



Information Governance Team

Postal Address:
Coventry City Council
PO Box 7097
Coventry
CV6 9SL

www.coventry.gov.uk

E mail: infogov@coventry.gov.uk

Phone: 024 7697 5408

15 April 2026

Dear Sir/Madam

**Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)
Request ID: FOI821131972**

Thank you for your request for information relating to Parking enforcement notices.

You have requested the following information:

I am researching how parking enforcement notices are formatted and issued across different local authorities in England, and I would be grateful if you could provide the following documents:

Request 1: The current template documents (pro-forma notices) used by your parking enforcement team to issue the following notices:

- **Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) issued on-street or by post**
- **Notice to Owner (NtO)**
- **Notice to Keeper (NtK), where applicable**
- **Charge Certificate**

If your authority uses different templates for different contravention categories (moving traffic vs. parking, or higher vs. lower band charges), please provide one example of each.

Request 2: If you hold them in an easily retrievable form, a small number (5–10) of anonymised or redacted Penalty Charge Notices issued within the last 12 months, with all personal data (name, address, vehicle registration) removed or redacted. I am interested in understanding real-world formatting variation rather than just the template.

I understand that if Request 2 would require disproportionate effort to fulfil, you may

decline that part of the request, in which case Request 1 alone would be very helpful.

In response to your first request, we confirm that Coventry City Council holds the information you requested pertaining to letter templates. However, we are withholding that information since we consider that the following exemptions apply to it.

This information is exempt from disclosure under Section 31(1)(a) – Law Enforcement. Disclosure of this information would be likely to prejudice the prevention or detection of crime.

Section 31(1)(a) is a qualified exemption and therefore is subject to the Public Interest Test.

Section 31(1)(a) provides an exemption where prejudice could be caused. A disclosure made via the FOIA, is considered a disclosure to the world at large. It is the Council's view that disclosure of the requested information would allow individuals to create fraudulent documentation to copy Council communications. Therefore, we believe that disclosure would compromise our security processes and increase the risk of fraud.

To use this exemption, we are required to undertake a public interest test. The matters which were considered in applying the public interest test are as follows:

Factors in favour of disclosure

- It is in the public interest to be open and transparent about our use of public authority processes. It is also in the public interest to provide some transparency regarding Council processes and enforcement.

Factors in favour of withholding

- There is a public interest in ensuring it is not easier for fraud to be committed
- Disclosing this information could significantly undermine the Council's ability to detect and prevent fraudulent activities, including unauthorised access to records and impersonation of Council communications.

It is considered that the greater public interest, therefore, lies in not providing the information at this time. In coming to that conclusion, the public interest in providing the information has been carefully weighed against any prejudice to the public interest that might arise from withholding the information; in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Request 2: If you hold them in an easily retrievable form, a small number (5–10) of anonymised or redacted Penalty Charge Notices issued within the last 12 months, with all personal data (name, address, vehicle registration) removed or redacted. I am interested in understanding real-world formatting variation rather than just the template.

I understand that if Request 2 would require disproportionate effort to fulfil, you may decline that part of the request, in which case Request 1 alone would be very helpful.

For your second request, we hold the information which you have asked for, but we have estimated that the cost of meeting your request would exceed the cost limit of £450 specified in the Freedom of Information and Data Protection (Appropriate Limit and Fees Regulations 2004). This represents the estimated cost of one person spending 18 hours or more, in determining whether the information is held, locating, retrieving and extracting it.

We do not hold the information in a easily retrievable reportable format nor and anonymised form. We have therefore estimated that it will require more than 18 hours work by an officer to manually collate this information. Your request has therefore been refused under section 12(2) of the Act.

For information, we publish a variety of information such as: [FOI/EIR Disclosure Log](#), [Publication Scheme](#), [Facts about Coventry](#) and [Open Data](#) that you may find of useful if you are looking for information in the future.

If you are unhappy with the handling of your request, you can ask us to review our response. Requests for reviews should be submitted within 40 days of the date of receipt of our response to your original request email: infogov@coventry.gov.uk

If you are unhappy with the outcome of our review, you can write to the Information Commissioner, who can be contacted at: Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF or email icocasework@ico.org.uk.

Please remember to quote the reference number above in your response.

Yours faithfully

Information Governance