



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

Parking Code Enforcement Framework consultation

Enforcing the Private parking Code of Practice (PAS 232 –
Privately managed parking – Operation and management –
Specification)



© Crown copyright, 2020

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/>

This document/publication is also available on our website at www.gov.uk/mhclg

If you have any enquiries regarding this document/publication, complete the form at <http://forms.communities.gov.uk/> or write to us at:

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF
Telephone: 030 3444 0000

For all our latest news and updates follow us on Twitter: <https://twitter.com/mhclg>

August 2020

Contents

Scope of the consultation	4
Background	6
Determination of appeals	7
Enforcing the Code of Practice	9
Scrutiny and Standards Board	10
The level of parking charges	11
The Three-tiered system	11
Mirroring the Local Authority system	12
Appeals Charter	14
Levy	16
Full list of questions	17
About this consultation	20
Annex A	21

Scope of the consultation

Topic of this consultation:	<p>This consultation seeks views on a Code Enforcement Framework for private parking operators, which will ensure they comply with the new Publicly Available Specification for private parking. It covers the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Determination of appeals 2. Enforcing the Private parking Code of Practice 3. A Scrutiny and Standards Board 4. The level of parking charges 5. Appeals charter 6. Levy
Scope of this consultation:	<p>The Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government is consulting on a Code Enforcement Framework, following the Parking (Code of Practice) Act 2019.</p> <p>In parallel, the British Standards Institute are consulting on a Publicly Available Specification for the private parking sector, which will in effect create a single Code of Practice as described in the Act.</p>
Geographical scope:	These proposals relate to England, Wales, and Scotland.
Impact Assessment:	N/a

Basic Information

To:	This consultation is open to everyone. We are keen to hear from a wide range of interested parties from across the public and private sectors, as well as from the general public.
Body/bodies responsible for the consultation:	The Ministry of Housing, Communities, and Local Government
Duration:	This consultation will last for 6 weeks from 31 August 2020 to 23:59 12 October 2020
Enquiries:	<p>For any enquiries about the Parking Enforcement Framework consultation please contact:</p> <p>parking@communities.gov.uk</p> <p>For any enquiries about the Parking Code of Practice Publicly Available Specification, which is being consulted on in parallel please contact: cservices@bsigroup.com</p>

<p>How to respond:</p>	<p>You are not obliged to answer all the questions.</p> <p>Please respond to the Code Enforcement Framework Consultation by completing an online survey at: https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=EGG0v32c3kOociSi7zmVgAVPFAOtwRxLhHRwQ610oEIUMzhQSVo0WUQ4SERVSEZaUU9DTUhFQ1VMUy4u</p> <p>If any of your responses exceed either: 4,000 characters per response to a single question (approximately 500 words) or 16,000 characters for the entire form response (approximately 2,500 words) then please complete and email the template here to parking@communities.gov.uk</p> <p>If you are responding in writing, please make it clear which questions you are responding to.</p> <p>Written responses should be sent to: Parking enforcement consultation Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 3rd Floor, South East Fry Building 2 Marsham Street LONDON SW1P 4DF</p> <p>When you reply it would be very useful if you confirm whether you are replying as an individual or submitting an official response on behalf of an organisation and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - your name, - your position (if applicable), - the name of organisation (if applicable), - an address (including post-code), - an email address <p>To respond to the Code of Practice consultation being run in parallel, please complete the online survey: https://standardsdevelopment.bsigroup.com/projects/2020-00193</p>

Background

1. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government is consulting on new measures to improve the regulation of the private parking industry.
2. Parking is a crucial part of our transport infrastructure. We all have an interest in how car parks are managed, especially given the important link between transport accessibility and the vitality of our high streets and town centres.
3. In response to widespread concerns about the poor practice and behaviour of some parking operators, the Government supported the Parking (Code of Practice) Act 2019, which was introduced by Sir Greg Knight MP. It will lead to the creation of an independent Code of Practice for private parking companies. We are also consulting on the process for managing appeals against private parking charges.
4. The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government must have regard to a failure to act in accordance with the parking code when deciding whether a parking operator should have Approved Operator Scheme (AOS) status. Without AOS status the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) will not release data. This data includes information on the vehicle keeper, so a company blocked from accessing it would be unable to pursue parking charges.
5. On 3 November 2019, the government announced that the British Standards Institution (BSI) would write the Code in consultation with consumer and industry groups and would carry out a full consultation once the draft is ready.
6. The BSI is now carrying out this consultation. They will be hosting the consultation on the BSI portal, and are inviting respondents to comment on individual clauses of the draft Code. This part of the consultation can be found here: <https://standardsdevelopment.bsigroup.com/projects/2020-00193>
7. The Code, however, is only one part of a wider regulatory framework. Government is consulting on the Code Enforcement Framework via this document and is inviting views on how we can improve the regulation of the private parking industry for the benefit of consumers, parking operators and landowners alike.

