



**DECRIMINALISATION OF PARKING ENFORCEMENT AND
IMPLEMENTATION OF RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEMES**

A REVIEW BY THE OVERVIEW SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MAY 2002

CONTENTS:

- 1. Executive summary**
 - 1.1 Introduction**
 - 1.2 Terms of Reference**
 - 1.3 Content of Review**
 - 1.4 Evidence Gathering**
 - 1.5 Recommendations**

- 2. Background**
 - 2.1 Decriminalisation**
 - 2.2 Current waiting restrictions**
 - 2.3 Appeals against Parking Charge Notices**
 - 2.4 Residents Parking Schemes**

- 3. Review**
 - 3.1 Decriminalisation**
 - 3.2 Organisational Structure**
 - 3.3 Parking controls**
 - 3.4 Finances**
 - 3.5 Charges**
 - 3.6 Consultation**

APPENDIX 1

Notes from evidence gathering meetings

APPENDIX 2

Income from parking charge notices and other parking statistics from authorities in the Kent Parking Group

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Members of the Overview Scrutiny Committee agreed to undertake a review of the Decriminalisation of On-Street Parking Enforcement and implementation of Residents Parking Schemes.

1.2 The terms of reference of the Review were:

To examine the effectiveness of the implementation of decriminalisation of on-street parking throughout the Borough and the operational experience of such to date (including financial aspects).

To examine all aspects of the proposed revised Residents' Parking Schemes, including the public demand for additional schemes and requests for discontinuation of current schemes.

To compare the Gravesham experience in both these subjects with the experience of other peer Boroughs.

To issue a report, making recommendation for service improvements, to the Cabinet.

1.3 The context in which the review was undertaken was the devolution of parking enforcement to local authorities under the 1991 Road Traffic Act and Statutory Instrument 1999 No. 3314 which came into force on 4th January 2000.

1.4 A number of evidence gathering meetings were held from February to April 2002. A total of 9 witnesses were interviewed representing Gravesham Borough Council, Kent County Council, Thanet District Council, Medway Council, Peacock Street Neighbourhood Association and Wellington Street Residents Association.(Notes of these evidence gathering meetings, which have been agreed with the parties concerned, are attached at Appendix 1)

1.4 The recommendations to the Cabinet are:-

1.5.1. **Review all current waiting restrictions to identify those which are no longer needed and where additional restrictions are required.**

1.5.2. **The management of on and off-street parking be consolidated under a single department within Engineering Services**

1.5.3. **Move towards flexible working between parking inspectors and parking attendants as soon as possible so as to take account of the introduction of pay and display within the Council's car parks**

1.5.4. **Investigate the introduction of Controlled Parking Zones within Gravesend Town Centre, which could combine proposed residents parking schemes with on street pay and display.**

- 1.5.5. Allow the purchasers of Resident Parking Scheme Permits to park free of charge in Council owned car parks which have a Pay and Display regime at night subject to limitation.**
- 1.5.6. Prioritise the use of the revenue from on-street parking to provide sufficient parking attendants to enforce effectively current and immediate future parking restrictions.**
- 1.5.7. Introduce an annual visitors permit on a 1 per household basis at a cost of 50% of a residents permit as an alternative to the purchase of daily tickets.**
- 1.5.8. Introduce the block sale of visitors permits to Health Organisations for use by their peripatetic members/staff when visiting clients within Gravesham**
- 1.5.9. Consultation on petitions for existing and future residents parking schemes to be Ward Member led, who will determine, in consultation with Engineering Services, the best consultation method to use. Make the general requirement to be a positive response in excess of 50% of the respondents to any consultation document before the petition goes to the Joint Transportation Board for decision.. All requests by way of petition which have been submitted to the Council and are awaiting consideration to be processed on this basis as soon as possible, with a time-table to be submitted to the Joint Transportation Board for Member agreement.**

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Decriminalisation

Decriminalisation came about through Kent Police withdrawing from parking enforcement. Kent County Council as the Highways and Traffic Authority, had to make the application for decriminalisation. It had then to formally delegate the operational and financial management to the Kent District Councils. Any District could have refused to implement decriminalisation and in that case the County would have had to consider how to implement and run the schemes across Kent. However, all District Councils in Kent had taken on the enforcement role. There was a perception that KCC would have been unlikely to achieve an effective parking enforcement service across Kent run centrally from Maidstone. Local delivery of parking management was crucial to achieving effectiveness.

2.2 Current waiting restrictions

List of waiting/loading restrictions supported by Traffic Regulation Orders

Description	Carriageway Markings	
No waiting at any times	Double yellow line	
No waiting at any time No loading 08.30 - 18.30 Mon - Sat	Double yellow line + single kerb blips @ about 2m c/c	
No waiting at any time No loading 10.30 - 16.30 Mon - Sat		
No waiting at any time No loading Mon - Sat between the hours 07.30 - 09.30 & 16.30 - 18.30		
No waiting at any time No loading between 07.00 - 00.00 midnight		
No waiting + No loading Mon - Fri 08.00 - 09.30 & 14.30 - 16.00		
No waiting at any time No loading at any time		Double yellow line + double kerb blip @ about 2m c/c
No waiting 08.00 - 18.30 Mon - Sat		Single yellow line
No waiting between 08.00 - 10.00 Mon - Fri		
No waiting 13.00 - 13.30 Mon - Fri		
No waiting 12.30 - 13.00 Mon - Fri		
No waiting 12.00 - 12.30 Mon - Fri		
Parking place Mon - Sat 07.00 - 19.00 Maximum stay 2 hours limit Residents permit - no limit	White box marking	
Parking place 08.00 - 18.30 Maximum stay 1 hour Residents no time limit Residents only 18.30 - 08.00		
No stopping on 'School Keep Clear' markings with sign		School zig zags as described

Current waiting restrictions (cont)

Description	Carriageway Markings
Bus Stop Clearway	300mm thick single yellow line with words ' Bus Stop'
Bus/Coach bays	Yellow box markings with 'Bus/Coach'
Taxi Rank	Yellow box marking with 'Taxis'
Disabled Drivers Parking Bay	White box marking with word 'Disabled'
Loading Bay	White box marking with 'Loading Only'
Doctors Bay	White box marking with 'Doctor'

2.4 Appeals against Parking Charge Notices

An appeal system in which people can have confidence is vital to public acceptance of Decriminalisation. Evidence given by Mr Easterbrook outlined the use of the National Adjudication Service by GBC in recognition of this principle.

