

## **REPORT TO PICKMERE PARISH COUNCIL**

**2<sup>nd</sup> October 2018**

### **AGENDA ITEM 9.1      PARKING ISSUES IN AND AROUND THE IROS**

#### **1.      Introduction**

- 1.1      Arising from the problem of vehicles parking overnight and for longer periods at the IROS, members considered the attached report in July 2018 and felt that the principle of using such a company to enforce parking restrictions was broadly agreeable. A further report was requested in relation to the options available.
- 1.2      In addition reference is made to other parking issues in the vicinity that exist at the time of writing this report.

#### **2.      Report – employment of parking company**

- 2.1      The details submitted by the two companies have been further considered and it is concluded that the procedure operated by UK Car Park Management (UK-CPM) should be pursued. This procedure involves the erection of several of the company's small no parking signs, following which authorised representatives of the Parish Council will then be able to send the company a photograph of a vehicle not complying with the car parking requirement, and the company then posts the owner of the offending vehicle a Parking Charge Notice (PCN), and subsequently pursues payment of the parking charge. The Parish Council is not involved in the PCN procedure once it has conveyed the details of the offending vehicle to the company.
- 2.2      The Parish Council would receive £10 for each parking charge that is paid to the company. The parking signs are provided by the parking company, although there may be an additional charge if they are to include special wording (e.g. noting the hours the car park may not be used) or it may be necessary to erect a separate sign giving this information.
- 2.3      Other forms of regime are possible as described in the attached July report, but the one recommended appears best to suit the Council's requirements.
- 2.4      Your Council will need to decide on the hours when parking is stated to be not permitted; 10.00pm to 6.00 am is initially suggested for discussion purposes.
- 2.4      Registration for this service is largely carried out by internet; authorisation is therefore required for your Clerk to seek to set up such a service with UK-CPM. Should any significant difficulties arise in the registration process, this will be reported to you.
- 2.5      Once the system is in operation, it is proposed that several councillors and your Clerk be authorised to take photographs of offending vehicles and report them to the company for the issue of PCNs.

#### **3.      Other parking issues**

- 3.1 It appears that a vehicle may have been abandoned on the Council's parking area at the IROS. The vehicle is relatively old, has been on the carpark without moving for some time, and its Road Tax expired in June this year, although it still has a current MOT certificate. The Parish Council is not able to identify the owner, so it is not known whether it is a local resident or not.
- 3.2 Cheshire East Council will take action to check the ownership of and remove such a vehicle if referred to them; however because it is on 'private land' i.e. land owned by the Parish Council, there would be a charge of £105.
- 3.3 It may therefore be considered that first step should be the posting of a notice on the vehicle warning of action the Parish Council might take to secure its removal. Should of course a parking company be employed as described above, that should effectively deal with the problem.
- 3.4 Finally, a communication has recently been received from CEC saying that the monies have now been approved to bring about the repair of road surfaces etc and the renewal of yellow lines and associated signs in and around Park Lane and Mere Lane. Accordingly, it is hoped that these works will proceed shortly, though no timescale has been given at the time of writing.

#### **4. Recommendation**

- 4.1 That the Clerk be authorised to register the Parish Council for UK-CPM's iTicket mobile App, and to secure the erection of the necessary signage, and that the appropriate persons be authorised to issue photographs of offending vehicles to UK-CPM.
- 4.2 That the 'no parking' hours to be enforced shall be stated to be 10.00pm to 6.00am.
- 4.3 That if necessary your Clerk in conjunction with the Chair be authorised to expend up to a figure of £150 on additional or specially worded signage to denote the hours of use of the car park.
- 4.4 That in relation to the possibly abandoned vehicle referred to, a notice should be posted on the vehicle warning the owner that the Parish Council may shortly seek to secure its removal from the site and disposal.
- 4.5 That members note the position with regard to the renewal of yellow lines etc on Park Lane and Mere Lane, etc.

**Jack Steel**  
**Clerk to Parish Council**

# **COPY REPORT**

## **REPORT TO PICKMERE PARISH COUNCIL**

**3<sup>rd</sup> July 2018**

### **AGENDA ITEM 9.6      PARKING AT THE IROS AND POTENTIAL MEASURES**

#### **1      Introduction**

- 1.1      Arising from the parking issues at the IROS members have asked that further details be supplied of the potential cost of further car park signage, and also of the arrangements for employing a parking company to manage the IROS parking spaces and ensure compliance with the Parish Council's rules.

#### **2      Report – Signage**

- 2.1      One local company has been contacted and offered a price of £160 plus VAT for a 'Dibond' (i.e. aluminium/composite sandwich) sign A2 in size, with post, and including 16 words. For the fixing of the sign, the price would be £95 plus VAT if placed in the grass verge, or £120 if placed in a concrete or tarmac surface.

#### **3      Report – Parking Companies**

- 3.1      Two parking companies have been contacted. Both offer a warden service, free of charge. However, with one company, the Council must pay for the initial signs, the number, size and principal wording of which are regulated. This company quoted £35 plus VAT for each sign (40cm by 30cm), and for 8 spaces they would require 3 signs. The implications of a warden service are that the parking rules must be clear – and in our case the rule would have to be simply along the lines of 'no parking between 10.00 pm and 6.00 a.m.) In addition, for the warden service there would be no flexibility – if the warden finds a vehicle there outside the permitted hours, (s)he will issue a PCN.
- 3.2      As an alternative, both companies operate a more DIY process. In one case the Council representative would write out the PCN and post it on the vehicle and take a time/date-stamped photo of the vehicle registration and including the parking sign. The photo is then uploaded to the company who then pursue the payment of the fine, including taking it through any appeal and court case, without cost to the Council. The Council receives £20 for each fine paid under this arrangement.
- 3.3      The second company has a similar process. However, this only requires the taking of the time-date stamped photograph. This is uploaded to the company who issue a PCN by post. The Council in this case receives £10 for each fine paid.

- 3.4 The benefit of the DIY approach is that the flexibility to issue a PCN or not is left to the Parish Council – e.g. if there is a particular reason on a particular day for not enforcing the 10.00 p.m. rule then no PCN needs to be issued.
- 3.5 In the case of both companies, the identity of whoever serves the PCN is not divulged at any stage.
- 3.6 Two comments were made in speaking to representatives of the companies:
1. The use of a parking warden service in a situation like Pickmere’s – small car park, PCNs perhaps served on local residents – can lead quickly to conflict among the local community.
  2. On the other hand, one representative said that with a situation like that of the IROS, once the scheme has been running for a short time, it becomes almost self-enforcing and the need for the issue of PCNs reduces.
- 3.7 The arrangements described do have some attraction, and a DIY approach would seem the most appropriate, in that it gives the Parish Council flexibility to not enforce in a particular situation or on a particular occasion. However, this approach does mean that reliance is placed on a representative of the Parish Council to take the photograph of the offending vehicle, and therefore be potentially identifiable to the offender at the time the photograph is taken.
- 3.8 If members are inclined to adopt this approach to the problem it is recommended that small sub-group of members consider the detail of both company’s systems, and perhaps seek a third possibility, and bring back a recommendation to a future Council meeting.

### **Recommendation**

- 2.1 That members consider the report and take action as appropriate.

**Jack Steel**  
**Clerk to Parish Council**