

**Decision session of the cabinet member for      22 January 2014  
Housing .**

Report of the Assistant Director of Housing and Community Safety,  
Steve Waddington.

**Parking Enforcement Pilot, Housing Land.**

**Summary:**

1. This report requests approval, following the completion of the car parking pilot to continue the use of an independent parking enforcement contractor operating on designated sites of housing land.

**Background:**

2. Opportunist parking on sites owned by housing but not governed by highways enforcement was becoming an increasing concern leading to problems for tenants, garage renters and other residents. The main issue had been that legitimate users of the garages/parking spaces were having problems with access to spaces that they had paid for or had to put up with inconsiderate opportunistic parking in non parking spaces. . This problem creates long-standing complaints and grievances that Estate Managers are powerless to resolve.
3. North Yorkshire Police are usually unable to assist, as no criminal laws have been broken. Highways have no enforcement powers, except where the land is both in the York Traffic Order and enforcement is operational.
4. Where feasible and affordable, physical deterrents of bollards or barriers are installed, restricting access to legitimate users only. Provision costs can be high. Sometimes these physical deterrents are subject to vandalism. On one site, a newly fitted barrier was vandalised

three times within the first month of installation. High visibility stickers were also placed on cars in one area but these proved to be ineffective.

5. A pilot with an independent parking enforcement contractor (Autohorn) commenced in August 2008 with a view to tackling the above issues at the following sites:

Aberford House Garages	Backhouse Street
Garages	
City Mills	Corbridge House
Kilburn House Garages	Merchants Court
North Street	Tudor Road Garages
Forge Close	Leicester Way

6. Warning signs are displayed informing people of the consequences of unauthorised parking and clearly stating the company's name. Sites are subject to random patrols by uniformed staff. Alternately, customers can contact Autohorn control centre and request an operative attend a specific site if a problem occurs. Attendance is not within a guaranteed timescale, but would be as soon as practical
7. Offending vehicles are issued with a civil fixed penalty charge of £30, with up to 14 days to pay. Non-payment results in an increased charge of £60 if paid within the next 28 days and £150 thereafter and a referral to Autohorn's legal department and debt recovery agency who use DVLA to obtain the registered keeper's details.

### **Consultation:**

8. Consultation has taken place with the Tenant's Federation October 2013 and the meeting indicated that they fully support option 2. Estate Managers also support this option. Autohorn have also been consulted about the process.

Garage users and residents will be advised in writing prior to the commencement of parking enforcement on any site, and the schemes would only be introduced if the majority agree to this.

## **Options:**

### Option one

9. Roll out the use of an independent parking enforcement contractor to all other identified sites across the City.

### Option two

10. Grant advance approval in principle to roll out the use of an independent parking enforcement contractor to all other identified sites across the City as the need arises.

### Option three

11. Maintain the existing arrangements.

### Option four

12. Discontinue existing arrangements.

## **Overall Analysis:**

13. Feedback from those estate managers under the pilot has been that there has been a substantial improvement in the parking arrangements on their estates where parking enforcement has been put in place.
14. Feedback from the Housing Assistant Team who manage the garage sites also confirms there has been a substantial drop in the number of complaint calls received regarding parking from those sites under the pilot.
15. A survey sent to all garage users examining the effectiveness of the pilot has supported feedback from others, see appendix 2. 45.4% of those who responded saw an improvement in parking and 63.6% felt that the pilot had been a success.
16. In addition to random patrols by uniformed staff, Autohorn have provided a responsive service to local residents by providing a contact number to call should they notice a vehicle parked illegitimately on a site monitored by them. This has assisted in reducing the number of issues and therefore, the number of complaints.

17. City Mills in particular has been a success with the additional step of introducing parking permits. Under the scheme, car owners were provided with two permits, non car owners with one permit to enable these to be issued to legitimate visitors to the scheme.

18. Since the pilot commenced in October 2010, Autohorn have issued a total of 900 parking tickets as shown in the following table. The fee is £30 if paid in the first 2 weeks and then £60 thereafter.