2.4 Residents Parking Scheme

In Gravesend Town Centre a residents parking scheme was introduced in the early 80's under the control of Traffic Wardens managed by Kent County Constabulary. No charge was made for resident's permits. The roads included in the scheme are listed below:-

Arthur Street	East Terrace	Sheppy Pl./Victoria Ave
Berkley Road	Edwin Street	Spencer Street
Bernard Street	Gordon Place	St. Andrew's Road
Brandon Street	Grange Road	St. James's Avenue
Clarence Row	Lennox Avenue	St James's Road
Clarendon Road	Lennox Road	The Avenue
Cobham Street	Lennox Road East	The Grove
Cumberland Avenue	Peacock Street	Trafalgar Road
Cutmore Street	Royal Pier Road	Waterloo Street
Darnley Road	Saddington Street	Wellington Street
Darnley Street		Wilfred Street

Because of the lack of police enforcement, no credibility attached to this scheme. Such lack of enforcement also negated any debate, which might have arisen from the impact of enforcement, including consideration of whether some streets should be withdrawn from the scheme through majority resident preference.

Feedback to some Committee members from residents within their Wards living in some of the above streets reinforced this point indicating that there would be resistance to the proposed charge for permits without adequate enforcement.

Non permit holders may park in the bays for up to 2hrs between 07.00 and 19.00 Mon - Sat. Outside these hours non -residents can park without time limit.

OUTCOME OF REVIEW

3.1 Decriminalisation.

GBC started the process of decriminalisation of parking enforcement towards the end of 1997 with a review of yellow lines and other waiting restrictions to ensure they matched the then current register of Consolidated Traffic Regulation Orders.

Advice by Kent County Council, in the light of experience of other Districts/Boroughs, was to delay a review of whether some waiting restrictions were no longer needed or new restrictions required until decriminalisation had "settled down"

Now that some time has elapsed, a full review is seen as appropriate.

Recommendation 1.5.1:

Review all current waiting restrictions to identify those which are no longer needed and where additional restrictions are required.

3.2 Effectiveness of the implementation of decriminalisation.

Although evidence given by resident groups, and anecdotal "evidence" by GBC Councillors, revealed a public perception that parking restrictions are not being enforced effectively. This is at variance with the statistical comparative evidence of Parking Charge Notices issued (see Appendix 2).

Clearly such statistical evidence relates to an average figure for GBC's relatively small number of Parking Attendants (possibly explaining the public perception). There needs to be, not only a measure of EFFICIENCY, but also a measure of how many Parking Attendants are needed to provide an effective enforcement regime for on-street, at present, and in off-street car parks when Pay and Display has been implemented sufficient to gain public credibility.

Other Councils interviewed held a similar view that effective enforcement was the key to the success of decriminalisation.

A Kent Parking Group has been established, comprising 13 Kent Local Authorities, KCC and Hastings, This group will consider all aspects of parking management, Best Value review outcomes and the collection of benchmarking data.

The exchange of information within this group could be the catalyst to the development of performance indicators and the intention is to include this subject when undertaking the overall review of the implementation of the recommendations contained within this report which are agreed by the Cabinet.

3.3 Organisational structure.

Gravesham currently has their on and off-street parking managed by 3 different departments within the authority:-

Engineering Services, who have responsibility for the consultation and implementation of on street parking schemes.

Building and Town Services, who are responsible for the management of off street parking.

Financial Services, who manage the parking attendants and collect the fines.

Gravesham and Oxford are reported to be the only authorities that have adopted Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement who manage on and off-street parking as separate entities. In the case of Oxford this is because the County Council has retained the on-street enforcement role.

Additionally, evidence given suggests that operational efficiencies can be achieved by combining everything in one section.

Recommendation 1.5.2:

The management of on and off-street parking be consolidated under a single department within Engineering Services.

Evidence given by Medway and Thanet Councils whose off-street car parks have a "Pay & Display" payment system-indicated that they achieve maximum operational efficiency by having a single set of Parking Attendants, under one management, who enforce both off- street and on-street parking .

Gravesham's own intention to introduce "Pay & Display" in Rathmore Road Car Park, in place of "pay on exit", combined with the Angelsea Car Park being managed by the freeholder in future indicates that there will be a decreasing role for the staff employed to "manage" Council car parks but an increasing need for an enforcement regime associated with "Pay & Display".

Recommendation 1.5.3:

Move towards flexible working between parking inspectors and parking attendants as soon as possible so as to take account of the introduction of pay and display within the Council's car parks.

3.4 Parking controls.

Before the advent of Residents parking Schemes the purpose of parking controls was generally for safety reasons and to preserve the free flow of traffic on major routes.

Residents Parking Schemes (RPS) fulfil a different function in that they are intended to give preference to residents who wish to park near their property at night and at weekends. However, it is important for residents to understand that they are not guaranteed a parking space, merely exempted from whatever enforcement regime is introduced.

The demand for such schemes arises out of a perceived nuisance from; commuter parking, local worker parking and leisure activity parking including people attending places of worship.

If a RPS confines parking to residents only all day, then it effectively 'sterilises' a street and can work to the disadvantage of visitors to nearby shops, visiting tradesmen, health workers etc.

Evidence given by Kent County Council reinforced this point and it is for this reason that they are responsible for agreeing what is proposed and to have the right of veto if it considers the proposals to be unreasonable.

A Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) defines an area in which every part of the highway within the zone must have a restriction. CPZs need signs at the entrance and exit to the zone and have lesser requirements for signs within the zone reducing street clutter. If streets in the immediate vicinity of a CPZ are excluded from the zone, then signing can become very complex. Evidence given by Medway Council, who use CPZ's almost exclusively, revealed that there is a tendency for parking to migrate to those uncontrolled streets. Thus such exclusion should be resisted.

A CPZ can include residents parking schemes and on street pay and display.

Kent County Council has no formal policy on the introduction of CPZs.

Recommendation 1.5.4:

Investigate the introduction of Controlled Parking Zones within Gravesend Town Centre which could combine proposed residents parking schemes with on street pay and display.

Recommendation 1.5.5:

Allow purchasers of Resident Parking Permits to park free of charge in Council owned car parks which have a Pay and Display regime at night subject to limitation.