Determination of appeals

8. There are two trade associations representing parking operators: the British Parking Association (BPA) and the International Parking Community (IPC). Currently, they both offer separate appeals services for the parking operators which belong to their Approved Operator Schemes (AOS). These appeals services are the Parking on Private Land Appeals (POPLA) and the Independent Appeals Service (IAS) respectively.
9. From correspondence, media reports and parliamentary debates, government has heard widespread concerns with the existing way that appeals are handled in the private parking sector. Issues include a perceived lack of independence of the appeals services from the industry and confusion amongst consumers about the existence of multiple appeals services.
10. Section 7 of the Parking (Code of Practice) Act 2019 gives the Secretary of State the power to appoint a single appeals service to handle appeals against private parking charges, if the Code of Practice requires it.
11. The government is supportive in principle of a single appeals service to bring increased consistency, fairness and transparency over how appeals are heard and decisions are made. We are consulting on this point as we want to understand the views of the public and relevant stakeholders on how parking appeals should be managed.
12. There are several different models for how appeals services could operate. Parking appeals for Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) issued by local authorities are dealt with by a tribunal. Tribunals have a statutory basis and their appeals are handled by legally qualified adjudicators.
13. POPLA and IAS have no statutory basis but offer an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) service to motorists. Though ADR adjudicators are not required to be legally qualified, these services provide training to their staff in relevant parking law and how to handle appeals.
14. Some appeals services offer the option of in-person hearings, while others are online only or provide telephone hearings. In recent years, online portals have been developed to enable parking operators, local authorities and motorists to upload evidence, ask questions and comment on evidence provided by other parties.
15. We do not intend the costs per appeal to operators in any new system to be substantially different than the current industry average.
16. The appeals service could be self-funding, through charging operators directly for handling parking appeals. This would incentivise parking operators only to issue legitimate tickets and to resolve issues before they reach the appeal stages.

Q1 Do you agree or disagree that members of APAs should be required to use a single appeals service appointed by the Secretary of State? *Strongly agree/Somewhat agree/Neither agree nor disagree/Somewhat disagree/Strongly disagree*

Q1.1 Please explain your answer *Free text box*

Q2 Please provide any other feedback on the determination of appeals, including the funding model and features that an appeal service should offer e.g. telephone or in-person hearings, the ability to submit evidence online *Free text box*

Enforcing the Code of Practice

17. Under the current system of self-regulation, the parking trade associations (ATAs) are responsible for auditing their members' compliance with the voluntary industry-produced Codes of Practice.
18. Parking operators must belong to an ATA-operated Approved Operator Scheme (AOS) in order to have the ability to request data from the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) vehicle register in order to pursue parking charges. If they breach the Code, they risk losing their ability request DVLA data, and therefore will not be able to enforce parking charges through the post where they have no other means of identifying the driver or registered keeper of the vehicle in question.
19. We propose to build on and strengthen this system of ATA auditing by creating additional safeguards to ensure parking operators are adhering to the new Code of Practice.
20. Section 5 of the Parking (Code of Practice) 2019 obliges the Secretary of State to have regard to a failure to act in accordance with the parking code when deciding whether an operator is able to request DVLA data or whether "a person should be, or should continue to be, an accredited parking association."
21. Therefore, firstly, we propose that the Secretary of State will only enable members of an ATA to have the ability to request data from the DVLA if the Secretary of State is satisfied that the ATA itself has robust processes for auditing operators' compliance with the Code.
22. In order to be approved, the Secretary of State will expect the ATAs to produce a Certification Scheme based on the Code of Practice, outlining how they will ensure that its operators meet the new standards mandated by the Code. Government will ask the United Kingdom Accreditation Service (UKAS) to assess the Certification Schemes before awarding accredited certification to the ATAs.
23. The Certification Schemes could cover such issues as processes for operators submitting signs, parking charge notices and the length of consideration periods to the ATA for approval, to ensure that they meet the criteria specified by the Code of Practice.
24. The Certification Schemes could also contain a Sanctions Scheme detailing how the ATA will deal with alleged breaches of the Code of Practice, and how the details of these breaches and any investigations will be reported.

