

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Neighbourhood & Community Services Scrutiny Panel **DATE:** 29th March 2016

CONTACT OFFICER: Neale Cooper, Directorate Finance Manager

(For all enquiries) (01753) 875417

WARD(S): All

PART I **FOR INFORMATION**

RAC REPORT - 'LOCAL AUTHORITY PARKING FINANCES IN ENGLAND'

1 Purpose of Report

To review the veracity of the figures quoted for Slough Borough Council in the RAC report as requested by Members at the Panel meeting on the 6th January 2016.

2 Recommendation(s)/Proposed Action

The Panel is requested to note the information provided.

3. The Slough Joint Wellbeing Strategy, the JSNA and the Five Year Plan

3a. Slough Joint Wellbeing Strategy Priorities

This report compares the financial information contained in Appendix 3 of the RAC publication against the same set of costs held by SBC.

3b Five Year Plan Outcomes

This report is related to the following outcome:

- The Council's income and the value of its assets will be maximised.

4 Other Implications

(a) Financial

The financial implications are contained within this report.

(b) Risk Management

None

(c) Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

There are no Human Rights Act Implications.

(d) Equalities Impact Assessment

There is no identified need for the completion of an EIA.

5 Supporting Information

Background

- 5.1 In December 2015, the RAC Foundation published a report 'Local Authority Parking Finances in England' produced by David Leibling. The 35 page report looks at parking revenues for 353 local authorities over a number of years and includes Slough Borough Council in its comparisons and analyses.
- 5.2 Appendix 3 of the RAC report contains a table comparing the parking operations surplus of 353 local authorities for the years 2010/11 to 2014/15, and a ranking based upon the 2014/15 surpluses. In this table, SBC is shown as operating at a loss of £273k in 2014/15 and ranking 340 out of the 353 listed local authorities.
- 5.3 At the Panel meeting on the 6th January 2016, Members asked questions regarding this reported loss of £273k, and requested more information on the nature of the figures quoted and how they related to the costs held by SBC.
- 5.4 The RAC report uses the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) tables on parking income and expenditure for the period from 2010/11 to 2014/15. In particular, Appendix 3 utilises the data tables produced by DCLG drawn from the annual Revenue Outturn (RO) returns submitted by all Local Authorities. In the case of the £273k quoted by the RAC report, this was traced back to the actual RO return submitted by SBC last summer for 2014/15.
- 5.5 The RO return collects actual annual Local Authority income and expenditure across all services but groups these services into certain categories and types e.g. Education Services 'Early Years', Social Care and Public Health 'Physical Support – Adults (18-64)', and break these down into 'Employees', 'Running Expenses', 'Sales, Fees & Charges' and 'Other Income'. The financial information is collected on a full cost basis which means that support costs e.g. accommodation, IT, HR etc. are also included in the financial information.
- 5.6 Parking services are included in RO2 which covers Highways and Transport and treats On-Street and Off-Street parking separately. The table below is an extract from the SBC RO submitted to DCLG for 2014/15 last July.

	Employees £ 000	Running Expenses £ 000	Total Expenditure £ 000	Sales, Fees & Charges £ 000	Other Income £ 000	Total Income £ 000	Net Current Expenditure £ 000
Parking services							
61 On-street parking	150	1,166	1,316	1,118	-5	1,113	204
62 Off-street parking	38	890	928	769	90	859	69

- 5.7 As can be seen from the RO financial information submitted by SBC to DCLG, the £273k total net cost for Parking services matches the £273k quoted in Appendix 3 of the RAC Foundation report for SBC. It should be noted that the £273k net costs includes office accommodation for the parking team, insurance and maintenance costs for the car parks, 'support' costs (payroll, IT, finance etc.) as well as the costs of the parking team etc; all local authorities should be submitting their RO returns on the same financial basis.

6 Comments of Other Committees

None.

7 Conclusion

The Panel to note that the figures contained in Appendix 3 of the RAC report for SBC do not deviate from the figures provide by SBC to DCLG in the RO return for 2014/15.

8 Background Papers

'1' - RAC Foundation report - David Leibling, December 2015