

Parking on Private Land Appeals

Annual report 2018



Parking on Private Land Appeals annual report

Welcome to the third annual report since Ombudsman Services began administering Parking on Private Land Appeals (POPLA).

Once again, we've seen an increase in the number of appeals in the past year. This coincides with an increase in the number of privately managed car parks, and an increase in the use of Automatic Number Plate Recognition technology.

We believe the increase also coincides with motorists having a better understanding of private parking. Misinformation about private parking charges being unenforceable is now balanced with examples of private parking operators successfully pursuing parking charges. More motorists realise that ignoring a Parking Charge Notice won't make it go away and that appealing against incorrect or unfair parking charges is a suitable course of action.

POPLA considers appeals based on the facts and law. This often prevents us from allowing appeals where unforeseen circumstances have prevented a motorist from keeping to the parking conditions. However, we've continued to contact parking operators where we see genuine special circumstances and ask if they are willing to cancel parking charges. We've had a good response with parking operators often willing to cancel parking charges where they recognise situations beyond a motorist's control.

Further, the British Parking Association set additional expectations of its operators in the past year. These were for events such as the old pound coin going out of circulation. These expectations were not required by law or covered in the British Parking Association Code

of Practice – but where we saw that parking operators had not met the British Parking Association's expectations – we asked if operators would be willing to cancel parking charges and received a positive response.

POPLA has seen its work this year go beyond the resolution of individual appeals. We've seen positive actions from parking operators because of our appeal decisions and work with the British Parking Association. Stopping motorists receiving unfair parking charges has a much greater impact than allowing individual appeals. We aim to work with the British Parking Association on more prevention in 2019.

John Gallagher
Lead Adjudicator

More motorists realise that ignoring a Parking Charge Notice won't make it go away and that appealing against incorrect or unfair parking charges is a suitable course of action.



Team set up

The POPLA team has 27 assessors, 10 of which have been introduced to the team this year. All new assessors have been recruited from within the alternative dispute resolution sector and undergone a thorough accreditation process.

We also have a further pool of POPLA trained colleagues working in other sectors at Ombudsman Services. This allows us to increase staff to meet any peaks in demand.

The POPLA assessors are supported by three team managers, a head of area, a sector expert, and Lead Adjudicator John Gallagher. John is an Ombudsman with 13 years' experience in handling complex disputes. John is an accredited mediator and is currently writing a dissertation on consumer response rates to alternative dispute resolution services. John has lead responsibility for decision-making and decision quality at POPLA.

2018 saw several POPLA colleagues moving onto roles within government and civil service. We would like to take this opportunity to thank those colleagues for their hard work over their time with POPLA.

Appeal numbers

Between 1 October 2017 and 30 September 2018, POPLA received 67,122 appeals and decided 50,082. We allowed 11,447 appeals, refusing 38,635.

In addition to the appeals we decided, parking operators decided not to contest 15,562 appeals. This means that of the 65,644 appeals that completed the POPLA process, 27,009 resulted in cancelled parking charges - 41% of all processed appeals.

Please see the appendix for a full breakdown of appeals received, appeals by operator, appeals allowed and refused by operator, and appeals not contested by operator.

50,082
appeals decided

*1 October 2017 – 30 September 2018



Common appeals and our approach

Genuine mistakes

Over the past year there has been a theme of appeals where motorists accept that they didn't keep to the parking conditions but consider the Parking Charge Notice unfair because they made an honest mistake.

This can mean tough decisions. We consider each case on the facts and law. If a motorist makes an error that results in them not keeping to the parking conditions, it's unlikely that this will provide grounds for us to allow an appeal.

Sometimes, the set up at a car park might contribute to a motorist error. Where we have seen this, we have worked with parking operators to try to stop the same problem happening to others. Working with an operator



to improve things for motorists doesn't compromise the independence of POPLA's service.

For example, we received an appeal that a motorist had made payment to a council owned payment machine when parking in a privately-owned car park. Upon review of the evidence, the assessor could see that a council owned payment machine was located on the boundary of the land between the private car park and the council on-road parking. Although the location of the council machine was not the responsibility of the private car park operator, it had caused confusion for the motorist, leading to their error.

The assessor referred the case to the operator and highlighted that the council machine had caused confusion. The operator agreed to cancel the parking charge and worked with the council to have the payment machine moved to a more suitable location. This positive action from the parking operator should help prevent other motorists being confused and making the same error.

Confusion over grace periods

We are still seeing appeals where motorists are confused about grace periods. We hope to clear up confusion.

The British Parking Association expects its parking operators to allow a minimum ten-minute grace period at the end of an agreed period of parking. This is to allow for short delays in a motorist returning to their vehicle and leaving the car park.

In previous versions of the British Parking Association Code of Practice, 13.2 talked about a grace period before the parking period began.

