

## **Final Report of the Customer Overview and Scrutiny Panel into Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement**



**June 2006**



**CONTENTS PAGE**

**1. PREFACE ..... 3**

**2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY/LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND COSTS ..... 4**

**3. INTRODUCTION ..... 11**

**4. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION ..... 12**

**5. FINDINGS ..... 15**

**6. CONCLUSION ..... 29**

**7. APPENDICES ..... 30**

---

## 1. PREFACE

At the request of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee the Customer Overview and Scrutiny Panel was asked to investigate the effectiveness of the Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement, which came into effect in September 2004. The Panel was also asked to assess the impact the introduction of the Parkwise Scheme had on residents, visitors, motorists, traders and businesses in Chorley and to identify any future improvements for customer service.

The Panel has now completed the Inquiry and the recommendations will be forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for their consideration and then to the Executive Committee for final approval.

May I take this opportunity, on behalf of the Customer Overview and Scrutiny Panel, to thank all who took part in this Inquiry.

STELLA M WALSH  
CHAIR - CUSTOMER PANEL

---

## **2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY/LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND COSTS**

The Customer Overview and Scrutiny Panel undertook a Scrutiny Inquiry into the Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement.

The objective of the Inquiry was to investigate the effectiveness of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement in Chorley, to assess the impact the introduction of the Parkwise scheme has had on residents, visitors, motorists, traders and businesses; to compare with best practice elsewhere and to identify any future improvements for customer service.

During the late 1980's, police forces across England and Wales were under increasing pressure to provide more officers on the beat and this led to redeployment of Traffic Wardens. As a result of this, Central Government passed the Road Traffic Act 1991. Lancashire Constabulary gradually reduced their Traffic Wardens over the years, and in 2001 gave formal notice to Lancashire County Council that all enforcement of parking by police would cease on 5th April 2004. In response to this, Lancashire County Council, as the Highway Authority, and after consultation with all the Districts, applied to Department for Transport for the powers to carry out Decriminalised Parking Enforcement across the county. This came into effect on 6th September 2004.

Lancashire County Council devolved responsibility to the district Councils for the day to day running of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement. Operational matters relating to the Parking Attendants would be dealt with in each district between the Parking Manager and the Area Manager for the contractor (National Car Parks). Parkwise were a department of Lancashire County Council and not a private contractor.

It should be noted that the implementation of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement in Lancashire was the first time a County Council and a number of district councils have operated Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement in a partnership arrangement. As there are 12 districts and the County Council this was a complex operation over a large area.

A high proportion of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement was governed by statute. The old system could not be resurrected once it was in place. The procedure for the issuing of Penalty Charge Notices and the way that appeals were dealt with was, in the main, set out in statute. There were road safety reasons for Traffic Regulation Orders such as the flow of traffic, pedestrian and driver visibility and to prevent vehicles being an obstruction at junctions.

The approach of the Parking Attendants a year in to Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement has developed into a more relaxed style, especially with members of the public. It was noted that some of the initial criticism might have been justified.

The investigations have highlighted key points, including:

- There were no targets set for the number of Penalty Charge Notices issued. The motorists set the number of Penalty Charge Notices issued as if no one parked in contravention no notices would be issued.
- Less than 1% of Pay and Display tickets bought received a Penalty Charge Notice.
- A Parking Attendant issued a Penalty Charge Notice based on the information available to them.
  
- Ongoing interest from the press must be expected in relation to Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement. On the day of the site visit to Sefton Borough Council,

Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement was front-page news in the local paper five years after implementation.

- Preston, Burnley and Lancaster deploy a higher percentage of Parking Attendants per head of population than Chorley. There were 7 Parking Attendants deployed at any one time in Chorley.
- Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement was self-financing and would not cost Chorley Borough Council anything as the costs were carried over until it made a surplus.
- Parking Attendants provided other services to the public such as, directions, where disabled drivers could and could not park, where to purchase things, lost property such as keys and delivered residents parking permits. Parking Attendants reported faulty lighting, broken glass and litter and looked after people if they were taken ill.
- Blue Badge holders received a high proportion of the Penalty Charge Notices issued. This was partly due to confusion over which side of the badge should be displayed. It was a security risk if people displayed the wrong side as it displayed a photograph of the disable person.
- There are instances where Parking Attendants were physically and verbally assaulted.
- The suggested alternatives to pay and display car parks were not suitable for Chorley.

#### Customer Overview and Scrutiny Panel Membership

Councillor Mrs. S Walsh (Chair)	Councillor Miss J Molyneaux
Councillor A Cullens	Councillor Russell
Councillor Mrs. D Dickinson	Councillor E Smith
Councillor M Lees	Councillor Mrs. J Snape
Councillor Malpas	Councillor C Snow

#### Officer Support

Lead Officer

Mr. Iain Price

Parking Manager

#### Democratic Services

Miss Ruth Hawes

Assistant Democratic Services Officer

#### Contribution of Evidence

The Panel would like to thank Members of the Public, Chorley Borough Councillors, Parish Councillors and representatives of the Disability Liaison Group, the Markets Liaison Group and the Town Centre Forum who have provided evidence and contributed to the Inquiry. The Panel would also like to thank officers of Sefton Borough Council, representatives from the contractor (National Car Parks) and Councillor D Gee (Executive Member for Traffic and Transportation) for their contributions to the inquiry.

## Recommendations

The Customer Overview and Scrutiny Panel, after taking account of all the evidence, recommend the following:

### Recommendations to Chorley Borough Council

1. That it be noted that in the early stages there was some cause for concern that generated media interest. There have been improvements since the Inquiry has been ongoing. Recommendations 4, 5, 6, 11c have already begun.  
*Cost: There are no costs associated with this recommendation.*
2. That the Director of Customer, Legal and Democratic Services be requested to resolve the outstanding issues in relation to the agency agreement as soon as possible.  
*Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council).*
3. That the Parking Manager liaise with the contractor (National Car Parks) to ensure that Parking Attendants make a note of circumstances when a driver returned to their vehicle, had been issued with a Penalty Charge Notice and was encouraged by the Parking Attendant to follow the appeals procedure.  
*Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council)/(National Car Parks).*
4. That the Parking Manager liaise with the contractor (National Car Parks) to ensure that Parking Attendants record verbal abuse on the hand held equipment and in the pocket book.  
*Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council/National Car Parks).*
5. That the Parking Manager liaise with the contractor (National Car Parks) to ensure that Parking Attendants use a leaflet showing additional information as to why a Penalty Charge Notice had been issued to Blue Badge holders, similar to that used in Bolton.  
*Cost: Lancashire County Council have taken up this idea and will produce the leaflets for all Lancashire districts.*

