

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

CABINET: 12TH DECEMBER, 2016

REFERENCE FROM ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE: 8TH NOVEMBER, 2016

509 CIVIL PARKING ENFORCEMENT AND TOWN CENTRE CAR PARKING
UPDATE (REF) -

Cabinet had referred the report to the Scrutiny Committee for its consideration it being noted that Civil Parking Enforcement had been a work programme item for the Committee in view of Members' previous concerns.

In presenting the report the Head of Visible Services and Transport advised that paragraph 11 of the report referred to the total number of parking charge notices issued for 2013/14, 2014/15 and 2015/16 as identified below.

Year	Total Number of Contravention Notices Issued	Formal Appeals	Successful Appeals
2013/14	8547	130	67
2014/15	7128	97	33
2015/16	6903	74	28
Total	22578	301	128

Appendix A to the report also provided details of the streets where the parking notices had been enforced. Members were informed that if they did not see streets in their areas listed in the Appendix this did not mean that the streets had not been patrolled, it was simply that the streets had been in compliance.

A Member queried the reporting mechanism for such reports as he considered that the report should be presented on an annual basis. The Head of Service advised that the Council was in compliance with its agreement for reporting arrangements but that the report had not specifically been reported to Cabinet, however the information could be viewed on the Council's website.

A Member also raised concern with regard to the number of notices that had been issued as they considered that the figure was extremely low, particularly in comparison to a small Local Authority in Merthyr Tydfil where they had made a significant profit and also issued 17,000 PCN notices. The officer advised that the service was regularly monitored and reviewed and discussions were regularly undertaken between Bridgend and the Vale with regard to the service but that the original agreement that had been made between the two Authorities and the provider was that the business case was to be self-financing and not for profit.

During consideration of the report, it was suggested that the agreement be reassessed as to its value and to consider whether an increase in enforcement officer numbers should be recommended. It was, however, noted that there were different levels of offences and that in some Local Authorities there may be higher charges relating to specific enforcement offences. Some Members raised concern as to perceived issues in the Penarth area where it appeared enforcement officers were being lenient to some members of the public more than others particularly in loading bay spaces. Councillor Dr. I.J. Johnson, again with permission to speak, advised of a query raised at a meeting the previous evening with local traders in High Street Barry as to whether enforcement officers could vary their times of attendance. The Head of Service agreed to take such comments back to the relevant Board meetings for discussion.

The Member from Cowbridge commented that the CPEs in his area appeared to be effective and although it was noted that only one PCN had been issued Ogmore by Sea this year as opposed to 437 the previous year, this being as a result of people being compliant.

The Cabinet Member for Building Services Highways and Transportation commented in relation to loading bays that this was a bit of a balancing act for the Council as in essence obstruction was a Police matter and it was a low priority of concern for the Police, particularly if they had to be called away on another Police matter. He reiterated the comments made by the Head of Service that the original business agreement had been established in respect of traffic management issues and had not been for profit. Councillor Cox stated that having been a previous Cabinet Member, he could confirm that the ethos for the collaboration with Bridgend had been about in relation to traffic management and not for profit.

During the meeting, although the consensus of opinion of Members of the Committee was that they supported collaboration, they did however, consider that a review of the current arrangements was required, particularly in relation to value for money and whether the number of enforcement officers that patrolled the Vale was adequate. The Head of Service suggested that an officer from Bridgend Council attend a future meeting of the Scrutiny Committee to speak to Committee but this suggestion was rejected at this time until further information was received. The Head of Service also advised that a camera car was being considered with Bridgend and there would be a further report to the Committee on the matter in due course.

Having fully considered the report it was subsequently

RECOMMENDED to Cabinet - T H A T a root and branch review of the current agreement with Bridgend Council be undertaken in order to ascertain whether the Vale Council is receiving value for money to include the provision of further data on enforcement undertaken and the cost of the service.

Reason for recommendation

In view of comments made at the meeting and to ensure value for money.