

RAC Parking Report Automation—Queries for England, round 2

mz

12.9.2019

1. The England report introduction ends with the following paragraph:

“These headings do not always agree with accounts published by local authorities because of their different treatment of overheads and allocation of surpluses to other transport projects. Furthermore six local authorities include off-street parking in their internal trading accounts which leads to further inconsistencies. These trading figures have been added to the revenue accounts”

Basically I do not really understand what this means. I mean I get the first part, if one were to compare this data with LA sources, there might be inconsistencies. But what does the last sentence mean? Which trading figures? Which revenue accounts? Have been added by whom? Or is it by who?

And back in April in an email from David he said :

“For your information, I also make an adjustment for trading activities for six councils in the English figures, the largest of which is Plymouth. They are based on the RO table TSR which only shows the net income. I assume, based on other similar activities, that the turnover is twice the surplus and the costs are equal to the surplus.”

So what do you want me to do with this?

2. Just a quick scan seems to indicate that the England reports do not contain any comparisons to Wales and Scotland like the others do. Do you want me to stick to the original England report as a template or should I try to include as much similar stuff as in the new Wales and Scotland reports as possible?
3. Should the introductory paragraph also include the source of the Nottingham WPL?
4. So removing the parks is easy, but how exactly do i remove the Nottingham WPL? e.g. for 2017 I have the following data for Nottingham city
 - income from on street parking: 5,113 (penalties = 1855, fees and permits = 3258)
 - income from off street parking: 15,445
 - -> total income = 20,558
 - expenditure on street parking: 1,117
 - expenditure off street parking: 4,907 -> total expenditure = 6,024
 - and of course the surpluses: on street: 3,996 , off street: 10,538 and total surplus: 14,534.

WPL data is:

- wpl income: 9,178
- wpl expenditure: 219
- and of course there is a surplus: 8,959

So what do i do with this? Do I subtract the WPL income, expenditure and surplus from the off-street income, expenditure and surplus? e.g. the new off street parking subtracting the levy would then be 15,445 - 9,178 = 6,267? and then i use this number in calculating the totals etc?

5. The summary table for England compares the parking surpluses with “All England transport expenditure”. The surpluses are for the 353 LAs only. So no national parks, and no GLA. But the total transport expenditure is inclusive of these authorities. Is that cool?
6. The summary text currently reads

“If the 2018-19 budget is exceeded by the same proportion as the 2017-18 outcome, then parking surpluses could be very nearly £1 billion.”

I’ve changed it to:

“then total parking surpluses would amount to £ XYZ million.”

with the alternative option being that it “falls short” by the same proportion. That OK?

7. In the summary chart I have added a separate line for the budgeted surplus - instead of the previous continuation of the surplus line to just the next year’s budgeted surplus. That OK?
8. In the Income chapter 2017-18 there is the claim that “Penalty income in London was £241 million”. According to the outturn excel tables the “On-street parking: Penalty Charge Notice income included in line 61” was £293million for London Boroughs. What do i do with this? At the same time the income for the rest of England is reported as being £134 mill and in the excel table it’s down as £135. Which is better. But need to get a handle on this.
9. Furthermore the next sentence refers to numbers of PCNs issued but I have no idea where the data for that came from, it doesn’t seem to be referenced in the report?
“The number of parking PCNs in London rose by 4% to 3.3 million (excluding TfL) but the average income per PCN was £74 in 2017-18 unchanged from 2016-17.”
10. Furthermore, while in table 1 the on-street income numbers are split into fees and permits, penalties, and total, in table 2 they are not, and only the income is given. but in the accompanying text, the same split is explicitly used.. I don’t know, just as a general principle you should have a data overload in the tables and pull out salient bits in the text. Not have text with numbers that are pulled out of nowhere. Do you want me to add the two rows for fees and penalties to table 2? Well in actual fact I would also need to compare to the previous year, because that’s in the text as well. Or do i throw out the text?
11. Additionally / semi-related to q10. In table 2 the column “all of England” is summing up the first two columns, and repeating data in table 1. So could be thrown out. That could make room for the previous year data as suggested in q10. or just be kept empty. but repeating stuff like that also feels like bad form to me.
12. Last but not least, table 2 is prime material for a good data visualisation, stacked charts and the like. should i attempt one?
13. OK, the expenditures “chapter”. It has like two sentences? And again numbers that are not in any tables (expenditure as proportion of income). Is that really all you want?