

## **PARKING SERVICE ANNUAL REPORT FOR FINANCIAL YEAR 2013/14**

**Purpose of the report:** To provide information about on-street parking enforcement within Surrey during 2013/14 financial year.

### **Introduction:**

- 1 The County Council is responsible for the management of on-street parking enforcement. On the 31 March 2008, part 6 the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA) was enacted. This introduced a number of additional powers and changed the terminology from Decriminalised to Civil Parking Enforcement. Surrey Police do not enforce waiting restrictions in the county and enforcement patrols are carried out by Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) employed by the district / borough councils with the authority of the county council.
2. Within the Secretary of State's statutory guidance to local authorities on the civil enforcement of parking contraventions, it states that enforcement authorities should produce an annual report about their enforcement activities. The purpose of this report is to fulfil this requirement.

### **Background**

3. The County Council started operating Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE), in 2004. At that time the enforcement of restrictions and associated administrative functions was carried out by the eleven districts and borough councils on behalf of the County Council with localised agency agreements introduced on a staggered basis.
4. For the operation of CPE up to April 2011, the agency agreements stipulated that the County Council was responsible for all costs. From the 2012/13 financial year and beyond it was agreed that the district and borough Council's carrying out on street enforcement in Surrey would be responsible for any deficit within their areas. Nine districts agreed to this, with Tandridge and Waverley deciding to no longer be involved with on-street parking enforcement. In these districts CPE was carried out by Reigate and Banstead and Guildford respectively.

5. In April 2013 new five year parking enforcement agency agreements were put in place with all Surrey district and borough councils except Tandridge and Waverley as explained above. The aim of these agreements was to improve operational efficiency and increase transparency as well as local accountability of the on street enforcement operation. The agreements give local committees (who make decisions about where to put parking restrictions) more involvement in enforcement as well.
6. Financial information has been reported by all nine agents (for eleven areas), and has been collated to give the total income / expenditure for on street parking enforcement for the 2013/14 financial year for the County Council as a whole. This is shown in Annex 1.
7. Part 6 of the TMA states that an annual parking report should detail all on-street income / expenditure plus various other figures relating to performance and should be put in the public domain. This report contains the recommended data broken down by individual district in Annex 2. Although not a County Council function, enforcement data for the district and borough council owned and managed car parks is also provided.

#### **Financial reporting**

8. The purpose of operating a parking service is not to generate income but to provide a quality service for residents, businesses and motorists within Surrey, helping improve road safety and reduce congestion as well as access to local businesses.
9. The introduction of the TMA created significant changes in the way parking enforcement is undertaken. A key change was the introduction of differential penalty charges, dependant on contravention. The reasoning behind this is that it is deemed some parking contraventions are more serious than others (such as parking on double yellow lines rather than overstaying your time in a parking bay) so the level of penalty charge should reflect this. There are two bands with the higher rate set at £70 and the lower at £50 (both discounted by 50% if paid within 14 days). Whether a contravention is a higher or lower rate is prescribed in the regulations and not subject to local discretion. The number of PCN's paid at each level is shown in Annex 2.
10. From 2013/14, where there is an operating surplus in any district or borough it has been agreed to split it between the local committee for that area, the county council and the enforcement team. Note: previous arrangements are explained in the 12/13 report revised on street parking enforcement arrangements have been agreed by the Surrey Cabinet and are in place for the for 2013/14 financial year.
11. The total cost of operating on-street parking in each district for 2013/14 is detailed in Annex 1. The figures are as supplied by our enforcement partners and the actual outturn in the county's accounts is slightly different due to the timing of payments and need for accruals at the end of each financial year (this will balance over time).

12. The overall cost of operating on street parking enforcement in Surrey changed from a deficit of £314,431 in 2010/11 to a surplus of £644,377 during 2011/12. In 2012/13 the overall surplus increased to £848,430 and has again risen to £1,031,000 in 13/14. Some of the reasons for this are explained below.

