

**REPORT FOR: TENANTS' AND
LEASEHOLDERS'
CONSULTATIVE FORUM**

Date: 25 February 2010

Subject: Parking Enforcement Proposals

Responsible Officer: Lynne Pennington Interim
Divisional Director Housing

Exempt: No

Enclosures: Appendix A: Estates requiring
Parking Enforcement

Appendix B: Application form with
terms and conditions

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report provides an update on the current position to procure a parking enforcement contract and sets out an alternative method to control parking on housing estates.

Recommendations:

The Committee is requested to note the contents of this report and comment on the proposals.

Section 2 – Report

Background

Most housing estates across the borough were originally designed to include and accommodate limited parking spaces for residents. With the passage of time the car-per-property ratio continues to grow culminating in the limited spaces becoming totally insufficient to meet the need.

Another factor of this shortage of car parking on the estates is the number of commuters and local shoppers taking advantage of the lack of parking enforcement on Housing land.

A few years ago a local enforcement company, namely, Borough Parking Enforcement (BPE) was engaged informally to patrol 8 small sites.

BPE held the enforcement agreement for the area and kept 100% of the PCN revenue. The Council did not contribute towards BPE's costs. Unfortunately the risk associated with this model resulted in either aggressive enforcement tactics or insufficient enforcement. Once the initial enforcement had curbed offending, the amount of revenue available for the contractor was insufficient to justify regular patrol visits to the area. This resulted in either poorly patrolled areas or as stated before aggressive tactics which in turn resulted in poor value for money and poor service to the residents.

In conclusion, the arrangement with BPE resulted in sporadic patrols and inefficient enforcement leading to lack of control, accountability or transparency.

In early 2009, BPE was offered the opportunity to formalise the arrangement by entering into a short-term contract but declined to do so on the premise that it would not be commercially viable. The arrangement was therefore terminated.

Resident services have been working with Corporate Procurement to arrange for an alternative external supplier to deliver a full parking enforcement service at:

- Churchill Place, Barons Mead
- Francis Road
- Northolt Road Estate
- Hartington Close
- Pinner Green
- Chaucer House
- Kipling Place (Woodlands Estate)
- Dobbin Close

It is envisaged that an enforcement service will cover approximately 250 car parking spaces and bays for the estates mentioned above.

Current situation

On 17th April 2009, two potential contractors submitted bids in respect to the provision of a parking enforcement service. The bids were evaluated to ensure value for money, assess the degree to which a competitive pricing structure was evident and to ensure comparable market costs for the type of service that had been specified.

Following the evaluation process a representative Panel comprising of officers, members and a resident representative interviewed the preferred contractor on 12th June 2009 in an attempt to assess the degree to which they may provide the type of service that is specific to Housing's needs.

The negotiations regarding the cost of providing a parking enforcement service have concluded. The negotiation period has been extensive due to officers attempting to substantially reduce the Council's monthly liability. The ideal situation for this contract is to try and balance revenue against cost so the Council can at least break even and possibly make a profit. However, the lack of any complete historical data means that one cannot accurately predict the number of Permit requests and PCN's issued.

However, the operating annual cost for the potential contract, based on 2 visits per site is likely to be in the region of £46,379.04. It is unclear as to whether the Council will generate sufficient revenue to breakeven during the first year of the contract. Under this regime it is anticipated that the cost of a parking permit will be comparable to the CPZ i.e. £46.

Implications of the Recommendation

The assumptions and estimates focus in part on the amount of offending translating into PCN revenue and also the take up of residents and visitor permits translating into permit revenue.

The contract models proposed in this document mitigate these risks by paying operational costs to the contractor, and then attempting to recoup these costs from permit revenue and a share of the PCN revenue. There are a number of key risks associated with the proposal, the details of which are set out below.