Q3 Please provide any comments you have on the proposal to enforce the Code by combining the ATA's existing audit procedures with additional safeguards. *Free text box*

Q4 Please outline any alternative means by which the Code could be monitored and enforced. You may wish to cite evidence from other regulatory frameworks which are relevant. *Free text box*

Scrutiny and Standards Board

25. In addition to the system of accredited certification by UKAS, the government proposes to establish a Scrutiny and Standards Board. This programme board could comprise representatives from MHCLG, DVLA, Devolved Administrations and industry and would oversee the operation of the new regulatory system.
26. Its articles of association would guarantee that the government representatives would have a majority vote.
27. These functions could include, for example:
- a. A regular meeting of ATAs, DVLA and MHCLG representatives to review comments from the public, media coverage and other relevant information.
 - b. Consideration of regular reports from the ATAs into their investigations into their members' compliance with the Code.
 - c. Advising ATAs on the findings of investigations revealing breaches of the Code by their members, in particular where they warrant the application of sanctions.
 - d. Producing an annual report covering the Body's activities and such general conclusions as it may draw from its audit, investigation and scrutiny of data.
 - e. Reviewing and commenting on the pre-publication drafts of Accredited Parking Associations' Annual Reports.
 - f. Providing advice and guidance on appropriate standards of performance and professionalism in the parking industry, including amendments to the Code as it may deem desirable to deliver its purpose more effectively.
 - g. Advising SoS on applications from Parking Associations for accreditation.
 - h. Advising SoS on withdrawal or suspension of accreditation of a Parking Association.
28. The Board could also review information and data relevant to the operation of the new regulatory framework. For example:
- a. The number of parking charges issued by parking operators
 - b. The number of requests made to the DVLA by each APA member¹
 - c. The number of appeals accepted by parking operators
 - d. The number of appeals brought to the single appeals service by parking operators
 - e. The number of appeals upheld by the single appeals service against parking operators
 - f. The number of parking charges issued by parking operators

Q5 Please provide any feedback you have on the proposed governance arrangements for monitoring the new Code of Practice *Free text box*

¹ Published quarterly by the DVLA

The level of parking charges

29. Currently, both ATAs set a voluntary limit of £100 on the amount that can be charged as a penalty for an alleged breach of the terms and conditions of the car park. Higher amounts require approval from the ATA. We are consulting on two new systems which could replace this: the Three-tiered system and Mirroring the Local Authority system.
30. In implementing both approaches, the Code could require that operators follow schema developed by the APAs. APAs would include their parking charge system in their Certification Schemes which would then be assessed both by UKAS and the Scrutiny and Standards Board to ensure that they are sufficiently aligned and meet the objectives of the new regulation.
31. The Certification Schemes could stipulate a maximum cap for parking charges. This would be assessed by UKAS and the Scrutiny and Standards Board.
32. If an operator wishes to set a parking charge higher than that cap, the Certification Scheme could detail a robust procedure for how the APA would weigh up that evidence before deciding whether a higher level of parking charges is permitted. Factors to consider would include the effectiveness of the deterrent and proportionality to the tariff (in the case of permitted paid-for parking). These procedures would, in turn, be monitored by UKAS and the Scrutiny and Standards Board.

The Three-tiered system

33. Through the Code development process, a new system has been proposed which offers a tiered approach to parking charges.
34. In addition, APAs would need to set out how parking charges are proportionate to the site in question, taking into consideration, for example, the cost of parking if the site is 'paid for'.
35. The tiered approach would create three tiers, outlined below with indicative sums and discount rates for early payment within 14 days:

UPPER LEVEL BREACH UP TO A CAP OF £120 (DISCOUNTED WHERE APPROPRIATE TO £70)

36. This tier would be for the most serious breaches; those which, for example, put motorists or others in danger. Without limitation, these could include, for example:
 - a. Parking in an accessible bay (Blue Badge bay)
 - b. Parking where parking not permitted such as in an ambulance bay or outside fire escape
 - c. Obstructive or dangerous parking to the detriment of others
 - d. Parking in service/loading areas and/or yellow box, hatched areas

