

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

SUBJECT: GENERAL PROGRESS AND SERVICE STANDARDS

REPORT OF: THE LEAD OFFICER

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To report to the Committee on progress in respect of: (a) the take up of civil enforcement of bus lanes powers by Councils in England [outside London]; (b) general progress and service standard information.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Joint Committee:

- [i] Notes the information in respect of the take up of civil bus lane enforcement powers.
- [ii] Notes the performance information.

FINANCIAL CONSEQUENCES TO THE REVENUE BUDGET

None

CONTACT OFFICER

Louise Hutchinson, Joint Committee Services, PATROL, Barlow House, Minshull Street, Manchester, Tel: 0161 242 5270

BACKGROUND

1. PERIOD OF REPORTING

This report provides information in relation to the period April to March 2011.

2. COUNCILS IN THE SCHEME

The following local authorities are party to the BLASJC Agreement: at 28th June 2011

Bath and North East Somerset Council	Reading City Council
Brighton & Hove City Council	Oxfordshire County Council
Essex County Council	Sheffield City Council
Hampshire County Council	Nottingham City Council
Manchester City Council	Stockton on Tees Borough Council
Liverpool City Council	Bristol City Council
Bournemouth Council	Gloucestershire County Council
South Tyneside Council	Coventry Council
Bradford City Council	Bury Metropolitan Borough Council
Stoke on Trent Council	Leeds City Council
Luton Borough Council	

3. ADMINISTRATIVE TARGETS

Two indicators give an indication of availability and responsiveness for the Service acknowledgement of appeals and telephone response times. As an integrated tribunal, no distinction is made between the response to bus lane and parking related telephone calls. Details in relation to acknowledgement of appeals are given in Table 1 below.

PERIOD	% of appeals acknowledged within 2 working days	TARGET
April 2008 to March 2009	96%	95%
April 2009 to March 2010	97%	95%
April 2010 to March 2011	98%	95%

4. SERVICE STANDARDS – PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appealing to the Traffic Penalty Tribunal is a judicial process and, as such, it is not appropriate to set out rigid timescales for deciding appeals, however the Tribunal's objective is to "To provide a tribunal service which is user-focused, efficient timely, helpful and readily accessible". The Joint Committee in 2007 approved the introduction of the following service standards:

Personal Hearings

60% of cases to be offered a personal hearing date within 8 weeks of receipt of the Notice of Appeal.

90% of cases to be offered a personal hearing date within 12 weeks of receipt of the Notice of Appeal

Postal Decisions

80% of postal decisions to be made within 7 weeks of receipt of the Notice of Appeal.

It is recognised that Members are also interested in the period of time taken to dispose of a case and for this reason, the following statistics reflect the number of weeks to case closure rather than the number of weeks to the date of the first hearing offered.

The reports on case closure include all cases registered and decided during April 2010 to September 2010. This data will include cases that have been delayed for the following reasons.

Requests from parties to the appeal:

- Additional time to submit evidence
- Requests for adjournment of hearings
- Inconvenience of hearing time/venue
- Availability of witnesses

Adjudicators may require:

- Adjournments for additional evidence or submissions
- A personal hearing supplemented by a later telephone hearing to consider additional evidence.
- Consolidation of cases which relate to a common issue.
- Holding cases pending a particular Decision of the Traffic Penalty Tribunal or High Court

Case closure times – bus lanes (England)

The table below indicates that the average number of weeks between registration and decision issued has reduced across all hearing types. However there has been a slight reduction in the number of cases with less than 7 weeks between registration and decision. This still falls below the original target of 80%. The number of cases with less than 8 weeks between registration and decision has increased across personal and telephone hearings. In terms of cases with less than 12 weeks between registration and decision, there has been an increase in the number of postal and personal hearings however the telephone hearings have remained static. Overall the direction of travel between 2009/10 and 2010/11 is positive.

Type of Hearing	Postal		Personal		Telephone	
	April 2010 to March 2011	April 2009 to March 2010	April 2010 to March 2011	April 2009 to March 2010	April 2010 to March 2011	April 2009 to March 2010
Average no of weeks between registration and decision issued	5.73 weeks	7.34 weeks	10.58 weeks	15.38 weeks	7.73 weeks	10.76 weeks
Cases with less than 7 weeks between registration and decision (postal target)	72.70% 540	73.18% (311)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cases with less than 8 weeks between registration and decision (personal/ telephone target)	n/a	n/a	39.06% (25)	17.57% (13)	73.03% (65)	56.10% (23)
Cases with less than 12 weeks between registration and decision (personal/telephone target)	89.35% (671)	85.18% (362)	75% (48)	43.24% (32)	87.64% (89)	87.80% (36)