1. Uncertain revenue, potentially resulting in financial loss to the council
2. High permit prices upsetting residents (previous permit price was £7.50)
3. Parking enforcement in areas that don't really have a parking problem will make the permit prices seem more like a tax than a service.
4. Increased administration and resources required to manage the process
5. Currently no independent appeals process
6. Residents / offenders could chose to ignore the enforcement (possible due to civil legal costs)

Alternative Model

Due to the ongoing issues relating to parking at Cowan Avenue it was decided to consult residents regarding the implications of erecting a metal girder gate to act as a physical barrier to deter unauthorised access and parking. Further additional information regarding the sites and the girder gate are set out in Appendix 1 of this report. The results of the consultation indicate that residents support the notion and are willing to pay the diminutive service charge of £1 per week.

Residents were formally advised on 6th October 2009 of the outcome of the consultation process. The gate has now been installed and is fully operational.

An Application Form with Terms and Conditions (Appendix B) incorporated were sent out as part of the consultation process.

The uptake position as at 26 January 2010 is given below:

Site/Address	Total spaces	Spaces taken up	Annual Fees Recovered (£)	Less Cost of gate (£)	Net cost (£)
Cowan Avenue, Northolt Road	25	23	1,196.00	2,209	1,013.00

There are potential applicants in the pipeline for the remaining two spaces. It should be noted that there is no cost to any resident other than the £52.00 fee per annum when the first key is issued to successful applicants. Lost keys will result in an additional charge estimated to be in the region of £100. We expect to recover the full £1,300.00 in annual renewal fees which will pay off this year's deficit of £1,013 within the 2010/11 Financial Year. Thereafter £1,300 income would be generated by this gating system.

Using the above as a pilot it is suggested each site of the remaining sites is consulted upon to assess the degree to which residents would approve of a barrier scheme to act as a form of parking control on their estate. Due to the differing landscape and estate design we can either install barrier gates or drop-down lockable posts.

Details of the remaining 7 existing sites as well as 3 additional sites where a potential income stream can be tapped along with their requirements for either metal gates or bollards are set out in Appendix A of this report.

Financial Implications

There is no budget provision for parking enforcement contracts in the HRA budget, either the current or future years. Annual expenditure exceeds income and to introduce additional costs without generating additional income, will put further pressure on the HRA balances.

The position at Cowan Avenue suggests a small shortfall in the first year of operation [which should be contained within existing provision], but provides increased income on an annual basis where there is a 100% take up of permits.

If this proposal is adopted across estates with similar issues, there is a likely to be a shortfall of £10k in the first year of operation followed by annual income generation of £13k. Whilst the shortfall is quite small, this does still mean that compensatory underspends across the HRA need to be found to offset the increased costs that have not been built into the budget.

Based on the relative success of the gate at Cowen Avenue, a brief cost analysis, including the three additional sites is given below:

Site/Address	Total Spaces	Potential Annual Fees (£)	LESS Cost of Gate (G)/Bollards (B) (£)		Net Cost (£)
Churchill Place	30	1,560	1 G	2,000	-440
Francis Road	60	3,120	60 B	6,000	-2,880
Hartington Close (less 25 recycled bollards)	47	2,444	47 B	2,200	244
Pinner Green	13	676	13 B	1,300	-624
Chaucer House	12	624	1 G	2,000	-1,376
Kipling Place	11	572	1 G	2,000	-1,428
Dobbin Close	36	1,872	3 G	6,000	-4,128
Site/Address (additional sites)					
Northolt Road (rear of community hall)	30	1,560	1 G	2,000	-440
Binyon Crescent (garage area already gated)	15	780		0	780
Charles crescent (garage area already gated)	30	1,560		0	1,560
Total	254	13,208		23,500	-10,292

Legend

Re-negotiated gate cost = £2,000 each

Drop down bollard cost =£100 each less 25 re-cycled

Annual fee = £52 per space (permit)

Risk Management Implications

Parking enforcement is not included as a specific risk in the Directorate risk register. However, the cost of providing a parking enforcement service where the Council has a monthly liability will have an adverse impact of the Housing Revenue account as it is a non-budgeted for item.

Pursuing an alternative parking control mechanism by utilizing metal barrier gates with Gerda locks will result in an initial fiscal outlay £ 10,292. It may be beneficial to establish a programme where these monies can be capitalized.