3.5 Finances

Income and Expenditure – Car Parking Enforcement as at 13 March 2002

	Actual 1999-00	Actual 2000-01	Probable 2001-02	Estimate 2002-03
	£	£	£	£
Set Up Costs	48,011			
Employees	22,088	73,276	82,990	110,170
Running Expenses	682	28,382	50,550	49,440
Support Services	8,074	24,843	31,960	32,800
Total Expenditure	78,855	126,501	165,500	192,410
PCN Income	(32,977)	(163,098)	(203,000)	(245,000)
Total Income	(32,977)	(163,098)	(203,000)	(245,000)
Net Income	45,878	(36,597)	(37,500)	(52,590)
Rathmore Road car park improvements				50,000
Contribution to Decrim Reserve	0	0	10,000	10,000
Funding of Highways work	0	0	11,500	0
Net (Surplus)/ Deficit for the year	45,878	(36,597)	(16,000)	7,410
Cumulative (Surplus)/ Deficit	45,878	9,281	(6,719)	691

Total expenditure estimated 2002-03 includes £50,000 for Rathmore Road
The reserve is to be used for the future replacement of equipment

Oral evidence to the Committee by Medway and Thanet Councils indicated that they had found it essential that any surplus should be directed, in the first instance, to the employment of as many Parking Attendants as were needed to obtain public credibility for satisfactory enforcement of waiting restrictions, particularly when introducing Residents' Parking Schemes with a permit charge and assuming responsibility for on-street enforcement.

This is particularly pertinent for Gravesham at this time with a recent decision to use a future surplus for Capex associated with car park "Pay & Display" equipment.

The Council is allowed to keep the penalties from "on-street" parking offences, but is required by law to use any surplus income for other parking related schemes.

The spending of surplus income over £50,000 requires approval from Kent County Council but is ring fenced to the local area.

Income from off street car parks, including enforcement fines, is available to the Authority's budget generally. However, there needs to be an apportionment of shared costs of parking attendants in regard of their on street enforcement duties.

Recommendation 1.5.6:

Prioritise the use of the revenue from on-street parking enforcement to provide sufficient Parking Attendants to enforce current and immediate future parking restrictions.

3.6 Charges.

Penalty Charge Notices (PCN):

Level of PCN	Paid within 14 days	Paid between 14 & 28 days	Paid after 28 days
£60	£30	£60	£90

The proposed charge for a Residents Permit is £30 and for visitors permits £2 /day. Visitors' permits are made available by the authorities giving evidence on the same basis as those proposed by Gravesham Borough Council, but also on the scale of one per household at a cost of 50% of the Residents Permit charge. This is seen to assist residents who have numerous visitors.

Additionally, these authorities also negotiate the block sale of Visitors Permits to Health Organisations to avoid the problems that the parking restrictions can cause their peripatetic care workers.

(Comparisons of charges and income with other authorities in the Kent Parking Group are reproduced at Appendix 2)

Recommendation 1.5.7:

Investigate the introduction of an annual visitor's permit on a 1 per household basis at a cost of 50% of a resident's permit as an alternative to the purchase of daily tickets.

Recommendation 1.5.8:

Investigate the block sale of visitor's permits to Health Organisations for use by their peripatetic members/staff when visiting clients within Gravesham.

3.7 Consultation.

Consultation on the introduction of new parking schemes and amendments to existing ones is very important. It is very difficult to obtain representative opinions from all groups who were likely to be affected by any proposals and a view needs to be taken as how non responses to consultation should be addressed.

The favoured consulting method is currently through leaflet drops to residents.

In some instances public meetings are held but attendance at such meetings was largely from objectors and a strong chairman was needed to ensure that all points of view were represented.

When a new scheme is being considered Medway, for example, sends out a 6 page colour leaflet describing the proposals with maps and photographs of how the scheme will be signed. The last page is a simple questionnaire with 3 questions seeking the respondent's views on the proposed scheme.

Both Thanet and Medway saw a positive majority of residents who chose to respond as necessary for a Residents Parking Scheme proposal to proceed. i.e. 50% plus of those who responded. Their experience had also indicated that Ward Member led requests for new schemes, i.e. the initial requests channelled through the Member, worked better in determining true need.

Recommendation 1.5.9:

Consultation on petitions for existing and future residents parking schemes to be Ward Member led, who will determine, in consultation with Engineering Services the best consultation method to use. The general requirement to be a positive response in excess of 50% of the respondents to any consultation document before the petition can go to the Joint Transportation Board. All requests by way of petition which have been submitted to the Council and are awaiting consideration to be actioned on this basis on a time-scale yet to be agreed.

APPENDIX 1

OVERVIEW SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

REVIEW: Decriminalisation of on-street parking enforcement and implementation of residents parking schemes

VENUE: Civic Centre - Gravesend - 7th February 2002

PRESENT: Councillors: M Snelling (Chair)
J Christie
D Turner
R Smith
C Meredith
D Thomas
W Dyke

IN ATTENDANCE: Mrs S Whatmough – Head of Democratic Services
Mr D Finch – Corporate Policy Officer (Scrutiny Research)

INTERVIEWEE: Mr Norman Easterbrook – Head of Engineering Services

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE GIVEN TO MEMBERS

1. Mr Easterbrook began by saying the GBC started the process of decriminalisation of parking enforcement towards the end of 1997 with a review of yellow lines and other waiting restrictions. The authority had maintained an up to date register of consolidated traffic regulation orders and in the light of this Kent County Council advised that a detailed review was not entirely necessary, so it was never completed.
2. At this very early stage of the decriminalisation process there weren't many authorities to benchmark with or seek advice from.
3. Winchester were among the first, but tried to introduce decriminalisation and consolidate their traffic regulations at the same time. This proved to be over ambitious and took many months to sort out.
4. GBC decided to stick with what it had in terms of waiting restrictions and consolidated orders, introduce decriminalisation and carry out a review when the process had settled down.
5. Now that enforcement is in the hands of the authority we are in a position to complete the original review so that new schemes can be introduced and unnecessary yellow lines and waiting restrictions can be removed.
6. Mr Easterbrook's role is a technical one with responsibility for the consultation and development of proposed schemes, the removing of existing waiting restrictions and the issuing of permits. His department also employs a consultant to complete the complex legal processes associated with traffic regulations.