MIDDLE LEVEL BREACH UP TO A CAP OF £100 (DISCOUNTED TO £60)

37. A middle tier would relate to breaches, whilst not as serious or dangerous as those in the upper level, still impact upon businesses, landowners, the environment and genuine customers or car park users. For example, these could include:

- a. Parking in a reserved bay (parent and toddler)
- b. Parking on pavement where parking is not permitted
- c. Parked in Staff Parking Only area
- d. Overstay of maximum free period or paid-for tariff
- e. Vehicle exceeds maximum weight and/or height and/or length permitted in the area
- f. Parking across multiple bays

LOWER LEVEL BREACH UP TO A CAP OF £80 (DISCOUNTED TO £50)

38. While not dangerous, this level includes selfish and poor parking i.e. breaches of terms and conditions that are in place to regulate appropriate use and the reduction of inconvenience to other car park users. This could include, for example:

- a. Parking in bays for other classes of vehicles such as motorcycles or scooters, bicycles or taxis
- b. Use of an expired permit
- c. Re-parking / returning within period prohibited
- d. Parking where parking not permitted such as grass verges or landscaped areas
- e. Parking with engine running where prohibited
- f. Permit displayed not valid for area occupied

Mirroring the Local Authority system

39. Alternatively, consumer groups often call for alignment with the council system, which is defined in section 4 of the statutory guidance for local authorities on enforcing parking restrictions². The primary purpose of penalty charges is to encourage compliance with parking restrictions. In pursuit of this, enforcement authorities should adopt the lowest charge level consistent with a high level of public acceptability and compliance. It's important to recognize the Local Authority system is based in civil, or in some cases, criminal law, which private parking operators cannot operate under as non-statutory bodies. However, it is still possible to adopt similar principles for setting parking charge levels for private parking.

Outside of London

40. Outside of London, there are two tiers with discounts for early payment which are as follows³. Councils can choose a slightly lower charge, depending on local circumstances and as long as they apply it consistently:

UPPER LEVEL BREACH BETWEEN £60 – 70 (DISCOUNTED TO £30 – 35)

41. Contraventions that qualify for this higher amount are set out in a table, and include:

- a. Parked in a suspended bay/space or part of bay/space

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/civil-enforcement-of-parking-contraventions/guidance-for-local-authorities-on-enforcing-parking-restrictions#setting-charges>

³ https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukSI/2007/3487/pdfs/ukSI_20073487_en.pdf

- b. Parked in a residents' or shared use parking place without clearly displaying either a permit or voucher or pay and display ticket issued for that place
- c. Parked in a restricted area in a car park
- d. Parked in a designated disabled person's parking place without clearly displaying a valid disabled person's badge

LOWER LEVEL BREACH BETWEEN £40 – 50 (DISCOUNTED TO £20 – 25)

42. All other contraventions would fall into this penalty charge level

Greater London

43. For Greater London, penalty charges are set by the London local authorities acting jointly and by Transport for London, with the approval of the Mayor (and provided that the Secretary of State does not object.) There are two tiers with a higher penalty charge level and different contraventions that fall into each level⁴. Again, lower-tier councils can choose a slightly lower charge, as long as they apply it consistently:

UPPER LEVEL BREACH BETWEEN £110 – 130 (DISCOUNTED TO £55 – 65)

44. Contraventions that qualify for this higher amount are set out in a table and include⁵:

- a. Parked in a loading place or bay during restricted hours without loading
- b. Parked in a restricted area in a car park
- c. Parked in a designated disabled person's parking places without displaying a valid disabled person's badge in the prescribed manner

LOWER LEVEL BREACH BETWEEN £60 – 80 (DISCOUNTED TO £30 – 40)

45. Contraventions that qualify for this lower amount are set out in a table and include⁶:

- a. Parked in a car park when closed
- b. Parked after the expiry of a paid for time
- c. Parked for longer than permitted

Increase of charge following a Charge Certificate

46. In the circumstances where the PCN remains unpaid, for both Greater London and Outside of London, **the penalty level will increase by 50% following the issuance of a Charge Certificate.** Any court fees for the registration of a debt will add £8 to this fine level. If no payment is made after this the council will pass the case on to Civil Enforcement Agencies following the issue of a Warrant of Control.

