



**Ombudsman  
Services**

**POPLA**

Parking on Private Land Appeals

# **Parking on Private Land Appeals**

**Annual Report 2019**





## Contents

Welcome	4
POPLA team set up	5
Appeal numbers	5
General approach to appeals	6
Common appeals	7 - 11
Operators not contesting appeals	12
Appeals based on mitigating circumstances	13
POPLA operations	14 - 15
System improvements	16
Scotland and Northern Ireland	16 - 17
Parking [Code of Practice] Act	17
POPLA Annual Report statistics	19
Results of concluded appeals	20
Results of concluded appeals per operator	21 - 25
Appeals withdrawn before assessment by month	26
Appeals withdrawn before assessment per parking operator	27 - 31
Decision data by month	32
Decision data per parking operator	33 - 37
Appeals referred to operators based on mitigating circumstances and keying errors	38
Parking Charge Notices cancelled by operators following a mitigation referral and keying errors	38
Results of appeals opened for assessment <b>Scotland and Northern Ireland</b>	39
Results of appeals opened for assessment per parking operator <b>Scotland and Northern Ireland</b>	40
Appeals withdrawn before assessment by month <b>Scotland and Northern Ireland</b>	41
Appeals withdrawn before assessment per parking operator <b>Scotland and Northern Ireland</b>	42
Decision data by month <b>Scotland and Northern Ireland</b>	43
Decision data per parking operator <b>Scotland and Northern Ireland</b>	44
Contact details	45



## **Parking on Private Land Appeals** Annual Report

### **Welcome to Ombudsman Services' fourth POPLA Annual Report**

We've seen a year of significant growth, with the number of appeals received increasing by 33%. One reason is that POPLA now provides full UK coverage – meaning motorists in Scotland and Northern Ireland have a route to free and independent appeal that wasn't previously available. I talk more about this expansion below.

Greater public awareness of POPLA is a further factor. We have been engaged in significant media activity – letting motorists know that private parking charges are enforceable and we're here for them if a Parking Operator maintains that a charge is valid.

And, as with last year, the growth coincides with an increase in the number of privately managed car parks, and an increase in the use of Automatic Number Plate Recognition technology.

Keying errors remain a hot topic. Motorists feel very frustrated when they've paid for parking – but they've ended up with a Parking Charge Notice because of a genuine mistake when entering their registration into a keypad or App.

We've continued to work with operators where we see genuine mistakes to persuade them to cancel Parking Charge Notices, even if they are legally valid. This approach has resulted in the cancellation of a number of Parking Charge Notices but still leaves motorists relying on the goodwill of parking operators.

So, we've been working with the British Parking Association on this issue to ensure its Code of Practice includes firmer instructions for operators – requiring them to let off motorists who've made genuine mistakes.

And of course, this year has seen the passing of the Parking [Code of Practice] Act. POPLA welcomes the introduction of this Act, which will see a new Code of Practice introduced to cover all private parking operators and drive up standards in the industry. The Act also allows the government to appoint a single appeals service to cover all of private parking. This Annual Report talks about some of work we've done to ensure we're prepared to perform the role if called upon.

**John Gallagher**  
*Lead Adjudicator*

**POPLA now provides full UK coverage –  
meaning motorists in Scotland and Northern  
Ireland have a route to free and independent  
appeal that wasn't previously available.**

## POPLA team set up

POPLA team numbers have increased up to 20% throughout the year to cope with demand.

Ombudsman Services has recruited and trained new colleagues, but also demonstrated its flexibility by using experienced Investigation Officer's from other areas of the business to meet seasonal peaks and increasing appeal volumes.

This flexibility has seen us stay within KPI for most of the year, in the face of massive growth, while keeping costs proportionate. More detail on our KPI performance is contained below.

The POPLA assessors are supported by two team managers, a head of area, a sector expert, and the Lead Adjudicator.

I would like to give particular thanks this year to our Sector Expert Craig Ineson. Craig provides advice to the team on complex cases. The increase in appeals has meant an increase in advice requests. Craig has coped admirably – guiding the team to ensure the correct answers on complex cases.

Craig has also helped me produce decision-making guidance for the team and completed television and radio interviews to give motorists advice on key issues.

## Appeal numbers

Between 1 October 2018 and 30 September 2019, we received 89,609 appeals. We processed 79,962 and decided 57,875. We allowed 13,155 appeals, refusing 44,720.

In addition, parking operators decided not to contest 18,857. This means that of the 79,962 appeals that completed the POPLA process, 32,012 resulted in cancelled parking charges – 40% 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.

**57,875**

**Appeals decided**  
**1 October 2018 -**  
**30 September 2019**



## General approach to appeals

It is important to remind appellants and operators that POPLA does not follow an investigative process when deciding appeals.

The appellant has an opportunity to submit their reasons for appeal and it is for the Parking Operator to prove the validity of the Parking Charge Notice by producing evidence to rebut those reasons. The appellant also has an opportunity to comment on the Parking Operator's evidence pack before an assessor decides the appeal.

POPLA assessors do not have a remit to seek further information, evidence, or appeal reasons from appellants – or to ask parking operators for further rebuttal reasons or evidence. Assessors probing one party or the other for further evidence could prejudice the outcome. Accordingly, we can only consider evidence provided by the parties during the process.

This means that appeal outcomes are incredibly sensitive to the appeal reasons and evidence, and the response of the Parking Operator. The same circumstances in the same car park can result in a different outcome if appellants submit different reasons for appeal, or the operator submits a different response.

On a similar note, it is important to point out that an allowed POPLA appeal does not necessarily mean a Parking Charge Notice was issued incorrectly. It means the Parking Operator's evidence did not rebut the motorist's appeal reasons and/or justify the validity of the Parking Charge Notice.