7. Mr Easterbrook was of the opinion that the management of both on-street and off-street parking would be better served and resourced if it was a self-contained unit under the highways arm of Engineering Services. The current position where the responsibility is divided between 3 departments, Engineering Services, Asset Management and Revenues is far from ideal. He added that of the 61 Local Authorities who had adopted Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement powers only Gravesham and Oxford had opted to keep on and off street car parking separate. In the case of Oxford this was because the County Council had retained the on street enforcement role.
8. He felt that enforcement and residents parking schemes were first and foremost a traffic issue and the revenue they raised, whilst an important source of income for the authority, was secondary.
9. Mr Easterbrook was asked whether alternative parking control schemes, such as parking meters, had been considered.
10. He said that parking meters were very costly to install and maintain and the authority would be advised to install a pay and display system, as fewer machines were needed. He went on to add that as our off-street parking was redeveloped pay and display would be introduced.
11. This would need an increase in parking attendants to maintain the public perception that the schemes were being properly enforced. He felt that 6 parking attendants would be an acceptable number.
12. Mr Easterbrook was asked whether there was an Independent Adjudication service to deal with appeals. He replied that there was a National Parking Adjudication Service based in Manchester. A similar service exists for London Boroughs and was used by authorities outside London before the NPAs was set up.
13. Moving on to the introduction of residents parking schemes, Mr Easterbrook was asked what consultation took place before any proposed scheme was put before the highways sub committee of the authority.
14. He believed that letter drops to residents within proposed schemes was the right way, although he did concede that the views of other members of the public who would be affected by the scheme, were not canvassed. However he added that canvassing the views of casual parkers and tradesmen would be extremely difficult and was likely to be unrepresentative.
15. In some instances a public meeting was considered to be a better option but the attendances at such meetings were largely objectors and a strong chairman was needed to ensure that all points of view were represented.
16. It is being considered that area meetings be held with objectors resident in streets within proposed schemes.
17. GBC have tried to introduce types of schemes which are:-

The Existing Town Centre Scheme -

No waiting 7 am - 7 pm Monday to Saturday except for a period not exceeding 2 hours, no return within 1 hour.

Vehicles displaying a resident's parking permit are exempt from the above time limited waiting restriction.

18. The initial change after consultations in December 1999 proposed 2 one hour periods am and pm when vehicles not displaying a residents permit could park. These evolved during 2000 at the end of which the following scheme was advertised by public notice.

Berkley Road, Bernard Street and Wilfred Street:

Residents' parking bays for permit holders only Monday to Sunday inclusive except 10:30 am to 11:30 am and 2:30 pm to 3:30 pm when non-permit holders would also be able to park.

£30 pa for resident's permit.

£2/day for visitor's permit (limited to 100 max).

AND all other roads.

Residents' parking bays for permit holders only Monday to Sunday inclusive except 8:30 am to 9:30 am and 3 pm to 4 pm when non-permit holders would also be able to park.

£30 pa for residents permit.

£2/day for visitors permit (limited to 100 max).

19. KCC raised an objection to the above so the next proposal in April 2001 was:-

Residents' parking bays for permit holders only Monday to Sunday inclusive except 8:30 am to 6:30 pm when non-permit holders can park for up to 1 hour, no return within 2 hours.

£30 pa for resident's permit.

£2/day for visitor's permit (limited to 100 max).

20. This was re-advertised in December 2001.
21. It was pointed out that having a permit, whether free or subject to a fee, did not entitled the permit holder to a parking space it only gave exemption to the waiting restrictions pertaining in the scheme.
22. Some types of residents parking scheme such as residents only or ones with heavily restricted casual parking and those operating for 7 days a week have been rejected by KCC.
23. The scheme to be introduced in Meopham does not operate on weekends as it addresses the problem of commuter parking.
24. More casual parking is available on Sundays as the single yellow line waiting restrictions do not operate.
25. Another problem was that of commuter coaches. GBC were talking to coach companies on how to solve the problem. Options suggested had been reducing the number of pick

up points and looking for a site for additional car parking. With some 80 coach movements/day in some residential roads there was no simple answer to this problem.

26. Mr Easterbrook concluded that some other options needed further examination, he felt that some roads warranted resident's only schemes. There had been very limited application of this type of scheme in the county apart from Canterbury where special circumstance had been agreed by KCC.
27. The enforcement of limited waiting schemes was very resource intensive requiring many visits by Parking Attendants to determine illegal parking.
28. The public perception on enforcement was critical if the authority was not to lose its credibility and the residents become dissatisfied with the value for money they were getting for their permit.

Follow-up meeting with Norman Easterbrook
9th April 2002

Present:

Councillors: M V Snelling (Chair)
K Jones
D Turner

In Attendance: Mrs S Whatmough, Head of Democratic Services
Mr D Finch, Corporate Policy Officer

1. The issue of whether or not KCC had the right of veto over proposed residents parking schemes was still somewhat confused. It was decided to write on behalf of the Committee to seek clarification and, at the same time, ask how GBC could raise the limit of surplus income, at which KCC spending approval is required, from £50k to £100k.
2. Both Medway and Thanet Councils have effectively combined on-street pay and display and residents parking schemes within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). Mr Easterbrook was asked if zones of this type could be introduced in Gravesham. He replied that on-street pay and display was easy to enforce and provided additional income and he had it in mind to introduce similar zones in certain areas. He added that pay and display machines were fairly expensive (£3,000 each).
3. Mr Easterbrook said that a "one size fits all" approach is inappropriate. When a Controlled Parking Zone or Residents Parking Scheme is proposed there is a need to address the requirements of each area and identify solutions to specific issues.
4. He reiterated the need to explain the 'pros' and 'cons' very carefully when carrying out consultation on any proposed scheme.
5. Mr Easterbrook said that removing some of the unnecessary waiting restrictions, would maximise the amount of on-street parking.
6. When asked how many Parking Attendants were needed for effective enforcement of on-street parking, Mr Easterbrook thought that 6 to 8 would be sufficient. He added that when pay and display was introduced in our off-street car parks this number would need to be increased to 10-12 to cover this additional enforcement role.

