



North Essex Parking Partnership

Joint Committee On-Street Parking

Causeway House Offices,
Braintree District Council,
Bocking End, Braintree CM7 9HB

28 October 2021 at 1.00pm

The vision and aim of the Joint Committee are to provide a merged parking service that provides a single, flexible enterprise of full parking services for the Partner Authorities.

Information for Members of the Public

Access to information and meetings

- You have the right to observe meetings of the Joint Committee, including those which may be conducted online such as by live audio or video broadcast / webcast. You also have the right to see the agenda (the list of items to be discussed at a meeting), which is usually published five working days before the meeting, and minutes once they are published. Dates of the Joint Committee's future meetings are available here: <http://www1.parkingpartnership.org/north/committee>.
- Occasionally certain issues, for instance commercially sensitive information or details concerning an individual, must be considered in private. When this is the case an announcement will be made, the live broadcast will end, and the meeting will be moved to consider the matter in private.

Have Your Say!

- The Joint Committee welcomes contributions from members of the public at most public meetings. Members of the public may attend and speak at meetings for up to three minutes.
- Members of the public may also address the Joint Committee directly, for up to three minutes, if they so wish. If you would like to know more about the Have Your Say! arrangements for the Parking Partnership's Joint Committee, or request to speak, please email: democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk
- For online meetings of the Joint Committee [used during lockdowns], a written contribution to each meeting of no longer than 500 words may be made by each person which should be submitted before noon on the working day before the meeting date, sent to: democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk

If you wish to address the Joint Committee directly, or to submit a statement to be read out on your behalf, the deadline for requesting this is noon on the working day before the meeting date.

North Essex Parking Partnership

Terms of Reference of the Joint Committee

The role of the Joint Committee is to ensure the effective delivery of Parking Services for Colchester Borough Council, Braintree, Epping Forest, Harlow, Tendring and Uttlesford District Councils, in accordance with the Agreement signed by the authorities in April 2011, covering the period 2011 – 2018.

Members are reminded to abide by the terms of the legal agreement: “The North Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee Agreement 2011 ‘A combined parking service for North Essex’ ” and in particular paragraphs 32-33.

Sub committees may be established. A sub-committee will operate under the same terms of reference.

The Joint Committee **will be responsible for** all the functions entailed in providing a joint parking service including those for:

- Back-Office Operations
- Parking Enforcement
- Strategy and Policy Development
- Signage and Lines, Traffic Regulation Orders (function to be transferred, over time, as agreed with Essex County Council)
- On-street charging policy insofar as this falls within the remit of local authorities (excepting those certain fees and charges being set out in Regulations)
- Considering objections made in response to advertised Traffic Regulation Orders (as part of a sub-committee of participating councils)
- Car-Park Management (as part of a sub-committee of participating councils)

The following are **excluded** from the Joint Service (these functions will be retained by the individual Partner Authorities):

- Disposal/transfer of items on car-park sites
- Decisions to levy fees and charges at off-street parking sites
- Changes to opening times of off-street parking buildings
- Ownership and stewardship of car-park assets
- Responding to customers who contact the authorities directly

The Joint Committee has the following specific responsibilities:

- the responsibility for on street civil parking enforcement and charging, relevant signs and lines maintenance and the power to make relevant traffic regulation orders in accordance with the provisions contained within the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984

Strategic Planning

- Agreeing a Business Plan and a medium-term Work (or Development) Plan, to form the framework for delivery and development of the service.
- Reviewing proposals and options for strategic issues such as levels of service provision, parking restrictions and general operational policy.

Committee Operating Arrangements

- Operating and engaging in a manner, style and accordance with the Constitution of the Committee, as laid out in the Agreement, in relation to Membership, Committee Support, Meetings, Decision-Making, Monitoring & Assessment, Scrutiny, Conduct & Expenses, Risk and Liability.

Service Delivery

- Debating and deciding
- Providing guidance and support to Officers as required to facilitate effective service delivery.

Monitoring

- Reviewing regular reports on performance, as measured by a range of agreed indicators, and progress in fulfilling the approved plans.
- Publishing an Annual Report of the Service

Decision-making

- Carrying out the specific responsibilities listed in the Agreement, for:
 - Managing the provision of Baseline Services
 - Agreeing Business Plans
 - Agreeing new or revised strategies and processes
 - Agreeing levels of service provision
 - Recommending levels of fees and charges
 - Recommending budget proposals
 - Deciding on the use of end-year surpluses or deficits
 - Determining membership of the British Parking Association or other bodies
 - Approving the Annual Report
 - Fulfilling obligations under the Traffic Management Act and other legislation
 - Delegating functions.

(Note: the Committee will not have responsibility for purely operational decisions such as Staffing.)

Accountability & Governance

- Reporting to the Partner Authorities, by each Committee Member, according to their respective authorities' separate arrangements.
- Complying with the arrangements for Scrutiny of decisions, as laid out in the Agreement
- Responding to the outcome of internal and external Audits

**North Essex Parking Partnership
Joint Committee Meeting – On-Street**

Thursday 28 October 2021. Meeting held at Braintree District Council,
Causeway House, Bocking End, Braintree

Agenda

Attendees

Executive Members:-

Cllr Simon Crow (Colchester)
Cllr Richard Freeman (Uttlesford)
Cllr Alistair Gunn (Harlow)
Cllr Sam Kane (Epping Forest)
Cllr Michael Talbot (Tendring)

Officers:-

Trevor Degville (Parking Partnership)
Rory Doyle (Colchester)
Amelia Hoke (Epping Forest)
Owen Howell (Colchester)
Linda Howells (Uttlesford)
Samir Pandya (Braintree)
Miroslav Sihelsky (Harlow)
Ian Taylor (Tendring)
Alexandra Tuthill (Colchester)
Richard Walker (Parking Partnership)

Members to attend (non-voting)

Cllr Richard van Dulken (Braintree)

Apologies from:-

Cllr Sue Lissimore (Essex County)

Introduced by Page

1. Welcome & Introductions

2. Apologies and Substitutions

3. Declarations of Interest

The Chairman to invite Councillors to declare individually any interests they may have in the items on the agenda.

