

DECRIMINALISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT – QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 Members to consider the report of the Head of Revenue and Housing Management on progress towards implementing Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE) in the Rochford District.
- 1.2 DPE is scheduled to be introduced on 1 October 2004 and, in view of the quickening pace of implementation, at their meeting on 11 December 2003 Members agreed to receive a quarterly update.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Road Traffic Act 1991 provides for the decriminalisation of certain non-endorsable parking offences in London and allows Local Authorities outside London to apply to the Secretary of State for similar powers. These mainly include parking offences on yellow lines and on-street parking spaces. It does not include endorsable parking offences and offences related to obstruction, for which Essex Police continue to be responsible.
- 2.2 DPE powers allow Local Authorities to take over responsibility for enforcing parking contraventions from the Police and to retain revenue received from penalty notices to fund enforcement activities.
- 2.3 The Council has an agreement with Essex County Council to adopt powers to enforce on-street parking regulations with effect from 1 October 2004.
- 2.4 At a meeting of this Committee held on 5 June 2003 an action plan was agreed that would see the introduction of DPE to an agreed timetable. In October the Head of Service and Transportation Manager met with Essex County Council (ECC) representatives and the consultant acting on behalf of the County Council to make final adjustments to the financial model for Rochford District Council. The model makes projections about the cost of service delivery and income generation. The model is discussed later in this report as it relates to staffing.
- 2.5 The full financial model (and previous versions) runs to around 30 pages and is available in the Members' Library.

3 CURRENT POSITION

- 3.1 Progress towards implementing DPE is proceeding well and in accordance with the action plan. As reported in December, extracts from the financial

model have been included in the 2004/5 Budget, work covering the 33km of yellow line traffic regulation orders is progressing well and in January works started to convert Meeting Room 3 at the Civic Suite to office accommodation for the Transportation Team, as agreed at Council.

- 3.2 Again in December, Members noted the approval that Patrol Officers' roles should be extended to include potential environmental stewardship work, but that because of financial constraints on the 2004/5 budget, it would not be possible to consider the implementation of this until 2005/6. The Head of Service was requested to amend the implementation plan accordingly and to defer competition testing until a later date.
- 3.3 ECC advise that start-up capital (£81,576) and start-up expenses (£38,167) will be available from 1 April 2004 by adjustment to the precept payment. However, in view of the time lapse between the earlier Council decision to adopt DPE for the District and the proposed Special Parking Area application to the Department of Transport, ECC officers are asking for the Council to reconfirm its position at this meeting.

4 "KEEPING ROCHFORD MOVING" CAMPAIGN

- 4.1 Very soon, work will need to be started on the publicity campaign to introduce motorists to DPE. With the limited policing of controlled roads in the District over the last 3 years, motorists have become used to parking on yellow lines with the high probability that they will not attract a penalty charge notice (PCN). From 1 October 2004 the likelihood is that, if they continue this practice, they will attract a PCN. This is likely to be a culture shock to many motorists. With Members' concurrence, the Head of Service would like to follow the very successful campaign led by ECC around "Keeping Essex Moving". This campaign highlights all the positive attributes of DPE and, in particular, emphasises the freeing-up of roads for moving traffic.
- 4.2 Rather than a 'big bang' approach on 1 October, it is proposed that motorists be educated about parking restrictions in the three or four months running up to DPE implementation. The last month of which could see Patrol Officers placing "Warning Notices" on offending vehicles. Members' views on this approach are sought.

5 HIGH PROFILE/LOW PROFILE

- 5.1 Councils have used different approaches to managing DPE. Some have a very high profile approach to the task with Patrol Officer vehicles clearly liveried and marked accordingly. Early in the DPE process Members endorsed the idea of a Parking Enforcement Response Unit (PERU) where residents could call a 'hot line' to report illegally parked vehicles and the Head of Service would like further guidance from Members on this issue.

