

North Yorkshire County Council**Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee****26 October 2016****Civil Parking Enforcement Annual Report****Report of the Assistant Director - Highways and Transportation****1.0 Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide a review of countywide Civil Parking Enforcement in 2014/15 and 2015/16.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The Government's statutory guidance on Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) states that enforcement authorities should publish an annual report about their enforcement activities.
- 2.2 The County Council is the on-street enforcement authority and this report therefore only relates to on-street enforcement. The report covers the financial years 2014/15 and 2015/16.
- 2.3 The County Council has entered into legal agreements with Harrogate and Scarborough Borough Councils to deliver the on-street enforcement service on the following basis:
- Harrogate Borough Council delivers enforcement in Harrogate Borough, Craven and Selby
 - Scarborough Borough Council delivers enforcement in Scarborough Borough, Ryedale, Hambleton and Richmondshire
- 2.4 Unfortunately it is not possible to provide meaningful comparison with other operations as only a third of authorities publish annual parking reports and the Department for Transport do not publish any local authority data.

3.0 Traffic Management Benefits

- 3.1 CPE enables the County Council to better manage the network particularly in locations where there is an identified traffic management problem.
- 3.2 The ultimate aim is for 100 per cent compliance with parking restrictions and the purpose of issuing a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) for a contravention is to influence driver behaviour in the future.
- 3.3 It is important to remember that motorists parking in contravention of parking restrictions can have a negative impact on:
- road safety

- traffic flow and therefore localised congestion
- the turnover of short-stay parking spaces
- the ability of residents to find a space in residents parking zones
- the ability of Blue Badge Holders to park in designated disabled bays

4.0 Financial Position

4.1 The financial position for the countywide CPE account is summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Countywide CPE financial summary		
	2014/15	2015/16
Pay and display income	2,818,908	2,939,327
Penalty Charge Notice Income	1,411,626	1,401,752
Permit/other income	607,242	589,423
Total income	4,837,776	4,930,502
Total expenditure	1,945,987	1,910,900
Balance	£2,891,789	3,019,602

- 4.2 Pay and display income has increased by £120,419 which equates to 4 per cent. This is a relatively small increase and fluctuations year by year are common given the factors that affect visitor numbers, for example the weather.
- 4.3 Penalty Charge Notice income has remained static. Permit and other income (e.g. fees for suspending parking restrictions or providing people with dispensations) has also remained relatively static.
- 4.4 Expenditure has remained relatively static in 2014/15 and 2015/16. However, both Harrogate and Scarborough Borough Councils have made efficiencies in the back office over recent years. Table 2 overleaf presents expenditure for the operations in Harrogate and Scarborough Boroughs since 2010/11. It can be seen from Table 2 that Harrogate Borough Council has reduced expenditure considerably over this period. Whilst the expenditure in Scarborough Borough has remained relatively constant they have absorbed the additional resource requirements for Whitby following the park and ride implementation which clearly represents an efficiency.

Table 2 – Expenditure Harrogate and Scarborough Boroughs		
Year	Harrogate Borough Council (£)	Scarborough Borough Council (£)
2010/11	922,436	766,977
2011/12	913,102	752,292
2012/13	871,489	754,068
2013/14	798,912	766,668
2014/15	808,128	702,795
2015/16	753,812	756,668

- 4.5 Given that the most significant proportion of expenditure is on staffing, both front line Civil Enforcement Officers and staff in the back office, it is becoming more challenging to continue making efficiencies without reducing the level of service provided. However, officers will continue to monitor expenditure closely and work with both Harrogate and Scarborough Borough Councils to explore future opportunities for efficiencies.
- 4.6 A decision on allocation of the CPE surplus was taken by the Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services (BES) in consultation with the Executive Members for BES on the 25 May 2016.