4. Have Your Say

The Chairman to invite members of the public or attending councillors if they wish to speak either on an item on the agenda or a general matter.

5. Minutes

To approve as a correct record the draft minutes of the Joint Committee meetings held on 24 June 2021 and 10 August 2021.

7-18

Continues overleaf

North Essex Parking Partnership

<p>6. Traffic Regulation Order Update and Application Decision Report The report is to prioritise proposed traffic regulation order schemes from the list of applications that have been received by the North Essex Parking Partnership.</p>	<p>Trevor Degville</p>	<p>19-28</p>
<p>7. Consideration of Objections – Epping Forest District Amendment 16 This report is to consider the comments and objections that have been received following the advertising of the proposal and decide what actions NEPP should take.</p>	<p>Trevor Degville</p>	<p>29-48</p>
<p>8. Financial Update The report sets out the current financial position for NEPP from 2020/21 to the end of period 5, August 2021.</p>	<p>Richard Walker</p>	<p>49-52</p>
<p>9. Annual Report 2020-21 The 2020-21 Annual Report is provided for consideration</p>	<p>Richard Walker</p>	<p>53-70</p>
<p>10. Essex Parking Partnerships post 31 March 2022 This report provides information from Essex County Council about the future operation of the Essex Parking Partnerships from 1 April 2022 and invites the existing Partners to join a new Agreement.</p>	<p>Richard Walker</p>	<p>55-70</p>
<p>11. Update on Obstructive Parking Verbal update on developments.</p>	<p>Richard Walker</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>12. Forward Plan 2020-21 To note the North Essex Parking Partnership Forward Plan for 2021-22.</p>	<p>Owen Howell</p>	<p>71-74</p>

**NORTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP
JOINT COMMITTEE FOR ON-STREET PARKING**

24 June 2021 at 1.00pm

**Held in the Grand Jury Room, Town Hall, High Street
Colchester CO1 1PJ.**

Members Present:

Councillor Richard Freeman (Uttlesford District Council)
Councillor Sam Kane (Epping Forest District Council)
Councillor Beverley Oxford (Colchester)*
Councillor Michael Talbot (Tendring)

Councillor Richard van Dulken (Braintree District Council)**

**Councillor van Dulken attended as a non-executive, non-voting representative of Braintree District Council

Substitutions:

*Councillor Beverley Oxford attended as substitute for Councillor Simon Crow

Apologies:

Councillor Simon Crow (Colchester)
Councillor Alistair Gunn (Harlow District Council)
Councillor Sue Lissimore (Essex County Council)

Also Present:

Richard Walker (Parking Partnership)
Lou Belgrove (Parking Partnership)
Liz Burr (Essex County Council)
Jason Butcher (Parking Partnership)
Rory Doyle (Colchester Borough Council)
Jake England (Parking Partnership)
Owen Howell (Colchester Borough Council)
Linda Howells (Uttlesford District Council)
Hayley McGrath (Colchester Borough Council)
Samir Pandya (Braintree District Council)
Miroslav Sihelsky (Harlow Council)
Ian Taylor (Tendring District Council)
James Warwick (Epping Forest District Council)

91. Appointment of Chairman

Nominations were made as follows:

- Councillor Beverley Oxford nominated Councillor Simon Crow
- Councillor Michael Talbot nominated Councillor Sue Lissimore

Neither nomination proposal was seconded and so neither proceeded to a vote.

Following clarification that a member of the Joint Committee could be appointed to be Chairman for that meeting only, the Joint Committee voted to appoint Councillor Sam Kane as Chairman for this meeting only, with the appointment of a Committee Chairman to be deferred to the next meeting so as to give Joint Committee members the opportunity to first meet each other and discuss the appointment before a member is appointed to the position.

92. Appointment of Deputy Chairman

Councillor Kane was nominated for Deputy Chairman, however the Joint Committee agreed that this decision should, as with appointment of the Chairman, be deferred until a future meeting so as to allow Joint Committee members, including those not present, the opportunity to first meet each other and discuss the appointments before members are appointed to the positions.

93. Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Joint Committee meeting held on 18 March 2021 be confirmed as a correct record.

94. NEPP Annual Governance Review and Internal Audit Report '20-21

Hayley McGrath, Colchester Borough Council's Corporate Governance Manager, summarised the report and emphasised that, whilst there was no statutory requirement for the production of a governance report, it was very much considered to be best practice. The review by the Internal Auditors concluded that adequate performance and appropriate controls had been evidenced for the North Essex Parking Partnership [NEPP] for 2020-21.

The two issues raised by Internal Audit, as detailed in the report, had both been resolved, so no causes for concern were noted.

In response to questions regarding the contractual relationship between the NEPP and G4S, The Corporate Governance Manager explained that, following the ending of the initial partnership and its extensions, a new contract was drawn up and put out to tender, with G4S then successfully taking that contract.

RESOLVED that the Joint Committee had considered and noted the Annual Governance Review of the North Essex Parking Partnership.