With the re-negotiated pricing, introduction of an additional 3 sites with potential income, the level of the initial impact has been greatly curtailed.

Introducing a parking enforcement mechanism will reduce the complaints from residents and provide evidence of landlord control.

Risk included on Directorate risk register? No

Separate risk register in place? No

Corporate Priorities

This report incorporates the corporate priority to:

- Deliver cleaner and safer streets

The gate recently installed at Cowen Avenue, Northolt Road has received good responses from residents. The former parking issues have been overcome and no complaint remains unresolved. If this level of success is repeated across the other sites then a major cause of complaint could be reduced thereby improving customer satisfaction

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Donna Edwards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Chief Financial Officer
Date: 29 January 2010		
Name: Paresh Mehta	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Monitoring Officer
Date: 2 February 2010		

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Beverley Bonnefoy, Senior Professional-Communities & Investment, 020 8416 8684

Background Papers: Previous report by Timothy Hurley – Parking Enforcement Proposals - presented to TLCP on 10 November 2009

1.	Consultation	YES
2.	Corporate Priorities	YES

Appendix A: Estates requiring Parking Enforcement

Name of Estate	Name of Road(s)	Number of Spaces	Gates/Bollards required
Churchill Place	Barons Mead	30 spaces. Located adjacent to station and is subject to use by commuters. Also has underground car park which requires a key to access.	1 Gate
Francis Flats	Francis Road	60 spaces. A highways parking scheme in operation on surrounding streets.	60 Bollards
Northolt Estate	Cowen Avenue/ Northolt Road	30 spaces plus 2 disabled bays. Currently a highways parking scheme in place along Cowan Ave which runs through the estate. However, the main car park is subject to parking from local businesses and commuters.	1 Gate
Hartington Flats	Hartington Close	47 Spaces. Currently a number of spaces are controlled using drop down bollard system which could be utilized across all spaces.	47 Bollards
Pinner Green Flats	Pinner Green	13 Marked Bays which is subject to parking from local businesses.	13 Bollards
Chaucer House	Canterbury Road	12 Marked Bays. Near to garage who's users have illegally parked in our car park.	1 Gate
Kipling Place	Uxbridge Road	11 spaces.	1 Gate
Dobbin Close	Dobbin Close	35 spaces plus 1 disabled bay. Located adjacent to primary school where parents are dropping/picking up children in early morning and afternoon.	3 Gates

The above table shows the 8 estates where parking controls were in place under the BPE contract. The table also shows the number of available parking spaces on each estate. Also included is a column indicating where a possible alternative means of providing secure parking for residents could be considered. One option is to install barrier gates across parking areas or install bollards to prevent illegal access into these areas. Over the last year £500 has been spent on routine repairs and maintenance to the barrier gates and approximately £300 on bollard repairs/replacement.

Barrier Gate

The Barrier gate is fabricated with 80 x 40 x 3 RHS frame and 25 x 25 x 3 vertical bars. Adjustable hinges with M20 pivot bolt and 27 dia x 3.2 CHS spacer welded into SHS and ground flush. Three posts (lock post, hinge post and retainer post) are from 100 x 100 x 6 SHS 1800mm high. Posts are concreted 600mm into the ground using extra rapid concrete mix to allow fast setting time. The gate is hung onto the hinges when the posts have set. A male pin is welded to the gate and a Gerda barrier gate lock is welded to the lock post. A retaining pin is welded to the retainer post. All components are hot dipped galvanised. Should the gate be over 3800mm in width, a jockey wheel should be fitted 375mm high with 3" rubber wheel. Barrier gates cost £3,000.00 each but this has been negotiated down to £2,000 only plus keys.

Bollards

Drop down bollards – lockable steel bollard including set foundation bolts in concrete or brick paving. 2 keys supplied. Cost £100 approx.

Example of controlled parking on our estates:



Drop Down Bollards at Hartington Close

Examples of un-controlled parking on our estates:



Kipling Place



Hartington Close



Dobbin Close



Chaucer House



Pinner Hill



Churchill Place



Francis Road