“You should allow the driver a reasonable ‘grace period’ in which to decide if they are going to stay or go. If the driver is on your land without permission, you should still allow them a grace period to read your signs and leave before you take enforcement action.”

Although the Code of Practice explained that this period was for motorists to review the terms and conditions and decide whether to stay or go, the reference to grace periods caused confusion for motorists. Many believed they would get a ten-minute grace period before parking commenced, plus a ten-minute grace period after their parking time had finished – a total of 20 minutes. We received appeals from motorists who believed they didn't need to pay parking charges because they'd overstayed for less than 20 minutes.

The British Parking Association has now updated its Code of Practice to remove the reference to a grace period from 13.2. However, we should be clear that a motorist doesn't automatically enter a parking contract as soon as they enter a car park.

There is a need for a consideration period before a parking period starts. It is difficult for a motorist to understand the parking conditions without leaving their vehicle: making it necessary to allow time where a motorist can get out of their vehicle, consider the terms and conditions, and decide whether to stay or go. For example, it would be reasonable for a motorist to park their vehicle, walk to the payment machine, disagree with the parking tariff, and leave.

The length of the consideration period depends on the motorist and the circumstances. Some motorists might park, walk to the payment machine, disagree with the terms and conditions of parking, and leave the car park within a couple of minutes. Other motorists, for example those with restricted mobility, might take several minutes to get out



their vehicle, several minutes to get to the payment machine, and several minutes to leave.

In such cases, we must determine whether the motorist left the car park as promptly as they could when they decided they did not agree to the terms and conditions.

We are aware that the British Parking Association is currently reviewing this entire section of its Code with the intention of clarifying for motorists and operators alike.

Calls to POPLA

Over the last year, POPLA has noticed a significant increase in the amount of calls around the payment of Parking Charge Notices. Motorists contact us to complain that they have paid the parking charge but still want to appeal, and the operator refuses to provide a POPLA verification Code. Motorists also contact us where their appeals have been unsuccessful to complain that they are unable to pay the parking charge at the reduced rate. Unfortunately, we are unable to help with these calls.

Under the rules of the scheme, a parking operator doesn't have to allow us to consider an appeal where a parking charge has been paid. To reduce confusion, the British Parking Association introduced a new clause into to Code of Practice in January 2018 which stated,

"It must be made clear on any notices issued or on an appeal rejection letter that the motorist has to choose either to pay or to appeal (this also includes appealing to the Independent Appeals Service) – they can't do both".

The British Parking Association Code of Practice also dictates the rules on parking operators offering payment of a parking charge at the reduced rate: "19.7 If prompt payment is made (defined as 14 days from the issue of the Parking Charge Notice) you must offer a reduced payment to reflect your reduced costs in collecting the charge."

In most cases, more than 14 days will have passed by the time a POPLA appeal reaches its conclusion. The parking operator will have also incurred additional administration time and costs in dealing with POPLA. Therefore, the requirement to offer a reduced fee to reflect reduced costs in collecting the charge no longer applies.

POPLA is not involved in the setting of the British Parking Association Code of Practice and it wouldn't be proper for us to become involved. The Code sets out the British Parking Association's rationale for the period of the reduced parking charge and although POPLA accepts that this presents a frustrating situation for motorists, we can't change this.

Incorporating British parking Association operator guidance into our decisions

Over the past year the British Parking Association has given instruction to its operators beyond those set out in its code of practice, that we have incorporated into our decision-making.

Removal of pound coins

In March 2017, new pound coins were introduced in the UK. In October 2017, old pound coins went out of circulation. The payment machines in some car parks were not updated to take new pound coins straight



away, meaning some motorists who wanted to pay using new pound coins were unable to do so.

Many car parks allowed multiple payment methods, such as phone or bank card, as well as cash payments. However, the British Parking Association let its operators know that if a motorist had intended to pay using cash at the machine and been unable to do so because the machine had not been updated to accept new pound coins, it expected the operator to cancel any Parking Charge Notices.

Consequently, POPLA saw few appeals relating to being unable to pay with new pound coins. Where we did see appeals, we contacted the parking operators to ask them to cancel the parking charges in line with the British Parking Association's wishes, and they agreed.

Simple keying errors

Many private car parks are now managed using Automatic Number Plate Recognition cameras. The cameras capture a vehicle's registration as it enters and exits the car park to check the length of stay.

The terms and conditions of a car park might require a motorist to provide their registration so that the parking operator can link the motorist's actions to the information captured on camera. For example, some car parks are for patron's only, so the parking conditions might require a motorist to report to reception and enter their registration into a key pad. Or, a motorist might be required to pay for parking and need to enter their registration when making payment (at a machine or on an app), so the operator can see that payment has been made for a specific vehicle.