95. Annual Review of Risk Management Report.

Hayley McGrath, Colchester Borough Council's Corporate Governance Manager, summarised the dedicated risk management processes which had been set in place to provide assurances regarding mitigations in place for strategic risks faced by the Partnership, to minimise any potential failure to achieve the service plan and/or strategies.

The Corporate Governance Manager noted that section three of the report should have been updated with three recommended changes:

- Amend risk 1.2 to make it consistent with the NEPP's strategies.
- A reduction in the scoring of 1.13 to three.
- A reduction in the scoring of 1.15 to three.

The risk calculation process was briefly summarised for the Joint Committee.

Richard Walker, NEPP Group Manager, answered questions regarding the timing and arrangements for setting out the new NEPP agreement and achieving approval from Essex County Council [ECC]. It was expected that this would come to the Joint Committee for its consideration in October, and then to the individual partner authorities for approval. Heads of terms were expected to be available for circulation and discussion by Joint Committee members in September.

RESOLVED that Joint Committee had endorsed the Risk Management Strategy for 2021/22, and agreed the Strategic Risk Register, subject to the amendments raised by the Corporate Governance Manager.

96. Finance Report – End of year and Reserves 2020/21

Richard Walker provided a high-level summary of the NEPP's financial position, including reserves of just over £1m. There had been a 38% drop in expected income from Penalty Charge Notices, due to the pandemic's effects, and the four-month moratorium on resident parking renewals had also lowered income. £600k in Government grants had been received, acting to mitigate some of the lost income.

In the year prior to Covid-19, a £286k surplus had been recorded by the NEPP, which had put it in a strong position.

The deficits shown in the table within the report showed that the Government grant did not entirely cover lost income and included the effects of lost income from the situation regarding resident parking scheme renewals.

The Joint Committee discussed the potential provision of electric vehicle [EV] charging bays and the financial implications. The Group Manager detailed some of the options, including reserving bays at street ends or on sea fronts, and explained that a proposed scheme in Colchester was currently out for consultation. This would affect many streets and it was hoped that increased uptake of active travel options would reduce the demand for bay parking.

In response to questions, it was clarified that Traffic Regulation Order [TRO] spending totalled around £185k per year. The County Council had stopped funding TRO work, after which this had needed to be covered by use of NEPP reserves. There had been significant spending on emergency Red Routes, taking significant sums from reserves.

To answer questions, the Group Manager detailed the NEPP's provisions for dealing with bad debts during normal times and that not all PCNs were paid immediately, thus being added to debt levels. A clarification of the current situation was promised.

RESOLVED that the Joint Committee noted the financial position at the end of the Financial Year 2020/21, and the current parking reserves position.

97. Annual Report Data

Richard Walker, Group Manager, explained that operational data was published on a rolling basis, in addition to an annual report. The report was due to be published on the NEPP website and gave an explanation of the difficult circumstances under which the NEPP had operated during 2020-21.

Members were promised a more-readable form of the dataset, as this had proved difficult to follow in the version provided.

98. Forward Plan 2021-2022

Richard Walker, Group Manager, gave a verbal update on the situation regarding regulation and enforcement relating to obstructive parking. There had been no substantive changes as yet, although an announcement from the Department for Transport was expected in the near future. The differences between footway parking and obstructive parking were outlined, along with the NEPP view that discretionary powers should be made available for enforcement, to allow for flexible enforcement, based on NEPP policies which would lay out circumstances in which footway parking would be permitted [e.g. in circumstances where this would not obstruct the footway].

A member asked whether there would be changes likely to enforcement of moving traffic enforcement. It was clarified that the likely outcome was that potentially the decriminalisation of offences, to allow for civil enforcement and to reduce pressure on the Police. This would make enforcement easier and it was hoped that there would be legislation to back up enforcement, issuing of Penalty Charge Notices and the use of data by parking authorities.

The Joint Committee considered whether it was likely that enforcement of decriminalised offences would be conducted by the NEPP or the County Council. It was noted that the County Council had control over bus lane cameras, and so might conduct enforcement of bus lane offences. The Group Manager gave the view that it was likely that bus lane enforcement, if related offences were decriminalised, may be delegated to the NEPP, as there was already much crossover/combined working between County Council assets and staff and those

of the NEPP.

Ian Taylor, Head of Public Realm at Tendring District Council, raised concern as to whether Tendring would be able to host the 9 December meeting, depending on the Covid-19 situation, but would look to find a suitable option for a venue.

It was noted that the 30 September JPC meeting was not ideally timed to match the schedule for agreeing the future NEPP Agreement. Richard Walker, Group Manager, gave assurance that draft heads of terms would be circulated as soon as possible, and suggested that the September meeting be rescheduled and delayed by a month (to the end of October 2021) in order to allow for the draft agreement to be properly considered.

RESOLVED that the Forward Plan 2021-22 be approved, subject to the rescheduling of the 30 September 2021 meeting to Thursday 28 October.

**NORTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP
JOINT COMMITTEE FOR ON-STREET PARKING**

10 August 2021 at 5.00pm

**Held in the Grand Jury Room, Town Hall, High Street
Colchester CO1 1PJ.**

Members Present:

Councillor Simon Crow (Colchester Borough Council)
Councillor Richard Freeman (Uttlesford District Council)
Councillor Alastair Gunn (Harlow District Council)
Councillor Sam Kane (Epping Forest District Council)
Councillor Sue Lissimore (Essex County Council)
Councillor Michael Talbot (Tendring District Council)

Councillor Richard van Dulken (Braintree District Council)*

*Councillor van Dulken attended as a non-executive, non-voting representative of Braintree District Council

Substitutions:

None.

