

## DECRIMINALISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT

### 1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 Members to consider the appended written report from the Essex County Council's consultant, shown at Appendices A and B to this report, and to receive a presentation on the Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement (DPE) in Essex.

### 2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 The Road Traffic Act 1991 gave powers to Highway Authorities to apply to the Secretary of State for the transfer of the responsibility for parking enforcement from the Police.
- 2.2 In partnership with the District Councils and Essex Police, Essex County Council identified the need for a County-wide strategy and commissioned consultants to undertake a study.
- 2.3 A traffic consultancy firm RTA Associates Ltd won the contract for this work and their principal, Mr Norman Downey, will present the findings of the study at the Meeting. Mr Downey has worked closely with the Head of Service in examining the impact on Rochford.
- 2.4 On 24 May 2000, the County Council hosted a Member Consultation Exercise when this Council was represented by Cllrs Cutmore, Fox and Leach.

### 3 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 The financial model for Rochford runs to many pages and a copy has been placed in the Members Lounge for examination. The Summary page has been reproduced as Appendix C to this report.

### 4 PARISH IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Although all parts of the District are affected by DPE the greatest impact will be felt in the town centres of Hockley, Rayleigh and Rochford.

### 5 RECOMMENDATION

It is proposed that Council **RESOLVES**

- (1) to accept the consultants report on DPE.
- (2) To support Essex County Council's application to transfer parking enforcement from the police. (HRHM)

S J Clarkson

Head of Revenue and Housing Management

---

**Background Papers:**

None.

For further information please contact S J Clarkson (01702) 546366

**ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL  
STUDY ON THE DECRIMINALISATION OF PARKING  
ENFORCEMENT**

**STUDY REPORT**

**RTA Associates Ltd**

---

**ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL  
STUDY ON THE DECRIMINALISATION OF PARKING ENFORCEMENT  
STUDY REPORT**

<b><u>CONTENTS</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
1 Executive Summary	2
2 Study Objectives	3
3 Police Position	4
4 Reactions from Districts	5
5 Viability in Each District	6
6 A County Wide Implementation	9
7 Responsibilities for Implementation	10
8 Recommended Strategy	11
9 Implementation programme	13
10 DPE Central Funding	14
10.1 Purposes	
10.2 Commencement	
10.3 Pay Back	
10.4 Surpluses	
10.5 Deficits	
11 Funding Programme	16
11.1 TRO review	
11.2 GIS implementation	
11.3 Training	
11.4 PR and Consultation	
11.5 Contracting	
11.6 Help Group	
12 Role of EEC	22
13 Relationship of Southend on Sea and Thurrock Councils	23
14 Common Issues, including the Agency Agreement	24
14.1 Recommended List of Issues	
14.2 Joint Operations	
Appendix A – Summary of District views	26
Appendix B – Outline requirement for a GIS system for TROs	27

## **STUDY ON THE DECRIMINALISATION OF PARKING ENFORCEMENT STUDY REPORT**

### **1 Executive Summary**

1.1 The decriminalisation of parking enforcement (DPE) involves the transfer of the responsibility for parking enforcement from the Police to the Highway Authority, as defined in the Road Traffic Act 1991.

1.2 Essex County Council identified a need for a countywide strategy to be examined in partnership with its Districts and Essex Police. The County Council is concerned about the effects that a piecemeal introduction of decriminalised powers would have on police resources, on enforcement in Districts not having DPE powers, and on public acceptance of the new regime.

1.3 The 12 second tier authorities within Essex (the Districts) have a very varied perspective on the future of parking enforcement in their areas. Some are very keen to adopt the powers, others are willing to consider the possibility, some do not consider it a significant issue, and one is quite opposed to the idea. One issue for this Study is to find a solution which recognises the Police position, and which gives suitable help and encouragement to all Districts to take on the powers if they wish to do so.

1.4 In general, the financial balance of a countywide project indicates that the costs of setting up the new enforcement would be recovered within a few years, with financial surpluses thereafter. To help with the financial equation, there are other opportunities for increased or new parking related income that could be considered.

1.5 The set-up costs for each District are an obstacle to the adoption of the powers. The on-going costs can be covered much more easily if the main expenditure prior to commencement can be provided as a loan to the Districts.

1.6 It is considered desirable, although not essential, for a Countywide implementation of DPE to occur, and that this should take place over a period of no more than 3 years.

1.7 The most practical way of implementing the powers would be to have each District take on the responsibilities in its own area. It is clearly a local service, and would integrate well with the responsibilities for off-street enforcement.

1.8 An Agency Agreement is required between the Highway Authority and each District to enable the powers to be exercised by the Districts. This should be

the same Agreement in each case, varying only with the detailed provisions for setting up the scheme for each District.

1.9 The County Council should offer a package of measures that will encourage each District to adopt the powers. This will help to standardise the way the powers are adopted within Essex, and will give real operational benefits to each District, which they would be unlikely to realise on their own.

1.10 The investment in this programme to be funded by the County Council should be recovered from each District after the start of the new enforcement as a levy on each parking ticket issued. Each District would be levied only until such time as it has paid back its initial loan. The broad intention should be that the County Council recovers its investment within a few years.

1.11 The two unitary Councils within Essex should be encouraged to participate in certain aspects of this joint programme, to the benefits of the traffic management of the county.

## **2 Study Objectives**

2.1 The decriminalisation of parking enforcement is a power available to Highway Authorities on application to the Secretary of State at the DETR. Simply, it allows a Highway Authority to take over the responsibility for non-endorsable parking contraventions from the Police, putting for the first time, the full responsibility on local authorities both to make traffic regulations, and to enforce them. The benefits of doing so from a traffic management point of view are considerable, and as a generalisation, decriminalised parking enforcement is another means available to local government to manage traffic, in this case, by controlling where vehicles are parked on-street within the area.

2.2 The responsibility for the exercise of this power rests with the Highway Authority, in this case, with Essex County Council (ECC). However, for a number of reasons, it is not normally the County Council in a two-tier structure that takes the direct responsibility for the operational aspects of implementing the powers. There are a number of reasons for that situation, which will be explored later in this report. At this stage, it is sufficient to identify that ECC decided late in 1999 that the question of *if* the powers should be implemented, and *if so, how*, the powers should be implemented, should be re-examined, to ensure that a strategic policy was developed within the whole County. This Study Report is the result of the examination of the general objective of decriminalising parking enforcement, with the very varying needs and ambitions of the second tier authorities within the County.