This process can cause problems for motorists. A motorist who's paid for their parking, or been

a patron of the landowner, might mis-key their registration. A common example is substituting the letter 'o' for the number '0'. This means that the registration caught by the camera doesn't match any registration entered into the required machine. Therefore, the technology will identify that a vehicle entered the car park and no payment was made, or there that there was no record of the motorist being a patron of the landowner. This starts the process of a parking operator issuing a Parking Charge Notice and causes the parking operator to incur costs for things like requesting the vehicle keeper details from the DVLA, postage, and administration.

In most appeals we see, the terms and conditions are clear that a motorist must enter their full and correct registration into the relevant machine. The terms and conditions are also clear that failure to enter the full and correct registration will result in a Parking Charge Notice. From an appeal consideration perspective, it is often plain that a parking contract was formed, the motorist did not keep to the conditions of the contract, and parking charge is due. From a fairness perspective, refusing an appeal doesn't always feel right where a motorist has paid for their parking or been a patron of the landowner.

Some parking operators have shown a recognition of this unfairness for many years. When identifying a motorist had received a Parking Charge Notice because of a simple keying error, they either cancelled the parking charge or offered to reduce the charge to an amount that covered the costs they've incurred to that point. The second of these options didn't always work, with some motorists assuming the operator had offered a reduced fee because they did not have a strong case. But when the appeals came POPLA, motorists ended up responsible for the full parking charge, because POPLA had to consider the



appeal based on facts and law, and didn't have remit to maintain the offer of a reduced charge.

The British Parking Association recognised that this was an area of frustration for motorists. In October 2017, it sent a message to its operators reminding them to put motorists at the heart of their thinking and to focus on effective car park management, rather than mistake punishment. The British Parking Association suggested that its operators considered cancelling Parking Charge Notices where it was clear that the parking charge had been caused by a simple keying error.

The message had the intended impact. POPLA saw a significant reduction in appeals relating to simple keying errors. Where we did receive appeals and identified that the parking charge wouldn't have arisen but for a simple keying error, we contacted the parking operators and reminded them of the British Parking Association's expectation. In most cases this resulted in the parking operators cancelling the Parking Charge Notices.

Of course, there can be a judgement call to be made on what is a simple keying error. Accidentally using an o instead of a 0 is different from deliberately writing a swear word into the keypad (examples of which we have seen). Our assessors apply their own judgement in determining simple keying errors.

We understand that the British Parking Association is considering amending its Code of Practice to publish best practice for operators for this issue.

Operators not contesting appeals

In last year's annual report, we highlighted a concern that parking operators chose not to contest a high percentage of appeals.

Although this resulted in cancelled parking charges for motorists, we were concerned that it showed a failure of parking operators to properly consider appeals at the initial stage. This had potential to create a problem where motorists who received a Parking Charge Notice didn't have the confidence or understanding to bring their appeal to POPLA. If the parking operator hadn't properly considered their appeal, it could leave the motorist paying an unfairly issued parking charge.

I am pleased to report that after we highlighted the issue to the British Parking Association, it worked with the operators that were contesting fewest appeals to ensure they were considering appeals correctly at the initial stage.

**23% appeals were
not contested by
operators**

The percentage of non-contested appeals, due to operator withdrawal, has reduced from 37% in the period 1 October 2016 and 30 September 2017, to 23% in the period 1 October 2017 and 30 September 2018.

These figures and the work completed by the British Parking Association leave us confident that parking operators are properly considering appeals at the initial stage more often.



Risk based car park inspections by the British parking Association

POPLA's core role is to determine the outcome in individuals appeals. It puts us in a unique position to gather data other parties are not able to. This data could be used for the benefit of motorists and parking operators.

For example, if the number of Parking Charge Notices issued at a particular site was disproportionate, it might indicate that the terms and conditions at that site were unclear to motorists, resulting in unfair parking charges.

We've had discussions with the British Parking Association about the possibility of it using our data to complete risk-based car park audits. This will allow it to target the car parks where the volume of appeals against Parking Charge Notices are the highest, so it can check that the terms and conditions are sufficiently clear for motorists and suggest amendments where appropriate.

POPLA will always be independent in our decision-making. However, where we can work with relevant stakeholders to prevent motorists from receiving unfair Parking Charge Notices, we are happy to do so.

Appeals based on mitigating circumstances

In most circumstances, motorists intend to keep to the parking conditions of a car park. Sometimes, events beyond the motorist's control prevent them doing so. For example, a motorist might park in a car park that allows a maximum stay of two hours and intend to leave the car park before that time has elapsed. But something might happen that prevents them from fulfilling their intentions. They might be held up, their car might not

start, they might become involved in a police incident, they might see someone in need and try to help, or they might have an accident or health scare that prevents them from leaving the car park on time.

POPLA can only decide an appeal based on facts and law. So, if a parking contract was formed and the motorist did not keep to the conditions of the contract, it might result in a refused appeal even if there is a genuine reason for a motorist being delayed. But where we see evidence of genuine circumstances that prevented the motorist from keeping to the parking conditions, we can refer the circumstances to the parking operator to ask if it would be willing to cancel the parking charge.