<p><b>Chorley</b> Borough Council</p> <p>Parking Services Additional Information</p> <p>You have been issued with a Penalty Charge Notice because we cannot read all the details on your Disabled Badge due to the way it has been displayed. The problem we found is as below:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Your Badge is face down and we cannot read the relevant details such as the Serial Number and Entry Code.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Your Clock is missing or obscured so we do not know your time of arrival.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Your Badge is obscured so we do not know your Blue Badge details.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Your Badge has fallen down and cannot be clearly read.</p> <p>Other: _____</p> <p>We are trying to help you park with the least inconvenience and it helps us to ensure compliance of those if your badge is displayed correctly. Should you wish to challenge the Penalty Charge Notice please write to: PNC/010 01256 1023 PNC/010 PR1 3ZA.</p> <p>Please enclose a copy of both sides of your Disabled Badge.</p>	<p><b>Chorley</b> Borough Council</p> <p>Parking Services Additional Information</p> <p>You have been issued with a Penalty Charge Notice because we cannot read all the details on your Disabled Badge due to the way it has been displayed. The problem we found is as below:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Your Badge is face down and we cannot read the relevant details such as the Serial Number and Entry Code.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Your Clock is missing or obscured so we do not know your time of arrival.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Your Badge is obscured so we do not know your Blue Badge details.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Your Badge has fallen down and cannot be clearly read.</p> <p>Other: _____</p> <p>We are trying to help you park with the least inconvenience and it helps us to ensure compliance of those if your badge is displayed correctly. Should you wish to challenge the Penalty Charge Notice please write to: PNC/010 01256 1023 PNC/010 PR1 3ZA.</p> <p>Please enclose a copy of both sides of your Disabled Badge.</p>
--	--

6. That the Parking Manager meet the Parking Attendants on their first day of employment to highlight certain points, for example, the importance of customer services.  
*Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council).*
7. That the Director of Streetscene, Neighbourhoods and Environment initiate Traffic Regulation Orders on the zig zag lines in front of schools in Chorley in conjunction with the "safer routes to school" initiative with Lancashire County Council.  
*Cost: Officer time, around £500 per advert per Traffic Regulation Order. There were six schools interested in this. (Chorley Borough Council).*

8. To undertake the following to address the negative perception of the public in relation to Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement:

b, That the Director of Policy and Performance include a question relating to Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement on any suitable surveys, with the citizens' panel to identify any concerns that the community have.

*Cost: Officer time. (Chorley Borough Council).*

c, That the Parking Manager distribute of publicity leaflets to local businesses and market traders such as, "pavements are for people" and "parking tips" to educate drivers that they can return to the vehicle and purchase additional time.

*Cost: The leaflets have been designed and printed in house (Chorley Borough Council).*



d, That the Parking Manager arrange for a sign to be erected on site where revenue from Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement had funded projects, for example, road safety schemes.

*Cost: £500 per sign, the total cost would depend on the number of funded projects (Chorley Borough Council).*

e, That the Parking Manager place a helpline number on all of the car park tariff boards to enable the public to report faults or problems to the contractor (National Car Parks).

*Cost: £200 in total (Chorley Borough Council).*

f, That a leaflet be produced showing where the Car parks were in Chorley. The leaflet to be produced by an external company but co-designed with the Council with sponsored adverts in from local businesses. The leaflets to be distributed to local businesses, Market Traders and the One Stop Shop.

*Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council).*

g, That if an infomercial, or a new corporate video, was produced references should be made to Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement.

*Cost: Corporate cost.*

9. That the Parking Manager trial the use of mystery shoppers with Internal Audit. The Panel would monitor the results and regularity of mystery shoppers. A dispensation could be given to allow a vehicle to park in contravention on a car park allowing the mystery shopper to assess:

- Whether a vehicle parked in contravention was issued with a Penalty Charge Notice,
- How the customer was dealt with,
- The quality of information given by the Parking Attendant and
- How the appeal was dealt with by Parkwise.

*Cost: £5 levy per Penalty Charge Notice and officer time (Chorley Borough Council)*

10. That the Director of Streetscene, Neighbourhoods and Environment write to all Chorley Borough Councillors and Parish Councillors requesting that any requests for parking enforcement be made to the Parking Manager on an annual basis.

*Cost: Officer time and postage (Chorley Borough Council).*

11. That the Parking Manager organise spot checks by Parking Attendants in residents parking areas out of hours, especially in the summer months.  
*Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council).*
12. To support the recent trial of a Parking Attendant using a scooter in the rural areas.  
*Cost: This information is commercially sensitive.*
13. That the Parking Manager, in conjunction with the Director of Human Resources, create a welcome pack for new Parking Attendants, including the Customer Charter and useful numbers including the Parkwise helpline, Borough Council Contact Centre and Police.  
*Cost: Officer time, in house printing (Chorley Borough Council).*

#### Recommendations to Lancashire County Council

14. That Lancashire County Council Social Services be requested to highlight which side of the Blue Badge should be displayed using a sticker.  
*Cost to Lancashire County Council £100 for 3,500 stickers. (This would commence in June 2006).*
8. To undertake the following to address the negative perception of the public in relation to Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement:
  - a, To request Lancashire County Council to produce a marketing toolkit for use by the districts, for example posters, leaflets, bus or radio advertising.  
*Cost to Lancashire County Council: The cost would depend on the size of the project. It is estimated between £5 and £10,000.*
15. That Lancashire County Council be requested to create a recognised permit for registered carers within Chorley and South Ribble Primary Care Trust area.  
*Cost to Lancashire County Council: Officer time, production of permit.*

#### Recommendations to the contractor (National Car Parks)

16. That the contractor (National Car Parks), in conjunction with Lancashire County Council be requested to review the Parking Attendant uniform  
*Cost: (The cost would be shared between Lancashire County Council and the Districts). This information is commercially sensitive.*
17. To support the use of technology to enhance service provision, for example, the use of electronic hand held devices.  
*Cost: Ongoing costs. (The Contractor).*