### 2.3 The key objectives of the Study can be summarised as follows:

- a) To examine the current parking policies in each District, particularly in the context of the availability of DPE;
- b) To model the impact of DPE on each, with the emphasis on the financial impact;
- c) To establish how to make DPE viable in each;
- d) To investigate the practicality of joint working between authorities, to increase viability;
- e) To recommend if DPE should be introduced;
- f) To recommend how it should be introduced;
- g) To consult with other parties, such as the Police where there may be a primary external influence on the decision.

2.4 As Essex County is larger than the administrative area of ECC, it was decided that the two Unitary Authorities within Essex; Southend on Sea and Thurrock, should be consulted in the course of this investigation. Their views were sought on the impact of a possible programme of implementation of decriminalised parking enforcement (DPE) on their parking policies.

## 3 Police Position

3.1 As the introduction of DPE is about transferring the responsibility for most parking enforcement from the Police to the Highway Authority, it was considered paramount that the current view of Essex Police was sought and understood in the context of this Study. Consequently, the Force was approached at a senior level, with a request for a policy statement. In addition, there are other significant consequences of the possible implementation, the most important being the possible impact of TUPE on the Police's current traffic wardens. Thus, if for no other reason, it is important to know the position in order to be able to include within any financial assessment, the possible costs associated with such a transfer.

3.2 The issue of DPE is a difficult one between all Police Forces and the Highway Authorities in their area. Essex Police, the County Council and the District Councils in Essex have been working in partnership on this issue since the powers became available in 1995.

3.3 The Police have stated that they wish to continue to work in partnership with ECC and the District Councils to get the best result for Essex. Successful implementation of decriminalised parking enforcement would lead to better enforcement. The improved enforcement would, in turn, lead to more efficient traffic management and to increased funding for transportation schemes in

Districts. The Essex Police Force is an active partner in traffic management and, as such, supports a countywide approach to the implementation of the powers. The Police are however, concerned about the wider responsibilities of traffic wardens as currently used within the Force. These responsibilities will still need to be undertaken. It is understood that there is a desire within the Force to retain a proportion of the warden resources at least for traffic management duties, responsibility for which will not, and cannot transfer to the authorities.

3.4 It is relevant to note that the Police position on parking enforcement under a criminalised regime is significantly different from an authority's view under a decriminalised regime. The Police are motivated to ensure safety and the free flow of traffic; Parking Attendants deployed by the authorities do not have the same powers as wardens, and must act upon a contravention as seen.

3.5 With this background, it is particularly important that this Study has been commissioned, as the attitude to DPE within the authorities of Essex will be strongly influenced by the availability and effectiveness of the warden service. While it is entirely possible for a uniformed police officer to issue a parking ticket, it is understood from police statistics that between 80 and 95% of all non-endorsable fixed penalty notices are issued by wardens. Therefore, a policy of relying on uniformed police officers to carry out parking enforcement would not be workable.

#### 4 Reactions from Districts

4.1 In order to determine the attitude of the various Councils through Essex towards DPE, a series of meetings was organised with a senior officer from each Council with responsibility for transportation matters. The appended table summarises the reactions from each District. The term "District" includes Boroughs. As can be seen, the 12 authorities fell into a number of clear categories, based on attitude towards DPE.

Openly negative towards DPE	1
Disinterested in DPE; no perception of a problem, and may not wish to react even if police withdraw	3
Interested, but not until pushed by lack of police enforcement	4
Keen, actively pursuing the powers	2
Committed to DPE	2
Total	12



4.2 The attitude is therefore well balanced and representative of all shades of opinion. The biggest factor influencing opinion is definitely the perception of the current parking problems in each District. Where there are major problems, there is a strong wish to obtain the powers, and where there are few problems, there is a desire for the status quo.

4.3 The question was asked as how their views might change were the current levels of wardens to be reduced further, or even removed altogether. It is clear that most authorities were not really able to answer that question, as there is very little knowledge of the consequences of taking on DPE in terms of financial implications, and changes of responsibilities. It was also obvious that many authorities had not given any serious consideration to the issue, and were not in a position to provide a considered response.

4.4 At the other end of the scale, there are several authorities who see DPE as the means of achieving control over a major aspect of their traffic management, and as a tool to help achieve the County-wide policies of vehicle demand restraint, and control over the growth in vehicle usage over the coming decades. Several are consequently at a stage where they are waiting for ECC to resolve how the powers should be implemented, and to give them a framework within which they can proceed with the implementation.

4.5 One view of the above analysis is that there are only 4 out of the 12 authorities in the County which would not wish to consider the issue of DPE seriously, were the Police to continue their withdrawal of wardens. An issue for this Study is how a policy can be determined which meets the very varying needs and ambitions of the 12 Districts.

## **5 Viability In Each District**

5.1 A major question to be addressed is the extent to which each District could take on these powers and meet the required position from the DETR of doing so without it being a burden on local taxpayers.

5.2 Financial models were built for each of the 12 authorities, which determined what has to be enforced, the manner in which it needs enforcement, the costs of doing so, and the income that may accrue as a consequence.

5.3 As a generalisation, it was found that the costs of on-street patrolling, issuing parking tickets and carrying out the administrative processes resulting from their issue were just about covered by the income likely to be received, with some authorities showing minor annual surpluses, and other showing deficits. When the recovery of the set-up costs incurred in order to introduce

DPE were taken into the equation, the best which can be achieved is a pay-back period of about 2 to 3 years, while other examples showed an accumulating annual deficit. It has to be stressed that each model viewed the opportunity from a conservative stand-point, and an efficiently run organisation should be able to achieve the estimated results with relative ease.

5.4 A major factor in this is that the value to be paid for a ticket is £40, a level which was set almost a decade ago, when DPE was first under consideration for the London Boroughs. Parking ticket values under DPE are set by Government, and not by local discretion. Since then the costs of enforcement have continued to rise, while the anticipated income for each ticket has remained static. The net surplus has therefore continued to be eroded. A £40 ticket is, in effect a £20 payment if paid within the statutory 14 days, a level which many drivers are now happy to pay for a days parking on a yellow line.

5.5 Communication with DETR was carried out in order to establish the policy on this level. It was reported that it is "highly probable" that the ticket value will be increased well before any Essex authority adopts the powers, and that it is considered that the most likely value will be £60. This would achieve the Government objective of keeping the discounted value in line with their fixed penalty notice (FPN) values for a similar offence.

5.6 In this context, the models were re-evaluated at the increased ticket value. Without exception, the financial balance swung from showing a small surplus or a deficit, to showing a healthy surplus. This is not surprising as the costs would be largely unaffected.