OVERVIEW SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

REVIEW: Decriminalisation of on-street parking and implementation of residents parking schemes

VENUE: Civic Centre - Gravesend -7th February 2002

PRESENT: Councillors:- M Snelling (Chair)
C Meredith
D Turner

IN ATTENDANCE: Mrs S Whatmough - Head of Democratic Services
Mr D Finch - Corporate Policy Officer (Scrutiny Research)

INTERVIEWEE: Mrs Jane Worrell - Revenues Manager

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE GIVEN TO MEMBERS:

1. Mrs Worrell had only recently taken over responsibility for Parking Attendants and the issue and collection of parking fines.
2. Mrs Worrell started by describing her responsibilities which were to send the Parking Attendants into the Borough to place a Parking Charge Notice (PCN) on any illegally parked vehicles. She also had responsibility for the administration and collection of parking fines and responding to enquiries from the public.
3. When decriminalisation was introduced in January 2000 Gravesham Borough Council had 3 Parking Attendants, during the intervening time this peaked at 3½ and currently there were 2. Due to the introduction of new Resident's Parking Schemes in April 2002 interviews for 3 additional Parking Attendants had taken place, 2 were due to start in February and the third in March.
4. Each Parking Attendant had to undergo a weeks training which covered both on and off-street parking and had to be supplied with a uniform. Parking Charge Notices can only be issued by a Parking Attendant in uniform.
The Parking Attendants work a staggered shift system which, due to the impending arrival of 3 new Parking Attendants, is under review.
5. When there was staff sickness and holidays, trying to match the public expectation of enforcement was very difficult. The staff had to be very flexible in their work patterns. When staff numbers were reduced for whatever reason they were concentrated in areas of most demand. When pressed Mrs Worrell felt that an ideal number of Parking Attendants would be 8, though a better estimate of numbers could be made after the 5 PAs have been operating for a period of time. The number of PAs would have to be reviewed in the light of any new schemes that may have been introduced could be taken into account. Currently there was no overtime pay for Saturdays and Sundays
6. Mrs Worrell considered the public to be generally unaware of the local allowances for yellow lines, loading etc. that were permitted within the Traffic Regulations She was

considering publishing a list of what the parking signs mean in a local paper to keep the public informed of what was permissible.

7. Mrs Worrell was asked what, if any, performance monitoring of Parking Attendants was carried out. She replied that no performance indicators were used. However, the expectation was that a Parking Attendant would issue about 15 Parking Charge Notices per day.
8. Benchmarking was done through the Kent Parking Group meetings.
9. As new parking schemes were introduced the intention was to have high profile enforcement of these areas to generate public confidence in the scheme.
10. In 2000/2001 Gravesham issued just over 10,000 Parking Charge Notices. Of the 10,000 PCNs issued up to 4th February 2002, 3000 had not been paid and of that 3,000, 1,800 were capable of being paid.
11. Returning to the resourcing issue, Mrs Worrell said that she had 1 member of staff, the Parking Manager, who deals with the administration of the PCNs and looks after the PAs. Other than that it is the responsibility of the Senior Recovery Officer to cover when the Parking Manager is on holiday or off sick. As Revenues Manager she also had responsibility for Council Tax collection and both these put a lot of pressure onto her staff.
12. The prospect of even more Parking Schemes being introduced with the resultant rise in Parking Charge Notices issued would increase the workload on her staff and their ability to cope would be severely tested.

OVERVIEW SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

<u>REVIEW:</u>	Decriminalisation of on-street parking enforcement and implementation of residents parking schemes
<u>VENUE:</u>	Compass Centre - Chatham - 11th February 2002
<u>PRESENT:</u>	Councillor M V Snelling Councillor K Jones
<u>IN ATTENDANCE:</u>	Mrs S Whatmough - Head of Democratic Services Mr D Finch - Corporate Policy Officer (Scrutiny Research)
<u>INTERVIEWEE:</u>	Mr Keith Hanshaw - Traffic Management and Parking Manager, Medway Council

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE GIVEN TO MEMBERS:

1. Mr. Hanshaw started by describing how parking enforcement was configured at Medway.
2. There is a Parking Office in Chatham Town Centre. There are 17 Parking Attendants, 3 Supervisors, a Parking Officer and Assistant who have responsibility for on and off-street parking. In addition, there are 3 staff at The Brook and Market Hall multi-storey car parks but they do not have a role in enforcement. There is a Notice Process Office which has 6 Admin. Assistants, a Parking Officer and Assistant. They have responsibility for parking tickets and the issuing of permits. Any requests for new parking schemes are dealt with by 4 staff in Traffic Management, though this is not their sole task.
3. In Medway consultation on decriminalisation was very clear using the local press and 5 Town Centre Forums.
4. No review of existing Waiting Restrictions was carried out. This was to be undertaken through a ward-by-ward review that was started after decriminalisation had been implemented.
5. Medway, being a Unitary Council formed by joining together Rochester-upon-Medway City Council and Gillingham Borough Council, had many different Traffic Regulation Orders that were badly written, badly signed and consequently impossible to enforce. A consultant was employed to consolidate all these Traffic Orders. Mr Hanshaw said that this was an essential pre-requisite to the successful implementation of decriminalisation. To have attempted to consolidate all the Traffic Orders and implement decriminalisation at the same time would have been to invite disaster.
6. The ward-by-ward review that had been started post decriminalisation was considered by Members and Senior Officers to be able to be undertaken on a one a month basis. Mr Hanshaw said that this was impossible as the review had to be very thorough and consultation was a very important part of the review process. There are 26 wards and Mr Hanshaw said that rather like painting the Forth Bridge when the review of all 26 wards was complete (3-4 years) it would be time to start again and repeat the exercise.

7. January 2000, the introduction of decriminalisation, revealed many businesses were working around illegal parking having come to an "understanding" with the Traffic Wardens. There was a need to encourage businesses that things had changed. What they had been getting away with for the previous 20 years was no longer possible, decriminalisation and 15 Parking Attendants enforcing parking and waiting restrictions had seen to that. The main problem centred around loading and unloading.
8. Medway's philosophy for issuing of PCN's was 'if you can't ticket all illegally parked vehicles in a street then don't ticket any'
9. Medway's preferred option to tackle its parking problems is the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). A CPZ requires every inch of road within an area to have some form of restriction, i.e. parking bays and yellow lines.
10. The usual operating time for a CPZ in Medway is 8 am - 7 pm. There are some that operate 8 am - 10 pm with no waiting, and one scheme that operates until midnight in one particular road due to a night club.
11. Before introducing any scheme consultation on a ward-by-ward basis is undertaken. The Ward Councillor is also heavily involved. The Council maintains a file for each ward containing information on all its parking problems.
12. Following consultation a scheme will be introduced if it is supported by greater than 50% of those who responded to the consultation, irrespective of the response rate. A response rate of 20% is considered to be good, but it is usually much lower. How to deal with those who cannot be bothered to respond is being looked at by Members. Schemes are automatically reviewed after 6 months. If the residents of any road within a CPZ wish to be excluded from the scheme, they are forced to be included otherwise the road will become a free car park.
13. Medway charges £15 for a residents permit, £15 for a carer's permit and £15 for a visitors permit (1 per property). A scratchcard is available for 50p/day and are sold to residents and businesses within a controlled area.
14. There is a proposal for NHS Trusts to purchase bulk permits, at a discount, for peripatetic staff such as midwives though the need for a permit would have to be justified.
15. Mr Hanshaw was asked how he dealt with anomalies such as church activities and sports clubs within a controlled zone. He said that for things like a funeral service, provided that the Council is notified in advance, they would not enforce the restrictions during the service.
16. For people taking part in sports activities there are "shared use bays" which have a pay and display machine for non permit holders.
17. The sort of incomes generated were:-