#### Recommendations to the Department for Transport

18. To support the following recommendations of the Childs report:
 

That the British Parking Association invites the Department for Transport:

  - To undertake urgent work to make more widely known the link between road safety, free flow of traffic and kerb space management and parking control (R1).
  - To seek from Local Authorities a full and audited annual disclosure which identifies income, expenditure and those specific areas in which any Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement surpluses have been spent and the benefit they bring to all stakeholders and
  - Prescribe a national model for how this information should be provided and ensure that it was in a form that was easily understood (R2).
  - To specifically encourage the adoption of an appropriately balanced Model Contract for use by Local Authorities and contractors (R4).
  - To require Local Authorities to undertake regular and local public opinion surveys into parking controls and Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement and identify key concerns the community have (R5).
  - To develop a communication strategy around parking control and Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement aimed at improving the public understanding and perception of them (R6).
  - To consider how parking control and enforcement and the benefits they bring can be better represented in the Highway Code (R7).
  - To require Local Authorities to undertake regular audits of traffic regulation orders and signs to ensure that they remain relevant and necessary and signs are



accurate, understandable and visible and that changes needed in regulations be made within a published time frame (R12).

To emphasise to Local Authorities the importance of regular reviews of traffic regulation orders and signage and seek the publication of a plan to achieve this (R13).

To consider whether through legislation, the name "Parking Attendant" should be changed to better reflect the role of such staff on the street (R15).

To consider ways in which it can be made obligatory to Parking Attendants to have undergone independently assessed training e.g. through the new City and Guilds qualification, either before appointment or within a set period of being appointed (R17).

To support an approach to the Home Office to explore how the victimisation of Parking Attendants might be made a higher priority for the Police (R23).

To urge Local Authorities to fully investigate and respond to requests to have a penalty charge notice withdrawn on receipt of the first communication from the driver (R32).

To urge Local Authorities to reinstate a full 14-day discount period if a road user can satisfy them that he/she did not receive the original Penalty Charge Notice (R33).

To encourage Local Authorities to publish annually the

- Number of Penalty Charge Notices issued each year
- Number of Penalty Charge Notices paid at the reduced rate
- Number of requests for Penalty Charge Notices to be withdrawn before the Notice to Owner was issued (R34)
- Number of formal representation made and allowed
- Time taken to respond to all requests

To collaborate with the British Parking Association in undertaking research to establish the most effective way of providing National good practice in parking control and the development of a good practice guide (R41).

That the British Parking Association

Explores the way in which the status and recognition given to Parking Attendants can be improved (R14).

Engages with specialist training advisors and reviews whether the levels of interpersonal skills and conflict resolution training in the Parking Attendant training syllabus was sufficient for the role they perform (R18).

Encourage Local Authorities and contractors who employ Parking Attendants, to provide specific financial support for those who wish to undertake job related and externally validated training, if the employer does not provide suitable training (R19).

Approach the Association of Chief Police Officers and seek to develop an enhanced response in case of Parking Attendant victimisation (R22).

Considers the establishment of an appropriate qualification for parking managers as a development on its work on training for Parking Attendants (R28).

And

That there was no change in the level of discretion given to Parking Attendants "on the street" (R27).

*Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council).*

19. That the Department for Transport be requested to develop a guide to parking to be sent to drivers with their drivers license and to consider parking issues in more detail in the driving test.

*Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council).*

### Total Cost Implications

Authority	Recommendations	Cost	Total £	
Chorley Borough Council	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 18, 19, 8b, 8c, 8d, 8e, 8f, 8g, 9, 16, 10, 11, 13	Officer time,		
	8b, 8c, 13	In house printing		
	8b, 8c, 13	In house design		
	7,	£500 per advert x 6 schools = £3,000.	£3,000.	
	8d,	Depending on how many projects are funded £500 per sign	£500 per sign	
	8e,	£200 in total.	£200 in total.	
	8g	Corporate Communications		
	9,	£5 levy per Penalty Charge Notice	£5 levy per Penalty Charge Notice	
	16,	Cost of uniform (commercially sensitive)		
	10,	Postage £22	£22	
	12,	Cost of scooter hire (commercially sensitive)		
	Lancashire County Council	14, 5, 8a, 16, 15	Officer time,	
		5	In-house design and printing	
	14	£100 for 3,500 stickers	£100	
	8a,	Depending on project size £5,000 to £10,000	£5,000 to £10,000	
	16,	Cost of uniform		
	15	Production of permit		
Contractor (National Parks) Car	3, 4, 16,	Officer time,		
	17	Ongoing costs		

---

### 3. INTRODUCTION

#### Background

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee referred an Inquiry entitled Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement to the Customer Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

The subject of the Inquiry came to the attention of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 6 January 2005 after a suggestion by Councillor Mrs I Smith, scoring three for importance (Good evidence linking topic to Council's key aims and priorities) and four for impact (Substantial potential benefits community wide or for a significant proportion or section of the community) in the scrutiny topic selection assessment criteria set out in the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Toolkit.

#### Aims/objectives

The Panel's aims and objectives for the scrutiny Inquiry were identified as follows:

- (a) To investigate the effectiveness of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement in Chorley,
- (b) To assess the impact the introduction of the Parkwise scheme has had on residents, visitors, motorists, traders and businesses.
- (c) To compare with Best Practice elsewhere.
- (d) To identify any future improvements for customer service.

#### Terms of Reference

The terms of reference for the Inquiry were:

- (a) To conduct an investigation into Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement and Parkwise and to identify (if any) improvements to the service.
- (b) To assess the current service provision.
- (c) To report on the investigations findings and make recommendation initially to Overview and Scrutiny Committee consistent with the Inquiry's objectives and desired outcomes.

#### Inquiry Project Outline

The Panel completed the "Overview and Scrutiny Inquiry Project Outline". This document was Appendix A to this report.

#### Desired Outcome

The Panel hoped firstly, to identify methods to show Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement and Parkwise as reasonable and customer friendly to residents and visitors to the town and, secondly, to maximize operational efficiency of the service.