Q6 Which parking charge system is most appropriate for private parking?

- a) *the Three-tiered system*
- b) *Mirroring the Local Authority system*

⁴ <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/services/parking-services/parking-and-traffic/parking-advice-members-public/parking-and-traffic>

⁵ <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/services/parking-services/parking-and-traffic/parking-information-professionals/contravention-code>

⁶ <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/services/parking-services/parking-and-traffic/parking-information-professionals/contravention-code>

Q6.1 Please explain your answer. You may, for example, wish to make reference to other deterrent frameworks (for example, for railway tickets or traffic violations) *Free text box*

Q7 What level of discount is appropriate: 40% as is currently offered in private parking and suggested in the three-tiered system, or 50% as is offered in Local Authority parking?

a) 40%

b) 50%

Q7.1 Please explain your answer, including whether the discount should be set at a different level *Free text box*

Q8 How should the level of parking charges be set and how should the levels be revised in future? *Free text box*

Appeals Charter

47. Building on industry best practice, the government is interested in views on the concept of an Appeals Charter to ensure fairness, public confidence, transparency, proportionality and improved standards in the private parking sector.

48. By an Appeals Charter, we mean a statement of the way certain grounds of appeal based on innocent error or mitigating circumstances will be handled by the parking operator. This would be a safety net to ensure that responsible motorists who overstay or make an error are not penalised unfairly for doing so.

49. This could apply to both the three-tiered system or Mirroring the Local Authority system.

50. It could include the following provisions for reducing parking charges to between £0 and £20, depending on the nature of the issue.

a. Keying Error - Minor - £0 (no charge incurred by the motorist).

i. For example: 0 instead of o; l instead of L; 1 instead of l; One letter wrong or removed; One number wrong or removed; Two characters swapped

b. Keying Error - Major – Parking Charge reduced to between £0 and £20

i. For example: Motorist entered their partner's car registration; Motorist entered something completely unrelated to their registration; Motorist made multiple keying errors (beyond one character being entered incorrectly; Motorist has only entered a small part of their VRM, for example the first three digits.

c. Significant evidence of mitigation - £0 (no charge incurred by the motorist) and Parking Charge cancelled.

d. Evidenced vehicle breakdown - £0 (no charge incurred by the motorist or recovery vehicle - where relevant) and Parking Charge cancelled.

e. Non-evidenced mitigation if accepted between £0 and £20 dependent upon the circumstances.

- f. Failure to display permit (copy of permit then supplied) - Parking Charge reduced to between £0 and £20.
- g. Failure to display Blue Badge (copy of Blue Badge supplied) - Parking Charge reduced to between £0 and £20.
- h. Failure to display P&D ticket (copy of ticket supplied) - Parking Charge reduced to between £0 and £20.

Q9 Do you agree or disagree in principle with the idea of the Appeals Charter? *Strongly agree/Somewhat agree/Neither agree nor disagree/Somewhat disagree/Strongly disagree*

Q9.1 Please explain your answer *Free text box*

Q10 Do you agree or not that the examples given in the Appeals Charter are fair and appropriate? *Strongly agree/Somewhat agree/Neither agree nor disagree/Somewhat disagree/Strongly disagree*

Q10.1 Please explain your answer. You may wish, for example, to suggest additional cases to be covered in an Appeals Charter or query existing examples. *Free text box*

Levy

51. Section 7 of the Parking (Code of Practice) Act allows the raising of a levy for the purposes of meeting the costs of the new regulation. These costs include:

- a. the development costs of producing the Code of Practice.
- b. the creation of a UKAS accreditation scheme to assess potential conformity assessment bodies to audit for compliance with the Code.
- c. start-up costs for the single appeals service, with an aspiration to the appeals service becoming self-funding through charging operators or the trade associations.