5.7 However, comparing the costs of enforcement with the direct income from parking tickets is to ignore the reasons why DPE is implemented. In theory, it could be argued that there should be no income from parking tickets, as all parking acts should be compliant, and drivers should pay for the privilege of parking their vehicles in the urban centre. Enforcement is the means of achieving that theoretical objective. It is therefore entirely appropriate that other financial, knock-on implications of enforcement should be brought into the equation. These can be various, and include:

- increased use of on-street charging areas;
- new on-street charging areas;
- charging for currently free, off-street car parks;
- increased use of the Council car parks;
- income from the sale of parking permits;
- changed tariff structures designed to support short-stay parking acts in comparison to long-stay acts.

5.8 The financial models in some cases considered such options where it was clear that changes in parking provision were feasible and desirable. In other cases, local reports identified where such opportunities are thought to exist in the views of the consultants. All models included a 5% increase in Council off-street car park usage, a conservative figure when compared to that which has been achieved and documented in places such as Winchester.

5.9 In several cases, the views of officers in some Districts reflected a very different policy for car parking management compared to other Districts. While some are trying to restrain the growth in vehicle usage in line with the strategic policies of ECC, others still perceive the provision of parking as desirable in order to generate trips into their urban areas, and as a means of promoting economic vitality. There are adjoining Councils in which one subsidises car parking, while another sees pricing mechanisms as one means of restraint. Clearly, in this situation, it will be difficult to develop an operational DPE strategy and plan which attracts support from all of the Districts.

5.10 In every case, there are considerable set-up costs to be met in the introduction of DPE. These costs are for a variety of items and categories of expense, and while some are revenue items, such as staffing costs prior to commencement, others are for capital items, such as new premises, new IT systems, and reviews of traffic regulations orders (TROs). Efforts were made to categorise the set-up costs as revenue or capital, and this definition is important in the context of a major recommendation later in the report.

5.11 If the set-up costs are taken out of the equation, the financial balance in the Districts would be positive on an annual basis, from the second year on.

5.12 The evaluation of set-up costs can vary considerably from one authority to another, depending upon the state of preparedness of a Council, and how the project is tackled. For example, if a Council already has a current parking IT system, and decides to contract out the set-up and operation of the DPE scheme, the need for up-front costs could be considerably reduced compared to a Council which decides to bear all costs directly itself. To obtain comparable information, it was decided to evaluate each District as if it were to bear all set-up costs itself, and to run the operation using in-house resources.

5.13 Any successful strategy for DPE must avoid any suggestion that Districts will be forced to undertake additional revenue raising measures in order to implement DPE. It would help to achieve the overall objectives if the financial strategy encouraged them so to do. It is considered important to ensure that Districts can keep issues such as off-street charging and income separate from the DPE aspects, to avoid the inevitable conflict that may arise if such matters

became involved.

## **6 A County Wide Implementation**

6.1 The consultants were aware in the Brief of the issue of the desirability or need for a countywide solution for DPE. However, it is considered useful to review that statement in the context of this Study.

6.2 Meeting traffic management needs implies taking a strategic view across the whole county; if enforcement of parking regulations matters in one part of the county, it should matter in all parts. It may only be the extent of the concern which alters, not the basic need. The public is generally concerned about parking enforcement, and the implications of illegal parking. Many consultation exercises carried out in other parts of the country have established a remarkably high degree of support for "better enforcement". It would seem quite inappropriate to tolerate one degree of non-compliance in one part of the county while taking action against it in another. Consistency is therefore a strong argument for a common view to be taken across the whole county.

6.3 The Government wants to see in the LTP submissions, a strategic consideration to demand restraint. It has been made abundantly clear that they want to see DPE rolled out as a basic tool to restrain demand for vehicular use.

Making a commitment to DPE is therefore strategically important at this level. DPE also fits well with other Government policies; if workplace charging becomes a reality, the likelihood is that the first knock-on consequence would be a displacement of vehicles onto the highway, in order to avoid paying the tax. Those authorities not ready for this impact will be badly placed to cope. However, Essex County Council is not considering work place charging at the present time.

6.4 One point made to the consultants is the need to have consistency of enforcement across geographical areas as an element to encourage investment and funding for major projects. In this context, the south Essex corridor is considered to be particularly significant, taking in as it does, the 2 Unitary Councils.

6.5 Any implementation should occur in the shortest realistic timeframe, to achieve some of the benefits mentioned above. While a single "live date" is quite unachievable, implementation across a 3 year time period is not.

6.6 It would not seem appropriate to delay viable projects. However, unwillingness on the part of some Districts would not provide a sound base for development of a countywide scheme. DPE needs total commitment from

those involved to make it work successfully.

6.7 Finally, the scale of project itself may mitigate against a county wide solution, at least in the short term. There is not a lot of direct expertise in the implementation of DPE within the county at present, and having most or all of the Districts following simultaneous projects could stretch the available resources unacceptably.

***Recommendation:***

***That all Districts consider the contents of this report in association with their individual District reports, and provide a formal written response to the County Council by 18 August 2000. This should include:***

- 1) whether the District supports the principle of decriminalised parking enforcement***
- 2) whether the District wishes to request delegated powers***

## **7 Responsibilities for Implementation**

7.1 Thus far, the discussion has been about the powers in general, with an assumption that the control would be applied by the District Council for its own area. The question has to be asked if this is an appropriate consideration.

7.2 The powers are primarily for on-street parking enforcement. However, the powers also apply to off-street places, thus providing an identical enforcement environment across a whole geographic area. This was one of the primary objectives and benefits of DPE, to get away from having different agencies enforcing adjacent parking locations, such as car parks and the nearby streets. Currently, the DETR will not allow an Application for the powers unless it covers the entire geographic area of a District as a minimum, and unless it includes the on and off-street places. As the off-street locations in public ownership are all owned and operated by the Districts and not the County Council, it would not be efficient or desirable to have ECC enforce the streets while the District enforced the car parks. In an extreme case, if a District were to refuse to enforce its on-street areas, and if the Police had removed their warden service, it is believed that the DETR might countenance ECC enforcing (or having enforced on its behalf), the on-street areas in that District. Clearly, this would be a highly undesirable step to have to take, but if the alternative was no enforcement of parking, it might have to be taken. In this circumstance, ECC could bring in a contractor, or it could set up a service level agreement with a neighbouring District to have the responsibilities carried out by one District in the area of another District, acting as agent for ECC.

7.3 In discussions with the various Councils, this concept was almost unanimously rejected as being totally unacceptable. It is this reality which, it is believed, will encourage Districts to view this DPE requirement quite differently.

7.4 Equally, every District was adamant that ECC should have no responsibility for any aspect of the management of their car parks. Any solution therefore, should avoid any suggestion that Districts should be other than fully responsible for all aspects of the management and financing of their car parks operations.