Apologies:

None

Also Present:

Richard Walker (Parking Partnership)
Liz Burr (Essex County Council)
Rory Doyle (Colchester Borough Council)
Amelia Hoke (Epping Forest District Council)
Owen Howell (Colchester Borough Council)
Samir Pandya (Braintree District Council)
Ian Taylor (Tendring District Council)

99. Appointment of Chairman

Councillor Lissimore's nomination was proposed by Councillor Talbot and seconded by Councillor Freeman

RESOLVED that Councillor Lissimore was appointed Chairman, with four votes in favour and no votes against the appointment.

100. Appointment of Deputy Chairman

Councillor Kane's nomination was proposed by Councillor Talbot and seconded by Councillor Lissimore.

RESOLVED that Councillor Kane was appointed Deputy Chairman, with four votes in favour, no votes against, and one abstention.

101. Minutes

It was confirmed that there were no minutes to approve at this meeting.

102. Application T13419282; Approval of scheme details

[Councillor Kane joined the meeting at this point]

Mr Richard Risdon attended and, with the Chairman's permission, addressed the meeting, pursuant to Section 18.8 of the NEPP Joint Committee Agreement 2011.

Mr Risdon spoke to request that the Joint Committee approve the Parking Partnership to move forward with the process to institute a single yellow line parking restriction in Purlieu Way, Theydon Bois, drawing attention to a survey that he had conducted in 2019 which showed that 78% of residents supported a single yellow line, in force for one hour per day, and in line with the restrictions present in many surrounding streets. The Joint Committee were told that few local residents supported the alternative suggestion that a residents' parking scheme be pursued instead.

Mr Risdon argued that, whilst some commuters were returning to their previous travel habits, these working/parking patterns did not constitute the main problem in this street. Waste vehicles and other large vehicles had continued to experience difficulties in navigating bends where on-street parking occurred. Most properties in Purlieu Way were described as having off-street and driveway parking, and a drive-sharing scheme was in place.

The streets surrounding Purlieu Way were described as already having one-hour single yellow line restrictions already, and dissatisfaction was raised with the change in approach from the NEPP, with the previous approval given by the Joint Committee in 2019 to proceed with moving towards such a restriction in Purlieu Way not being followed, and officers this year indicating their views that such a

restriction would be inappropriate for adoption.

Mr Geoffrey Sanders attended and, with the Chairman's permission, addressed the meeting, pursuant to Section 18.8 of the NEPP Joint Committee Agreement 2011.

Mr Sanders spoke in support of the original application for a single yellow line restriction for Purlieu Way, with a one-hour operation per day, echoing earlier views given that a residents' parking scheme would not be popular with local residents. The view was given that residents should not be expected to pay for parking permits when the residents of neighbouring roads did not have to do so. Even should a permit price be imposed that was found to be reasonable by residents, it was argued that there would be nothing to prevent rises in the permit prices in future years.

Mr Sanders argued that the imposition of a one-hour single yellow line restriction would be far less costly to enforce and emphasised the local support for this option, then asking for clarification as to what would constitute 'sufficient objections' to this approach, in reference to 6.2 of the report on this item which stated that it was unlikely for a traffic regulation order to be imposed if sufficient objections were received.

Trevor Degville, Parking Technical Manager, spoke to address the points made by the two members of the public who had addressed the Joint Committee.

It was explained that the NEPP had encountered problems with the use of single yellow lines in that they were a prohibitive measure which would affect residents as well as non-residents, especially with greatly-increased numbers of people working from home, and that there were both positives and negatives in their use. Residents' parking schemes were being widely used across North Essex, although admittedly there were single yellow lines in operation in the area around Purlieu Way.

The Parking Technical Manager informed the Joint Committee that the NEPP had received seven objections to the installation of single yellow lines, even before such a potential scheme had been advertised by the NEPP. Richard Walker, NEPP Group Manager, further explained that the NEPP placed importance on the weight and severity of any objections raised, rather than in the number of objections received. When the Joint Committee approved Traffic Regulation Orders, it was giving the go-ahead for officers to start the process to investigate how best to implement the Orders, rather than prescribing specifically how these orders should be enacted. The Joint Committee had the right to approve or cancel any traffic regulation orders.

It was confirmed that the official consultation period had not yet been carried out following the original approval by the Joint Committee for this to go ahead, and the report noted why NEPP officers recommended that a residents' parking scheme be implemented in place of a single yellow line restriction. Consultation would be carried out on any scheme which the Joint Committee approved.

The Joint Committee discussed the use of single yellow lines in neighbouring roads. The Group Manager advised that the Joint Committee might wish to review the whole area's restrictions as to whether current uses of single yellow lines were still appropriate. The Group Manager emphasised that the main problem with single yellow lines with specific times of operation was that it made enforcement more difficult, as any enforcement would have to occur at those specific times, with the knock-on effect of making it harder to schedule other enforcement activities in other areas.

The Joint Committee sought further information, such as whether the restrictions would be in place at weekends, and at what time. It was explained that existing restrictions in the area were set at different times of day. Questions as to whether single yellow lines would be on both sides of the road, and whether timings could be different on different sides elicited the answer that yes, this was a possible option.

A Committee member queried whether further alternative types of schemes were available for use, or if there were 'pay as you go' options for use with residents' parking schemes.