799 appeals referred back to parking operators

384 of those parking charges were cancelled

In the last year we have seen a rise in appeals referred to operators to due to mitigating circumstances. In last year's annual report, we reported that between 1 October 2016 and 30 September 2017, we referred 142 appeals back to the parking operator due to mitigating circumstances. Of those referrals, the parking operator agreed to cancel the parking charge in 78 cases. In the period between 1 October 2017 and 30 September 2018, we referred 799 appeals back to parking operators, resulting in parking operators cancelling 384 parking charges.

Although the ultimate choice on whether to cancel parking charges in such circumstances lies with the parking



operators, we consider the number of cancelled Parking Charge Notices to show the success of the process. When we highlight genuine mitigating circumstances to parking operators, they decide to cancel the parking charges in nearly half of the cases, even though they have no obligation to do so.

Almost half of parking charges that were referred back to operators for mitigating circumstances were cancelled.

Byelaws

There was a delay in POPLA considering appeals against parking tickets issued on land subject to Byelaws. This was due to relevant stakeholders confirming with government whether notices issued under Railway Byelaws could be dealt with by POPLA.

POPLA has now received confirmation from the Department for Transport that it considers issuing penalties on Byelaws land a legitimate practice. It has also confirmed that as a matter of good practice, parking operators should offer an independent appeal against the penalties.

Due to the lack of progress on government guidance, the British Parking Association took the decision to remove the requirement for parking operators to signpost motorists to POPLA for penalty charges issued under byelaws from 18 September 2017. The British Parking Association has now instructed its operators to signpost motorists to independent appeal for all penalties issued on Byelaws land after 1 November 2018. There were a considerable number of delayed appeals within the POPLA system. It was thought that we would hear these appeals when the government made a decision.

However, the parking operators in question took the decision not to challenge these appeals. This doesn't mean the notices were issued incorrectly. The parking operators made this decision due to the significant delay. All motorists with appeals delayed for this reason have had the penalties cancelled.

There is a notice in the [appendix](#) explaining how POPLA will consider appeals for penalties issued after 1 November 2018.

Media engagements

In November 2017, POPLA took part in the recording of Channel 5 programme *Britain's Parking Hell*.

We shared details of selected consumers that had appealed, with their agreement, so the programme makers could ask about the circumstances in which they received Parking Charge Notices. We then decided the appeals and explained the reasons for our decisions.

We also took the opportunity to explain the role of POPLA, so motorists were aware of our role and when they could come to us. The programme aired in August 2018.

Further to this, Lead Adjudicator John Gallagher has also appeared on Radio 4's *You and Yours* to discuss our approach to appealing parking charges.



Parking [Code of Practice] Bill 2017-2019

Sir Greg Knight is currently sponsoring the Parking [Code of Practice] Bill 2017-2019.

The bill is to:

“Make provision for and in connection with a code of practice containing guidance about the operation and management of private parking facilities; and for connected purposes.”

The Bill has passed through the House of Commons and had its first reading in the House of Lords on 26 November 2018. The bill is on course for Royal Assent in 2019.

POPLA welcomes the potential of a clear and independent parking Code of Practice which should make improvements in the standards of private parking operators.

The bill would also provide a boost for appeal handlers, allowing them to measure decisions against clear and independently set standards.



Appendix

POPLA update on tickets issued for alleged breach of Byelaws

POPLA postponed appeals against tickets (penalties and parking charge notices) issued on land subject to Byelaws. We'd been waiting for a response from the Department for Transport on the remit for parking operators to issue tickets on the land and on POPLA's remit to deal with penalties.

The Department for Transport has now provided a response confirming it considers parking operators to have a remit to issue penalties in line with section 14 of the Railway Byelaws. The Department for Transport also confirmed that it expects parking operators to offer an appeal (such as through POPLA) in relation to tickets issued on Railway Land.

POPLA ordinarily deals with appeals against tickets (parking charge notices) issued by British Parking Association approved operators on relevant land as defined in the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012. The Act sets out rules on the steps parking operators should take when ticketing on relevant land and POPLA measures against these rules when dealing with appeals.

Now that we have the Department for Transport response, POPLA will be considering appeals against tickets issued on Railway Land (and other land subject to Byelaws). Such land is not relevant land as defined by the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012. This means we will be applying different rules to appeal consideration.

Although our decisions on whether a motorist has, for example, overstayed or displayed a ticket, will be largely the same: many of the appeals we deal with relate to a failure of process in relation to the ticketing itself. Motorists may appeal that they did not receive the ticket in reasonable time, or that the ticket they received did not contain correct information.

This document sets out our expectations of the actions operators should take when ticketing on land subject to Byelaws. Unless we receive and accept further guidance from a relevant stakeholder (such as the Department for Transport or British Parking Association), we will measure against this document when making decisions.