Q11 Do you agree or disagree that the parking industry should contribute towards the cost of the regulation? *Strongly agree/Somewhat agree/Neither agree nor disagree/Somewhat disagree/Strongly disagree*

Q11.1 Please explain your answer. *Free text box*

Full list of questions

Q1 Do you agree or disagree that members of APAs should be required to use a single appeals service appointed by the Secretary of State? *Strongly agree/Somewhat agree/Neither agree nor disagree/Somewhat disagree/Strongly disagree*

Q1.1 Please explain your answer *Free text box*

Q2 Please provide any other feedback on the determination of appeals, including the funding model and features that an appeal service should offer e.g. telephone or in-person hearings, the ability to submit evidence online *Free text box*

Q3 Please provide any comments you have on the proposal to enforce the Code by combining the ATA's existing audit procedures with additional safeguards. *Free text box*

Q4 Please outline any alternative means by which the Code could be monitored and enforced. You may wish to cite evidence from other regulatory frameworks which are relevant. *Free text box*

Q5 Please provide any feedback you have on the proposed governance arrangements for monitoring the new Code of Practice *Free text box*

Q6 Which parking charge system is most appropriate for private parking?

- a) *the Three-tiered system*
- b) *Mirroring the Local Authority system*

Q6.1 Please explain your answer. You may, for example, wish to make reference to other deterrent frameworks (for example, for railway tickets or traffic violations) *Free text box*

Q7 What level of discount is appropriate: 40% as is currently offered in private parking and suggested in the three-tiered system, or 50% as is offered in Local Authority parking?

- a) *40%*
- b) *50%*

Q7.1 Please explain your answer, including whether the discount should be set at a different level *Free text box*

Q8 How should the level of parking charges be set and how should the levels be revised in future? *Free text box*

Q9 Do you agree or disagree in principle with the idea of the Appeals Charter?
Agree/Disagree

Q9.1 Please explain your answer *Free text box*

Q10 Do you agree or not that the examples given in the Appeals Charter are fair and appropriate? *Agree/Disagree*

Q10.1 Please explain your answer. You may wish, for example, to suggest additional cases to be covered in an Appeals Charter or query existing examples. *Free text box*

Q11 Do you agree or disagree that the parking industry should contribute towards the cost of the regulation? *Agree/Disagree*

Q11.1 Please explain your answer. *Free text box*

About this consultation

This consultation document and consultation process have been planned to adhere to the Consultation Principles issued by the Cabinet Office.

Representative groups are asked to give a summary of the people and organisations they represent, and where relevant who else they have consulted in reaching their conclusions when they respond.

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal data, may be published or disclosed in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA), the EU General Data Protection Regulation, and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

If you want the information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, as a public authority, the Department is bound by the Freedom of Information Act and may therefore be obliged to disclose all or some of the information you provide. In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government will process your personal data in accordance with the law and in the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties. A full privacy notice is included at Annex A.

Individual responses will not be acknowledged unless specifically requested.

Your opinions are valuable to us. Thank you for taking the time to read this document and respond.

Are you satisfied that this consultation has followed the Consultation Principles? If not or you have any other observations about how we can improve the process please contact us via the [complaints procedure](#).

Annex A

Personal data

The following is to explain your rights and give you the information you are be entitled to under the Data Protection Act 2018.

Note that this section only refers to your personal data (your name address and anything that could be used to identify you personally) not the content of your response to the consultation.

1. The identity of the data controller and contact details of our Data Protection Officer

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) is the data controller. The Data Protection Officer can be contacted at dataprotection@communities.gsi.gov.uk

2. Why we are collecting your personal data

Your personal data is being collected as an essential part of the consultation process, so that we can contact you regarding your response and for statistical purposes. We may also use it to contact you about related matters.

3. Our legal basis for processing your personal data

The Data Protection Act 2018 states that, as a government department, MHCLG may process personal data as necessary for the effective performance of a task carried out in the public interest. i.e. a consultation.

3. With whom we will be sharing your personal data

The Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government may anonymise personal data before sharing it with relevant government departments, including the Department for Transport and the Department for Health and Social Care

4. For how long we will keep your personal data, or criteria used to determine the retention period.

Your personal data will be held for two years from the closure of the consultation

5. Your rights, e.g. access, rectification, erasure

The data we are collecting is your personal data, and you have considerable say over what happens to it. You have the right:

- a. to see what data we have about you
- b. to ask us to stop using your data, but keep it on record
- c. to ask to have all or some of your data deleted or corrected
- d. to lodge a complaint with the independent Information Commissioner (ICO) if you think we are not handling your data fairly or in accordance with the law. You can contact the ICO at <https://ico.org.uk/>, or telephone 0303 123 1113.

- 6. Your personal data will not be sent overseas**
- 7. Your personal data will not be used for any automated decision making.**
- 8. Your personal data will be stored in a secure government IT system.**