7.5 ECC should be involved in the whole process from a strategic point of view; ECC is not well placed to mount a new operational service around the County, and clearly, parking is a local issue, not a County one. As has already been demonstrated, there is a very strategic dimension to this DPE project, and ECC should undertake a coordinating and facilitating role, which is discussed in detail below.

**Recommendation:**

*That where DPE is implemented, it is the responsibility of Districts, working within an ECC framework, to implement the project. If any District does not take on this responsibility, and if the level of on-street compliance demands, ECC should take direct responsibility for that enforcement.*

## **8 Recommended Strategy**

### **8.1 The key conclusions thus far are:**

The number of Police traffic wardens is reducing. A number of Districts already consider the level of resource directed to enforcement to be inadequate.

Most Districts are either keen now to go ahead, or would be keen were the Police to reduce further their resources for enforcement.

The financial case for DPE is proven, and would be further enhanced by having the £60 parking ticket level, or by including in the assessment realistic opportunities for additional parking related income. In the view of the consultants there are few Districts where this does not apply. The set-up costs are a major burden for Districts.

There are sound arguments for a county-wide implementation for DPE, not at one time, but over a phased programme covering a small number

of years.

DPE operations should be the responsibility of the Districts, while strategic provision and guidance should come from ECC.

The solution should avoid directly requiring Districts to introduce charges in relation to parking, or to commit existing financial resources to make the scheme work.

8.2 A successful solution will be one which does not generate conflict or animosity between ECC and the Districts, but where the two levels of organisations are seen to be playing their respective roles, using their respective strengths and capabilities.

8.3 ECC should encourage all Districts to commit to take on the DPE powers within an overall programme covering about 3 years. The benefits should be made clear to Districts and the alternatives detailed, along with the consequences. The intention is to achieve a consensus between ECC and each District, such that the 2 authorities are locked in an agreement to help each other in partnership. If any District does not commit to the partnership, it will be made clear to their Members that the alternative will be to rely on the Police to provide enforcement, or if that becomes unavailable or inadequate, to have the on-street enforcement in their area undertaken by ECC in accordance with their current policy.

8.4 In return, and within the partnership, ECC should commit to a package of measures designed to encourage and help each District in the partnership to implement the powers. The package should focus on addressing the need for capital funds to set-up each DPE scheme, and on tackling those aspects where ECC is clearly better placed to undertake that aspect of the project. Where substantial investment is made by ECC for aspects which are required for the set-up of the project, these funds should be paid back by each District from its new source of parking ticket income to ECC over a period of a maximum of 5 years. This pay back will be most easily geared to the number of parking tickets issued, and treated as a charge per ticket issued. This will make the recovery easily identified, it will gear it closely to the actual size of the operation for each District, and it will link it closely to other charges, such as the levies to be paid to the National Parking Adjudication Service, which are also based on the tickets issued in each District.

8.5 All capital set-up costs for the defined aspects, for each District, should be funded from LTP sources.

8.6 There should be an Agency Agreement in place between ECC and each District, which is discussed in more detail below. However, this Agreement should clearly identify that any surpluses resulting from the enforcement would belong to ECC, as Highway Authority, but would be available to add to the locally determined funds for transportation purposes, subject to the requirements as specified in Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which basically ring-fences such *surpluses* to projects within the transportation infrastructure.

8.7 The arrangements for decision making in relation to the traffic regulation orders in each District should remain unaltered.

**Recommendation:**

*That ECC should sign an Agreement with each district committing ECC to pay for defined set-up capital costs for each District, and committing the District to repay the investment over a period from income due, and which allows each District to have discretion over the income surpluses, subject to defined controls.*

## **9 Implementation programme**

9.1 It has been noted above that the implementation programme should stretch over no more than 3 years. Ideally, this period should be less, but it would not seem possible to get all Districts to move ahead on a tight timescale, and to encourage participation, this period has been proposed.

9.2 Implementation of DPE cannot occur in just any month of the year. It is generally considered sensible to avoid November and December for reasons associated with the increased volumes of parking activity, and the holiday period of July and August is also a poor time to select. The operations take some time to establish and settle down, so it is a good idea to have as full a staffing contingent as possible, during the initial three months. Equally, other councils tend to select April as a good time to start, being the beginning of the financial year. This does mean however, that the availability of external training resources, which will be required, is difficult during January to March. With so many Districts to implement, it will be sensible to phase them into 3 or 4 groups, all due to start on or about the same time. This will be controllable from the ECC/DETR aspect, it will not over-stretch any skilled resources being made available from ECC, and it will give the opportunity to share experience.



9.3 Even for those Districts which have made a commitment to go down the DPE route, the time required for implementation will be in excess of 12 months, and it will be sensible to allow an 18 month period from the time the District and ECC agree the implementation. It would seem that the earliest implementation will be in the autumn of 2001, with another group going live in the late spring of 2002, and possibly the final group in the autumn of 2002. Clearly, it will be vital to agree quickly which District is going in which group. From our discussions, the consultants would suggest:

- Group 1: Colchester, Brentwood, Epping Forest,
- Group 2: Chelmsford, Tendring, Basildon, Rochford
- Group 3: Braintree, Castle Point, Harlow, Maldon, Uttlesford

## **10 DPE Central Funding**

### **10.1 Purposes**

10.1.1 Central funding should be provided for an agreed list of capital expenditure items. These would include:

- \* IT systems
- \* TRO review (where appropriate)
- \* Signs and lines remedial work
- \* TRO/GIS system
- \* parking ticket issuing equipment
- \* radio systems
- \* PR campaign

These items would represent a major investment in each District, were the costs to be borne locally. The detailed expenditure should be agreed between ECC and each District, ideally in advance, in order to fix the scale of the investment from ECC. Thereafter, ECC should run an account for each District.

### **10.2 Commencement**

10.2.1 The payback of the investment should be based upon a common formula of an amount for every parking ticket (PCN) issued. This has the merit of simplicity, and accountability. The same calculation is required to determine the costs to be paid to the National Parking Adjudication Service.

10.2.2 Payback should commence from the start of the new enforcement, and be made monthly, based on the numbers of tickets issued in the previous month. This will help with the monitoring of the scheme. It is recognised that the income for many of the tickets will not come into the Council for some time thereafter, but the efficiency of the implementation and management of the ticket processing will determine to a degree, when the income will arrive. As this is in the hands of the District, it seems reasonable to provide an extra incentive to make debt recovery effective.

### **10.3 Pay Back**

10.3.1 The amount per PCN to be paid back to ECC should enable recovery to be effected within a maximum period of 5 years. Given that a broad estimate is that each District should be able to reach a break-even after 3 years of operation, this allows a further 2 years for repayment from surpluses. Thereafter, the monies for each District should have been repaid, and the accounts should be closed.