#### General Information

Information on Chorley Borough Council's overview and scrutiny toolkit policies and procedures can be found on the Council's website: [www.chorley.gov.uk/scrutiny](http://www.chorley.gov.uk/scrutiny)

---

## 4. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

### Documentary Evidence

The Panel received and considered several reports and documents, these included:

- Background information on Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement and Parkwise
- Penalty Charge Notice statistics: On street/Off street (on car parks), Appeals successful/not successful and Appeals by offence
- Comparisons with other local authorities in Lancashire for numbers of tickets, numbers of Parking Attendants, number of Penalty Charge Notices issued and cancelled
- Information relating to Disabled Badge holders
- A summary of letters to the local press
- The recommendations of the Childs report (an independent report commissioned by the British Parking Association)
- The training manuals for the Parking Attendants produced by the contractor
- Evidence submitted by the public

The Scrutiny Inquiry Information Checklist (Appendix B) details the written documents assessed by the Panel.

### Witnesses

The Panel consulted the Disability Liaison Group on 21 November 2005, the Town Centre Forum on 7 December 2005 and the Markets Liaison Group on 21 February 2006 and considered the views and experiences that were shared.

The Panel, at its meeting on 7 December 2005, interviewed the following persons:

- Contract Manager for Lancashire
- Contract Supervisor
- Communications Officer, Chorley Borough Council
- Accountant for Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement, Chorley Borough Council

The Panel, at its meeting on 22 March 2006, interviewed Councillor Mrs. I Smith and the Deputy Director of Legal Services. On 6 April 2006 the Panel discussed the issues raised during the Inquiry and the draft recommendations with Councillor D Gee (Executive Member for Traffic and Transportation).

A copy of the Scrutiny Inquiry Witness Checklist was attached to the report as Appendix C.

## Research

Members of the public, Chorley Borough Councillors and Parish Councils, completed a questionnaire, undertaken by Beacon Research, in relation to Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement.

The Panel undertook a site visit to Sefton Borough Council, as an authority who had implemented Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement five years ago.



Members and Officers during the site visit to Sefton Borough Council.

## Panel Meetings

The agendas, reports and minutes of the Customer Overview and Scrutiny Panel held on 9 August 2005, 17 August 2005, 7 September 2005, 5 October 2005, 9 November 2005, 24 November 2005, 7 December 2005, 22 March and 6 April can be found on the Councils website: [www.chorley.gov.uk](http://www.chorley.gov.uk)



## 5. FINDINGS

### Objective/Key Issue 1 To investigate the effectiveness of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement in Chorley,

Evidence	Findings	Recommendation
Panel 9 August 2005 Sub-Group 7 December 2005	<p>Contrary to popular belief Parkwise was a department of Lancashire County Council and not a private contractor. Prior to the implementation of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement in September 2004 there had been 1.5 full time equivalent Police Traffic Wardens in the Borough of Chorley. Since implementation there were 7 full time equivalent Parking Attendants.</p> <p>One Parking Attendant used a mobile patrol in the outskirts of the Borough. Parking Attendants were assigned a beat in the town centre and were monitored by two supervisors. Each beat was different and they were rotated.</p>	<p>1. That it be noted that in the early stages there was some cause for concern that generated media interest. There have been improvements since the Inquiry has been ongoing. Recommendations 4, 5, 6, 11c have already begun.</p> <p><i>Cost: There are no costs associated with this recommendation.</i></p>
Sub-Group 7 December 2005	<p>Prospective Parking Attendants now shadowed a Parking Attendant, not in uniform, before any formal training to get an idea of the job. The performance of Parking Attendants was monitored through the tour log and the activity log, whether registrations were noted and then rechecked after allocated times. Feedback was received from the Parking Manager and members of the public. There were no targets set for the numbers of Penalty Charge Notices issued.</p>	
Panel 9 August 2005 Panel 22 March 2006	<p>The Parking Attendant could only issue a Penalty Charge Notice on the basis of the information available to them. A Penalty Charge Notice would be issued if a pay and display ticket was not displayed in the vehicle or the vehicle was parked in contravention</p>	

	<p>of a Traffic Regulation Order. A warning notice would be issued if a Traffic Regulation Order had changed only recently. A Parking Attendant could not cancel a Penalty Charge Notice once it had been issued or give a warning. This was to protect the Parking Attendant from potential allegations of bribery. The appeals procedure was on the reverse of the Penalty Charge Notice and was set out in Regulations. If the ticket was face down or the person could prove that they were loading or unloading the Penalty Charge Notice would be cancelled. Parking Attendants would encourage drivers to follow the appeals procedure.</p>	
<p>Sub Group 7 December 2005 Panel 22 March 2005</p>	<p>Due to the nature of the job it was difficult for the contractor to reward their staff, as there could be no suggestion of incentives. Per month there were 200 Argos points distributed across the whole of Lancashire, comprising 140 staff with a maximum of 20 points per Parking Attendant for examples of teamwork, integrity, customer focus and knowledge. One point equated to one pound.</p>	
<p>Panel 9 November Panel 22 March 2006</p>	<p>The comparison of car parking charges with other local authorities in the area shows that Chorley was competitive on car parking prices. The numbers of pay and display car park tickets had remained the same, and for some months had increased, since the implementation of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement.</p>	
<p>Sub-Group 7 December 2005 Panel 22 March 2005</p>	<p>A Parking Attendant would take a photograph of the issued Penalty Charge Notice on the windscreen on the vehicle, the pay and display machine and the reason why the car was in contravention; for example, there was no valid pay and display ticket. In some cases loading and unloading was permitted and a Parking Attendant would allow an observation period. In certain other cases, for example a bus stop no observation time was required and a Penalty Charge Notice would be issued straight away.</p>	



<p>Sub-Group 7 December 2005 Panel 22 March 2006</p>	<p>Preston, Burnley and Lancaster deploy a higher percentage of Parking Attendants per head of population than Chorley. There are 7 Parking Attendants deployed at any one time in Chorley, unless training was ongoing or a Parking Attendant was being supervised. The number of Parking Attendants had been devised after consideration of the number of car parks, Traffic Regulation Orders and residents parking schemes. The report of the consultant originally suggested 14, but this was re-evaluated as the ring road could be removed from the calculation.</p>	
<p>Panel 22 March 2006</p>	<p>There were issues outstanding in relation to the agency agreement that was discussed with Legal Services.</p>	<p>2. That the Director of Customer, Legal and Democratic Services be requested to resolve the outstanding issues in relation to the agency agreement as soon as possible. <i>Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council).</i></p>
<p>Sub-Group 7 December 2005</p>	<p>The number of Penalty Charge Notices issued by Parking Attendants in error had decreased since the first few months of implementation.</p>	
<p>Sub-Group 7 December 2005</p>	<p>Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement was self-financing and would not cost Chorley Borough Council anything as the costs were carried over until it made a surplus. All costs and income were held in a separate trading account.</p>	