### Operational Report

13. Surrey is a varied county and consequently the number of PCNs issued is not consistent in all areas. In simplistic terms the opportunity to undertake enforcement in a built up area is greater than in the countryside. The type of restriction can also have a significant impact. For example, limited waiting bays, where parking is permitted for a certain amount of time but then re-parking in the same place is not allowed for a set period (such as 1 hour, with no return allowed for 2 hours), while popular with residents and businesses, are difficult and require significant resources to enforce.
14. The number of PCNs issued in recent year's county wide has remained at around 80,000. There was a slight increase to 89,000 in 13/14. This could be attributed to changes in operational enforcement activity (eg more CEO's and 'out of ours' patrols). It is also possible that there has been increased activity as a result of an improving economic situation. The picture is not straight forward, however as some district and boroughs have improved the consistency and effectiveness of their parking enforcement operation leading to increased numbers of PCN's being issued.
15. In April 2011, Guildford Borough Council took over on street enforcement in Waverley. At the same time Reigate and Banstead took over enforcement in Tandridge. In both cases the transition went smoothly and helped turn around historical financial deficits for parking enforcement in these areas to a 'break even' situation or a surplus in 2011/12 and 2012/13. In January 2013, on street parking charges were introduced in Farnham and this helped increase the operational surplus in Waverley as a whole.
16. The majority of the operating surplus derived from parking enforcement is from the largest towns with established CPZ's including Guildford, Woking, Farnham and Walton on Thames. In late 2010 the County reviewed and revised resident permit charges. Until the review, permit charges were as low as £10 per year in some areas and varied considerably across the County. This did not reflect the true cost of administering a resident parking scheme and consequently a new charge of £50 was introduced from April 2011.
17. Annex 2 details operational parking data for the eleven boroughs / districts. It is laid out as recommended by the guidance; hence the inclusion of number of vehicles immobilised / removed. This is shown as not applicable because the county council and our agents do not immobilise or remove vehicles for parking contraventions, in line with the policy decision made by the former Executive.

18. There needs to be a fair enforcement regime if waiting restrictions are to be respected by motorists. This needs to be balanced against the cost of enforcement to ensure that any proposal is financially sound and does not generate unsustainable revenue commitments for the County or district. It is not always possible to provide levels of enforcement that some residents would like.
19. The SCC and district/borough parking teams regularly assess and amend existing signs and lines on the ground to ensure that they meet the requirements of the legislation. This has helped make it clearer to drivers to understand what the restrictions are and helped remove any ambiguity.
20. Each local committee area in Surrey also receives a more specific parking enforcement report for its area. These can be found on the respective local committee web page.
21. Parking is a pressure in many locations within Surrey. The Council receives many requests to increase or introduce restrictions, and for additional enforcement where controls already exist. Reviews of restrictions are ongoing throughout the County, in accordance with the priorities of the Local Committee for that area. If the funding is available the Parking Team aim to review each area on an 15 month cycle, however this depends on the number of locations in the review.

#### **New operational arrangements**

21. New arrangements for on street parking enforcement were agreed by the Surrey Cabinet on the 23 October 2012 following extensive discussion with our enforcement partners. These took effect in April 2013 with the introduction of new 5 year agency agreements with district and borough councils covering the same as described in paragraph 4. The most significant changes are that the local committee now have a scrutiny or oversight role for on street parking enforcement as well as deciding how to spend 60% of any surplus in their area.

#### **Financial and value for money implications**

22. The Secretary of State's statutory guidance states that it is a sensible aim for CPE operations to be self-financing, and that if they are not, the authorities should be certain that the operations can be paid for from within existing funding. With continued pressure on public finances, it is increasingly important for Surrey to try to run its CPE operation in a way that is at least cost neutral, as neither national nor local taxpayers should be expected to meet any deficit.

23. In order to help improve efficiency and reduce costs the county council has set up a two call off contracts in recent years that can be used by the district and borough councils. So far these have been for the supply and installation of pay and display machines and a 'cashless parking payment' system. These contracts make the most of the bulk buying power of all the authorities in the County.
24. The surplus identified in Annex 1 must be used in accordance with Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended). This generally limits use to highway, parking or environmental work in the public realm.