The focus of this document is Railway Land, as the Department for Transport provided guidance on Railway Land only. Other sites such as airports and shipping ports have Byelaws specific to those sites: and some of those Byelaws set out specific processes. We will consider processes for specific sites where appropriate. In the absence of specific processes, our expectations at those sites will as set out below.

Considerations

- Who can the operator pursue?
- Timescales for ticketing.
- What we expect to see in a penalty notice.

Who can the operator pursue?

The Byelaws 14 (4) are specific that the owner of a vehicle "may be liable for a penalty as displayed in that area". Therefore, if pursuing for breach of Byelaws, the parking operator can only pursue the **owner** of the vehicle. The



owner may or may not be the person who was driving at the time. Another person driving the vehicle doesn't affect the owner's liability for a penalty.

Following the same standard as the Traffic Penalty Tribunal for local authority penalties, we will presume the owner to be the registered keeper unless they prove otherwise.

Parking operators can pursue the owner of a vehicle for breach of Byelaws by affixing a penalty to the windscreen of a vehicle for the attention of the vehicle owner. They may also seek keeper information from the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Authority to send a notice to owner through the post. If the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Authority determines that the parking operator has reasonable cause to seek the information, they may provide it to the parking operator.

Timescales for ticketing

The Railway Byelaws set out no timescales for the issue of a penalty for breach of Byelaws. However, the parking operator is timed out of prosecuting the motorist for breach of Byelaws after six months.

We consider a lack of timescales unreasonable to motorists in respect of appealing. If a driver or an owner did not receive notification of a parking charge or penalty until several months after an incident of alleged improper parking, they may have little or no memory of the event and their ability to appeal will be hampered.

The Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 sets out timescales for the issuing of parking charge notices. While the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 doesn't apply on Railway Land, the standards have been put in place for situations

like those in question. As those standards are used across the industry, and both parking operators and motorists are familiar with the standards, we consider it suitable that we use these standards as a guide when considering appeals against penalties issued on Railway Land.

What does this mean in practice?

Penalty notice:

- **Affixed to vehicle:** this should be given by affixing it to the vehicle at the time the alleged breach of Byelaws is identified.
- **Issued via post following a penalty notice affixed to vehicle:** this should be given in the period of 28 days following the period of 28 days beginning with the day after that on which the initial penalty notice was affixed to the vehicle.
- **Issued via post without a penalty notice having previously being affixed to vehicle:** this should be issued in the period of 14 days.

As with the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012, we will presume a penalty notice sent by post, unless proved wrong, to have been delivered on the second working day after the day on which it is posted; and for this purpose, "working day" means any day other than a Saturday, Sunday or a public holiday in England and Wales.



What we expect to see in a penalty notice

The Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 provides specific instructions on the information that should be contained within a parking charge notice. This information allows drivers and keepers to understand the allegation against them, the situation in which they find themselves, and their options. There are no such requirements for penalties for breach of Byelaws or parking charges where the parking operator is not seeking to pursue the keeper using the provisions within the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012.

However, we consider it important that tickets [penalties and notices] clearly communicate the circumstances to owners and drivers so they know their options and can make an informed decision on what to do next.

We've set out expectations for a Penalty Notice for breach of Byelaws on Railway Land.

A penalty notice should:

- Say it is a Penalty Notice (this can be abbreviated to PN providing the phrase Penalty Notice is used first).
- Be dated. Specify the alleged contravention including the time and date, site, and period of parking. Confirm how the Byelaws were brought to the motorist's attention.
- Confirm the law under which it has been issued. Be issued to the vehicle owner (Registered Keeper assumed to owner unless proved otherwise).
- Confirm potential consequences of non-payment, including prosecution.
- Confirm the amount of the penalty – which should be the same as the penalty shown in the car park.
- Inform the owner of any discount offered.
- Explain how to pay and who to pay.
- Confirm the appeal procedure

A penalty notice should not:

- Mention the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012. This is irrelevant and will confuse the owner about the situation they are in.
- Mention Parking Eye Vs Beavis.
- Say the words "parking charge", "parking charge notice", or "PCN".
- Refer to keeper or driver liability.
- Say anything untrue or misleading.

By mentioning the above, the penalty notice will confuse the owner about the situation they are in, as these aspects are irrelevant in the circumstances.