### **10.4 Surpluses**

10.4.1 All surpluses, that is excesses of income after all operational costs, including the above repayment, have been taken into account, should be available to be spent within each District, as an additional amount to the locally determined funds. This provides a real incentive to ensure each scheme is locally managed and is efficiently run. It will also help the arguments about the introduction of DPE if it is known that funds will be retained locally to invest in transportation. The use of all surpluses for on-street income are defined in Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

### **10.5 Deficits**

10.5.1 Districts must be allowed to determine their own needs for parking control in accordance with their LTP and County Policy. If the number of PCNs issued is low and an annual deficit occurs, this deficit should be paid by the County Council.

10.5.2 At the figure of £40 per PCN, three Districts are likely to have a deficit after year 3 of operation, although the models do not take into account opportunities for Districts gaining extra income through other mechanisms such as charging for on-street parking.

10.5.3 Under these circumstances, deficits should be covered from the Locally Determined Programme allocation. Districts with a surplus from DPE would net an additional sum to spend on transport issues in accordance with the existing guidelines.

10.5.4 This mechanism means that the incentive is there for Districts to manage their operations efficiently to increase surpluses and for districts in deficit to aim for a surplus in order to have extra funding for local transport issues.

## **11 Funding Programme**

### **11.1 TRO review**

11.1.1 One of the key requirements for the implementation of DPE is that the Highway Authority has to convince the DETR that the TROs are accurately represented on the ground. It is also of interest to DETR that the TROs are appropriate to the current needs, and they expect to see an ability to continue that aspect of the review on an on-going basis. From the District's point of view, it is also crucial that the TROs are accessible. Whereas a magistrate will rarely if ever want to see a TRO, adjudicators take the simple view that if they are making decisions on the application of the law, the TRO represents the law, so they need to see it. So any person dealing with a representation or an appeal has to have quick and convenient access to the TRO details.

11.1.2 The TRO review can take many forms, but fundamentally, it is required to check that the signs and lines are correctly implemented on the ground, and that they are kept that way. The latter is less onerous once parking attendants are in place, but getting the TROs correctly represented can be a costly exercise. It is also often necessary to consider consolidation of the TROs, and perhaps even changes to the TROs for other measures, such as the introduction of on-street charging. In the costings, we have assumed the minimum level of activity, which would be represented by a District comparing each item within each TRO with its physical representation on the ground, and making corrections where necessary, unless an area had been reviewed, consolidated or checked within the previous say, 3 years. It could be argued of course, that such activity should be on-going at all times, and that the monies to effect this should be budgetted for each year as a rolling budget. In that sense, this activity is really only pulling together that expenditure into a single year, or 2 at the most.

11.1.3 With the split responsibilities across the county for TROs, this issue becomes more complex. In theory, the responsibility for TROs should all be handed out to each District, in order that they can enforce them, maintain them, have access to them etc. In practice, it has been noted that several Districts are not of a scale to warrant taking on such responsibilities, and that the necessary skills would be better kept in the County Area Offices for those Districts not currently responsible for the TROs. In the case of Tendring, it would seem to be untenable to continue to have responsibility for their TROs split between County and District.

**Recommendation:**

*That each contracted District (or ECC in the case of directly maintained Districts) carry out a check of its signs and lines. The costs of this should come under the funding programme. This must be done in time to start DPE enforcement.*

## **11.2 GIS implementation**

11.2.1 Above, the issue of accessibility of the TROs was mentioned. Also, there will clearly be situations where ECC maintains TROs, but District ticket processing staff have a basic requirement to access up-to-date TROs rapidly, something they cannot do at present. The best solution to this is to put all of the TROs within Essex onto a single Geographic Information System. The system must be able to show a graphical representation of each TRO, and to hold within a database, all of the details relating to the TRO, such that a complete detailed presentation can be prepared for an adjudicator with the minimum of time and effort being required.

11.2.2 A software solution should be obtained by analysis of the products available, and a service utilised to get all TROs throughout the County entered onto the system over as short a period as possible. The configuration required to meet the described objectives would require a central server and database, with links to each Area Office and to each District in the project. An outline requirement for such a system is contained in an Appendix B to this report.

11.2.3 The take-on of the data will be a major undertaking, which ideally, should be carried out in as short a time period as possible to avoid duplicate systems consuming people's time.

**Recommendation:**

*That ECC investigate the GIS/TRO marketplace, and procure products and a service to meet the above objectives.*

**11.3 Training**

11.3.1 Training of both Parking Attendants and ticket processing staff is absolutely fundamental to successful implementations. However, it is difficult to administer, and costly to lay on, when there are small numbers of staff involved. Once all the Districts go live, there will be an on-going need for training, to meet the staff turnover requirements. This can be even more difficult to meet as a need. The demand for training may be reduced if most of the Traffic wardens transfer under TUPE.

11.3.2 Economies of scale will result from a plan to establish a contract by tender with a reputable training organisation, which can provide local training courses on a regular basis. These courses should lead to recognised levels of competence, such as the current NVQ programme.

11.3.3 Courses should be held at a location convenient for the group of Districts going live; others could then send other staff if necessary, and if places exist. Once all Districts are operational, regular courses should still be programmed, to allow for turnover. This activity may eventually be taken up in the identical needs of a wider base of Councils, including perhaps, all of those in East Anglia when DPE is operational.

**Recommendation:**

*That ECC go out to tender to establish a contract to have training provided for all Districts in the programme, to a defined timetable, and with a defined content.*

**11.4 PR and Consultation**

11.4.1 There are ~~two~~ forms of consultation and dissemination of information associated with this project:

- a) statutory consultation and consultation with other organisations closely linked to the overall process; these include the police, neighbouring authorities, the DVLA, the County Court, the National Parking Adjudication Service, and the Highways Agency.
- b) public consultation.

The first category above is simple and unlikely to be controversial; the second category is a matter for local decision as to the extent. Some authorities carry out a wide consultation exercise, which is really a public information service to spread the word on the introduction of DPE. Other authorities take the view that DPE does not involve changing any regulations, and only changes the person issuing the tickets, and the means of administering the process thereafter.

11.4.2 Whichever position is adopted, the sensible path for the coordinated programme of DPE is to have ECC manage the PR, the formal consultation and information dissemination. This will ensure the same message is given out in a consistent format, and it will provide economies of scale in design, production and printing costs. It will also simplify the formal consultation, as it only need involve one set of letters to the neighbouring authorities in other counties and in London, as well as a single policy involvement from the Essex Police.