<b>Parking Site</b>	<b>PCNs Issued</b>	<b>Paid</b>	<b>Uncollectable</b>
Aberford House Garages	82	48	26
Backhouse Street Garages	50	31	15
City Mills	189	90	21
Corbridge House	20	15	3
Huby Court	0	0	0
Kilburn House Garages	52	43	4
Leicester Way	23	11	9
Mansfield House	124	70	23
Medway House	63	6	21
Merchants Courts	66	26	11
North Street	169	117	24
Tudor Road Garages	21	17	3
Walmgate Shops	20	0	0
Winterscale Court	21	4	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>160</b>

19. The service has operated at no cost to the council other than a one off set up charge per site of approx £150 per site plus extra costs for any sites that need a permit system. The set up fees included the provision and installation of the required signage.

## **Options Analysis:**

### **Option One: Roll out the use of an independent parking enforcement contractor to all other identified sites across the City.**

20. Feedback from Estate Managers has been that whilst parking issues exist on multiple sites across the City, the extent of these varies considerably. Feedback from Housing Assistants and Customer Services Advisors also confirms this opinion.
21. The introduction of enforcement controls across the city offers the advantage of a consistent approach and the possibility of reducing and preventing future complaints from sites not currently included in the pilot. However if problems commence at a site that is not included this will not allow officers any flexibility.
22. Financial commitment required for set up may be easier to calculate if all identified sites are surveyed and brought into the scheme at one time. However, there will be a charge to set up the scheme at a great number of sites where there is little or no issues, at a cost of £150 or little more.

### **Option Two: Grant advance approval to roll out the use of an independent parking enforcement contractor to all other identified sites across the City as the need arises.**

23. Advance approval to introduce sites based on need may offer increased flexibility in dealing with any issues/complaints. A list of new sites have been identified in appendix one
24. If a minimum of three complaints are received within a 6 month period then Officers can request for the scheme to be included within the parking enforcement scheme.
25. Financial commitment may be lower at the outset, but it may not be clear how much further commitment will be required, especially considering the increasing number of car owners.

**Option Three: Maintain existing arrangements.**

- 26. The pilot has had positive feedback and there is no suggestion that any sites included should be removed.
- 27. This option does not address any areas not already included in the pilot where issues exist.

**Option Four: Discontinue existing arrangements.**

- 28. Owing to the positive feedback received regarding those sites already included in the pilot, there is little to support this option.
- 29. Customer complaints will increase, as the issues, which caused the pilot to be launched, would no doubt return.

**Corporate Objectives:**

- 30. This report will assist the Council in becoming an “Effective Organisation” by reducing opportunistic parking and maintaining access for garage customers and other residents.

**Implications:**

- 31. **Financial:** implications will vary dependant on the option chosen. The highest cost being presented by option 1. However it should also be noted that any costs are one off as there are no ongoing costs once surveys and signage provision and installation has been completed.
- 32. With option 2 the additional expenditure can be contained within existing Estate Managers Estate Improvement budget. However for option 1 all potential sites would need to be identified and a growth bid submitted for the next financial year.

Options	Numbers of sites	Cost
Roll out across the city to all sites identified now and in the future	Numerous sites across the city all housing land, garage sites etc.	£2550 now and ongoing costs per site as detailed above subject to change.

Roll out initially to identified sites	17 additional sites	£2550 minimum
Maintain arrangements	No additional sites	£0
Cancel the scheme	No sites	£0

33. **Equalities:** The illegal use of garage forecourts could affect residents with disability who may need access to their garage. To roll the scheme out to the rest of the city would be more equitable.
34. **Legal:** There are no legal implications.
35. **Crime and Disorder:** There are no crime and disorder implications.
36. **Information Technology:** There are no information and technology implications.
37. **Property:** There are no property implications other than ensuring any new sites selected are housing land.
38. **Other:** Liaison with Parking would need to exist where sites have adopted or adopt partial restrictions to eliminate confusion or error.
39. **Risk Management:** In compliance with the council's risk management strategy, there are no risks associated with the recommendations of this report.

**Recommendations:**

40. Management team are asked to endorse option 2 to provide advance approval to roll out the use of an independent parking enforcement contractor to the identified sites across the City and to new ones as the need arises subject to the criteria.

