

REPORT TO PICKMERE PARISH COUNCIL

3rd 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