**Objective/Key Issue 2 To assess the impact the introduction of the Parkwise scheme has had on residents, visitors, motorists, traders and businesses.**

<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Panel 22 March 2005	Less than 1% of customers who used the car parks in Chorley were issued with a Penalty Charge Notice. The number of pay and display tickets did not include Blue Badge holders (for disabled people) as they do not have to purchase a pay and display ticket. Of this number 50% of the Penalty Charge Notices were issued for not displaying a ticket or not purchasing a ticket at all.	
Panel 9 November 2005	The instances of people parking in a selfish manner, for example, across two spaces had decreased since the implementation of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement. It was now easier to find a car parking space at busy times.	
Sub-Group 7 December 2005 Panel 22 March 2005	Parking Attendants provided other services to the public such as, directions, where disabled drivers could and could not park, where to purchase things, lost property such as keys and delivered residents parking permits. Parking Attendants reported faulty lighting, broken glass and litter, looked after people if they were taken ill and liaised with the Closed Circuit Television operators to keep an eye on car doors/windows that had been left open. Tax warning notices were issued if the vehicle tax was out of date.	
Panel 9 November 2005	A survey was undertaken of members of the public during September 2005 with 365 respondents to examine the attitudes towards parking facilities within Chorley Town Centre. In particular, the survey looked at car parking provision and the role of parking attendants. The vast majority of respondents (76.3%) agreed that Parking Attendants were always around and provided a visible deterrent to illegal parking, with 46.3% agreeing that Parking Attendants provided	

<p>Panel 24 November 2005 Panel 22 March 2006</p>	<p>effective enforcement for the outer and residential areas. Opinions were divided on the subject of Parking Attendants as might be expected.</p>	
	<p>As a result of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement Traffic Regulation Orders and related signs were subject to an ongoing audit. The car parks and pay and display machines were regularly maintained. The pay and display machines were checked each day to be within one minute of the Parking Attendants watch. Resident parking areas have been reviewed to allow parking in limited waiting bays. Comments received from applications in relation to Parking Attendants for residents parking permits had been positive.</p>	

**Objective/Key Issue 3 To compare with Best Practice elsewhere.**

Evidence	Findings	Recommendation
<p>Panel 7 September 2005 Site visit 9 November 2005 Panel 22 March 2005</p>	<p>The appeals procedure was set out in Regulations. The fact that Penalty Charge Notices were cancelled showed that there was a robust appeals procedure in place. The appeals procedure laid down in the Road Traffic Act 1991 set out the actions to be followed at each stage. The first stage under the Act was the formal representation and service of the Notice to Owner. At this point the charge reverted to its full amount of £60. Parkwise do accept informal challenges prior to the issue of the Notice to Owner. Whilst this was not a statutory requirement, Parkwise treats this as "best practice" in common with most authorities across the country.</p>	<p>3. That the Parking Manager liaise with the contractor (National Car Parks) to ensure that Parking Attendants make a note of circumstances when a driver returned to their vehicle, had been issued with a Penalty Charge Notice and was encouraged by the Parking Attendant to follow the appeals procedure. <i>Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council/National Car Parks).</i></p> <p>4. That the Parking Manager liaise with the contractor (National Car Parks) to ensure that Parking Attendants record verbal abuse on the hand held equipment and in the pocket book. <i>Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council/National Car Parks).</i></p>
<p>Sub-Group 17 August 2005 Panel 7 September 2005 Sub-Group 7 December 2005 Site visit 9 November 2005</p>	<p>Blue Badge holders received a high proportion of the Penalty Charge Notices issued. This was partly due to confusion over which side of the badge should be displayed. It was a security risk if people displayed the wrong side as it displayed a photograph of the disable person. In instances where a Penalty Charge Notice had been issued because the Blue Badge had been displayed incorrectly the Penalty Charge Notice would be cancelled on the first offence and a letter sent explaining how the Blue Badge should be displayed. The Disabled Drivers Association had lobbied central government for the enforcement of Blue Badges due to the large-scale abuse of the badges.</p>	<p>14. That Lancashire County Council Social Services be requested to highlight which side of the Blue Badge should be displayed using a sticker. <i>Cost: £100 for 3,500 stickers (Lancashire County Council). (This would commence in June 2006).</i></p> <p>5. That the Parking Manager liaise with the contractor (National Car Parks) to ensure that Parking Attendants use a leaflet showing additional information as to why a Penalty Charge Notice had been issued to Blue Badge holders, similar to that used in Bolton. <i>Cost: Lancashire County Council have taken up this idea and will produce the leaflet for all Lancashire Districts).</i></p>
<p>Site visit 9 November 2005</p>	<p>The training received by the Parking Attendants did have a module on customer service, but it was highlighted that the Borough Council Parking Manager could stress points that were particularly important to the Council. Parking Attendants from Chorley were not seconded out to other districts in Lancashire, although if required Parking Attendants</p>	<p>6. That the Parking Manager meet the Parking Attendants on their first day of employment to highlight certain points, for example, the importance of customer services. <i>Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council).</i></p>