- 5.2 Liveryed vehicles look professional and their presence on patrols can often deter motorists from even considering parking on yellow lines. Conversely, a liveryed vehicle places itself open to vandalism. Unmarked vehicles (as with the existing car park patrol vehicle) would probably not attract attention, but equally would not act as a deterrent when on patrol. Some motorists might see this as covert and not open, transparent and honest. Again, Members' views are sought.

6 STAFFING

- 6.1 Although on-street and off-street parking will be delivered as an integrated service, it will be necessary to record finances as two separate services for accounting purposes.

- 6.2 The existing parking team comprises:

Transportation Manager	- who also has responsibility for Taxi and Private Hire vehicles and driver licensing, and Community Transport in the District.
Assistant Transportation Manager	- who will be the Primary Adjudication Officer on DPE Penalty Fines. Currently this postholder spends around 80% of his time on parking related matters with the remaining 20% being devoted to assisting the Transportation Manager in her wide-ranging duties.
Administrative Assistant	- dealing with PCN income, season tickets, correspondence and coin counting/recording.
4 Patrol Officers	- some working on a part-time shift rota basis, to cover car parks at their busiest times. Their overall hours commute to three full-time equivalent (FTE) staff.

- 6.3 Based on the length of yellow lines to patrol, patrol schedules, projected PCN issue levels and customer contacts the ECC model envisages the following staff structure:-

Operation Management

<u>Post</u>	<u>Time Allocation</u>
Manager	50%
Assistant Management (Enforcement)	80%

Patrol Enforcement

Supervisor (will also patrol)	100%
Patrol Officers (4.3 FTE)	100%

Administration, Permit and PCN Processing

Administrative Assistants (1.3 FTE)	100%
-------------------------------------	------

- 6.4 DPE will therefore mean additional skills, capacity and responsibility for existing operational management staff (but no additional staff).
- 6.5 An uplift in patrol enforcement of 2.3 FTE staff and 0.3 FTE staff for administrative functions.
- 6.6 These requirements have been based on the consultants' model, which has proved accurate for all other Essex Authorities that have implemented DPE. ECC have therefore based their funding on these estimates. If the Council wishes to boost any staffing element then it would need to bear the cost itself. The Head of Service, based on experiences shown at other Local Authorities, is confident that staffing levels illustrated above appear about right for Rochford.
- 6.7 If Members endorse these staffing levels then it will be necessary for the Policy and Finance Committee to consider recommendations for grades and appointments.

7 FINANCE AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 ECC are providing start-up capital and start-up expenses on an interest-free loan basis, which will be repaid through a £2.00 'bounty' for each PCN issued. The Head of Service and ECC consultant estimate that PCN issues should plateau at around 5,900 each year, resulting in an annual repayment figure to ECC of £11,800. The County Council is also prepared to meet the cost of any 'unavoidable losses' in the management of on-street parking enforcement, but the Head of Service does not envisage this will be required.
- 7.2 The summary of the latest version (4.0) of the financial model is appended.

8 RISK ASSESSMENT

8.1 Strategic Risk

The Council is required to be a major force of influence in car park administration and should demonstrate its commitment to delivering the aims and objectives of its agreement with ECC.

8.2 Resources Risk

The Council is a major landowner in the District with its car parks producing the only substantial source of income (around £600,000 in 2003/4) available. The introduction of DPE across the District should encourage greater use of car parks. This has been factored into the financial model. Failure to provide adequate resources to successfully run DPE would jeopardise the programme.

8.3 Reputation Risk

DPE has now been successfully implemented in around 65% of Local Authorities. Rochford District Council would not wish to be seen as the 'first to fail'.