**Appeal outcomes are incredibly sensitive to the appeal reasons and evidence, and the response of the Parking Operator.**



## Common appeals

### Signage

A majority of appeals we see include that the motorist did not see or understand the signs.

Signs play an important part in the forming of a parking contract. A motorist cannot agree to be bound by parking conditions unless they are given the opportunity to read the signs and agree to the conditions by parking the vehicle.

Where parking is permitted, entrance signs play an important part in letting a motorist know they are entering a car park and should check the terms and conditions in the car park.

At some locations, it is also apparent from the number of signs and payment machines that a motorist might be expected to abide by some conditions of parking. If we determine that a motorist was made aware or should have been aware of the parking conditions, it is unlikely that we will allow an appeal because a motorist says they did not see the signs.

But we commonly allow appeals because the signage is unclear. The BPA Code of Practice sets out that signs should be conspicuous and legible, and written in intelligible language, so that they are easy to see, read and understand. We agree that these are important factors and we often see signs that don't meet the expected standard.

A motorist's interpretation of the parking conditions can differ from the intended parking conditions. For example, a sign at a retail park containing a McDonalds might say "1-hour maximum stay for McDonalds' customers only" – with the intention that only McDonalds' customers can park and only for an hour.

A motorist might be dining or shopping somewhere else at the site and believe the one hour maximum did not apply to them – because they were not a McDonalds' customer.

Ultimately, it is the Parking Operator that designs and erects the signs, so it is within the Parking Operator's gift to ensure that the signs are sufficiently clear. If there is ambiguity, and the motorist's interpretation of the signs is reasonable, it will result in allowed appeals.



## Impossible to keep to the terms and conditions

We have seen some signs where the language is sufficiently plain, but they cause confusion because they are not consistent with the set up at the site.

If such confusion exists, and the motorist has acted reasonably when parking, we may decide to allow an appeal.

For example, we dealt with an appeal where the signs stated to “park within marked bays only”. There were no bay markings at the site. The motorist parked in a reasonable place, perpendicular to a wall, and with enough space for another car to park next to them. The Parking Operator issued a Parking Charge Notice because the motorist had not parked in a marked bay.

Although the motorist had not kept to the parking conditions – it was impossible for them to do so. The motorist had parked in way in which they believed they had kept to the intended parking conditions on the site, by parking in a space that appeared suitable for parking.

We allowed the appeal and reported the operator to the BPA for investigation. The signage was confusing and, arguably, entrapping motorists as none could keep to the stated parking conditions.

## Keying errors

Many car parks are monitored by Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras. The terms and conditions of such car parks will often require the motorist to input their Vehicle Registration Mark (VRM) when paying or visiting reception at the site (for example at a gym with parking for gym members only). This is so the payment or registration can be linked to the vehicle caught on camera.

If the motorist does not input their correct VRM, the technology will suggest that no payment has been made for the vehicle, or the vehicle has not been confirmed to be one allowed on site (e.g. a gym member’s car).

This will start a sequence of events which might result in a Parking Charge Notice being issued to the keeper of a vehicle – if the Parking Operator applies for, and is granted, vehicle keeper details from the DVLA.

An informal instruction from the BPA to its members in October 2017 means many keying error cases do not reach POPLA. The BPA expects its operators to focus on parking management rather than mistake punishment and sent a message to its operators reminding them of this expectation in respect of keying errors.

Many parking operators put this into practice by having technology that helps the motorist confirm a VRM that matches those already recorded by the ANPR Cameras.



Others try to identify vehicles that might have paid for parking, or been entitled to park, but made a mistake when entering their VRM. If they identify such a vehicle, they will not issue a Parking Charge Notice. Identification is often simpler if there is only one digit incorrect in the VRM.

If the vehicle isn't identified prior to the operator issuing a Parking Charge Notice, many operators show leniency when a motorist appeals direct to the Parking Operator and demonstrates that they were entitled to park. In some circumstances, they will cancel the Parking Charge Notice (perhaps if they should have identified the error pre-issue). Otherwise, they will ask the motorist to pay only administration charges that have resulted from the motorist's error (the cost of getting motorist information from the DVLA, postage charges, the cost of dealing with the appeal).



So, despite an increase in car parks where motorists are required to input their VRM, POPLA sees relatively few appeals about this issue.

But not all parking operators are acting with the same level of leniency. We continue to see some appeals and the motorists involved are very clear that they feel there has been an injustice.

This perception of injustice often means escalation to MPs and the media and has been a significant driver for high level queries to our press team. We've been interviewed about keying errors for TV and Radio many times throughout the year – to explain our position when dealing with appeals and give advice to motorists.

Keying errors evidently provoke strong feelings and lead to motorists and members of the public seeing the parking industry in a bad light. This bad light can also reflect on POPLA because we must make decisions based on facts, law, and the BPA Code of Practice.



If the signs are sufficiently clear that a motorist has to enter their full and correct VRM – and the motorist does not do so – we can only conclude that the motorist had not kept to the parking conditions – so the Parking Charge Notice may be valid.

However, where motorists have made a genuine mistake but proved they were entitled to be in the car park (because they had paid or were a patron of the landowner) – we contact the parking operators and remind them of the BPA's expectation that they focus on effective parking management. We ask them to cancel parking charges for this reason.

The response has been a little disappointing. We referred 762 appeals to parking operators where we had identified accidental keying errors. Operators agreed to cancel the Parking Charge Notice in 227 cases, 29.8%. We understand that prior to POPLA considering these appeals, the operators had already decided that the Parking Charge Notices were valid. However, we think this is an area where operators could have shown more goodwill to benefit motorists and the reputation of the industry.