11.4.3 As well as the need for consultation at the strategic level, there will of course, be a requirement for a local consultation programme, to be undertaken by each District, to their own locally designed plan, but supported by material prepared centrally.

11.4.4 The costs of this programme should be part of the total investment to be recovered from the operational Districts.

***Recommendation:***

***That ECC establish and manage a coordinated programme of public relations, consultation and information provision.***

## **11.5 Contracting**

- 11.5.1 Under Best Value, the need to test services in comparison to the private sector will grow. A logical time to carry out such testing can be as a part of the implementation of DPE. For those Districts which

decide to test the market in this way, it would make sense to establish a contracting out framework across the county, which could act as a basis for all Districts to compare their services, and to adopt a external service where it is considered appropriate.

11.5.2 Already one District has a contracted out service for their current enforcement. Contracting out parts or all of these services within a District undoubtedly has significant benefits, as has been shown by many other authorities that have chosen to go down this route. However, it is recognised that many Districts will wish to avoid going through any such tendering process, at least initially.

11.5.3 If there are around 3 or more Districts which believe that they would consider seriously the possibility of using a contracted out service, then ECC should undertake to provide a general framework contract which each District could use to provide services. By this, ECC would coordinate the design, tendering and selection associated with a contract, with the objective of having a preferred contractor with whom one or more Districts could then establish a Service Level Agreement under the terms of the contract, without further work in the whole contracting process. This would save a great deal of effort and time for each District, and it would help in the countywide coordination of implementation.

11.5.4 One issue, which has not been discussed thus far, is the seasonal nature of the demand for enforcement in certain parts of Essex. At least two Districts, Maldon and Tendring report very marked seasonal patterns of car parking activity. This causes specific problems for them, in the context of DPE. By having the presence of a contractor within the county, there is a resource that could be drafted in to help with seasonal problems, including weekends. This is not to imply that the Districts could not resolve this problem between themselves, but there is no precedent for such joint action, and it is considered that contractors would be more flexible, and motivated to respond.

11.5.5 It is thought that Southend on Sea would also benefit from being part of such an arrangement, due to their seasonal demand for enforcement.

**Recommendation:**

*That if there is sufficient interest, ECC design, tender and award a framework contract with call-off arrangements for each District to use for externalised services, including seasonal and out-of-hours demands.*

11.5.6 This contract should also be designed to include the capabilities to undertake clamping of illegally parked vehicles, and the removal of vehicles where such action is warranted. Some authorities, after a few months of DPE, have found that there are special categories of vehicles for which the issue of a parking ticket is insufficient deterrent. The only recourse is to clamp or remove the vehicle the next time it is seen in contravention, as a means of delivering a stronger message. Normally, within any individual District, it would be considered financially impractical to consider such action. With 12 Districts, it is considered likely that after perhaps about a year of operation, a clamping and/or removal operation could be justified both financially and in operational terms, if treated as a county-wide resource. Thus, if Tendring thought that particular problems were likely on particular weekends, the service could be committed to that area for that period. Similarly, if normal enforcement was proving inadequate late at night in certain other towns, this resource would be targeted to these trouble spots.

**Recommendation:**

*That after about a year from the first implementation, ECC review the need for clamping or removals. If there is a recognised need, which is sustainable, ECC should design and let a contract to carry out this enforcement.*

**11.6 Help Group**

11.6.1 The experience of moving from the current system of enforcement to this new form is still relatively new, and there is still not a lot of relevant experience about in the job marketplace.

11.6.2 In the period after the implementation programme has been set up, and Districts have made their commitments, ECC should fund a Group activity to provide advice and help to the officers in the various Districts concerned. This group need not meet more often than every 6 to 8 weeks, and it should take the form of a working group, where common issues and experiences can be shared, to mutual benefit. The Group could invite external people to attend, where they have



existing experience, and they could be given a small budget to commission work which will have a common basis in need.

11.6.3 To ensure the momentum, ECC should organise and chair this Group.

*Recommendation:*

*That ECC facilitate a regular Group to share knowledge and experience between the Districts implementing DPE.*

## **12 Role of ECC**

12.1 In addition to the tasks identified above, ECC has a very special role in its own right, if this project is to succeed.

12.2 ECC must draw up and agree with each District an agency agreement to delegate the DPE powers, and possibly other related measures, such as the powers for on-street charging. It is recommended that this Agreement should be kept separate from other Agreements, as it has a number of unique characteristics. It is heavily orientated around finance, and in particular, income and income surpluses. There are major implications of either party to such an Agreement deciding to terminate, and these need to be recognised, and spelled out. There are also the finance recovery measures proposed in this study, which have to be agreed.

12.3 Each District going down this path should sign the Agreement, subject to specific variances within the schedules to the agreement, which should be unique to each District, covering the exact financial circumstances.

12.4 ECC should prepare and submit to DETR the necessary SPA/PPA Application. It is understood from DETR that such a coordinated programme would probably simplify the Application process, and save time and effort particularly at the District level, as well as with ECC.

12.5 ECC should also monitor progress in each District within the programme, and should apply such pressure as it can to ensure that Districts keep to their timescales. It has to be recognised that once an Application is formally put to DETR, it has a date for commencement, and to fail to meet the date has implications; thereafter, for example, the Police cannot enforce, as they have no powers to act, except in cases of dangerous or obstructive parking.

12.6 ECC should also coordinate the standards and rules for issuing and

processing tickets, in order to try to establish a reasonably unified service and appearance of service across the county. To do so is to help the credibility and understanding of the new enforcement by the public.

12.7 ECC could also act as a clearing house for information and help, by keeping an up-to-date picture of where each District has reached in the programme, and being able to refer other Districts to the best source of potential help for specific issues.

***Recommendation:***

***That ECC accepts the above role and agree it as the base for future developments with each District.***

**13 Relationship to Southend on Sea and Thurrock Councils**

13.1 Meetings took place with officers from both of these Unitary Councils. Southend on Sea are committed to the implementation of DPE, and will be implementing the powers, subject to economic constraints within the LTP process. Thurrock have not formally evaluated the impact of DPE, but recognising the possibility that they may become surrounded by other authorities which have taken on the powers, they see the need to understand the impact for them.

13.2 Officers from both Councils expressed a strong wish to be kept informed of progress within Essex on this topic, and in particular from Southend on Sea, there was a recognition that major benefits could accrue to the Districts and ECC as well as to themselves, of joint planning and coordination of implementation.

13.3 The Essex Police will expect these two Councils to progress 'in tandem' with ECC to ensure a smooth and total transition across the whole of the Essex Police District.