Parking Charge Notices	-	£1m
Residents Permits/Scratchcards	-	£250,000

On street pay & display - £95,000

18. Medway issued 1000 PCNs/week.
19. There were currently 17 Parking Attendants and this will expand to 25 and Mr Hanshaw thought that this would probably rise to a maximum of 40.
20. Commuter parking both rail and coach had yet to be resolved.
21. Mr Hanshaw said that the level of enforcement would increase and this would affect businesses more than residents. He was aware that they were not meeting the public's expectation on enforcement with the current number of PAs.

OVERVIEW SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

REVIEW: **Decriminalisation of on-street parking enforcement and implementation of residents parking schemes**

VENUE: **Civic Centre - Gravesend - 18th February 2002**

PRESENT: **Councillors: M V Snelling (Chair)**
 D Turner
 J Christie
 K Jones

IN ATTENDANCE: **Mrs S Whatmough - Head of Democratic Services**
 Mr D Finch - Corporate Policy Officer (Scrutiny Research)

INTERVIEWEES: **Mr P Wright**
 Mr R Spicer
 Councillor K Gregory (all from Thanet Council)

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE GIVEN TO MEMBERS

1. Thanet is a relatively financially deprived area and as such Thanet Members were keen to develop an overall scheme for decriminalisation that would be self-funding and would not be a burden on the general charge payer. It was considered necessary to obtain objective evidence to enable accurate predictions of income and expenditure prior to presenting a case to Members. As part of this process a working party was set up in 1997.
2. To gain this objective information some isolated residents parking schemes were introduced. These, as well as some existing 'on street' pay and display and time limited bays, were managed by Council employed parking staff. The residents' schemes were successful and further information was gained from refining and building on schemes already operating in Birchington to establish a Controlled Parking Zone. The Controlled Parking Zone had pay and display, time limited waiting and resident's parking controls. The parking restrictions within the Controlled Parking Zone were divided into 3 zones; the inner zone - short-term pay and display; middle zone - parking restricted to one hour and the outer zone - long-term at 4 hours.
3. Data from this and other later projects provided Officers with the objective information about the management of 'on street' parking which they then used to predict and evaluate long term district wide income and expenditure streams.
4. Thanet currently has 14 Parking attendants who enforce both on and off street parking, with an extra 2 Parking Attendants for the summer.
5. There are 3 office staff who administer the 14 Parking Attendants and Parking Charge Notices.

6. Mr Spicer, as Community Services Manager, has overall responsibility for the Parking Attendants and the management of all the administrative procedures associated with the day to day operation of decriminalised parking. Mr Wright is responsible for the introduction, development and consultation procedures relating to all Traffic Regulation Orders including resident schemes.
7. The Parking Attendants currently work shifts 8am - 6pm seven days a week. Irregular patrols are made in the evenings and a 24-hour service is available, though rarely called upon.
8. Mr Wright said that Thanet has both residents parking schemes and Controlled Parking Zones. In Birchington, the Controlled Parking Zone contains time-limited waiting, pay and display and residents parking as part of the zone.
9. Their residents parking schemes are based on the KCC model undercover of which formal time limited parking is introduced which is available to all motorists. Local residents and their visitors however, having found a space, may park for longer than the authorised limit as long as they display a valid permit on the windscreen.
10. They have no resident only schemes.
11. Thanet currently charges £20 for a residents permit reduced from an original £60. £2/day for a visitors permit or a book of 20 permits at £1/day.
12. There are two forms of permit, annual and weekly and these apply to waiting restrictions only.
The annual permit is applicable to three groups :-
 - voluntary community service workers - no charge.
 - professional community service workers - £10
 - commercial users - £100

The weekly permit is site specific and applies to waiting and parking restrictions.

 - all applicants - £15

The Parking Office in consultation with the Highway Unit processes annual permits. The Highway Unit processes weekly permits.
13. Just prior to the start of decriminalisation, the Highway Unit issued over a 100 letters to Members, Parish Councils, Chambers of Commerce, residents associations, utility companies, local organisations and similar groups to give notice of the Council's intention to take over the enforcement of parking and waiting restrictions with all that that implied. They were given the chance to comment and, in respect of annual permits, only a few groups asked about future procedures and only a few annual voluntary permits have been issued.
14. Thanet's policy on resident schemes is one which is driven by the residents who have to approach the authority with a request for a scheme. They have to show that there is a significant majority living within a potential zone who would support a scheme. This is

taken to be about 70% of residents. Schemes are considered in areas where most residents have little option but to park on the highway.

15. Members are advised of any such substantiated request and they will decide if an informal consultation within the defined zone should take place. A standard document is issued to all householders who may then, having access to all the facts, reply on the form provided. The results of the consultation are then referred to Members.
16. Members will look to see if at least 70% of those who responded are in favour and decide, based on several factors, whether to begin the making of a formal Order to introduce a scheme.
17. Thanet tries to provide a balanced scheme. When a scheme is proposed a great deal of analysis takes place as to the relationship between supply and demand, the viability of the project in terms of management and income and the ability to strike a balance between the needs of all local road users.
18. If there is the potential for more permit requests than spaces available then Members will be advised that it is technically a sub-standard scheme.
19. Mr Spicer said that any residents' scheme, even with permits at £60, will not make money. Pay and display and other income sources are needed to underwrite residents' schemes. Thanet negotiated with KCC for a £100K profit limit rather than the standard £50K.
20. Thanet issues some 23,000 Parking Charge Notices a year with a population of 126,000. They have a high number of unregistered or incorrectly registered vehicles and any authority would be doing well if it had 60% of its fines paid.
21. Thanet has fewer appeals than similar authorities. They operate a policy of using a digital camera to photograph the vehicle with the Parking Charge Notice on it. This prevents many disputes.
22. Thanet is lenient to a certain extent by being fairly generous in waiving Parking Charge Notices which also reduces problems.
23. Thanet has received some allegations of corruption, including complaints of certain vehicles never getting tickets. None of these allegations have even been put in writing, and using CCTV, no evidence to corroborate these claims has been forthcoming.
24. From an operational and economic point of view it would be easier not to have any shared residents' parking schemes. Residents' only schemes would be easier to enforce but also uneconomic.
25. Generally speaking the District Councils Parking Office works closely with the County Highway Unit and both are very happy with the way the relationship works and parking enforcement is managed.