On a positive note, POPLA has contributed to discussions about including a section on keying errors in the BPA Code of Practice. We have provided perspective from the appeals we see and seen draft proposals that require parking operators to cancel Parking Charge Notices in certain circumstances and reduce the amount to only administration costs in others. If a Parking Operator does not follow the expectations set out in the BPA's Code of Practice, the BPA may determine a breach and issue sanction points, which could ultimately lead to expulsion and the Parking Operator being unable to seek vehicle keeper details from the DVLA. This would make managing parking using Automatic Number Plate Recognition technology impossible; as the operators won't be able to locate a vehicle keeper's address to send the Parking Charge Notice.

Further, with Parking Operator expectations set out in the BPA's Code of Practice, POPLA will be able to make decisions on keying errors without referral back to the operator.

If POPLA determines that a Parking Operator has not met expectations set out within the BPA Code of Practice, we will be able to allow appeals on that basis.

The introduction of keying error provisions into the BPA Code of Practice will bring welcome protection for motorists and should ensure that those who had made a genuine error in inputting their registration should never pay more than the Parking Operator's costs that have resulted from the error.

We would like to thank the BPA for listening to our feedback on this issue and involving us in ongoing discussions on the best way to ensure a fair system that protects motorists.

## Grace periods

We reported to the BPA that its Code of Practice was confusing in respect of grace periods.

The Code of Practice sets out that motorists should have a period in which they can consider the terms and conditions of parking and leave the car park if they reject those terms and conditions. For example, if the tariff is £5 an hour and the motorist decides that's too expensive, they can leave the car park without receiving a Parking Charge Notice.

The Code of Practice also sets out the motorists should have a minimum of ten minutes to leave the car park at the end of the parking period. So, if a motorist's ticket expires at 1.15pm, and they leave at 1.24pm, the motorist should not receive a Parking Charge Notice.

Both of these instructions to operators are aimed at ensuring motorists are treated fairly. However, both are referred to as Grace Periods in the current Code of Practice – when they are very different things.

Where this creates confusion is that motorists believe there is a Grace Period before and after the parking session. This can lead to motorists parking for less than 10 minutes without paying and believing it will be free – or believing they can overstay at the car park for 20 minutes (10 at the start and 10 at the end).

This isn't accurate – if a motorist parks their vehicle and leaves the car park – the period the motorist had to consider the contract ends.

We have suggested to the BPA that the period at the start of parking is not a Grace Period. It is a period for the motorist to consider the terms and conditions and decide whether they want to enter the parking contract. As such, it would be much clearer for the Code of Practice to describe this as Consideration Period.

This should mean less confusion, with a period at the end of the parking session being accurately called a Grace Period, allowing 10 minutes grace for motorists held up returning to their vehicles or exiting the car park.

The BPA has told us its next Code of Practice will reflect these suggested changes to make things clearer for motorists and parking operators.

Again, we would like to thank the BPA for listening to our feedback and working with us on this issue.



## Operators not contesting appeals

In last year's annual report, we highlighted a reduction in the number of appeals that operators had decided not to contest.

This followed us working with the BPA to raise concerns that some operators were opting not to contest large numbers of appeals. We worried that these operators might not be considering appeals properly at the first stage and waiting until POPLA presented an appeal to decide on the merits.

The number of appeals not contested by operators is consistent with our findings last year. Operators have decided not to contest in 23.5% of cases, which represents a very small increase of 0.5% on last year.

This does not provide us with any significant cause for concern. There are legitimate reasons for parking operators to not contest an appeal. The appeal and evidence presented through the POPLA website can sometimes give the Parking Operator a different perspective and leave them happy to cancel the Parking Charge Notice (either through goodwill or if they recognise it was issued incorrectly). Sometimes, landowners give parking operators instructions not to contest appeals even if the Parking Charge Notices are strictly valid.

There will always be some appeals that the Parking Operators decide not to contest – and this is to the benefit of motorists as a non-contested appeal results in the cancellation of the Parking Charge Notice.

Non-contested appeals are also very efficient for POPLA. If the motorist submits the appeal online and the operator decides not to contest, system confirmations are sent to both parties and the appeal closed without any human interaction. One might argue that 25% of the appeals we process are fully automated.



**Parking operators decided  
not to contest appeals in  
23.5% of cases.**



## Appeals based on mitigating circumstances



It remains that case that POPLA cannot allow an appeal because of mitigating circumstances. If a motorist has agreed to abide by terms and conditions by parking in a car park, and has not done so, it is likely that a Parking Charge Notice will be valid.

However, there are circumstances where the motorist is unable to keep the parking conditions for reasons beyond their control.

Motorists have described emotional and distressing circumstances to POPLA, to explain why they were unable to keep to parking conditions. And although we are unable to allow appeals for these reasons, we do refer such circumstances back to parking operators asking them to cancel the Parking Charge Notices based on the mitigating circumstances.

For example, one motorist parked in a hospital car park with a maximum stay of four hours. They fully intended to keep to these parking conditions, but the hospital quickly determined that the motorist needed an emergency blood transfusion. This resulted in the motorist having to stay in overnight and not removing his car within four hours. To receive a Parking Charge Notice though the post following this traumatic experience must have been incredibly frustrating.

The motorist provided us with hospital records of his check in and discharge times and these fit with his description of events and the ANPR camera records of him entering and leaving the car park. We therefore asked the parking operator to cancel the Parking Charge Notice because the motorist had been prevented from the keeping to the parking conditions because of an emergency that was out of their control. The parking operator agreed.

In the year from 1 October 2018 to 30 September 2019, we made a total of 359 mitigation referrals. Of these, parking operators agreed to cancel the Parking Charge Notice 37.3% of the time [134 cases].