***Recommendation:***

***That Southend on Sea and Thurrock Councils be invited to participate within the overall programme of implementation, excepting of course, for the financial arrangements proposed above.***

## **14 Common Issues, including the Agency Agreement**

### **14.1 Recommended List of Issues for Agreement**

14.1.1 The required Agency Agreement has to cover a wide range of issues, but the following list covers those where it is considered that most attention should be focused, as they may be the controversial ones:

- \* maintenance of an on-street account
- \* responsibility for capital costs
- \* responsibility for set-up expenses
- \* use of income to recover operational expenses
- \* use of surpluses after full recovery
- \* termination of the Agreement by either party
- \* timescales for implementation and recovery of investment
- \* conduct of the TRO review
- \* subsequent TRO and signs / lines maintenance
- \* use of the National Parking Adjudication Service

#### ***Recommendation:***

*That work should begin as soon as the general strategy is agreed, to formulate an Agreement that will act as the general form of Agreement for each District. Only detailed schedules should alter between Districts, covering such issues as the start date, the amount of investment by ECC and the pay-back programme.*

### **14.2 Joint Operations**

14.2.1 In the course of discussions with each District, the issue was raised about the scope for joint working, or of having services provided jointly, or from another District. There was common consent that such a move seemed to reflect the principles of Best Value, and that if there were genuine economies of scale, then efforts should be made to achieve them.

14.2.2 However, a number of issues mitigate against this theory. Districts will have to consider appeals against tickets issued in their name and in their own areas (unless they had been issued in the name of ECC), as they will be identified as the issuing authority. The legislation stipulates that representations must be considered by the issuing authority. Handling such correspondence is a very sensitive issue, and if done badly, as has happened elsewhere, it results in a

marked increase in correspondence to senior officers and Members. Districts are therefore advised to handle such matters themselves.

14.2.3 The main capital cost for ticket processing is the IT system required. Again, in theory, having one IT system for the whole county should offer economies of scale. However, setting up a network which could make this operate successfully would be very expensive, and would have to operate outside of the normal Council internal networks, to meet security of access standards. It is therefore almost certainly a much more expensive option than having a simple limited network within each Council.

14.2.4 The reality therefore is that joint operations are not tenable, and should not be pursued. Instead, each Council should aim to have similar, but independent systems.

***Recommendation:***

***That no detailed work should take place into the development of joint operations.***

## **Appendix A: Summary of District Views**

ESSEX COI COUNCIL - STUDY ON DECRIMINALISED PARKING ENFORCI  
SUMMARY OF DISTRICT and BOROUGH VIEWS

COUNCIL	CURRENT POSITION	CURRENT ATTITUDE TO DPE	POSSIBLE ATTITUDE IF POLICE WITHDRAW	SCALE
Basildon District Council	Enforcement is not a problem, except at some locations eg stations; some use of resident schemes, which Council enforces; little control over off-street parking esp. in Basildon;	Not interested; no ability to meet increased capital demand for set-up;	Would want to have DPE, but only to do it themselves, and would expect ECC to meet all deficits. Would probably accept external service provision for DPE.	2
Braintree District Council	Operate car parks as a service to support the economy of the towns; want to bring in some resident schemes; want to provide "cheap and convenient" parking; not in car parking to make money; Police provide adequate enforcement;	Not considered necessary; do not consider county wide scheme necessary; do not see need for single on and off-street regime; not keen on idea of charging on-street.	Would want to see if Members concerned; react if they are.	2
Brentwood Borough Council	Investigated DPE some time ago; Members strongly of the view that police enforcement is inadequate; want to increase current enforcement; progressing implementation of on-street charging	Keen to progress implementation; definitely see it as a Borough service to manage; not convinced of need for county wide implementation	Would only increase the need for better enforcement	5
Castle Point Borough Council	Parking enforcement is not a major problem; they have some small resident schemes, with more on the way; declining police resources noted with concern;	Members keen to have total enforcement control, although officers less keen; Members would accept a cost neutral scheme; see need for ECC to provide set-up funding;	Members will want DPE if police withdraw, and will want to do it as a Council;	3
Chelmsford Borough Council	Developed own parking policy; well developed local plans eg on-street charging; implementing CPZs; reviewing TROs	Members keen to DPE; actively want results of financial study; see police service as increasingly ineffective; do not see need for a county wide implementation;	Would only increase the recognition of the need to go DPE	4
Colchester Borough Council	DPE study completed; car parks charges regularly reviewed; on-street resident schemes run by BC; strong support for demand restraint. Police enforcement seen as inadequate.	Members and officers positive towards DPE, and want to be able to progress the implementation		5
Epping Forest District Council	Already got external contractor; considerable pressure for resident schemes; will shortly implement on-street charging; Police enforcement quite inadequate in many places; Essex Police taking over areas from Met Police;	Members keen on idea of DPE, particularly for areas where problems are greatest; want single regime across all of District; would want to do all of DPE themselves; agrees with principle of County wide rules for DPE; accept need to fund the scheme; would be prepared to enforce other Districts eg Harlow;	No change - seen as inadequate now.	4
Harlow District Council	Reducing involvement in car parks, with sale of some car parks; they run some on-street schemes, but with local enforcement, and non-standard on-street controls. Want to avoid need for new TROs, unless needed by safety.	Disinterested, and see no role for Council in on-street enforcement; Police enforcement adequate. Want to keep Members out of parking issues.	Recognise it may be necessary to take over enforcement, but that would responsibility of ECC, not HDC.	1
Maldon District Council	Happy with Police enforcement; compliance is not an issue; think police can do it better than they could, given location of bases eg Burnham; parking enforcement is only a very local issue in Maldon and Burnham - summer issue in latter mainly; recognise need to get drivers to use car parks; Burnham station is biggest problem area there; want to keep charges down, and are reducing them now; got small resident scheme;	Watching brief on DPE, following PCIEA going to Members; unlikely to be convinced that Council could do it better; concerned at possible cost;	Not keen to be involved.	2
Rochford District Council	Car parking service financially driven; Members keen to see increased levels of provision and control;	Members keen to see DPE introduced, but unsure of finances; would want to do it themselves; supports amalgamation of on and off-street; accepts paying for all operational costs, if capital setup centrally funded. Members would not support joint working.	Increased interest.	3

**ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL - STUDY ON DECRIMINALISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT  
SUMMARY OF DISTRICT and BOROUGH VIEWS**