Consultation options were discussed; the Group Manager informed members that informal consultation could be carried out on a range of options, but if approval is given for moving forward with a specific scheme, only that scheme could be officially consulted upon as part of the formal process. Such a formal consultation would seek to engage with all users of the road, not just residents.

At the Chairman's discretion, Mr Richard Risdon addressed the Joint Committee, to respond to members' comments. In his view, the scheme would not work if the hour of restrictions differed from one side of the road to the other, as most parking was only on the one side.

The Group Manager summarised the options for the Joint Committee; the Committee could approve moving forward with formal consultation on a single yellow line, or residents' parking, or it could direct that informal consultation is held on both options, or defer the decision to allow for more time to assess how commuter patterns change in the future.

Officers were asked as to whether there were any issues of residents on neighbouring roads parking on Purlieu Way. It was confirmed that this could form part of the consultation.

RESOLVED that the Joint Committee directs officers to design a single yellow line scheme for Purlieu Way and proceed to formal consultation (FIVE voted FOR, NONE voted AGAINST and there was a single abstention).

It was explained that consultations were generally held in Autumn/Winter, in preparation for any work to be done in the Spring, but that this consultation would be carried out earlier, if possible and bearing in mind the heavy workload of officers.

103. Consideration of Single Yellow Line Commuter Restrictions

Richard Walker, Group Manager, introduced the report and explained that he was seeking the Joint Committee's views on the general use of single yellow lines. It had been noticed that, during lockdowns, an increase in homeworking had led to a greater demand for on-street parking by residents. Single yellow lines were a restriction, unlike residents' parking schemes which were a permission-based system and were easier to run and enforce. The Joint Committee were asked to consider whether single yellow line restrictions were still suitable for commuter areas.

The Committee discussed the subject and members gave the view that no option for restrictions or parking control should be ruled out categorically, especially with changes in working habits leading to the potential for changes in parking needs and habits. The importance of effective enforcement was stressed.

RESOLVED that the option of single yellow lines as a parking restriction be maintained by the North Essex Parking Partnership.



North Essex Parking Partnership

28 October 2021

Title: Traffic Regulation Order Update and Application Decision Report
Author: Trevor Degville
Presented by: Trevor Degville

1. Decision(s) Required

1.1. To prioritise proposed traffic regulation order schemes from the list of applications that have been received by the North Essex Parking Partnership. These are provisionally indicated on the list as Approve. Other applications that have been received are provisionally shown as defer or reject. Following the June 2020 JPC decisions, fourth tier applications (outside of socially necessary such as junction protection and school entrance markings) can now be approved without being considered one of the partner authorities six choices. Fourth tier and permit schemes are shown with * after approve.

2. List of applications by authority

Ref No	District/ Borough	Name of Scheme	Type of Restriction	Brief Reason for Application	Provisional JPC Decision
T7620142	Uttlesford	Woodlands Park Great Dunmow	Waiting restriction/s and extension of loading restriction	Parking on inconsiderate parts of estate	Defer
T15571006	Uttlesford	Abbey Lane Saffron Walden	Alter restrictions to remove pay and display	More residential and Blue Badge parking	Approve
T22638074	Uttlesford	Chelmsford Road Great Dunmow	Limited waiting bays	Limited waiting bays outside takeaway restaurants. TTRO currently in place	Approve
T22648395	Uttlesford	High Street Great Chesterford	Waiting restriction	To allow traffic flow for larger vehicles such as buses	Approve

T20446337	Braintree	Easton Road Witham	Resident permit area/s	Building works involving also involving nearby car park	Reject
T11416643	Braintree	Woodham Drive/Maldon Road, Hatfield Peverel	Waiting restriction/s	Extension of junction protection required to deter parking	Approve*
T14409766	Braintree	Morley Road, Halstead	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection and line on one side of road	Approve*
T125357211	Braintree	Manor Street Braintree	Resident permit area/s	Permit parking due to pressures linked to TC & Station	Approve*
T125295610	Braintree	Finchingfield	Waiting restriction/s	Obstructive and inconsiderate parking by visitors to village	Approve
T18452983	Braintree	Bridge Street, Bures	Limited waiting bay/s	Obstructive & inconsiderate parking associated with visits to local businesses	Defer – PC to consult residents with revised scheme and if accepted to go through 2021 via Chairman’s delegated approval.
T18544625	Braintree	The Maltings & Shalford Road, Rayne	Waiting restriction/s	Junction parking	Approve*
T18540902	Braintree	The Street & Station Road, Rayne	Multiple restrictions	Parking associated with Post Office and nearby junction	Approve
T243509410	Harlow	Mallards Rise, Harlow	Waiting restrictions	Double yellow lines between the dropped kerbs behind a disabled bay	Reject
T27598358	Harlow	Cross Street, Harlow	Loading bays	Problems with loading for businesses	Approve (outside funding available)
T27618946	Harlow	Bynghams Access Road, Harlow	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Reject
T27622741	Harlow	Challinor, Harlow	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Approve*
T27627479	Harlow	Elmbridge, Harlow	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Approve*