26. Throughout the decriminalisation process and implementation of controlled parking schemes the Council and Members have been honest and straightforward emphasising that the user pays - 'you want it you pay'.

OVERVIEW SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

<u>REVIEW:</u>	Decriminalisation of on-street parking enforcement and implementation of residents parking schemes
<u>VENUE:</u>	Civic Centre - Gravesend - 11th February 2002
<u>PRESENT:</u>	Councillor M V Snelling (Chair) Councillor K Jones
<u>IN ATTENDANCE:</u>	Mrs S Whatmough - Head of Democratic Services Mr D Finch - Corporate Policy Officer (Scrutiny Research)
<u>INTERVIEWEE:</u>	Mr George Chandler - Transport Planning Manager, Kent County Council

1. Mr Chandler was asked what Kent County Council's role was in decriminalisation and Residents Parking Schemes. He said that the County, as the Highways and Traffic Authority, had to make the application for decriminalisation. It had then formally delegated the operational and financial management to the Kent District Councils. Any District could have refused to implement decriminalisation and in that case the County would have had to consider how to implement and run the schemes across Kent.
2. Mr Chandler was asked whether decriminalisation across the county had been a success. He replied yes it had, but this was because success had to be measured against previous position of the Kent Police withdrawing parking enforcement. His personal view was also that KCC would be unlikely to be able to achieve an effective service across Kent run centrally from Maidstone - local delivery of parking management was crucial to achieving effectiveness.
3. He went on to say that in his opinion most decriminalisation schemes took 18 months to settle down and this would then be an appropriate time to carry out a review. Mr Chandler added that reviews should be carried out locally and there was no need to refer any review of decriminalisation to Kent County Council.
4. There was national guidance on Waiting Restrictions associated with double, single yellow lines, loading, unloading etc. but interpretation based on local conditions was permitted.
5. Mr Chandler said that in his opinion Medway were experiencing problems of poor communication, offences not being ticketed and their IT system left a lot to be desired. These problems probably stemmed from the different approaches across different areas of the authority.
6. Mr Chandler was asked about the policy of surpluses in excess of £50,000 from on-street parking being spent in Gravesham. He replied that over £50,000 required approval from the County Council, but any money raised was ring-fenced to the local area. The emphasis on spending the money was firmly with the District Councils and as Kent

County Council had put no money into enforcement it would be inappropriate for it to take any out.

7. Mr Chandler went on to describe Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) as defining an area in which every inch of highway within the Zone must have a restriction. CPZs need signs at the entrance and exit to the Zone and have lesser requirements for signs within the zone (reducing street clutter), but if streets are excluded from the CPZ then signing can become very complex. A Controlled Parking Zone does not have to include a Residents Parking Scheme. He added that there was no formal County policy on Controlled Parking Zones: if local circumstances suggested one was appropriate then the District Councils could introduce them as necessary.
8. Residents Parking Schemes (RPS) have the Waiting Restrictions on signs adjacent to the parking bays. He said that they can exclude, or severely restrict, casual parking and be effectively residents only, the disadvantage being that it is not an effective use of space. Kent County Council policy on Residents schemes is that they should not normally have exclusive use of the highway for residents. This can be done in appropriate circumstances and some limited exclusive systems do exist in Kent.
9. Enforcement of limited waiting and casual parking is very resource intensive. The principle involved should be to match resources to the restrictions and not the reverse. He was of the opinion that appropriately arranged visitors schemes could be used to accommodate local businesses, builders, repair services etc. within a Residents Parking Scheme.
10. He was asked what influence he had over the design of a Residents Parking Scheme. He replied that his input was technical only. He gave specialist advice to others within the County Council and to the District Councils.
11. It was suggested that Kent County Council had rejected a Gravesham Borough Council proposed Residents Parking Scheme on the grounds that it was too restrictive. Mr Chandler said that he did not have the power of veto and would more likely have questioned whether the proposed scheme was appropriate.
12. There were other issues like terraced housing, multiple occupancy that caused parking problems with many households having 2 or more cars. In most authorities there were more car owning residents than available spaces.
13. Maidstone does not charge for its permits and has massive over subscription. Ashford's permit charge is £5 for life. Their system failed with the consequence that they are having to introduce a different system.
14. Mr Chandler's personal view of the cost of a permit is that it should be 1.5 times the penalty charge discount rate. The legislation allows the administrative costs associated with permits to be recovered.

OVERVIEW SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

<u>REVIEW</u>	Decriminalisation of on-street parking and implementation of residents parking schemes
<u>VENUE:</u>	Civic Centre - Gravesend - 14th March 2002
<u>PRESENT:</u>	Councillor M V Snelling (Chair) Councillors: J Christie D H W Turner R Smith W G Dyke J P Burden K Jones
<u>IN ATTENDANCE:</u>	Mrs S Whatmough - Head of Democratic Services Mr D Finch - Corporate Policy Officer (Scrutiny Research)
<u>INTERVIEWEE:</u>	Mrs E M Jones - Secretary Wellington Street Residents Association

Mrs Jones was asked what was causing the parking problems. She replied that there were transit vans, builders skips, post office workers, cars dumped cars not being removed and to a lesser extent people parking to go shopping. This was particular bad on Saturday mornings. She wondered whether some limit could be put on how long skips were allowed to take up parking spaces.

When asked what she expected from a scheme, Mrs Jones said that residents should have priority, only residents able to park overnight and that any scheme should be effectively enforced. Many of the vans parked in Wellington Street did not display any residents permit nor did they seem to attract a penalty charge notice.

The residents she represented were in favour of the scheme as it was last proposed:-

Residents parking bays for permit holders only Monday to Sunday inclusive except 8.30 am to 6.30 pm when non-permit holders can park for up to 1 hour, no return within 2 hours.

£30 p.a. for residents permit.

£2/day for visitors permit (limited to 100 max).