COUNCIL	CURRENT POSITION	CURRENT ATTITUDE TO DPE	POSSIBLE ATTITUDE IF POLICE WITHDRAW	SCALE
Southend on Sea Borough Council	Perceive police resources as completely inadequate for effective enforcement; implementing policies which will increase parking pressures; want effective demand management policies; LTP Partnership committed to zero tolerance on illegal parking	Committed to the principle of DPE, and progressing DPE within LTP development; Members supportive, implementation could be complete within next 2 years, subject to funding. See DPE as strategically vital to develop parking strategies, as well as to all of south Essex.	Unlikely to have an impact, as the intention is to go DPE as soon as practical; possible short term problem if police resources further reduced before the Council is ready at the current pace.	4
Tendring District Council	Council has a large number of car parks to manage, plus one on-street resident schemes; very seasonal demand; most of the year there is little enforcement problems; but for the summer, the problems can be horrific; no on-street charging although it has been considered by Members;	Police enforcement adequate in winter, and totally inadequate in summer; Members aware of DPE, but issue has not been formally considered; would probably be keen if financially viable; would have to be District wide agency; sees merit in joint working to address seasonality;	Issue would rise up the agenda.	3
Thurrock Council	Police involvement seen as declining; on-street charging implemented; TRD review well advanced	Useful as a traffic management tool; not yet ready to go that way; recognise issue if rest of Essex goes DPE; waiting for Police to increase the pressure on them by declining enforcement further;	Would wish to keep pace with rest of neighbours, and would want to participate in an Essex wide plan.	3
Uttlesford District Council	Enforce car parks and on-street resident schemes; considered DPE, and now have a Member Parking Strategy Working Party considering the issue	Interested, but concerned about costs; waiting to be pushed forward; Members concerned at non-compliance; no policy	Would respond positively, and thought that Members would embrace DPE; probably want to enforce on-street themselves; willing to consider sharing operations	3

KEY: SCALE	MEANING:	SUMMARY
1	openly hostile towards DPE	1
2	negative towards DPE; no perception of a problem	3
3	interested, but not until pushed by lack of police enforcement	4
4	keen, actively pursuing the powers	3
5	resolution exists	1
		12

## **Appendix B: Outline Requirement for a GIS System for Traffic Regulation Orders**

Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) contain detailed descriptions of waiting and movement restrictions as set out in a specific street or area. These normally take the form of a detailed written description of the provisions giving rise to the restrictions, combined with written schedules of specific locations where the restriction is being introduced. A GIS / TRO Mapping System should be able to provide a means of viewing restriction data by plotting it against Ordnance Survey maps. It should also provide facilities to hold the relevant detailed text data about each TRO item, so that it can be presented to the user for any item selected from screen.

In addition to being able to hold current data, the system must also provide facilities to manage the data from day-to-day so that new restrictions can be designed and documented. The system must also provide the facility to manage the revocations of current orders and link this to confirmation of new orders where this is appropriate. It will be necessary for the system to maintain a history of the TROs in force from time to time. It must be possible for users to determine whether they wish to view restrictions currently in force, previously in force at a given point in time or those proposed for the future. Enquiries on the system should also enable data to be viewed by type of restriction, by specific TRO, by times of day or days of the week.

The system should provide the user with the ability to generate new restrictions on the GIS maps. Tools should be provided to help users determine the prolongation of kerbs, highway boundaries or building lines. There should also be the facility to help measure distances from these reference points, again with the assistance of tools provided by the system. In this way users should be able to select the start and end point of a restriction, after which the system should automatically plot the restriction in relation to the identified road feature e.g. kerb or centre line. Collection of the specific text information for each new item should be an integral part of the system and the plotting of the restriction, and the system should provide assistance in identifying the appropriate content for the item description e.g. suggestions as to the form of words to use and road names within the vicinity of the new item plotted.

The data held in relation to orders must be accessible by users in the form of printed reports. Where new orders are created the system should provide the facility of automatically generating draft schedules for the items entered. The schedules should be accessible via standard word processing packages to facilitate completion of the TRO document. Each item included within the schedule generated should be updated with a cross-referenced link to the schedule document. When viewing an item on the system it must be possible to access the linked documents if required by the users.



RTA 1991 - FINANCIAL MODEL OF IMPLEMENTATION

CLIENT: ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCILVERSION: BASE MODEL

MODEL VERSION:	1.1
MODEL DATE:	07-11-10

**MODEL OPTIONS SELECTED:****PARKING ATTENDANT TIME ALLOCATION:**

If the Parking Attendants have duties which reduce the effective time they will spend enforcing the parking regulations, this will be reflected by a proportional split being entered for the Other Duties (Enforcement Duties will adjust automatically).

Actions: Enter required percentages under On-Street and/or Off-Street

Non-Parking Enforcement Duties			Parking Enforcement
	Options:	Selected Option	Balance
On-Street	0 - 100%	0%	100%
Off-Street	0 - 100%	0%	100%

**ON-STREET PAY & DISPLAY CHARGING:**

The model has three possible options which can be selected as follows: -

- Current Select for no change to the current status on implementation of DPE
- New P&D-1 Includes the income and expenses derived from schedule "P&D-1"
- New P&D-1&2 Includes the income and expenses derived from schedule "P&D-1" and schedule "P&D-2".

Actions: Select one "Option" and copy over "Selected Option" to revise model

Options:	Selected Option	Option Number
Current	Current	1
New P&D-1	Refresh PCN Tables after Changing Selection	
New P&D-1&2		

**OFF-STREET CAR PARK CHARGING:**

The model has three possible options which can be selected as follows: -

- Current Select for no change to tariffs or transaction volumes
- Option 1 Considers revised tariffs, transaction volumes and distributions of transaction by tariff.
- Option 2 Considers same changes as Option 1 but for alternative tariff structure.

Actions: Select one "Option" and copy over "Selected Option" to revise model

Options:	Selected Option
Current	Current
Option 1	
Option 2	

**OFF-STREET CAR PARK TRANSACTION VOLUMES INCREASE**

This is the estimated increase in transaction volumes experienced in Off-Street Car Parks post DPE.

Apply percentage volume increase to "Current" income

Actions: Select the required option to apply or not apply the percentage change to "Current Income"; then Enter required percentage volume increase under "Selected Option"

Options:	Selected Option
Yes or No	Yes
0 - 100%	5%

**OFF-STREET CAR PARK CHARGING IN FREE CAR PARKS**

Selecting the "Yes" Option will include an estimated volume of transactions from Free Car Parks to be included in the calculation of "Off-Street Car Park Charging". It will also modify the Enforcement required now these Car Parks are charged for.

Actions: Select one "Option" and copy over "Selected Option" to revise model

Options:	Selected Option
Yes	No
No	

**CURRENT VAT RATE**

The model will use this rate for all calculations involving VAT e.g. Net income from parking tariffs or ECN Charges

Actions: Enter current VAT rate under "VAT Rate"

Range	VAT Rate
0 - 100%	17.5%