T22331711	Harlow	Sunny Croft, Harlow	Waiting restriction/s	Blocked driveway access for disabled badge holder	Approve
T10646508	Harlow	Brays Mead, Harlow	Resident permit area/s	Lack of space due to non-residential parking	Approve*
T22585956	Harlow	Bush Fair, Harlow	Waiting restriction/s	Parked vehicles blocking road	Approve
T22589714	Harlow	Park Lane, Harlow	Pay and display bay/s	Parked vehicles causing issues	Approve*
T22604988	Harlow	Millersdale, Harlow	Resident permit area/s	Non-residential parking causing problems for residents	Approve*
T22608121	Harlow	Pollard Hatch, Harlow	Limited waiting bay/s	To increase turnover of spaces	Approve
T22611388	Harlow	Wharley Hook, Harlow	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Approve*
T22618717	Harlow	Old Road/Bury Road, Harlow	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Approve*
T22624937	Harlow	South Road, Harlow	Waiting restriction/s	Removal of limited waiting and reintroduce waiting restrictions.	Approve
T19666446	Harlow	Bushey Croft, Harlow	Resident Permits	Permits for new developments	Approve*
40109.5	Colchester	NAR estate Colchester	Waiting restrictions	Possible commuter parking issues	Reject
T22547828	Colchester	Colchester Road Copford	Waiting restrictions	Change to hours of previously introduced scheme	Reject
T93908711	Colchester	Victoria Road Colchester	Permit Parking	Removal of permit parking bay required to improve road safety	Approve
T9562561	Colchester	Nayland Road/Braiswick Lane, Colchester	Waiting restriction/s	Extension of double yellow lines to deter parking close to junction	Approve*
T14495924	Colchester	Oaks Drive Colchester	Resident permit area/s	Removal of parking bay requested	Approve
T14573037	Colchester	Roman & Castle Roads Colchester	Resident permit area/s	Extension to current RP	Approve

				scheme if it is safe to do so	
T21429439	Tendring	North Road, Clacton on Sea	Waiting restrictions	Replace single yellow lines with loading restrictions	Reject
T234060311	Tendring	Frinton Road, Holland on Sea	Limited waiting	Convert unrestricted parking bay near car park to limited waiting to prevent all day parking	Defer
T15727013	Tendring	Waterside, Brightlingsea	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection, extended to allow access of HGVs	Approve*
T21511768	Tendring	Reckitts Close, Clacton	Permits	Issues with obstructive parking due to narrow nature of the road.	Reject (but this may be debated locally later)
T145927110	Tendring	Waldegrave Way Lawford	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Approve*
T14545467	Tendring	Colchester Road Lawford	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Approve*
T16648638	Tendring	St Vincent Road / Wash Lane / Kings Road / Freeland Road, Clacton	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Approve*
T164391611	Tendring	Connaught Gardens, Clacton	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Approve*
T17371883	Tendring	Stephenson & Telford Road, Clacton	Waiting restriction/s	Industrial Estate parking issues	Approve
T14480463	Tendring	The Street, Ardleigh	Waiting restriction/s	Issues with post office parking	Approve*
T23665477	Tendring	Southcliff Park/Holland Road, Clacton	Waiting Restriction/s	Junction protection	Approve*
60019	Epping Forest	Willow Tree Close, Abridge	Waiting restriction/s	Waiting Restrictions	Reject
60022	Epping Forest	Green Walk, Ongar	Waiting restriction/s	Waiting Restrictions	Reject
60031	Epping Forest	Hartland Road, Epping	Waiting restriction/s	Waiting Restrictions	Reject
60044	Epping Forest	Coppice Row, Theydon Bois	Other restriction	Commuter Parking	Reject
60059	Epping Forest	Ladywell Prospect, Sheering	Waiting restriction/s	Waiting Restriction	Reject

60063	Epping Forest	Forest Drive, Theydon Bois	Other restriction	Pavement Parking	Reject
60068	Epping Forest	Glebe Road, Ongar	Waiting restriction/s	Waiting restriction	Reject
60082	Epping Forest	Eastbrook Road, Waltham Abbey	Resident permit area/s	Resident parking	Deferred
60088	Epping Forest	Cleland Path, Loughton	Waiting restriction/s	Waiting restrictions- junction/ pavement parking	Reject
60090	Epping Forest	High Street (St Martins Mews), Ongar	Limited waiting	Adjustment of parking bay	Reject
60091	Epping Forest	Theydon Grove, Ongar	Resident permit area/s	Extension to residents parking bays	Reject
60101	Epping Forest	Lower Road, Loughton	Resident permit area/s	Res parking- waiting restrictions	Reject
60104	Epping Forest	Sheering Lower Road, Sheering	Resident permit area/s	Resident parking	Reject
60107	Epping Forest	Church Hill, Epping	Waiting restriction/s	Change of restriction	Reject
60115	Epping Forest	Hillyfields, The Croft, Debden	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Reject
60118	Epping Forest	Broomstick Hall Lane, Waltham Abbey	School Entrance Markings	School restrictions	Reject
60122	Epping Forest	Greenfields Close, Loughton	Waiting restriction/s	Waiting restrictions	Reject
60131	Epping Forest	Cloverly Road, Ongar	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection.	Reject
60143	Epping Forest	Lavender Mews, Ongar	Waiting restriction/s	To improve access into Lavender Mews.	Reject
60147	Epping Forest	St Johns Road/ Church Hill, Loughton	Waiting restriction/s	To improve safety by extending the current double yellow lines to cover a blind bend.	Reject
60150	Epping Forest	Centre Drive, Epping	Waiting restriction/s	To reduce the restrictive hours of the SYL, to enable residential parking and still deter commuter parking.	Reject
60152	Epping Forest	Hemnall Street, Epping	Waiting restriction/s	To improve line of sight when exiting junction on the Hemnall Street.	Reject