5.0 Penalty Charge Notice analysis

Countywide analysis

- 5.1 The Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) analysis for 2014/15 is presented in **Appendix 1 (a)** and the analysis for 2015/16 is presented in **Appendix 1 (b)**.
- 5.2 The total number of PCNs issued in 2015/16 has reduced slightly on the previous year by 840 which equates to a 2 per cent reduction.
- 5.3 The PCN per visit indicator is a good way of monitoring compliance with parking restrictions. The PCN per visit rate has remained constant and shows that across the county a PCN is issued on average every 5-6 visits. The level of resource deployed is generally considered to be appropriate to deal with the nature of the issues. However, it does mean that the county is not being saturated with enforcement officers and some motorists are clearly still prepared to risk being issued with a PCN.
- 5.4 The percentage of PCNs paid has remained constant at 82 per cent. The vast majority of these PCNs are paid at the discount i.e. within 14 days.
- 5.5 In 2014/15 informal or formal representations were made against 11,401 PCNs which equates to 23 per cent of the total PCNs issued. Following these representations 5,096 of the PCNs were cancelled. A further 2,504 PCNs were written off for other reasons. In total 15 per cent of all PCNs issued were either cancelled or written off. Officers feel that this is reflective of the reasonable approach taken when considering representations particularly when additional evidence is presented by the motorist. Only a very small proportion of cancellations are the result of an error by the Civil Enforcement Officer or an issue with a Traffic Regulation Order.
- 5.6 In terms of the 2015/16 data on representations / cancellations the position for all districts except Harrogate shows no real change other than the fact that the number of PCNs written off for other reasons is lower. This is because we are still pursuing outstanding payments on a number of PCNs through bailiffs. In Harrogate there has been a substantial reduction in the number of PCNs against which an informal or formal representation was made. One reason for this is that because of staffing challenges the enforcement resource has been concentrated more on the town centre pay and display zone and slightly less on the surrounding disc zones. There are generally fewer challenges against

PCNs issued in pay and display zones. The second reason is that an improvement in the way informal appeals are dealt with has reduced the number of cases moving to formal appeal.

- 5.7 No vehicles have been immobilised or removed as a result of the CPE operation in either 2014/15 or 2015/16.

District analysis

- 5.8 The locations where 10 or more PCNs have been issued are listed in **Appendix 2 (a)** for 2014/15 and **Appendix 2 (b)** for 2015/16. In line with the strategy and agreed prioritisation the majority of PCNs are issued in the market towns. Appendices 2 (a) and 2 (b) also summarise the financial position at a district level.
- 5.9 The public consultation undertaken in 2011 demonstrated that people believe enforcement should mainly be carried out in places where the most parking offences occur. The Parking Strategy therefore states that enforcement activity will have to be prioritised. This prioritisation identifies market towns, tourist locations, schools and other locations only where there is a body of evidence to justify action
- 5.10 Both Harrogate and Scarborough Borough Councils still respond to reports of parking infringements in other locations and act accordingly where there is a body of evidence to justify action.
- 5.11 The PCN per visit figures for Bedale and Northallerton are much higher than other towns although the figures for 2015/16 show a reduction on 2014/15. It is important to note that the approach to enforcement is consistently applied in all towns and the restrictions in these two towns are compliant with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions.
- 5.12 One partial explanation is that the majority of enforcement is carried out on the High Street in Northallerton and the Market Place in Bedale and when visiting these would be logged as one visit, whereas in some other locations the restrictions are spread across more streets.
- 5.13 Officers are currently considering whether any steps can be taken in respect of the signing on the High Street in Northallerton and the Market Place in Bedale to provide further clarity to motorists.

6.0 Financial implications

- 6.1 There are no financial implications associated with the recommendations in this report. The financial position for the countywide CPE account is summarised in paragraph 4.

7.0 Legal implications

- 7.1 There are no legal implications associated with the recommendations in this report. The County Council ensures that the CPE operations in North

Yorkshire are delivered in accordance with the Traffic Management Act 2004 and associated secondary legislation and statutory guidance.

8.0 Equalities implications

- 8.1 Given that the report is for information it is the view of officers that the recommendations do not have an adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics identified in the Equalities Act 2010.

9.0 Recommendations

- 9.1 That Members note the content of the review of countywide Civil Parking Enforcement for 2014/15 and 2015/16.