POPLA annual report statistics

Jump to:

[Results of appeals opened for assessment](#)

[Results of appeals opened for assessment per assessor](#)

[Appeal withdrawn before assessment by month](#)

[Appeal withdrawn before assessment per assessor](#)

[Appeals referred to operators based on mitigating circumstances](#)

[Parking Charge Notices cancelled by operators following a mitigation referral](#)

[Decision data by month](#)

[Decision data per operator](#)

Results of appeals opened for assessment

	Allowed	Refused	Not contested	Total
2017	2802	9077	4772	16651
October	1062	3274	1520	5856
November	1102	3288	1569	5959
December	638	2515	1683	4836
2018	8086	28707	13678	50471
January	903	3633	1533	6069
February	814	3257	1316	5387
March	823	3249	1292	5364
April	848	2840	1342	5030
May	992	2949	1488	5429
June	889	3016	1601	5506
July	1012	3256	1729	5997
August	927	3378	1692	5997
September	878	3128	1685	5691
Grand total	10888	37784	18450	67122



Results of appeals opened for assessment per operator

	Allowed	Refused	Not contested	Total
Absolute Parking Management	1	7	11	18
Adaptis Solutions	0	0	1	1
AEJ Management	1	1	1	3
All Parking Services	32	0	1	33
AM Parking Services	7	28	3	38
Anchor Security Services	156	217	24	397
ANPR Parking Services	12	5	28	45
APCOA Parking	134	492	756	1382
Athena ANPR Ltd	1	0	0	1
Atlas Enforcement	3	1	2	6
Bridge Security	23	0	0	23
Britannia Parking Group	239	930	600	1769
Business Watch Guarding	1	0	0	1
Capital Car Park Control	28	22	2	52
Carflow Ltd	15	51	11	77
Carrpool Ltd	2	0	1	3
City Permits	1	0	0	1
Civil Enforcement	654	3161	1068	4883
Close Unit Protection	31	47	50	128
Cobalt Telephone	1	0	1	2
Corporate Services	32	127	32	191
CP Plus	202	455	164	821
Dean Clough Ltd	2	0	0	2
Defence Systems Ltd	74	440	61	575
Dorset County Hospital	3	0	0	3
Elite Management	171	83	229	483
Elite Parking Management	8	1	10	19
Empark	72	23	9	104
Enterprise Parking Solutions	5	8	7	20
Ethical Parking Management	6	1	1	8
Euro Car Parks	377	2082	1019	3478
Euro Parking Collections	18	0	5	23
Everything Parking	2	0	0	2
First Parking	53	257	310	620
Future Parking	8	8	0	16
Galan Parking	1	6	7	14
Gemini Parking Solutions	177	304	65	546
Green Parking Ltd	2	2	0	4
Highview Parking	186	835	330	1351
Highview Parking ZZPS	1	0	0	1



Horizon Parking Ltd	77	318	231	626
Indigo [ZZPS 919]	1	0	7	8
	Allowed	Refused	Not contested	Total
Indigo Park Services	57	27	70	154
Indigo Solutions	0	0	22	22
JD Parking Consultants	8	24	20	52
Key Parking Solutions Limited	7	23	6	36
LCP Parking Services 358	5	63	11	79
Leeds Teaching Hospitals	1	0	0	1
Liberty Services 358	199	154	64	417
Llawnroc Parking Services	0	0	2	2
Local Car Park Management	4	7	2	13
Local Parking Security	414	74	21	509
Lodge Parking Ltd	10	15	4	29
MET Parking Services	199	1398	770	2367
Minster Baywatch	75	214	66	355
NCP	124	585	710	1419
NCP ANPR Rail	0	1	1	2
NCP Ltd	226	1245	846	2317
Northern Parking Service	40	132	17	189
Northwest Parking	8	6	22	36
NSGL	26	89	40	155
NSL Ltd	25	11	1	37
Observances Parking	89	6	30	125
OCS Group	22	37	5	64
One Parking Ltd	266	353	213	832
P4 Parking	70	166	269	505
Parking & Enforcement	34	55	51	140
Parking Charge Limited	49	76	79	204
Parking Control Solutions	5	6	2	13
Parking Debt Collectors	1	0	1	2
Parking Enforcement &	11	13	23	47
Parking Eye Ltd	2839	12927	5087	20853
Parking Solutions 24	46	76	22	144
Parking Ticketing	108	292	48	448
Premier Park	201	2155	503	2859
Premier Parking Solutions	1	0	1	2
Prime Parking	0	0	2	2
Private Parking Management	9	0	11	20
Private Parking Solution	72	168	30	270
RCP Parking Ltd	32	21	7	60
Salisbury NSH Foundation	0	2	0	2
Secure-a-space	21	133	43	197
Serco Limited	43	42	46	131



Shield Security Services	8	0	5	13
Smart Parking	1557	4547	3007	9111
	Allowed	Refused	Not contested	Total
Spring Parking	349	13	14	376
SR Security Services	11	12	4	27
StarTraq Limited t/a NotinMyParkingSpace.com	2	0	2	4
Total Car Parks	17	10	44	71
Total Parking Solutions	177	271	156	604
UK Parking Control Ltd	538	2278	849	3665
University of Kent	4	4	3	11
University of the West of	4	0	0	4
Vehicle Control Solutions	0	0	97	97
Wing Parking	24	93	29	146
Workflow Dynamics	23	33	8	64
WY Parking Enforcement	7	15	12	34
Grand total	10888	37784	18450	67122