#### **Equalities Implications**

25. Effective enforcement of parking restrictions and enforcement can assist accessibility for those with visual or mobility impairment by reducing instances of obstructive parking. Parking restrictions also allow blue badge holders better access to shops and services through the provision and enforcement of disabled bays.

#### **Risk Management Implications**

26. None

#### **Implications for the Council's Priorities or Community Strategy/Local Area Agreement Targets**

27. On street enforcement contributes to objectives of the Surrey Transport Plan helping tackle congestion and improve accessibility, which can be hindered by inconsiderate parking.

---

**Report contact:** David Curl, Parking Strategy & Implementation Team Manager

**Contact details:** parking@surreycc.gov.uk or call 0300 200 1003

**Sources/background papers:**

Parking Service Annual Report 2012/13.

Operation of Civil Parking Enforcement 23 October 2012, SCC Cabinet

# On Street Parking Enforcement in Surrey

## financial out turn by area 2013/14

<b>Enforcement Area</b>	<b>Income Totals (all sources)</b>	<b>Expenditure total (on enforcement operation)</b>	<b>Surplus or deficit total from on street enforcement (negative indicates a deficit)</b>
<b>Elmbridge</b>	£701,506	£500,320	£201,186
<b>Epsom &amp; Ewell</b>	£327,832	£281,897	£45,935
<b>Guildford</b>	£1,450,450	£821,310	£629,140
<b>Mole Valley</b>	£108,097	£165,931	-£57,834
<b>Reigate &amp; Banstead</b>	£349,561	£494,673	-£145,112
<b>Runnymede</b>	£146,992	£151,508	-£4,516
<b>Spelthorne</b>	£171,532	£133,417	£38,115
<b>Surrey Heath</b>	£359,266	£417,304	-£58,038
<b>Tandridge</b>	£98,605	£103,372	-£4,767
<b>Waverley</b>	£379,742	£197,144	£182,598
<b>Woking</b>	£839,703	£635,406	£204,297
<b>Totals</b>	<b>£4,933,286</b>	<b>£3,902,282</b>	<b>£1,031,004</b>

## Annual Report 2013/14

All figures are for PCNs issued between 1st April 2013 and 31st March 2014.