## POPLA operations

### Calls to POPLA



In the year from 1 October 2018 to 30 September 2019, POPLA has handled 20,854 inbound calls. The POPLA team continues to receive calls about many issues including queries about logging appeals, requests for advice about the best way to appeal, or complaints about the outcome of an appeal.

The POPLA team will happily guide motorists on how to submit an appeal. But in order to maintain our independence, we cannot give motorists more than general advice on what to put in their appeal. It is for the motorist to submit their own reasons for appeal and it would not be right for the POPLA team to guide motorists on what to submit.

The general advice we give is to provide as much information and evidence as possible to support an appeal. An appeal is far more likely to be successful with supporting evidence.

Regarding calls about appeal outcomes; we appreciate that people will be disappointed if the evidence has not led us to allow their appeal. However, POPLA operates a one stage process and we cannot overturn a decision because a motorist disagrees with an assessor's judgement call. We would ask motorists to bear this in mind before calling us to try to have an appeal outcome changed.

### System problems

At the end of October 2018, we identified two system issues:

- 1) Appeals submitted on our website were not reaching our case management system or being forwarded to parking operators.
- 2) Individual pieces of evidence submitted by motorists were not reaching our case management system.

We worked hard and fixed the system issue within a few weeks of identification. We continue to monitor and have not seen a reoccurrence.

One impact of the first problem was that parking operators were not aware of the pending POPLA appeals and pursued motorists for payment of unpaid Parking Charge Notices. A second was a delay in dealing with the appeal.

We contacted affected parking operators to explain the delay and ask them to stop pursuing payment until we had considered the appeals. We notified appellants of the reasons for the delay. We then heard the appeals as normal.

The impact of the second problem was that we made decisions on appeals where not all motorist evidence had been considered. This could have resulted in incorrect decisions. We reviewed all appeals where we had found missing evidence. In many cases, the evidence was immaterial – or we had already found in the

motorist's favour. Where we found evidence that meant we had made the wrong decision – we contacted both parties and issued a revised decision.

We are sorry for the system issues we experienced and any negative impact this had on motorists and parking operators. We thank motorists, operators, and the BPA for the patience and understanding they showed.

We are pleased that we were able to contain and deal with the issue swiftly.

## Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

POPLA has a KPI requiring us to issue decisions within 55 days of the motorist submission. 28 days of this period is taken up by the time allowed for the operator to respond and a motorist to comment on the operator's evidence pack.

Significant POPLA growth and resource allocated to system issues put a strain on our ability to meet this KPI. Despite our best efforts, we slipped to just beyond 55 days in January 2019.

By allocating resource from elsewhere within Ombudsman Services, we were delivering decisions, on average, within 55 days by February. Since then we have been issuing decisions within 55 days or less.


We are currently issuing decisions, on average, 45 days from submission. This is just 17 days from the date most cases are available for review and ten days within our target KPI.

We're currently deciding appeals around

**17 Days**



from the date we have received the responses from both parties.



## System improvements

POPLA has recently committed to system improvements for the benefit of motorists, parking operators, and the industry.

These improvements will:

- allow operators to provide evidence more quickly – reducing administration time and costs.
- provide an enhanced customer journey.
- enrich the data we collect throughout the process.

We firmly believe that POPLA is in a great position to gather data from across the industry and develop insights that can be used to drive up industry standards. It can also be used to contribute to wider discussion on important issues such as the environment, clean air, and town planning.

## Scotland and Northern Ireland

At the time of last year's Annual Report, POPLA only considered appeals against Parking Charge Notices issued in England and Wales.

This was because the Protection of Freedoms Act [PoFA] 2012, the legislation by which parking operators are able to pursue a vehicle keeper rather than a driver, only applies in England and Wales.

Although parking operators are unable to pursue a vehicle keeper in Scotland and Northern Ireland – they are still able to pursue the driver.

So, since 2012, drivers have been receiving Parking Charge Notices in Scotland and Northern Ireland and did not have a route to an independent appeal service. If a driver appealed to the parking operator and the parking operator rejected the appeal, they would have nowhere else to turn.

To provide an additional layer of consumer protection, the BPA asked POPLA if we would be willing to consider appeals from drivers who had received Parking Charge Notices in Scotland and Northern Ireland. We happily agreed and set to work on updating our systems to accept appeals from these locations.

From 1 May 2019, we were ready to accept appeals against Parking Charge Notices issued in Scotland and Northern Ireland. Up to 30 September 2019, we received 1,035 appeals: 835 from Scotland and 200 from Northern Ireland.

Of these, we have decided 728, with 122 allowed and 606 refused.

Parking Operators have also opted not to contest 239 appeals, which is 24.7% of appeals concluded.





That means that of the drivers who appealed to POPLA, 361 [34.8%] had the Parking Charge Notice cancelled.

The stats for Scotland and Northern Ireland are included in the overall figures. But the appendix includes separate figures for Scotland and Northern Ireland to show full transparency for this new area of the scheme.

## Parking (Code of Practice) Act

On 15 March 2019, Sir Greg Knight's Parking (Code of Practice) Bill achieved Royal Assent and became the Parking (Code of Practice) Act.

The Act allows for the creation of a single Code of Practice to cover all private parking. The creation of this Code will be overseen by the British Standards Institution. It will be important that stakeholders feed into the drafting of the code and POPLA will be ready to share valuable data and insight that we have to help deliver a code that raises standards across the whole sector and is fair to motorists and parking operators.

The Act also allows for the creation of a single appeals service. A single appeals service would mean greater consistency for motorists, and for this reason it can only be welcomed.

To assist the government in determining the best solution, POPLA welcomed the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) to our offices. We demonstrated how the POPLA model and our approach is professional and works to a substantial quality assurance framework that builds in continuous improvement in all that we do.


We continue to invest in our system to enrich our data and deliver valuable insights and horizon scanning. This will allow us to identify problem car parks, areas, appeal types, and operators.