9 RECOMMENDATION

9.1 It is proposed that the Committee **RESOLVES:-**

- (1) That Decriminalised Parking Enforcement be adopted on an agency basis and that an enforcement approach to Decriminalised Parking Enforcement be also adopted.
- (2) That the concept of a Parking Enforcement Response Unit be maintained.
- (3) That parking patrol vehicles in Council livery be provided.

and **RECOMMENDS to Policy and Finance Committee**

- (4) That consideration be given to staffing levels, responsibilities and grades for the successful running of Decriminalised Parking Enforcement.

Steve Clarkson

Head of Revenue and Housing Management

Background Papers:

None

For further information please contact Steve Clarkson on:-

Tel:- ext 3120
E-Mail:- steve.clarkson@rochford.gov.uk

RTA 1991 - FINANCIAL MODEL OF IMPLEMENTATION											MODEL VERSION: 4.0	
CLIENT: ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL											MODEL DATE: 06-Aug-93	
VERSION: BASE MODEL											Test 7	
SUMMARY OF MARGINAL INCOME & EXPENDITURE												
START-UP =	Enter 1 - 3	MONTHS	SCH REF	START-UP PERIOD (months)	START-UP CAPITAL	START-UP EXPENSES	FIRST 12 MTHS	SECOND 12 MTHS	THIRD 12 MTHS	FOURTH 12 MTHS	FIFTH 12 MTHS	
INCOME												
		PCNs ISSUED				0	4,205	5,901	5,901	5,901	5,901	
		PCN PAYMENTS	1		£0	£01,828	£103,161	£106,701	£106,701	£106,701	£106,701	
		CLAMP & REMOVAL PAYMENTS			£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	
		PERMIT PAYMENTS	2		£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	
		CAR PARK RECEIPTS	3		£0	£23,700	£24,293	£24,900	£25,522	£26,160	£26,808	
		ON STREET CHARGING	3		£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	
		NET C.COURT PROCEEDS	4		£0	£2,105	£8,659	£8,659	£8,659	£8,659	£8,659	
		TOTAL PAYMENTS			£0	£27,693	£136,112	£139,200	£139,862	£140,520	£141,178	
EXPENSES:												
					Annual Inflation Rate:		2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%		
		OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT	5	1	£36,490	£4,480	£32,884	£33,708	£34,548	£35,412	£36,297	
		ON-STREET ENFORCEMENT	6	1	£18,090	£9,973	£94,491	£95,883	£97,249	£98,601	£100,148	
		OFF-STREET ENFORCEMENT	7	1	£8,316	£1,258	£3,102	£3,179	£3,259	£3,340	£3,424	
		CLAMP & REMOVAL CONTROL	1		£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	
		TICKET & PERMITS PROCESSING	8	1	£24,090	£23,445	£30,662	£31,428	£32,214	£33,019	£33,845	
		PAY & DISPLAY	9	1	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	
		TOTAL EXPENSES			£81,576	£38,167	£121,138	£124,188	£127,271	£130,452	£133,714	
ANNUAL NET SURPLUS OR (DEFICIT)					(£81,576)	(£38,167)	(£43,445)	£11,948	£11,889	£9,430	£6,807	
CUMULATIVE NET SURPLUS OR (DEFICIT) EXCLUDING CAPITAL						(£38,167)	(£81,612)	(£69,667)	(£57,677)	(£48,247)	(£41,441)	
CUMULATIVE NET SURPLUS OR (DEFICIT) INCLUDING CAPITAL						(£119,743)	(£163,188)	(£151,243)	(£139,283)	(£129,823)	(£123,917)	
NPV INTEREST RATE					6%							
YEAR END NPVs (EXCLUDING CAPITAL)							(£79,193)	(£68,521)	(£58,455)	(£50,386)	(£45,899)	
NPV INTEREST RATE					6%							
YEAR END NPVs (INCLUDING CAPITAL)							(£160,729)	(£155,097)	(£149,031)	(£142,582)	(£137,475)	

- 1 NPV - Calculation assumes that the Start Up Cost is a negative cash flow at the start of year 1 and that each years cash flow thereafter is received at the end of the year.