	Whole Surrey 12-13		Whole Surrey 13-14		Elmbridge		Epsom & Ewell		Guildford		Mole Valley		Reigate & Banstead		Runnymede		Spelthorne		Surrey Heath		Tandridge		Waverley		Woking	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
<b>ON STREET PARKING</b>																										
Total Number of PCNs issued	78063		88894		14937	16.8	8747	9.8	14768	16.6	3643	4.1	9247	10.4	4851	5.5	5062	5.7	8953	10.1	2687	3.0	5780	6.5	10219	11.5
Number of CEOs employed	45		45.6	0.1	5.4	11.8	6	13.2	8.5	18.6	3	6.6	5	11.0	1.5	3.3	2.5	5.5	3.7	8.1	1	2.2	3	6.6	6	13.2
Number of higher level PCNs issued	53917	69.1	62051	69.8	10839	72.6	6734	77.0	8078	54.7	2237	61.4	7725	83.5	2970	61.2	4013	79.3	8116	90.7	2185	81.3	3583	62.0	5571	54.5
Number of lower level PCNs issued	24146	30.9	26840	30.2	4098	27.4	2013	23.0	6690	45.3	1406	38.6	1522	16.5	1881	38.8	1046	20.7	837	9.3	502	18.7	2197	38.0	4648	45.5
Number paid at discount	47099	60.3	52182	58.7	9465	63.4	5413	61.9	9710	65.8	1800	49.4	6221	67.3	3163	65.2	3303	65.3	6598	73.7	1976	73.5	4128	71.4	5818	56.9
Number paid at full (or above)	9185	11.8	10531	11.8	1786	12.0	1170	13.4	1868	12.6	920	25.3	1320	14.3	819	16.9	484	9.6	1018	11.4	331	12.3	690	11.9	1295	12.7
Total Number of PCNs paid	61252	78.5	69296	78.0	11251	75.3	6583	75.3	11578	78.4	2720	74.7	7541	81.6	3982	82.1	3787	74.8	7616	85.1	2307	85.9	4818	83.4	7113	69.6
Number of PCNs agains which formal or informal reps made	13541	17.3	14083	15.8	1970	13.2		0.0	2405	16.3	663	18.2	2377	25.7	821	16.9	1011	20.0	1583	17.7	515	19.2	880	15.2	1858	18.2
Number of PCNS cancelled as a result of formal or informal reps	7048	9.0	6139	6.9	1067	7.1	338	3.9	1472	10.0	374	10.3	694	7.5	212	4.4	422	8.3	367	4.1	147	5.5	436	7.5	948	9.3
Number of PCNs cancelled for other reasons	1766	2.3	1928	2.2	27	0.2	641	7.3	186	1.3	281	7.7	48	0.5	191	3.9	311	6.1	396	4.4	13	0.5	86	1.5	389	3.8
Number of PCNs written off	1092	1.4	1597	1.8	0	0.0	283	3.2	0	0.0	268	7.4	39	0.4	211	4.3	44	0.9	763	8.5	14	0.5		0.0	258	2.5
Number of Vehicles immobilised	0		0		0				0		0				0		0		0				0		0	
Number of vehicles removed.	0		0		0				0		0				0		0		0				0		0	
<b>OFF STREET PARKING</b>																										
Total Number of PCNs issued	63602		69178		10686	15.4	8152	11.8	12139	17.5	5366	7.8	4655	6.7	3567	5.2	6093	8.8	1524	2.2	2015	2.9	13215	19.1	1766	2.6
Number of CEOs employed	40.5		38.9		3.6	9.3	5	12.9	7	18.0	3	7.7	3	7.7	1.5	3.9	5.5	14.1	0.3	0.8	1	2.6	3	7.7	6	15.4
Number of higher level PCNs issued	10632	16.7	6787	9.8	203	1.9	684	8.4	1617	13.3	1323	24.7	745	16.0	101	2.8	1097	18.0	113	7.4	87	4.3	466	3.5	351	19.9
Number of lower level PCNs issued	52970	83.3	62391	90.2	10483	98.1	7468	91.6	10522	86.7	4043	75.3	3910	84.0	3466	97.2	4996	82.0	1411	92.6	1928	95.7	12749	96.5	1415	80.1
Number paid at discount	36222	57.0	37725	54.5	6894	64.5	4453	54.6	7251	59.7	3086	57.5	2762	59.3	2272	63.7	3261	53.5	877	57.5	1323	65.7	9017	68.2	982	55.6
Number paid at full (or above)	6529	10.3	7122	10.3	1092	10.2	868	10.6	1523	12.5	827	15.4	696	15.0	537	15.1	403	6.6	118	7.7	186	9.2	1480	11.2	260	14.7
Total Number of PCNs paid	47021	73.9	50167	72.5	7986	74.7	5321	65.3	8774	72.3	3913	72.9	3458	74.3	2809	78.7	3664	60.1	994	65.2	1509	74.9	10497	79.4	1242	70.3
Number of PCNs agains which formal or informal reps made	14240	22.4	14510	21.0	1746	16.3		0.0	2572	21.2	626	11.7	2237	48.1	923	25.9	1917	31.5	635	41.7	907	45.0	2947	22.3	Inc in on-st	
Number of PCNS cancelled as a result of formal or informal reps	7188	11.3	9660	14.0	1348	12.6		0.0	2097	17.3	536	10.0	820	17.6	385	10.8	1487	24.4	427	28.0	403	20.0	2157	16.3	Inc in on-st	
Number of PCNs cancelled for other reasons	2026	3.2	1290	1.9	9	0.1	1744	21.4	146	1.2	634	11.8	25	0.5	171	4.8	201	3.3	53	3.5	3	0.1	48	0.4	Inc in on-st	
Number of PCNs written off	1294	2.0	1738	2.5	0	0.0	267	3.3	720	5.9	283	5.3	14	0.3	73	2.0	85	1.4	479	31.4	5	0.2	79	0.6	Inc in on-st	
Number of Vehicles immobilised	0		0		0				0		0				0		0		0				0		0	
Number of vehicles removed.	0		0		0				0		0				0		0		0				0		0	