Our approach will be to offer a preventative solution – aligned with our Ombudsman model – seeking to stop unnecessary detriment to motorists as early as possible. For example, we can provide data and insight on what is happening to parking providers, MHCLG, consumer organisations, and other stakeholders and help resolve the root cause of the problem. Much more effective than dealing with an increasing number of appeals about the same issues. Of course, we will still be there to hear motorist's appeals where things have gone wrong.

If the government opts to appoint a single appeals scheme, POPLA is perfectly positioned to deliver for motorists and the industry.









## POPLA Annual Report Statistics

APPEALS RECEIVED - ALL OF UK	
October 2018	6057
November 2018	6901
December 2018	6040
<b>Total for 2018</b>	<b>18998</b>
January 2019	7303
February 2019	6435
March 2019	7617
April 2019	5309
May 2019	6488
June 2019	7039
July 2019	7768
August 2019	7452
September 2019	7361
<b>Total for 2019</b>	<b>70611</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>89609</b>



## Results of concluded appeals

	ALLOWED	REFUSED	NOT CONTESTED	TOTAL
October 2018	945	3450	1662	6057
November 2018	1258	3838	1805	6901
December 2018	1252	3225	1563	6040
<b>Total for 2018</b>	<b>3455</b>	<b>10513</b>	<b>5030</b>	<b>18998</b>
January 2019	1611	3894	1798	7303
February 2019	1189	3539	1707	6435
March 2019	1178	4004	2435	7617
April 2019	728	3093	1488	5309
May 2019	912	3871	1705	6488
June 2019	1052	4055	1927	7034
July 2019	1111	4652	2005	7768
August 2019	1100	4351	1994	7445
September 2019	819	2744	2002	5565
<b>Total for 2019</b>	<b>9700</b>	<b>34203</b>	<b>17061</b>	<b>60964</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>13155</b>	<b>44716</b>	<b>22091</b>	<b>79962</b>



## Results of concluded appeals per operator

	ALLOWED	REFUSED	NOT CONTESTED	TOTAL
Absolute Parking Management	2	5	11	18
Airedale NHS Foundation Trust	7	0	1	8
All Parking Services	48	1	102	151
AM Parking Services	4	36	10	50
Anchor Security Services	320	283	56	659
ANPR Parking Services	3	5	10	18
APCOA Parking	331	596	1262	2189
Bridge Security	35	0	0	35
Britannia Parking Group	215	1188	1245	2648
Canterbury Christ Church	1	0	0	1
Capital Car Park Control	52	49	5	106
Car Park Services	2	3	5	10
Carflow Ltd	10	70	27	107
Carpool Ltd	9	2	6	17
City Permits	13	24	11	48
Civil Enforcement	1136	4784	932	6852
Close Unit Protection	24	31	89	144
Cobalt Telephone Technologies	0	0	1	1
Corporate Services	150	35	26	211



## Results of concluded appeals per operator *Continued*

	ALLOWED	REFUSED	NOT CONTESTED	TOTAL
CP Plus	136	570	218	924
Dean Clough Ltd	1	1	0	2
Defence Systems Ltd	92	412	37	541
East Midlands Trains Ltd	0	0	1	1
Elite Management	282	8	191	481
Elite Parking Management	13	0	3	16
Empark	73	18	22	113
Enterprise Parking Solutions Ltd	20	30	43	93
Euro Car Parks	1525	3445	1922	6892
Euro Parking Collections	2	0	0	2
Everything Parking	1	0	2	3
First Parking	32	294	421	747
Future Parking	15	25	3	43
Galan Parking	5	5	4	14
Gemini Parking Solutions London Ltd	196	395	71	662
GMB Services (Scotland) Ltd	1	0	0	1
Green Parking Ltd	24	2	5	31
Highview Parking	250	1042	477	1753
Horizon Parking Ltd	111	499	342	952
Initial Parking Ltd	104	118	23	245
Ipserv Limited	49	55	51	155
JD Parking Consultants	11	34	40	85

## Results of concluded appeals per operator *Continued*

	ALLOWED	REFUSED	NOT CONTESTED	TOTAL
KBT Cornwall Limited t/as Armtrac Security Services	1	0	0	1
Key Parking Solutions Limited	5	14	4	23
Knightshield Security Ltd	1	0	1	2
LCP Parking Services	1	53	12	66
Liberty Services	3	0	4	7
Local Car Park Management	5	8	2	15
Local Parking Security	230	176	38	444
Lodge Parking Ltd	19	10	0	29
MET Parking Services	101	1151	671	1923
Millennium Door & Event Security Ltd	0	0	1	1
Minster Baywatch	59	248	157	464
Napier Parking	1	0	0	1
NCP	281	1978	2159	4418
NForce	5	5	1	11
Northern Parking Services (North East Ltd)	24	118	10	152
Northwest Parking Management Ltd	3	21	21	45
NSGL	26	85	23	134
NSL Ltd	29	13	0	42
Observices Parking Consultancy	78	40	15	133



## Results of concluded appeals per operator *Continued*

	ALLOWED	REFUSED	NOT CONTESTED	TOTAL
OCS Group	50	54	11	115
One Parking Solution Ltd	230	820	338	1388
P4 Parking	61	182	198	441
Parking & Enforcement Agency	133	111	41	285
Parking and Security Solutions Ltd	10	9	19	38
Parking Charge Limited	194	189	57	440
Parking Control Solutions	84	73	17	174
Parking Enforcement & Security Services	7	10	41	58
Parking Eye Ltd	3279	14365	5789	23433
Parking Solutions 24	68	59	39	166
Parking Ticketing 596	57	270	66	393
Premier Park	162	1812	730	2704
Prime Parking	1	0	5	6
Private Parking Management	11	0	26	37
Private Parking Solution (London)	116	326	55	497
Q-Park	1	0	3	4
Ranger Services	11	92	30	133
RCP Parking Ltd	79	33	15	127
Saba (was Indigo Park Services)	82	27	133	242
Salisbury NHS Foundation	3	6	3	12
Secure-A-Space	18	110	35	163
Select Parking Ltd	8	0	0	8