**Contact Details**

**Author:**

Author: Denis Southall  
Title: Housing Landlord  
Manager  
Dept: Housing Landlord  
Service  
Tel No: 551298

Co-Author: Rachael  
Bassett  
Title: Housing Team  
Leader  
Dept: Housing Services  
Tel: 551261

**Chief Officer Responsible for the  
report:**

Chief Officer: Steve Waddington  
Title: Head of Housing & Community  
Safety

**Report  
Approved**

Y
e
s

**Date**

*Chief Officer's name  
Title*

**Report  
Approved**

ti
c
k

**Date**

*Insert Date*

**Specialist Implications Officer(s)** *(None)*

**Wards Affected:** *This will depend on the sites identified  
for the pilot*

**AI**  
**I**

tick
------

**For further information please contact the author of the report**

**Background Papers:**

(None)

**Appendices: Table of proposed sites.  
Parking pilot survey**



## **Appendix One:**

**List of potential sites that have been nominated to be brought into the Car Parking scheme (subject to the criteria / site inspection).**

- Long Close Lane
- Hubby Court
- Carrick Gardens
- Pateley Place
- Lindsey Avenue (All blocks)
- Trinity Lane
- Ancroft Close (Garages)
- Hope Street (Garage Site)
- Hewley Avenue (Near blocks)
- Thurston House parking site
- Drake and Frobisher House
- Pottery Lane garage / bungalow area
- Baildon Close
- St Giles Court
- Clarence Street
- Derwent Bungalows adjacent to the allotment site
- Cygnet Street

## Appendix 2

### Car Parking Pilot Summary of Tenant Satisfaction Survey.

The attached survey was sent to all garage users currently under the existing pilot to measure their perception of success (or lack of) of the car parking pilot. Of the 33 surveys sent out, 33% were returned (11 surveys)

Below is the breakdown of responses and comments received:

#### **Have you seen any improvement in parking since the parking pilot was introduced?**

Yes:	5 (45.5%)
No:	3 (27.3%)
Not Sure:	2 (18.2%)

#### ***Have you ever had cause to call the parking enforcement agency?***

Yes:	1 (9.1%)
No:	9 (81.9%)

#### **If yes, was your query relating to:**

A ticket issued to your vehicle:	0 (0%)
Another vehicle:	0 (0%)
General enquiry:	0 (0%)
Other:	1 (9.1%)

#### ***Overall, do you feel the parking pilot has been a success?***

Yes:	7 (63.6%)
No:	1 (9.1%)
Don't Know:	2 (18.2%)

**Have you seen any improvement in parking since the parking pilot was introduced? (Additional comments)**

*“Vast improvement, cars are no longer parked around and opposite garage doors.”*

*“Parking in front of garage doors by non tenants has greatly improved.”*

*“When I got the garage, there were signs saying do not park in front of the garages, and that is working, no one parks in front of my garage.”*

*“It does not apply to me as I have a car parked in the garage which I do not use, so therefore I only visit the garage from time to time. On my visits, I never had any reason to complain.”*

*“Didn’t perceive a problem in the first place.”*

*“On the 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> March, a pick up vehicle was parked on the garage forecourt from 8:30 to 17:30 every day. How often are checks made?”*

*“No problems identified since I moved in.”*

**How would you rate the service provided by Autohorn Ltd with your enquiry?**

*“10 out of 10”* (This comment appeared on 2 surveys)

**How would you rate the service provided by Autohorn in managing parking at the garage sites?**

*“Excellent in preventing non tenants from obstructing garage doors”*

*“10 out of 10”*

*“Seems to be a waste of money to me, I’ve never seen any vehicles clamped or any notices issued.”*

*“Satisfactory”*

**What improvements, if any, would you like to see?**

**“Maybe a bigger sign on the side of the wall, there is enough room for a sign”**

*“Very happy with the way it has progressed.”*

*“More ‘No Parking’ signs, ‘No Parking’ painted on the forecourt. A phone number to report any problems.”*

*“I have not had any problems with access so cannot judge how effective. Have seen enforcement officers passing though.”*

***Any other comments?***

***“Thank you for improving access to the garages so much”***

*“I have heard through another tenant that the parking agents allow tenants up to 3 minutes to enter or leave the garage which does not allow for things like loading or unloading or checking things like oil, water etc. Surely the agents are there for the benefit of paying tenants not to penalise them?”*

*“Mend the gate leading to Aberford garages.”*