Appeals withdrawn before assessment by month

	Motorist	Operator	Total
2017	598	4169	4767
October	204	1318	1522
November	204	1202	1406
December	190	1649	1839
2018	1828	11393	13221
January	218	1412	1630
February	156	1072	1228
March	148	1250	1398
April	189	1132	1321
May	208	1179	1387
June	187	1222	1409
July	226	1344	1570
August	245	1451	1696
September	251	1331	1582
Grand total	2426	15562	17988



Appeals withdrawn before assessment per parking operator

	Motorist	Operator	Total
Absolute Parking Management	0	12	12
AEJ Management	0	1	1
All Parking Services	1	0	1
AM Parking Services	3	0	3
Anchor Security Services	5	15	20
ANPR Parking Services	1	28	29
APCOA Parking	44	636	680
Atlas Enforcement	1	1	2
Britannia Parking Group	35	529	564
Capital Car Park Control	0	2	2
Carflow Ltd	4	7	11
Carpool Ltd	0	1	1
Civil Enforcement	251	941	1192
Close Unit Protection	7	43	50
Cobalt Telephone Technologies	1	0	1
Corporate Services	20	11	31
CP Plus	40	118	158
Defence Systems Ltd	35	23	58
Diamond Premises Control	1	0	1
Elite Management	13	171	184
Elite Parking Management	0	10	10
Empark	1	8	9
Enterprise Parking Solutions Ltd	1	4	
Ethical Parking Management	1	3	4
Euro Car Parks	109	878	987
Euro Parking Collections	0	5	5
First Parking	34	264	298
Galan Parking	0	7	7
Gemini Parking Solutions London Ltd	19	41	60
Highview Parking	72	247	319
Horizon Parking Ltd	27	208	235
Indigo [ZZPS 919]	1	16	17
Indigo Park Services	3	68	71
Indigo Solutions	3	85	88
JD Parking Consultants	5	14	19
Key Parking Solutions Limited	4	2	6
LCP Parking Services	3	8	11
Liberty Services 358	7	58	65
Llawnroc Parking Services	2	0	2
Local Car Park Management	2	0	2
Local Parking Security	7	11	18
Lodge Parking Ltd	3	1	4



	Motorist	Operator	Total
MET Parking Services	49	669	718
Minster Baywatch	5	56	61
NCP	52	622	674
NCP Ltd	123	695	818
Northern Parking Services (North	7	9	16
Northwest Parking Management Ltd	0	16	16
NSGL	18	21	39
NSL Ltd	0	1	1
Observices Parking Consultancy	3	20	23
OCS Group	1	6	7
One Parking Ltd	63	143	206
P4 Parking	17	233	250
Park Direct UK Ltd	0	1	1
Parking & Enforcement Agency	4	49	53
Parking Charge Limited	8	70	78
Parking Control Solutions	0	2	2
Parking Enforcement & Security Services	9	19	28
Parking Eye Ltd	359	4513	4872
Parking Solutions 24	5	18	23
Parking Ticketing	16	32	48
Premier Park	125	317	442
Premier Parking Solutions	1	0	1
Prime Parking	2	0	2
Private Parking Management	4	7	11
Private Parking Solution (London)	19	10	29
RCP Parking Ltd	5	2	7
Secure-a-space	4	42	46
Serco Limited	2	45	47
Shield Security Services	1	4	5
Smart Parking	642	2354	2996
Spring Parking	2	8	10
SR Security Services	1	3	4
StarTraq Limited t/a	2	0	2
Total Car Parks	2	42	44
Total Parking Solutions	30	123	153
UK Parking Control Ltd	66	796	862
University of Kent	3	0	3
Vehicle Control Solutions	0	93	93
Wing Parking	5	22	27
Workflow Dynamics	0	8	8
WY Parking Enforcement	0	14	14
Grand total	2421	15562	17983



Appeals referred to operators based on mitigating circumstances

	Number of cases
2017	148
October	29
November	40
December	79
2018	651
January	138
February	91
March	44
April	46
May	55
June	70
July	77
August	72
September	58
Grand total	799

Parking Charge Notices cancelled by operators following a mitigation referral

	Number of cases
2017	120
October	20
November	37
December	63
2018	264
January	55
February	37
March	24
April	24
May	18
June	29
July	33
August	25
September	19
Grand total	384



Decision data by month

	Allowed	Refused	Total
2017	3060	8772	11832
October	1011	2631	3642
November	956	2992	3948
December	1093	3149	4242
2018	8387	29863	38250
January	947	3750	4697
February	633	2465	3098
March	740	3074	3814
April	860	3284	4144
May	805	2778	3583
June	729	2512	3241
July	904	2575	3479
August	938	3038	3976
September	781	2790	3571
October	1050	3597	4647
Grand total	11447	38635	50082