## Results of concluded appeals per operator *Continued*

	ALLOWED	REFUSED	NOT CONTESTED	TOTAL
Serco Limited	19	11	11	41
Shield Security Services	10	0	0	10
Smart Parking	1449	5397	2059	8905
Spring Parking	157	129	88	374
SR Security Services	41	13	10	64
StarTraq Limited t/a NotinMyParkingSpace.com	0	0	5	5
Total Car Parks	4	7	1	12
Total Parking Solutions	141	370	148	659
UK Car Park Management	2	0	0	2
UK Parking Control Ltd	449	2171	1171	3791
University of Kent	5	4	2	11
Vehicle Control Solutions	7	0	98	105
Wing Parking	10	63	24	97
Workflow Dynamics	17	12	6	35
WY Parking Enforcement	2	6	23	31
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>13155</b>	<b>44716</b>	<b>22091</b>	<b>79962</b>



## Appeals withdrawn before assessment by month

	MOTORIST	OPERATOR	TOTAL
October 2018	257	1406	1663
November 2018	307	1502	1809
December 2018	273	1293	1566
<b>Total for 2018</b>	<b>837</b>	<b>4201</b>	<b>5038</b>
January 2019	318	1483	1801
February 2019	225	1483	1708
March 2019	312	2125	2437
April 2019	198	1290	1488
May 2019	230	1475	1705
June 2019	295	1634	1929
July 2019	289	1716	2005
August 2019	276	1719	1995
September 2019	262	1731	1993
<b>Total for 2019</b>	<b>2405</b>	<b>14656</b>	<b>17061</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>3242</b>	<b>18857</b>	<b>22099</b>

## Appeals withdrawn before assessment per parking operator

	MOTORIST	OPERATOR	TOTAL
Absolute Parking Management	0	11	11
Airedale NHS Foundation Trust	1	0	1
All Parking Services	1	105	106
AM Parking Services	7	3	10
Anchor Security Services	25	30	55
ANPR Parking Services	1	9	10
APCOA Parking	77	1184	1261
Britannia Parking Group	86	1173	1259
Capital Car Park Control	3	3	6
Car Park Services	5	0	5
Carflow Ltd	23	4	27
Carpool Ltd	1	5	6
City Permits	0	11	11
Civil Enforcement	484	458	942
Close Unit Protection	7	81	88
Cobalt Telephone Technologies	1	0	1
Corporate Services	6	19	25
CP Plus	89	124	213
Defence Systems Ltd	19	19	38



## Appeals withdrawn before assessment per parking operator *Continued*

	MOTORIST	OPERATOR	TOTAL
East Midlands Trains Ltd	1	0	1
Elite Management	12	162	174
Elite Parking Management	0	3	3
Empark	6	16	22
Enterprise Parking Solutions Ltd	8	35	43
Euro Car Parks	243	1667	1910
Everything Parking	2	0	2
First Parking	57	361	418
Future Parking	2	1	3
Galan Parking	0	4	4
Gemini Parking Solutions London Ltd	36	36	72
Green Parking Ltd	0	5	5
Highview Parking	153	323	476
Horizon Parking Ltd	43	305	348
Initial Parking Ltd	2	22	24
Ipserv Limited	5	47	52
JD Parking Consultants	6	34	40
Key Parking Solutions Limited	3	1	4
Knightshield Security Ltd	1	0	1
LCP Parking Services	3	9	12
Liberty Services	0	3	3
Local Car Park Management	2	0	2

## Appeals withdrawn before assessment per parking operator *Continued*

	MOTORIST	OPERATOR	TOTAL
Local Parking Security	17	22	39
Lodge Parking Ltd	0	1	1
MET Parking Services	63	600	663
Millennium Door & Event Security Ltd	1	0	1
Minster Baywatch	19	137	156
NCP	256	1908	2164
NForce	1	0	1
Northern Parking Services (North East Ltd)	4	5	9
Northwest Parking Management Ltd	2	19	21
NSGL	2	22	24
Observances Parking Consultancy	0	15	15
OCS Group	5	6	11
One Parking Solution Ltd	65	275	340
P4 Parking	20	177	197
Parking & Enforcement Agency	3	39	42
Parking and Security Solutions Ltd	1	18	19
Parking Charge Limited	11	47	58
Parking Control Solutions	0	17	17
Parking Enforcement & Security Services	2	40	42





## Appeals withdrawn before assessment per parking operator *Continued*

	MOTORIST	OPERATOR	TOTAL
Parking Eye Ltd	446	5355	5801
Parking Solutions 24	4	32	36
Parking Ticketing 596	21	46	67
Premier Park	117	641	758
Prime Parking	6	0	6
Private Parking Management	0	27	27
Private Parking Solution (London)	35	20	55
Q-Park	1	3	4
Ranger Services	9	22	31
RCP Parking Ltd	9	6	15
Saba (was Indigo Park Services)	19	112	131
Salisbury NHS Foundation	0	3	3
Secure-A-Space	9	24	33
Serco Limited	1	10	11
Smart Parking	490	1546	2036
Spring Parking	7	83	90
SR Security Services	2	8	10
StarTraq Limited t/a NotinMyParkingSpace.com	0	5	5
Total Car Parks	1	0	1
Total Parking Solutions	40	109	149
UK Parking Control Ltd	109	1057	1166
University of Kent	1	1	2

