

Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

Under section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, Overview and Scrutiny Committees must require the Cabinet or local authority to respond to a report or recommendations made thereto by an Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Such a response must be provided within two months from the date on which it is requested¹ and, if the report or recommendations in questions were published, the response also must be so.

This template provides a structure which respondents are encouraged to use. However, respondents are welcome to depart from the suggested structure provided the same information is included in a response. The usual way to publish a response is to include it in the agenda of a meeting of the body to which the report or recommendations were addressed.

Issue: **Parking Permits**

Lead Cabinet Member(s): **Cllr Andrew Gant, Cabinet Member for Transport Management**

Date response requested:² **27 January 2026**

Response to report:

Enter text here.

¹ Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received

² Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received

Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

Response to recommendations

Recommendation	Accepted, rejected or partially accepted	Proposed action (if different to that recommended) and indicative timescale (unless rejected)
<p>1. That the Council recognises the urgent need for improvements in the online parking permit system, and extends the current contract by only one year</p>	Accept	Initial extension has only been agreed for 1 year. There is still the option / ability to extend for a 2 nd year if required but it is not the intention to do so.
<p>2. That as part of the early scoping process for the procurement, the Council involves members in reviewing the current system to identify, understand and design-out current flaws</p>	Accept	An appropriate level of stakeholder engagement and independent user tested will be built into the procurement and subsequent system testing process.
<p>3. That the Council prioritises quality and functionality over price in its weighting for the procurement of the new online parking permit system and/or reviews the measures it uses to adjudge quality to make them more reflective of end user experience.</p>	Accept	As per the county council's standard approach currently, contract assessment will be based on 60% quality, 10% social value and 30% price. User experience is a key part of the quality element with assessed user demonstrations.
<p>4. That the Council reviews its CPZ and parking strategy urgently, to allow it to inform the Council's technological requirements</p>	Accept	The enforcement service is engaging with transport policy teams with a view to update countywide parking policy & strategies, including CPZ. Ahead of that, Civil Enforcement Operational Policy is currently being reviewed and will be consulted on. To confirm future contracts will be flexible enough to respond to changes in parking policies and maximise the use of the latest technology to manage and enforce.

Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

<p>5. That the Cabinet investigates the viability of enabling trained ‘super-users’ to check the permit status of a particular car and report it to the Council without violating GDPR</p>	<p>Partially accept</p>	<p>The viability of ‘super users’ has been investigated from a number of angles, including employment law and user safety.</p> <p>From a data protection perspective, any information processed by a superuser must not indicate offence or give personal information, as this is enforcement data which requires prescribed lawful basis and statutory function for processing. As such providing the status of a particular car is not appropriate.</p> <p>However, there maybe options such as reviewing the status of say 10 cars or providing a direct feed to the council. As it is considered there are benefits to this, the feasibility of this will continue to be investigated.</p>
<p>6. That the Council, if it does not already do so, adopts a policy of writing to non-visitor permit users who do not have e mails to warn them when their permits are shortly to expire.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>Reviews of existing processes are being undertaken with the plan to improve communication - including implement writing to residents ahead of the permit expiry date for users who are not able to be contacted electronically. The intention is to identify an automated solution to the creation of letters.</p>
<p>7. That the Council works to raise awareness amongst GPs about their role in supporting unregistered carers access parking permits</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>Officers have and will continue to engage with GP’s to support this process through the traffic filters/ congestion charge trial and the need to support permit applications. This was met with limited success. We will continue to work with comms team within the council as how to improve engagement with GP’s.</p>