60161	Epping Forest	Sewardstone Road, Waltham Abbey	Waiting restriction/s	Parking causing a build-up of traffic and pavement parking	Reject
60163	Epping Forest	Beech Lane, Buckhurst Hill	Waiting restriction/s	Footway parking and parking on a bend	Reject
60168	Epping Forest	Old Shire Lane, Waltham Abbey	Waiting restriction/s	To prevent vehicles from obstructing access to Old Shire Lane Nature Reserve.	Reject
T19701889	Epping Forest	Bansons Way Ongar	Resident permit area/s	Relaxation of times and days of permit scheme	Reject
T17303061	Epping Forest	South Place Waltham Abbey	Resident permit areas	Additional spaces already added to Epping Forest District Council's car parks	Reject – catered for in council car park
T20354316	Epping Forest	The Gables, Ongar	Waiting restriction/s	Residents would like the current waiting restrictions revoked	Reject
T26553803	Epping Forest	Bower Hill, Epping	Waiting restriction/s	Removal of waiting restrictions in some areas to allow parking and so slow down traffic speeds	Reject
T23390929	Epping Forest	Willow Close, Buckhurst Hill	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Reject
T23390705	Epping Forest	Elgar Road, Buckhurst Hill	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Reject
T23390857	Epping Forest	Lower Queens Road, Buckhurst Hill	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Reject
T23390522	Epping Forest	Hornbeam Road, Buckhurst Hill	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Reject
T23390334	Epping Forest	Stradbroke Mead, Buckhurst Hill	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Reject
T23390648	Epping Forest	Oakrise, Buckhurst Hill	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Reject
T23390965	Epping Forest	Mountbatten Court, Buckhurst Hill	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Reject
T24367603	Epping Forest	Ormonde Rise, Buckhurst Hill	Resident permit area/s	Permit scheme and junction protection to deter commuter parking	Approve*
T10618929	Epping Forest	The Elms, Ongar	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection	Approve*

T15433467	Epping Forest	Brooklyn Avenue/Priory Road, Loughton	Waiting restriction/s	Junction protection and extension to current restrictions	Approve
T11502441	Epping Forest	Lower Queens Road/Alfred Road/Cascade Road, Buckhurst Hill	Resident permit area/s	Non-residential parking	Approve*
T12557914	Epping Forest	New Nazeing & associated roads, Nazeing	Waiting restriction/s	Short term inconsiderate parking associated with shopping parade	Approve
T17373217	Epping Forest	Mayflower Way, Ongar	Waiting restriction/s	Parking issue leading to verge damage	Approve
T225009910	Epping Forest	Broomstick Hall Road, Waltham Abbey	Waiting restriction/s	Issues with school based parking	Defer
T184491511	Epping Forest	Ravensmere, Epping	Resident permit area	Issues with commuters	Approve*
T22742969	Epping Forest	Baldwins Hill, Loughton	Resident permit area/s	Issues with commuters	Approve*
T22434212	Epping Forest	The Drive, Loughton	Waiting restriction/s	Issues with short term invasive parking	Approve
T156346411	Epping Forest	St Nicholas Place & Borders Lane, Loughton	Waiting restriction/s	Junction parking issue	Approve*
T21504258	Epping Forest	Badburgham Court/Ninefields, Waltham Abbey	Waiting restriction/s	Junction Protection and extension to current restrictions	Approve
T19356737	Epping Forest	The Lindens, Loughton	Waiting restriction/s	Junction parking issue	Approve*

3. List of Schemes Completed to date in 2021

3.1 For information, below is a list of advertised schemes to date in the 2021 and the current status of the scheme.

Reference number	District	Name of Scheme	Type of Restriction	Current Work Status
T8560459	Uttlesford	Godfrey Way, Great Dunmow	Waiting restriction/s	Operational
T18555702	Uttlesford	Blythwood Gardens, Stansted Mountfitchet	Waiting restriction/s	Operational
T21435336	Uttlesford	Highfields-Springfields, Great Dunmow	Waiting restriction/s	Operational
T18396735	Uttlesford	Crabtrees estate, Saffron Walden	Waiting restriction/s	Operational

T21459249	Uttlesford	Mellish Grove, Great Dunmow	Waiting restriction/s	Operational
T16545435	Uttlesford	Ashdon Road- Dame Bradbury school, Saffron Walden	School entrance markings	Operational
N/A	Uttlesford	Roads around Hatfield Forest	Red Route	Advertised
T15357706	Braintree	Market Hill Halstead	Waiting restriction/s	Operational
T23412799	Braintree	Swan Street, Kelvedon	Waiting restriction/s	Operational
T174114475	Braintree	High Street Kelvedon	Waiting restriction/s	Operational
T153929810	Braintree	Maltings View, Braintree	Resident permit area/s	Operational
T267259210	Braintree	Challis Lane, Braintree	Red Route	Advertised but not introduced following consideration of objections
T27569017	Harlow	Maddox Road, Harlow	Waiting restrictions	Readvertised but withdrawn following consideration of objections
T22410535	Harlow	Longwood School/Barley Croft, Harlow	Red Route	Advertised
T26422261	Harlow	The Rows, Harlow	Loading bays	Operational
T27611206	Harlow	School Lane/Arbour Mews, Harlow	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T27614513	Harlow	Milwards Exit Road, Harlow	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T21365603	Colchester	Marshino Drive/Holt Crescent, Colchester	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T19379733	Colchester	William Harris Way, Colchester	Limited waiting bays	Operational
T19381166	Colchester	Osprey Close/New Farm Road/Dale Close, Stanway	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T19469718	Colchester	Commerce Way, Colchester	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T14362139	Colchester	Paget Road, Rowhedge	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T15291502	Colchester	Thornwood, Colchester	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T22592695	Colchester	Churchfields, West Mersea	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T19741980	Colchester	Holly Road, Stanway	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T104751311	Colchester	Barn Hall Avenue, Stanway	Waiting restrictions	Operational