	from other districts could be seconded to Chorley, by agreement with the Parking Manager.	
Site visit 9 November 2005 Panel 5 October 2005	There could be a lot of vehicles parked directly in front of schools at the start and end of school. This was a road safety issue.	<p>7. That the Director of Streetscene, Neighbourhoods and Environment initiate Traffic Regulation Orders on the zig zag lines in front of schools in Chorley in conjunction with the “safer routes to school” initiative with Lancashire County Council.</p> <p><i>Cost: Officer time, around £500 per advert per Traffic Regulation Order. There were six schools interested in this. (Chorley Borough Council).</i></p>
Panel 24 November 2005	The British Parking Association commissioned an independent report entitled the “Childs report”. The report was an overview of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement. The report highlighted that the negative perception of the public in relation to Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement was an issue that needed to be addressed. This included the issue of verbal and physical abuse towards Parking Attendants.	<p>18. To support the following recommendations of the Childs report: That the British Parking Association invites the Department for Transport: To undertake urgent work to make more widely known the link between road safety, free flow of traffic and kerb space management and parking control (R1). To seek from Local Authorities a full and audited annual disclosure which identifies income, expenditure and those specific areas in which any Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement surpluses have been spent and the benefit they bring to all stakeholders and Prescribe a national model for how this information should be provided and ensure that it was in a form that was easily understood (R2). To specifically encourage the adoption of an appropriately balanced Model Contract for use by Local Authorities and contractors (R4). To require Local Authorities to undertake regular and local public opinion surveys into parking controls and Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement and identify key concerns the community have (R5). To develop a communication strategy around parking control and Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement aimed at improving the public understanding and perception of them (R6). To consider how parking control and enforcement and the benefits they bring can be better represented in the Highway Code (R7). To require Local Authorities to undertake regular audits of traffic regulation orders and signs to ensure that they remain relevant and necessary and signs are accurate, understandable and visible and that changes needed in regulations be made within a published time frame (R12). To emphasise to Local Authorities the importance of regular reviews of traffic regulation orders and signage and seek the publication of a plan to achieve this (R13). To consider whether through legislation, the name “Parking Attendant”</p>

	<p>should be changed to better reflect the role of such staff on the street (R15).</p> <p>To consider ways in which it can be made obligatory to Parking Attendants to have undergone independently assessed training e.g. through the new City and Guilds qualification, either before appointment or within a set period of being appointed (R17).</p> <p>To support an approach to the Home Office to explore how the victimisation of Parking Attendants might be made a higher priority for the Police (R23).</p> <p>To urge Local Authorities to fully investigate and respond to requests to have a penalty charge notice withdrawn on receipt of the first communication from the driver (R32).</p> <p>To urge Local Authorities to reinstate a full 14-day discount period if a road user can satisfy them that he/she did not receive the original Penalty Charge Notice (R33).</p> <p>To encourage Local Authorities to publish annually the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of Penalty Charge Notices issued each year</li> <li>• Number of Penalty Charge Notices paid at the reduced rate</li> <li>• Number of requests for Penalty Charge Notices to be withdrawn before the Notice to Owner was issued (R34)</li> <li>• Number of formal representation made and allowed</li> <li>• Time taken to respond to all requests</li> </ul> <p>To collaborate with the British Parking Association in undertaking research to establish the most effective way of providing National good practice in parking control and the development of a good practice guide (R41). That the British Parking Association Explores the way in which the status and recognition given to Parking Attendants can be improved (R14). Engages with specialist training advisors and reviews whether the levels of interpersonal skills and conflict resolution training in the Parking Attendant training syllabus was sufficient for the role they perform (R18). Encourage Local Authorities and contractors who employ Parking Attendants, to provide specific financial support for those who wish to undertake job related and externally validated training, if the employer does not provide suitable training (R19). Approach the Association of Chief Police Officers and seek to develop an enhanced response in case of Parking Attendant victimisation (R22).</p>
--	---

		<p>Considers the establishment of an appropriate qualification for parking managers as a development on its work on training for Parking Attendants (R28).</p> <p>And</p> <p>That there was no change in the level of discretion given to Parking Attendants "on the street" (R27).</p> <p><i>Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council).</i></p> <p>19. That the Department for Transport be requested to develop a guide to parking to be sent to drivers with their drivers license and to consider parking issues in more detail in the driving test.</p> <p><i>Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council).</i></p>
--	--	---

## Objective/Key Issue 4 To identify future improvements for customer service.

Evidence	Findings	Recommendation
<p>Site visit 9 November 2005 Panel 7 September 2005 Panel 9 November 2005</p>	<p>There had been adverse press relating to Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement. There was a need to highlight to the public the correct position. On the day of the site visit to Sefton there was a front-page story about Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement years 5 after implementation. Officers at Sefton advised that if businesses talked down parking to the press this was negative for the town centre and therefore bad for business. The Local Authority would not define the number of Penalty Charge Notices that were issued as the motorists dictate this. This also applies to Chorley.</p>	<p>8. To undertake the following to address the negative perception of the public in relation to Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement:</p> <p>a, To request Lancashire County Council to produce a marketing toolkit for use by the districts, for example posters, leaflets, bus or radio advertising. <i>Cost: The cost would depend on the size of the project. It is estimated between £5 and £10,000 (Lancashire County Council).</i></p> <p>b, That the Director of Policy and Performance include a question relating to Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement on any suitable surveys with the citizens' panel to identify any concerns that the community have. <i>Cost: Officer time. (Chorley Borough Council).</i></p> <p>c, That the Parking Manager distribute of publicity leaflets to local businesses and market traders such as, "pavements are for people" and "parking tips" to educate drivers that they can return to the vehicle and purchase additional time. <i>Cost: The leaflets have been designed and printed in house (Chorley Borough Council).</i></p> <p>d, That the Parking Manager arrange for a sign to be erected on site where revenue from Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement had funded projects, for example, road safety schemes. <i>Cost: £500 per sign, the total cost would depend on the number of funded projects (Chorley Borough Council).</i></p> <p>e, That the Parking Manager place a helpline number on all of the car park tariff boards to enable the public to report faults or problems to the contractor (National Car Parks) <i>Cost: £200 in total (Chorley Borough Council).</i></p> <p>f, That a leaflet be produced showing where the Car parks were in Chorley. The leaflet to be produced by an external company but co-designed with the Council with sponsored adverts in from local businesses. The leaflets to be distributed to local businesses, Market Traders and the One Stop Shop. <i>Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council).</i></p> <p>g, That if an infomercial, or a new corporate video, was produced references should be made to Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement. <i>Cost: Corporate cost.</i></p>