**Appeals withdrawn before assessment per parking operator** *Continued*

	MOTORIST	OPERATOR	TOTAL
Vehicle Control Solutions	0	95	95
Wing Parking	1	24	25
Workflow Dynamics	0	5	5
WY Parking Enforcement	2	20	22
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>3223</b>	<b>18875</b>	<b>22098</b>



## Decision data by month

	ALLOWED	REFUSED	TOTAL
October 2018	945	3450	4395
November 2018	1258	3838	5096
December 2018	1252	3225	4477
<b>Total for 2018</b>	<b>3455</b>	<b>10513</b>	<b>13968</b>
January 2019	1611	3894	5505
February 2019	1189	3539	4728
March 2019	1178	4004	5182
April 2019	728	3093	3821
May 2019	912	3871	4783
June 2019	1052	4055	5107
July 2019	1111	4652	5763
August 2019	1100	4351	5451
September 2019	819	2748	3567
<b>Total for 2019</b>	<b>9700</b>	<b>34207</b>	<b>43907</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>13155</b>	<b>44720</b>	<b>57875</b>

## Decision data per parking operator

	ALLOWED	REFUSED	TOTAL
Absolute Parking Management	2	5	7
Airedale NHS Foundation Trust	7	0	7
All Parking Services	48	1	49
AM Parking Services	4	36	40
Anchor Security Services	320	283	603
ANPR Parking Services	3	5	8
APCOA Parking	331	596	927
Bridge Security	35	0	35
Britannia Parking Group	215	1188	1403
Canterbury Christ Church	1	0	1
Capital Car Park Control	52	49	101
Car Park Services	2	3	5
Carflow Ltd	10	70	80
Carpool Ltd	9	2	11
City Permits	13	24	37
Civil Enforcement	1136	4784	5920
Close Unit Protection	24	31	55
Cobalt Telephone Technologies	0	0	0
Corporate Services	150	35	185



## Decision data per parking operator *Continued*

	MOTORIST	OPERATOR	TOTAL
CP Plus	136	570	706
Dean Clough Ltd	1	1	2
Defence Systems Ltd	92	412	504
East Midlands Trains Ltd	0	0	0
Elite Management	282	8	290
Elite Parking Management	13	0	13
Empark	73	18	91
Enterprise Parking Solutions Ltd	20	30	50
Euro Car Parks	1525	3445	4970
Euro Parking Collections	2	0	2
Everything Parking	1	0	1
First Parking	32	294	326
Future Parking	15	25	40
Galan Parking	5	5	10
Gemini Parking Solutions London Ltd	196	395	591
GMB Services (Scotland) Ltd	1	0	1
Green Parking Ltd	24	2	26
Highview Parking	250	1042	1292
Horizon Parking Ltd	111	499	610
Initial Parking Ltd	104	118	222
Ipserv Limited	49	55	104
JD Parking Consultants	11	34	45

## Decision data per parking operator *Continued*

	MOTORIST	OPERATOR	TOTAL
KBT Cornwall Limited t/as Armtrac Security Services	1	0	1
Key Parking Solutions Limited	5	14	19
Knightshield Security Ltd	1	0	1
LCP Parking Services	1	53	54
Liberty Services	3	0	3
Local Car Park Management	5	8	13
Local Parking Security	230	176	406
Lodge Parking Ltd	19	10	29
MET Parking Services	101	1151	1252
Millennium Door & Event Security Ltd	0	0	0
Minster Baywatch	59	248	307
Napier Parking	1	0	1
NCP	281	1978	2259
NForce	5	5	10
Northern Parking Services (North East Ltd)	24	118	142
Northwest Parking Management Ltd	3	21	24
NSGL	26	85	111
NSL Ltd	29	13	42
Observances Parking Consultancy	78	40	118



## Decision data per parking operator *Continued*

	<b>MOTORIST</b>	<b>OPERATOR</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
OCS Group	50	54	104
One Parking Solution Ltd	230	820	1050
P4 Parking	61	182	243
Parking & Enforcement Agency	133	111	244
Parking and Security Solutions Ltd	10	9	19
Parking Charge Limited	194	189	383
Parking Control Solutions	84	73	157
Parking Enforcement & Security Services	7	10	17
Parking Eye Ltd	3279	14365	17644
Parking Solutions 24	68	59	127
Parking Ticketing 596	57	270	327
Premier Park	162	1812	1974
Prime Parking	1	0	1
Private Parking Management	11	0	11
Private Parking Solution (London)	116	326	442
Q-Park	1	0	1
Ranger Services	11	92	103
RCP Parking Ltd	79	33	112
Saba (was Indigo Park Services)	82	27	109
Salisbury NHS Foundation	3	6	9
Secure-A-Space	18	110	128
Select Parking Ltd	8	0	8



## Decision data per parking operator *Continued*

	MOTORIST	OPERATOR	TOTAL
Serco Limited	19	11	30
Shield Security Services	10	0	10
Smart Parking	1449	5397	6846
Spring Parking	157	129	286
SR Security Services	41	13	54
StarTraq Limited t/a NotinMyParkingSpace.com	0	0	0
Total Car Parks	4	7	11
Total Parking Solutions	141	370	511
UK Car Park Management	2	0	2
UK Parking Control Ltd	449	2171	2620
University of Kent	5	4	9
Vehicle Control Solutions	7	0	7
Wing Parking	10	63	73
Workflow Dynamics	17	12	29
WY Parking Enforcement	2	6	8
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>13155</b>	<b>44716</b>	<b>57871</b>



### Appeals referred to operators based on mitigating circumstances and keying errors

	NUMBER OF CASES
October 2018	46
November 2018	37
December 2018	38
<b>Total for 2018</b>	<b>121</b>
January 2019	41
February 2019	32
March 2019	38
April 2019	94
May 2019	182
June 2019	167
July 2019	177
August 2019	172
September 2019	197
<b>Total for 2019</b>	<b>1100</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>1121</b>