BARRIE MASON
Assistant Director - Highways and Transportation

Author of Report: Tom Bryant

Background documents

Report on Allocation of Civil Parking Enforcement Surplus taken to Business and Environmental Services Executive Members on 25 May 2016.

Appendix 1 (a) – Penalty Charge Notice analysis 2014/15								
	Craven	Hambleton	Harrogate	Richmondshire	Ryedale	Scarborough	Selby	Total / average
Number of higher level penalty charge notices issued	533	922	3,147	770	1,007	7,778	693	14,850
Number of lower level penalty charge notices issued	450	2,755	16,417	1,880	582	12,578	151	34,813
Total number of penalty charge notices issued	983	3,677	19,564	2,650	1,589	20,356	842	49,661
Penalty charges per visit	0.1	0.39	0.12	0.22	0.09	0.13	0.12	0.17
Total Number of penalty charge notices paid	876	3,146	16,529	2,176	1,341	15,531	633	40,232
Percentage of penalty charge notices paid	89%	86%	84%	82%	84%	76%	75%	82%
Number of penalty charge notices paid at discount rate	727	2,872	13,588	1,929	1,225	13,607	517	34,465
Number of penalty charge notices paid at non-discount rate	149	274	2,971	247	116	1,924	116	5,797
Number of penalty charge notices against which an informal or formal representation was made	221	687	4,678	456	311	4,884	164	11,401
Number of penalty charge notices cancelled as a result of an informal or formal representation	63	220	2,266	191	97	2,169	90	5,096
Number of penalty charge notices written off for other reasons	8	184	143	164	112	1,882	11	2,504

Appendix 1 (b) – Penalty Charge Notice analysis 2015/16								
	Craven	Hambleton	Harrogate	Richmondshire	Ryedale	Scarborough	Selby	Total / average
Number of higher level penalty charge notices issued	417	1,054	3,568	791	993	9,054	700	16,577
Number of lower level penalty charge notices issued	485	2,557	14,157	1,780	464	12,659	142	32,244
Total number of penalty charge notices issued	902	3,611	17,725	2,571	1,457	21,713	842	48,821
Penalty charges per visit	0.1*	0.47	0.14	0.21	0.11	0.14	0.06	0.18
Total Number of penalty charge notices paid	764	3,059	14,749	2,102	1,229	16,101	685	38,689
Percentage of penalty charge notices paid	88%	85%	83%	82%	84%	74%	81%	82%
Number of penalty charge notices paid at discount rate	674	2,806	11,968	1,850	1,107	14,162	559	33,126
Number of penalty charge notices paid at non-discount rate	90	253	2,781	252	122	1,939	126	5,563
Number of penalty charge notices against which an informal or formal representation was made	227	608	3,771	429	276	5,052	140	10,503
Number of penalty charge notices cancelled as a result of an informal or formal representation	57	248	1,518	199	82	2212	45	4,361
Number of penalty charge notices written off for other reasons	19	92	45	86	71	792	25	1,130

*Excludes Malham as the PCN per visit is skewed by an issue that has now been addressed (all PCNs were issued in the first visit)