Mrs Jones was asked what percentage of residents did her association represent. She replied that it was about 40%. Many of the residents were not interested and did not attend any meetings.

She added that there were a large number of residents of Asian origin who were difficult to communicate with and perhaps any consultation or newsletter should be available in alternative languages.

Mrs Jones suggested that further research be carried out to determine how many vehicles were eligible to park within a proposed scheme and how many spaces would be available. If these numbers could be matched then people would be more likely be prepared to pay for a permit.

Mrs Jones was asked whether, if her permit entitled her to park in a town centre car park, would she park there and walk home. Mrs Jones replied that she would not put herself at risk particularly after dark in this way. Indeed, only recently after arriving home late at night, she had parked her car illegally in Wellington Street and got a parking ticket rather than walk from the town centre.

Mrs Jones was asked whether she had noticed any improvement since the Council took over parking enforcement. She replied that the Parking Attendants were more in evidence which was a good thing.

She went on to say that her association had been disappointed by not being allowed a trial period of the proposed residents scheme, as she felt that this would have gone a long way to allay fears about whether such a scheme was workable.

She concluded by saying that the residents in Wellington Street had 3 main concerns which were:-

- 1) Cost of permits.
- 2) No guaranteed space.
- 3) Insufficient enforcement.

OVERVIEW SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

<u>REVIEW</u>	Decriminalisation of on-street parking and implementation of residents parking schemes
<u>VENUE:</u>	Civic Centre - Gravesend - 14th March 2002
<u>PRESENT:</u>	Councillor M V Snelling (Chair) Councillors: J P Burden J Christie D H W Turner R Smith W G Dyke K Jones
<u>IN ATTENDANCE:</u>	Mrs S Whatmough - Head of Democratic Services Mr D Finch - Corporate Policy Officer (Scrutiny Research)
<u>INTERVIEWEE:</u>	Rev S Bowkett representing Peacock Street Neighbourhood Association

1. Rev Bowkett said that a lot of complaints had been made by residents but these had not been analysed to identify the problems and address the causes of these problems.
2. He also expressed concern that the Council were intent on imposing changes to a scheme that they weren't perceived to be enforcing in the first place. Rev Bowkett was asked who was parking there and causing the problem. He replied that Post Office workers parked there also creating noise at unsociable hours, shoppers parking all through the week and there was also commercial parking outside shops.
3. The members of the neighbourhood association were of the opinion that parking attendants were rarely seen and the restrictions not enforced at all. They believed that if the restrictions were enforced they would work.
4. Rev Bowkett said that with some of the properties in Peacock Street being converted to multiple occupancy any scheme likely to be introduced would be oversubscribed, with many more cars than spaces.
5. Rev Bowkett was asked how the consultation had been received. He said that in his opinion and experience a very large proportion of the residents were 'non literate' and subsequently resistant to letters. He felt that something more personal like meetings would be more effective. His church when organising public meetings usually got a 10% response which he considered to be good. He used brightly coloured paper and a few bullet points for any written communication which tried to inform and engage residents.
6. Rev Bowkett believed that to introduce residents schemes and consult only residents did not fully address those sections of the community that would be affected by the introduction of any scheme.

7. There was not enough parking available for legitimate parkers. There needed to be adequate suitable parking for shoppers and workers.
8. The waiting restrictions currently proposed do not allow the church to function effectively on behalf of its congregation. The evening events and Sunday service will be severely affected. The idea of parents with young children, the old and infirm walking from town centre car parks is not a viable option, especially after dark.
9. The one size fits all approach to residents parking schemes in Gravesham is not appropriate. More consideration needs to be given to local issues and problems. The Peacock Neighbourhood Association has put forward a proposal as to how the number of spaces in Peacock Street can be increased. Their proposal along with suggestions as to how it might be funded met with a very lukewarm response from Council officers. From a secular standpoint he would like to see a 6 day scheme with 1 day different.
10. The main objections were:-
 - (1) Cost of permits and a perception that this cost would inevitably rise.
 - (2) Lack of spaces
 - (3) Lack of enforcement
 - (4) Not taking into account local differences when proposing parking schemes.

APPENDIX 2

Authority	Number of Parking Attendant	Enforcement Hours	Number of PCNs	Income	% of PCNs Paid	Permit Cost	Visitor Permit Cost
Ashford		08.00 - 22.00 Mon - Sat 09.00 - 18.00 Sun	4,499 off street 5,719 on street April -Dec 2001	£174,535 on & off street PCN's		£100 Zone A £40 Zone B £25 outside ring road (all p a)	£1/day
Swale	8 full time 3 part time	08.00 - 17.00 Mon - Sun Evening patrols 13.00 - 22.00	10,803 1 April 2000 - 31 Mar 2001		66%	£30 p a	£1/day
Gravesham	5	07.30 - 19.00 Mon - Fri 09.30 - 17.30 Sat 10.00 - 14.00 Sun	10,166 1 April 2000 - 31 Mar 2001	£52,551 on street PCN's (1 Jan 01- 31 Mar 01)		£30 p a	£2/day
Shepway	9	08.00 - 17.00	11,701 1 April 2000 - 31 March 2001	£155,422 on-street PCNs £59,521 permits		£25 p a	
Thanet	14	08.00 - 18.00 Mon - Sun Irregular evening patrols	24,368 1 April 2000 - 31 March 2001	£254,726 on-street PCNs £12,384 resident permits		£20 p a	£2/day
Tunbridge Wells	22	07.30 - 19.00 Mon - Sat Sunday & Night Enforcement covered by overtime	34,428 1 April 2000 - 31 March 2001	£758,000 on & off- streetPCNs £50,000 permits	80%	£20 p a	£5/book of 10

Authority	Number of Parking Attendant	Enforcement Hours	Number of PCNs	Income	% of PCNs Paid	Permit Cost	Visitor Permit Cost
Medway	17		40,268 1 April 2000 - 31 March 2001	£1,000,000 all PCNs £250,000 permits		£15	£15/prop/year 50p/day scratchcard
Tonbridge & Malling	7.5 FTE	08.00 - 17.00 out of hours targeting max 3/month	9,253 1 April 2000 - 31 March 2001			£14	£1/day
Hastings	22	07.00 - 24.00	50,425 1 April 2000 - 31 March 2001	£602,682 all PCNs £216,969 on street permits £379,381 pay and display	45%	£52	Up to 2hrs £0.60 Up to 5hrs £1.50
Dover	12		4,096 1 April 2000 - 31 March 2001			£30	£1

