



After ParkingEye: When will private parking fines still be unenforceable?

Transport and retail sector operators that provide parking schemes on private land, and parking enforcement companies that operate such schemes, may take an interest in a recent decision of the Supreme Court. Many will be familiar with the much-used argument made by consumers faced with large parking charges: that they are unenforceable penalties. The Supreme Court has now held that, on particular facts, an £85 parking charge was not a penalty but an enforceable charge for breach of a parking contract. But before anyone gets too excited about the much publicised decision in ParkingEye they should understand that this conclusion was reached on the facts of the case and may have limited wider application.

Background

The parking scheme in question was operated by a retail park owner, enforced by ParkingEye, and allowed two hours free parking but an £85 charge for any overstay. Against this background, the Court held that two of the main objectives of the parking scheme were to manage the efficient use of parking space, by encouraging two hour turnaround, which was in the interests of the retail outlets (and therefore the park owner) and customers using cars to access it. To achieve that objective the scheme needed enforcement and the £85 charge provided ParkingEye with an income stream to enable it to operate the scheme and make a profit; that was the second main objective.

Questions to answer

The Supreme Court clarified that when assessing whether a parking charge is enforceable the relevant questions are:

- What are the legitimate interests or objectives being pursued by the landowner and any sub-contractor administering the scheme?
- Bearing in mind these interests or objectives, is the scale of the parking charge proportionate, or it is “exorbitant or unconscionable”?
- Irrespective of the above, is the term “unfair” (and therefore not binding on the consumer) applying the statutory fairness test now found in the Consumer Rights Act 2015?

Decision

In the circumstances of Mr Beavis’ overstay, the parking charge was proportionate and, when considered against industry standard parking

charges, the BPA’s suggested maximum, and charges imposed by local authorities, it was not “exorbitant or unconscionable”. It was also not “unfair”. The Court found that a reasonable customer would have agreed to the term allowing for the £85 charge even if it had been allowed to individually negotiate it. However, in reaching this conclusion the Court was clearly influenced by the overall bargain being struck: the customer would be allowed two hours of free parking in return for which they had to accept the risk of being charged £85 if they overstayed. This was fair in circumstances where many of the customers would be the architects of their own misfortune, by ineffectively managing their shopping time.

What now?

This raises interesting questions about what level of fine might be enforceable in other cases, for example where there is an upfront charge for the initial stay or where the delay in the customer’s return to their car is not their fault. Clearly, the Court was not giving a blanket blessing that no level of ‘fine’ would be found to be an unenforceable penalty, nor did it rule out that, in other circumstances, a charge might be challenged as unfair. So whilst this case does provide useful guidance and clarification of the appropriate test to be applied, it also confirms that whether a parking charge is enforceable will depend on the facts of the case.

Car park owners and operators will still have to carry out an assessment when setting the level of charge for overstaying and specifying the circumstances in which such charges will be incurred.

Contact:

For more information please contact:



Chris Jackson
Partner

+44 (0) 117 939 2238
+44 (0) 7973 284 896



Lloyd Nail
Associate

+44 (0) 117 307 6827
+44 (0) 7891 498 171

Burgess Salmon LLP, One Glass Wharf, Bristol BS2 0ZX Tel: +44 (0) 117 939 2000 Fax: +44 (0) 117 902 4400
6 New Street Square, London EC4A 3BF Tel: +44 (0) 20 7685 1200 Fax: +44 (0) 20 7980 4966

www.burgess-salmon.com

Burgess Salmon LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales (LLP number OC307212), and is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. It is also regulated by the Law Society of Scotland. Its registered office is at One Glass Wharf, Bristol BS2 0ZX. A list of the members may be inspected at its registered office. Further information about Burgess Salmon entities, including details of their regulators, is set out in the ‘Who we are’ section of the Burgess Salmon website at www.burgess-salmon.com.

© Burgess Salmon LLP 2015. All rights reserved. Extracts may be reproduced with our prior consent, provided that the source is acknowledged. Disclaimer: This briefing gives general information only and is not intended to be an exhaustive statement of the law. Although we have taken care over the information, you should not rely on it as legal advice. We do not accept any liability to anyone who does rely on its content.

Data Protection: Your details are processed and kept securely in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. We may use your personal information to send information to you about our products and services, newsletters and legal updates; to invite you to our training seminars and other events; and for analysis including generation of marketing reports. To help us keep our database up to date, please let us know if your contact details change or if you do not want to receive any further marketing material by contacting marketing@burgess-salmon.com.