<p>Sub-Group 17 August 2005</p>	<p>There was a lack of concrete information on how Parking Attendants deal with customers face to face.</p>	<p>9. That the Parking Manager trial the use of mystery shoppers with Internal Audit. The Panel would monitor the results and regularity of mystery shoppers. A dispensation could be given to allow a vehicle to park in contravention on a car park allowing the mystery shopper to assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether a vehicle parked in contravention was issued with a Penalty Charge Notice,</li> <li>• How the customer was dealt with,</li> <li>• The quality of information given by the Parking Attendant and</li> <li>• How the appeal was dealt with by Parkwise.</li> </ul> <p><i>Cost: £5 levy per Penalty Charge Notice and officer time (Chorley Borough Council)</i></p>
<p>Sub-Group 7 December 2005</p>	<p>The basic uniform was implemented across the County and districts and the individual logos were then put on the uniform. There was a cycle of change for uniforms.</p>	<p>16. That the contractor (National Car Parks), in conjunction with Lancashire County Council be requested to review the Parking Attendant uniform <i>Cost: (The cost would be shared between Lancashire County Council and the Districts). This information is commercially sensitive.</i></p>
<p>Panel 9 November 2005 Panel 22 March 2006</p>	<p>Alternatives to pay and display car parks were considered. The alternatives suggested were pay on exit and pay on foot. Pay on Exit relied on staff manning exit barriers, verifying the amount of time the customer has been on the car park and charging accordingly. Time bands were often set at half hour intervals. It was expensive to install and operate, since it was labour intensive. Other major drawbacks as for "Pay on Foot."</p> <p>Pay on Foot was a very similar system as above, with barriers at the entrance and exits, but with centralised pay stations where the customer paid for their parking on the way back to their vehicle. Again, it was expensive to install, and running costs, whilst not as high as Pay on Exit, would still be higher than current, as the car park office would have to be manned for all the hours of operation.</p> <p>Drawbacks of both systems were that they rely on a secure layout on the car parks to prevent unauthorised egress bypassing the barrier. Therefore</p>	

	<p>the layout of the car park was important. Installation costs were high, as a barrier is required at the entrance and exit points, with associated wiring to the barriers and induction loop installation to prevent accidental activation of the barrier when a vehicle is on the loop. Suitable accommodation is required for the staff, either at the exit points (pay on exit) or a control room for pay on foot. Spaces would be lost on the car parks to accommodate this. The pay of foot system required pay stations to be located at convenient locations and presented a security risk. They would need some protection from the elements. A robust traffic survey would have to be carried out, but at peak times the consequences of vehicles queuing to gain access to the car park could cause severe disruption to the town's road network. The Panel were not aware of any surface car parks operating a pay on foot system. Recently, a pay on foot system was installed on a multi storey car park in Preston at a cost of approx. £70K, and the tariffs were increased shortly afterwards.</p>	
Panel 22 March 2006	Residents Parking areas in general were to be reviewed in the near future. Car parks were free between 6pm and 8am.	
Panel 22 March 2006	There was no recognised permit for registered carers within Chorley and South Ribble Primary Care Trust areas.	<p>15. That Lancashire County Council be requested to create a recognised permit for registered carers within Chorley and South Ribble Primary Care Trust area.  <i>Cost: Officer time, production of permit. (Lancashire County Council).</i></p>
Panel 5 October 2005 Sub Group 7 December 2005 Panel 6 April 2006	<p>There were areas in Chorley that experienced enforcement problems at certain times and days. The number of Penalty Charge Notices issued in rural areas was monitored. There was a mobile patrol that enforced the rural areas, but this was not currently enough to resolve the problems. A trial was carried out using a scooter (3 – 15 April 2006).</p> <p>There would be implications in relation to health and</p>	<p>10. That the Director of Streetscene, Neighbourhoods and Environment write to all Chorley Borough Councillors and Parish Councillors requesting that any requests for parking enforcement be made to the Parking Manager.  <i>Cost: Officer time and postage (Chorley Borough Council).</i></p> <p>11. That the Parking Manager organise spot checks by Parking Attendants in residents parking areas out of hours, especially in the summer months.  <i>Cost: Officer time (Chorley Borough Council).</i></p> <p>12. To support the recent trial of a Parking Attendant using a scooter in</p>

	<p>safety and lone working arising from having additional Parking Attendants alone in rural areas. Risk assessments would have to be conducted. If a Parking Attendant was to be dropped off in the outer core the hand held equipment would have to be trialled in relation to the radio being able to reach base.</p> <p>Mopeds had proven effective in city centres. The visibility of a Parking Attendant itself would move people on who had parked in contravention.</p>	<p>the rural areas. <i>Cost: This information is commercially sensitive.</i></p>
<p>Panel 22 March 2006</p>	<p>There was no Chorley Borough Council induction pack for new Parking Attendant as they commenced their duties in Chorley.</p>	<p>13. That the Parking Manager, in conjunction with the Director of Human Resources, create a welcome pack for new Parking Attendants, including the Customer Charter and useful numbers including the Parkwise helpline, Borough Council Contact Centre and Police. <i>Cost: Officer time, in house printing (Chorley Borough Council).</i></p>
<p>Sub-Group 7 December 2005</p>	<p>There were plans to stop the Parking Attendants using notebooks and use electronic hand held devices more extensively. This helped if it was raining and meant that the devices could be viewed in 'real time'. Digital cameras were already used to take quality photographs to help with the appeal process.</p>	<p>17. To support the use of technology to enhance service provision, for example, the use of electronic hand held devices. <i>Cost: Ongoing costs. (The Contractor).</i></p>



---

## 6. CONCLUSION

### General observations

After taking account of all the documentary and verbal evidence presented and the outcome of the visit to Sefton Borough Council the Customer Overview and Scrutiny Panel has identified a number of recommendations which, if implemented, the Members consider will enhance the service provided to the Public.

It has become clear, throughout the Inquiry, that Parking Enforcement is an emotive issue both locally and nationally. It is a complex topic, governed by statute with a lot of processes and background information to understand.

### Lessons learned for Scrutiny

The site visit to Sefton Borough Council was helpful in many ways and proved how important site visits are when undertaking an Inquiry. The Citizens Panel would be asked to take part in any future surveys.

---

## 7. APPENDICES

Appendix A  
Appendix B  
Appendix C

Overview and Scrutiny Project Outline  
Scrutiny Inquiry Information Checklist  
Scrutiny Inquiry Witness Checklist

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY INQUIRY PROJECT OUTLINE**

**Review Topic:**  
**Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement**

**Investigation by:**  
**Customer Overview  
and Scrutiny Panel**

**Type: Inquiry**

**Objectives:**

1. To investigate the effectiveness of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement in Chorley,
2. To assess the impact the introduction of the Parkwise scheme has had on residents, visitors, motorists, traders and businesses.
3. To compare with Best Practice elsewhere.
4. To identify any future improvements for customer service.

**Desired Outcomes:**

1. To identify methods to show Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement and Parkwise as reasonable and customer friendly to residents and visitors to the town.
2. To maximize operational efficiency of the Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement service.