Appendix 2 (a) - District analysis 2014/15

District	Income (£)	Expenditure (£)	District balance (£)	N.o. of PCNs issued	Locations (10 or more PCNs)				Payment rate (%)
					Locations	PCNs	Visits	PCN per visit	
Craven	33,181	36,942	-3,761	983	Skipton	938	10,873	0.09	89%
					High Bentham	26	306	0.08	
					Settle	10	74	0.14	
Selby	28,555	33,999	-5,444	842	Selby	771	5,481	0.14	75%
					Tadcaster	61	622	0.10	
Hambleton	328,794	77,784	251,010	3,677	Northallerton	2,538	3,793	0.67	86%
					Bedale	579	490	1.18	
					Thirsk	290	2,347	0.12	
					Stokesley	52	724	0.07	
					Easingwold	50	291	0.17	
					Hambleton Other*	166	1,126	0.15	
Richmondshire	75,875	61,309	14,566	2,650	Richmond	2,303	7,925	0.29	82%
					Leyburn	136	739	0.18	
					Richmondshire other**	218	1,132	0.19	
Ryedale	51,491	60,354	-8,863	1,589	Malton	837	8,677	0.10	84%
					Pickering	364	3,376	0.11	
					Helmsley	95	1,561	0.06	
					Ryedale other***	293	3,644	0.08	
Scarborough	1,824,846	867,471	957,375	20,356	Scarborough town	13,347	89,829	0.15	76%
					Area surrounding Scarborough town	1,159	8,790	0.13	
					Whitby	4,751	33,173	0.14	
					Filey	844	5,137	0.16	
					Northern rural villages (surrounding Whitby)	223	1,244	0.18	
					Southern area (surrounding Filey)	32	1,175	0.03	
Harrogate	2,495,034	808,128	1,686,906	19,564	Harrogate town	17,014	103,395	0.16	84%
					Knaresborough	1,535	12,177	0.13	
					Ripon	726	8,799	0.08	
					Boroughbridge	231	1,127	0.20	
					Patley Bridge	19	519	0.04	

* Includes Great Ayton, Aiskew, Brompton, Leeming Bar and Osmotherley

**Includes Hawes, Reeth, Catterick Garrison, Colburn, Middleton Tyas, Croft on Tees and Barton

***Includes Thornton le Dale, Norton, Sheriff Hutton, Kirkbymoorside, Hutton le Hole and Staxton

Appendix 2 (b) District analysis 2015/16

District	Income (£)	Expenditure (£)	District balance (£)	N.o. of PCNs issued	Locations (10 or more PCNs)				Payment rate (%)
					Locations	PCNs	Visits	PCN per visit	
Craven	26,514	39,920	-13,406	902	Skipton	728	8,231	0.09	88%
					High Bentham	21	367	0.06	
					Settle	56	218	0.26	
					Malham*	10	3	3.33	
					Ingleton	37	527	0.07	
					Crosshills	20	390	0.05	
Selby	31,025	36,516	-5,491	842	Selby	781	6,772	0.12	81%
					Sherburn	17	740	0.02	
					Tadcaster	34	678	0.05	
Hambleton	342,495	71,975	270,520	3,611	Northallerton	2,218	3,982	0.56	85%
					Bedale	715	616	1.16	
					Thirsk	281	2,444	0.11	
					Stokesley	43	165	0.26	
					Easingwold	50	167	0.30	
					Hambleton Other**	326	777	0.42	
Richmondshire	78,752	67,153	11,599	2,571	Richmond	2,225	8,213	0.27	82%
					Leyburn	106	659	0.16	
					Richmondshire other***	218	1132	0.19	
Ryedale	46,297	64,201	-17,904	1,457	Malton	604	6,429	0.09	84%
					Pickering	328	2,897	0.11	
					Helmsley	178	1,420	0.13	
					Ryedale other****	347	3,756	0.09	
Scarborough	1,926,129	877,323	1,048,806	21,713	Scarborough town	14,499	91,740	0.16	74%
					Area surrounding Scarborough town	1,535	8,316	0.18	
					Whitby	4,245	26,345	0.16	
					Filey	1086	6,329	0.17	
					Northern rural villages (surrounding Whitby)	325	2158	0.15	
					Southern area (surrounding Filey)	23	853	0.03	
Harrogate	2,479,290	753,812	1,725,478	17,725	Harrogate town	15,239	93,457	0.16	83%
					Knaresborough	1,478	10,903	0.14	
					Ripon	833	9496	0.09	
					Pannal	10	150	0.07	
					Boroughbridge	144	469	0.31	
					Pateley Bridge	13	219	0.06	

* Figure for Malham is skewed by an issue that has now been addressed (all PCNs were issued

** Includes Great Ayton, Aiskew, Brompton, Leeming Bar and Osmotherley

***Includes Hawes, Reeth, Catterick Garrison, Colburn, Middleton Tyas, Croft on Tees and Barton

****Includes Thornton le Dale, Norton, Sheriff Hutton, Kirkbymoorside, Hutton le Hole and Staxton