### Parking Charge Notices cancelled by operators following a mitigation referral and keying errors

	NUMBER OF CASES
October 2018	9
November 2018	5
December 2018	5
<b>Total for 2018</b>	<b>19</b>
January 2019	4
February 2019	9
March 2019	5
April 2019	34
May 2019	87
June 2019	62
July 2019	51
August 2019	55
September 2019	35
<b>Total for 2019</b>	<b>343</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>361</b>

## Results of appeals opened for assessment

### Scotland and Northern Ireland

SCOTLAND	ALLOWED	REFUSED	NOT CONTESTED
May 2019	3	17	13
June 2019	23	67	31
July 2019	24	135	51
August 2019	35	162	50
September 2019	17	108	41
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>186</b>

NORTHERN IRELAND	ALLOWED	REFUSED	NOT CONTESTED
May 2019	0	7	6
June 2019	10	21	9
July 2019	7	32	10
August 2019	2	45	18
September 2019	1	12	10
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>53</b>



## Results of appeals opened for assessment per parking operator

### Scotland and Northern Ireland

	SCOTLAND			NORTHERN IRELAND		
	ALLOWED	REFUSED	NOT CONTESTED	ALLOWED	REFUSED	NOT CONTESTED
APCOA Parking	0	1	0	0	0	0
Britannia Parking Group	2	10	17	0	0	0
Car Park Services	0	0	0	2	3	5
Civil Enforcement	18	98	18	3	31	9
CP Plus	0	2	0	1	0	3
Euro Car Parks	4	48	16	1	7	3
Gemini Parking Solutions London Ltd	0	0	1	0	0	0
Highview Parking	0	11	5	0	0	0
Horizon Parking Ltd	1	7	6	0	0	0
Local Parking Security	1	0	0	0	0	0
P4 Parking	3	18	7	0	0	0
Parking & Enforcement Agency	14	6	2	0	0	0
Parking Eye Ltd	14	114	50	0	0	0
Saba (was Indigo Park Services)	1	8	5	0	0	0
Smart Parking	35	116	46	13	76	33
Total Parking Solutions	0	0	1	0	0	0
UK Parking Control Ltd	9	50	12	0	0	0
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>53</b>

## Appeals withdrawn before assessment by month

*Scotland and Northern Ireland*

SCOTLAND	MOTORIST	OPERATOR	TOTAL
May 2019	2	11	13
June 2019	6	25	31
July 2019	3	48	51
August 2019	6	44	50
September 2019	8	33	41
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>186</b>

NORTHERN IRELAND	MOTORIST	OPERATOR	TOTAL
May 2019		6	6
June 2019	2	7	9
July 2019		10	10
August 2019	6	12	18
September 2019	2	8	10
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>53</b>



## Appeals withdrawn before assessment per parking operator *Scotland and Northern Ireland*

	SCOTLAND			NORTHERN IRELAND		
	MOTORIST	OPERATOR	TOTAL	MOTORIST	OPERATOR	TOTAL
Britannia Parking Group	2	15	17	0	0	0
Car Park Services	0	0	0	5	0	5
Civil Enforcement	9	9	18	0	9	9
CP Plus	0	0	0	0	3	3
Euro Car Parks	2	14	16	1	2	3
Gemini Parking Solutions London Ltd	1	0	1	0	0	0
Highview Parking	2	3	5	0	0	0
Horizon Parking Ltd	0	6	6	0	0	0
P4 Parking	1	6	7	0	0	0
Parking & Enforcement Agency	0	2	2	0	0	0
Parking Eye Ltd	1	49	50	0	0	0
Saba (was Indigo Park Services)	0	5	5	0	0	0
Smart Parking	2	44	46	4	29	33
Total Parking Solutions	1	0	1	0	0	0
UK Parking Control Ltd	4	8	12	0	0	0
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>53</b>

## Decision data by month

### Scotland and Northern Ireland

SCOTLAND	ALLOWED	REFUSED	TOTAL
May 2019	3	17	20
June 2019	23	67	90
July 2019	324	135	159
August 2019	35	162	197
September 2019	17	108	125
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>591</b>

NORTHERN IRELAND	ALLOWED	REFUSED	TOTAL
May 2019	0	7	7
June 2019	10	21	31
July 2019	7	32	39
August 2019	2	45	47
September 2019	1	12	13
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>137</b>





## Decision data per parking operator

### Scotland and Northern Ireland

	SCOTLAND			NORTHERN IRELAND		
	ALLOWED	REFUSED	TOTAL	ALLOWED	REFUSED	TOTAL
APCOA Parking	0	1	1	0	0	0
Britannia Parking Group	2	10	12	0	0	0
Car Park Services	0	0	0	2	3	5
Civil Enforcement	18	98	116	3	31	34
CP Plus	0	2	2	1	0	1
Euro Car Parks	4	48	52	1	7	8
Highview Parking	0	11	11	0	0	0
Horizon Parking Ltd	1	7	8	0	0	0
Local Parking Security	1	0	1	0	0	0
P4 Parking	3	18	21	0	0	0
Parking & Enforcement Agency	14	6	20	0	0	0
Parking Eye Ltd	14	114	128	0	0	0
Saba (was Indigo Park Services)	1	8	9	0	0	0
Smart Parking	35	116	151	13	76	89
UK Parking Control Ltd	9	50	59	0	0	0
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>591</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>137</b>

## Contact details

[www.POPLA.co.uk](http://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.

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](http://www.POPLA.co.uk)

If you would like to know more about Ombudsman Services, please visit [www.Ombudsman-Services.org](http://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