Decision data per parking operator

	Allowed	Refused	Total
Absolute Parking Management	1	6	7
AEJ Management	0	1	1
All Parking Services	32	0	32
AM Parking Services	5	28	33
Anchor Security Services	150	217	367
ANPR Parking Services	15	5	20
APCOA Parking	161	564	725
Athena ANPR Ltd	1	0	1
Atlas Enforcement	3	1	4
Bridge Security	26	0	26
Britannia Parking Group	247	907	1154
Capital Car Park Control	29	29	58
Carflow Ltd	16	52	68
Carrpool Ltd	2	0	2
Civil Enforcement	659	3198	3857
Close Unit Protection	35	49	84
Cobalt Telephone Technologies	1	0	1
Corporate Services	33	128	161
CP Plus	211	455	666
Dean Clough Ltd	2	0	2
Defence Systems Ltd	76	453	529
Dorset County Hospital Foundation Trust	3	0	3
Elite Management	168	84	252
Elite Parking Management	8	1	9
Empark	72	25	97
Enterprise Parking Solutions Ltd	5	7	12
Ethical Parking Management	7	4	11
Euro Car Parks	382	2055	2437
Euro Parking Collections	19	0	19
Everything Parking	2	0	2
First Parking	55	257	312
Future Parking	4	4	8
Galan Parking	1	7	8
Gemini Parking Solutions London Ltd	190	311	501
Green Parking Ltd	2	0	2
Highview Parking	184	848	1032
Highview Parking ZZPS	1	0	1
Horizon Parking Ltd	74	340	414
Indigo [ZZPS 919]	1	0	1
Indigo Park Services	60	32	92
Indigo Solutions	7	0	7
JD Parking Consultants	9	23	32



	Allowed	Refused	Total
Key Parking Solutions Limited	8	22	30
LCP Parking Services	4	64	68
Leeds Teaching Hospitals	1	0	1
Liberty Services 358	210	160	370
Local Car Park Management	5	8	13
Local Parking Security	470	75	545
Lodge Parking Ltd	9	17	26
MET Parking Services	188	1355	1543
Minster Baywatch	75	224	299
NCP	132	554	686
NCP ANPR Rail	0	1	1
NCP Ltd	232	1275	1507
Northern Parking Services (North East Ltd)	42	134	176
Northwest Parking Management Ltd	8	7	15
NSGL	26	91	117
NSL Ltd	25	12	37
Observances Parking Consultancy	113	6	119
OCS Group	22	35	57
One Parking Ltd	272	349	621
P4 Parking	79	170	
Parking & Enforcement Agency	35	58	93
Parking Charge Limited	49	79	128
Parking Control Solutions	2	4	6
Parking Debt Collectors	1	0	1
Parking Enforcement & Security Services	12	15	27
Parking Eye Ltd	2916	13493	16409
Parking Solutions 24	44	77	121
Parking Ticketing	114	134	428
Premier Park	223	2208	2431
Premier Parking Solutions	1	0	1
Private Parking Management	8	0	8
Private Parking Solution (London)	83	168	251
RCP Parking Ltd	29	23	52
Salisbury NSH Foundation	0	3	3
Secure-a-space	22	141	163
Serco Limited	38	41	79
Shield Security Services	7	0	7
Smart Parking	1775	4570	6345
Spring Parking	377	10	387
SR Security Services	11	16	27
StarTraq Limited t/a	3	0	3
Total Car Parks	17	10	27
Total Parking Solutions	179	278	457



	Allowed	Refused	Total
TR Luckins	0	1	1
UK Parking Control Ltd	557	2326	2883
University of Kent	5	4	9
University of the West of England	4	0	4
Wing Parking	23	95	118
Workflow Dynamics	23	36	59
WY Parking Enforcement	8	15	23
Grand total	11447	38635	50082



Contact details

www.POPLA.co.uk

POPLA
PO Box 1270
Warrington
WA4 9RL

0330 1596 126

Phone lines open Monday to Friday, 9am to 5pm. Closed on weekends and bank holidays.

Please note 03 numbers introduced by Ofcom are an alternative to chargeable 08 numbers such as 0845. Calls to 03 numbers cost the same or less than calls to 01 or 02 numbers and are included in any inclusive minutes or discount packages. These rules apply to calls from any type of line including mobile, fixed line or payphone.

Information and figures in this report were based on Parking on Private Land Appeals data collated from 1 October 2017 to 30 September 2018.



Parking on Private Land Appeals is administered by Ombudsman Services Ltd.

Please do not use the registered address for correspondence or to raise an appeal. If you wish to raise an appeal about a parking charge, please visit www.POPLA.co.uk

If you would like to know more about Ombudsman Services, please visit www.Ombudsman-Services.org

The Ombudsman Services Limited

Registered office: 3300 Daresbury Park, Daresbury, Warrington WA4 4HS. Registered in England and Wales.
Company registration number: 4351924 VAT registration number: 798 3441 79