**Terms of Reference:**

1. To conduct an investigation into Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement and Parkwise and to identify (if any) improvements to the service.
2. To assess the current service provision.
3. To report on the investigations findings and make recommendation initially to Overview and Scrutiny Committee consistent with the Inquiry's objectives and desired outcomes.

**Key Issues:**

1. Off Street Parking
2. On Street Parking
3. Customers experience and satisfaction.
4. Experience of Staff, e.g. security, training.
5. The publics understanding of the regulations
6. The publicity of the regulations and Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement service.
7. How appeals are managed.
8. Best Practice in other Authorities.

**Risks:**

1. The Council must comply with 1991 Road Traffic Act and Lancashire County Council Procedure Manual in relation to DPE.
2. Finance and resource implications.
3. Having desired outcomes beyond the capacity to deliver.
4. Town centre viability/perception of Chorley Borough Council

**Venue(s):**

Town Hall, Chorley; agreed site visits

**Timescale:** 6 months

**Start:** July 2005

**Finish:** January 2005

## Information Requirements and Sources:

### Documents/evidence: (what/why?)

- Background information on Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement and Parkwise
- Ticket statistics: On Street/Off Street, Appeals: successful/not successful,
- Tickets and Appeals by type of offence
- Training manuals for Parking Attendants
- Regulations and relevant contracts
- Comparisons with other areas for numbers of tickets, numbers of Penalty Charge Notices issued/cancelled and numbers of Parking Attendants.
- Comparisons with rural and urban settings
- Best Practice in other Authorities.

### Witnesses: (who, why?)

- Head of Public Space Services
- Executive Member for Traffic and Transportation
- Chorley Borough Councillors, including Councillor Mrs I Smith
- Representative from contractor (National Car Parks)/ Parking Attendants
- Representative from Chorley Chamber of Trade, Disability Liaison Group, Markets Liaison Group
- Members of the Public/residents?

### Consultation/Research: (what, why, who?)

- Letters to the local press
- Views of Town Centre Forum
- Questionnaire by Members of the Public, Councillors, Parish Councillors
- Parking Attendants

### Site Visits: (where, why, when?)

- Town Centre
- A neighbouring authority or an authority outside of Lancashire: to be determined
- A Parking Attendant training session

<b>Officer Support:</b>		<b>Likely Purpose</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Requirements:</b>
				<b>£</b>
<b>Lead Officer:</b>	<b>Alan Capstick</b>			
<b>Democratic Services:</b>	<b>Ruth Hawes</b>	<b>Site visits</b>		<b>50</b>
		<b>Questionnaire</b>		<b>1,100</b>
		<b>Postage and administration</b>		<b>50</b>
<b>Corporate Policy Officer:</b>	<b>To be identified as required</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>1,200</b>

## Target Body<sup>1</sup> for Findings/Recommendations

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



**SCRUTINY INQUIRY INFORMATION CHECKLIST**

**Name of Inquiry: Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement**

**Scrutiny Body: Customer Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Information Required</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Venue</b>
1	Background information on Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement and Parkwise	9 Aug 05	Union Street
2	Ticket Statistics On Street/Off Street, Appeals Successful/Not Successful, Appeals By Offence	9 Aug 05	Union Street
3	Comparisons with other areas for numbers of tickets, numbers of Parking Attendants, number of Penalty Charge Notices issued and cancelled	9 Aug 05	Union Street
4	Articles regarding two reports on the public perception of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement (Childs report and report by the University of Birmingham)	7 Sept 05	Town Hall
5	Information relating to Disabled Badge holders	7 Sept 05	Town Hall
6	An example of a Penalty Charge Notice	7 Sept 05	Town Hall
7	Publicity information to raise awareness for drivers who park inconsiderately	7 Sept 05	Town Hall
8	Comparison with rural and urban areas within Chorley	5 Oct 05	Town Hall
9	Result of questionnaire in relation to Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement undertaken by members of the public, Councillors and Parish Councils	9 Nov 05	Town Hall
10	Summary of letters to the local press	9 Nov 05	Town Hall
11	Best practice from other Authorities	9 Nov 05	Town Hall
12	Consideration of the recommendations of the Childs report	24 Nov 05	Town Hall

13	Consideration of Mid-Bedfordshire, Westminster and Sefton Parking Services Scrutiny Report	24 Nov 05	Town Hall
14	Consideration of the Parking Attendant Tours Log	7 Dec 05	Duxbury
15	Consideration of evidence submitted by the public	7 Dec 05	Duxbury
16	Training Manuals for the Parking Attendants	7 Dec 05	Duxbury
17	Additional Information leaflet for Blue Badge holders	22 March 06	Town Hall
18	Comments received with applications for residents parking permits	22 March 06	Town Hall
19	Comparison of car parking charges	22 March 06	Town Hall

## ***SCRUTINY INQUIRY WITNESS CHECKLIST***

**Name of Inquiry: Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement (DPE)**

**Scrutiny Body: Customer Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Witness</b>	<b>Information Required</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Venue</b>
1	Members of the Public	Feedback on experiences/suggestions for possible improvements.	Sept 05 Dec 05	By means of a questionnaire Consideration of letters/emails
2	Chorley Borough Councillors/ Parish Councils	Feedback on experiences/suggestions for possible improvements	Sept 05	By means of a questionnaire
3	Disability Liaison Group	Feedback on experiences/suggestions for possible improvements	21 Nov 05	Town Hall
4	Representative from the contractor (National Car Parks)	Identified questions	7 Dec 05	Duxbury
5	Parking Attendant Supervisor	Identified questions	7 Dec 05	Duxbury
6	Communications Officer	Identified questions	7 Dec 05	Duxbury
7	Accountant for Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement	Identified questions	7 Dec 05	Duxbury
8	Town Centre Forum	Feedback on experiences/suggestions for possible improvements	7 Dec 05	Town Hall
9	Markets Liaison Group	Feedback on experiences/suggestions for possible improvements	21 Feb 06	Town Hall
10	Councillor I Smith	Feedback on experiences/suggestions for possible improvements	22 March 06	Town Hall
11	Deputy Director of Legal Services	Update on Legal Issues	22 March 06	Town Hall
12	Executive Member for Traffic and Transportation	Consideration of draft recommendations and feedback as Executive Member	4 April 06	Town Hall