspended with immediate effect whilst we investigate.

PB – To suspend parking charges, he believes this would have to go to a director level and maybe also to the board?

KDK – Would it be worth making this a 12 month trail and then reviewing?

LV – Historically the communication has been very poor from Origin. Can we input into the questions and we need transparency of results?

SG – Will email Carol William to request that parking charges are suspended whilst the group decided what they want in the consultation of the blocks who need parking. We will organise a meeting on the week commencing 12th December to address this.

8) Agreed action points

This agenda topic was skipped due to meeting over running, please see actions below.

End of video call.

Actions

PB – To confirm the parking at Swan House and if it is all shared.

LV – To confirm if it is Swan House that she had in question.

SG – To confirm if she has the function to record on her zoom for next meeting.

AV – To set up emails for two residents if they want them set up.

AV – To send minutes to group for feedback before sending final version.

SG – To email Carol Williams to suspend parking enforcement.

LV, DS, DI, RS, NG ep & KDK – To agree on what they would want in the consultation going forward.

SG – To organise meeting for week 14-18 December.