

<b>OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – CALL IN PANEL</b>
<b>11 SEPTEMBER 2014</b>
<b>WORKPLACE PARKING LEVY FIXED CAMERA TRIAL PROJECT</b>
<b>REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES</b>

1. **Purpose**

To provide additional information requested in relation to the call in request received regarding delegated decision Ref No. 1605, Workplace Parking Levy Fixed Camera Trial Project.

2. **Action required**

This report is for clarification purposes.

3. **Background information**

The Workplace Parking Levy was introduced in October 2011 to fund a range of transport improvements in the city including the extension of Nottingham's tram network and the redevelopment of Nottingham Station – both of which are in the top three transport priorities which local businesses tell us are vital to theirs and the city's future economic vitality.

The introduction of the levy followed a public consultation and an Examination in Public conducted by an independent examiner in 2007, following the Council exploring and subsequently discounting other options to raise the necessary revenue, The options discounted were road user charging, a supplementary business rate, Business Improvement Districts, Local Authority business growth initiative, core cities business rate retention, sale of land or other assets, prudential borrowing, increased council tax, European grants, local developer contributions and the introduction of a local lottery.

3.1 The call in raised 5 points of which 1-4 were confirmed as valid and point 5 was declined as an invalid reason. Therefore we have provided as background responses to 1-4 below to provide additional evidence to support the DDM 1605.

3.2 Point 1. The decision does not indicate any consultation with businesses that will be affected by this trial

Under the legislation applicable to the WPL scheme there is no legal requirement to undertake consultation with employers on how the scheme is administered and enforced. The primary and secondary legislation (Transport Act 2000 and WPL Regulations) gives the necessary authority to the Council's duly authorised officers to gather evidence to ensure the scheme is enforceable and the camera trial would be part of this process.

However, the WPL team has an ongoing relationship and dialogue with employers in the City, working with them to ensure they are licensed

correctly and are fully aware of compliance processes, and if the fixed camera trial were to go ahead, the intention would be to engage with employers regarding the trial following completion of the DDM procedure.

3.3 Point 2. The decision does not indicate any consultation with businesses regarding their views on further CCTV enforcement?

As outlined above, while the Council is not legally obliged to consult with employers regarding the operational methods of how the scheme is enforced, if the trial were to go ahead the WPL Team will liaise with all employers on the proposed camera trial location (the Riverside Retail Park) and the land agents.

It is important to be clear that no CCTV enforcement has ever been undertaken by the WPL team as they do not use CCTV cameras as part of the schemes compliance and enforcement regime. The WPL team utilise Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras not CCTV. Fixed cameras are merely a different utilisation of ANPR technology that is already in use as part of the scheme.

The cameras being used are ANPR cameras which capture the Vehicle Registration Marks only and not images of any vehicle occupants.

No individual drivers will be identified using fixed cameras; the purpose of the trial is to monitor the number of vehicles that are parking on site, rather than the owners or users. Neither the ANPR cameras nor the WPL database are linked in any way to any other databases, such as the DVLA's or Police National Computer. No personal details of the vehicles owner are required as the WPL is a levy on employers, not individuals. All data collected is stored and disposed of in accordance with Council policy.

3.4 Point 3. Inadequate evidence of administrative savings to both the Council and affected businesses?

As the WPL scheme has evolved it has become apparent that compliance checking at large multi-occupancy car park sites, of which there are approximately six sites in the city, involves significant officer time spent engaging with each employer to manually check licensing information supplied, being able to gather and analyse this data automatically means less checking would be required with employers and so would therefore reduce administrative bureaucracy for them and also potentially providing savings on WPL administration.

Although it is difficult to accurately estimate the potential savings which could be made to WPL administration costs without first conducting the trial, initial indications would suggest that there is a potential to save approximately £312,000. Conducting a Compliance Survey (CS) costs approximately £9,000 per retail park site in officer time gathering and

subsequently analysing the data collected. The cost to survey the six retail parks is therefore approximately £54,000.

The camera equipment which would be purchased under the DDM would cost £66,516, and if the trial proves successful it is intended that the same equipment could be reused and moved between the six sites to carry out compliance checks. As the equipment has a seven year lifecycle, there is a potential to save approximately £312,000 over seven years.

As the WPL is self-funding, any savings made to the administration costs of the scheme can be reinvested back into public transport initiatives.

3.5 Point 4. Inadequate evidence that the 'Do Nothing' option is untenable?

The delegated decision does not state that the 'do nothing' option is untenable. It states that it is merely desirable, as part of the ongoing evolution of the WPL scheme, to look at new ways gather information more efficiently and effectively than at present with the resources and technology currently available to them.

The Council would be negating its duty to employers if it were to ignore new ways of more efficiently and effectively administering the scheme.

4. **List of attached information**

None

5. **Background papers, other than published works or those disclosing exempt or confidential information**

None

6. **Published documents referred to in compiling this report**

None

7. **Wards affected**

All

8. **Contact information**

Jason Gooding

Parking Manager

Parking Commercial Development

Telephone : 0115 8763132

Email: [Jason.gooding@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:Jason.gooding@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)