50122	Tendring	Woodberry Way, Walton on the Naze	Removal of seasonal restrictions on part of road	Operational
T15394746	Tendring	Church Road/Bateman Road, Brightlingsea	School Entrance Markings	Operational
T14639662	Tendring	Station Road, Lawford/ Manningtree	Red Route	Operational
T14644039	Tendring	Marine Parade/Orwell Road, Harwich	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T20562948	Tendring	Station Road, Thorpe-le-Soken	Red Route	Operational
T20645046	Tendring	Swan Court, Mistley	Waiting restriction/s	Operational
T20650006	Tendring	Station Street, New Pier Street and Vicarage Lane, Walton on the Naze	Resident Permit Areas	Operational
T20581649	Tendring	The Esplanade, Frinton on Sea	Limited waiting	Operational
T205709910	Tendring	Cliff Parade/East Terrace/Naze Park Road, Walton on the Naze	Limited waiting	Operational
T17562405	Tendring	South Street, Manningtree	Waiting restrictions	Operational
60007	Epping Forest	Fairmeads, Loughton	Waiting restrictions	Operational
60157	Epping Forest	Garnon Mead, Coopersale	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T103023910	Epping Forest	Kendal Road, Epping	Permit areas, pay and display and waiting restrictions	Operational
T267051910	Epping Forest	High Street, Roydon	Permit areas	Advertised but withdrawn following consideration of objections
T21399017	Epping Forest	Roundhills, Waltham Abbey	Waiting restrictions	Advertised but withdrawn following consideration of objections
T25439219	Epping Forest	Victoria Road, Buckhurst Hill	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T22681295	Epping Forest	Coronation Hill, Epping	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T18382466	Epping Forest	Shelley Grove, Loughton	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T19298873	Epping Forest	The Square/Leaden Close	Red Route	Operational
T13419282	Epping Forest	Purlieu Way, Theydon Bois	Waiting restrictions	Advertised
T18943800 & T15448472	Epping Forest	Gould Close, Morton	Permit area and waiting restrictions	Waiting restrictions

				introduced, permits advertised but withdrawn following consideration of objections
T13488598	Epping Forest	Sidney Street/Coppice Road, Theydon Bois	Waiting restrictions	Operational

4. Off-Street Works

- 4.1 The technical team has helped draft two off-street order changes for authorities in the Partnership. These are the Epping Forest District (Off-Street Parking Places) Order 2021 and The Colchester Borough (Off-Street) (Parking Places) Order 2021.



North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 28th October 2021
Title: Consideration of Objections – Epping Forest District Amendment 16
Author: Trevor Degville
Presented by: Trevor Degville

To consider comments and objections received following formal advertising of The Essex County Council (Epping Forest District) (Prohibition of Waiting, Loading and Stopping) and (On-Street Parking Places) (Civil Enforcement Area) (Amendment Number 16) Order and decide which actions NEPP should now take.

1. Recommended Decision(s)

- 1.1. To consider the comments and objections that have been received following the advertising of the proposal and decide what actions NEPP should take.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)

- 2.1. Legal duty on councils that introduce traffic regulation orders.

3. Options Available

- 3.1 There is a formal process that is set out in the relevant legislation and must be followed when traffic regulation orders are introduced. This includes consideration all objections to the proposal that are made during the objection period of 3 weeks after publication of the Notice of Intention. Where objections have been made to the proposals there are three options available to the Joint Committee which are set out below.
- 3.2 After consideration of the objections the committee could decide to introduce the proposal as advertised. This would lead to the yellow line being introduced.
- 3.3 The committee could decide to alter the current proposals to take into account the views that have now been expressed. In this case it is unlikely that any changes could be made without proposals having to be readvertised. If proposals are readvertised this would give the opportunity for further objections to be made.
- 3.4 The final option would be to stop the proposal, which would mean that no restrictions are introduced at this time.

4. Supporting Information

- 4.1. The type of restriction to be advertised was considered in the report “Application T13419282; Approval of scheme details” at the NEPP Joint Committee meeting of 10th August 2021
- 4.2. Following the August committee meeting the proposal was advertised from 16th September, with objections to be received by 8th October.
- 4.3. Redacted copies of the comments and objections that have been received following the advertising of the proposal can be found in the appendix to this report. Copies of the statutory documents including a map showing the proposal can be found on the parking partnerships website at [Policies TRO Proposals - North Essex Parking Partnership](#) under Epping Forest District Amendment Number 16.

5. Background Information

- 5.1. The NEPP has a delegated authority from ECC to introduce Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). There is a legal process that must be followed when permanent TROs are introduced which involves a formal consultation period of 21 days during which objections may be made to the proposals.
- 5.2. The Joint Committee delegated powers to the NEPP Group Manager to be able to consider objections that are received and to decide whether the advertised proposal should become a sealed order, should be amended, or should not progress further. The delegated powers enable NEPP officers to introduce restrictions more quickly, although the overall time it can take to introduce parking and waiting restrictions can still be substantial.
- 5.3. Where it is not clear what actions NEPP should take, the matter can be brought to the Joint Committee members to consider the objections and other comments and decide what actions should be taken.
- 5.4. Members are advised that when considering objections, it is not solely the number of objections that have been received that should be considered but the strength of argument put forward in the objections and if the proposals meet the aim of the scheme (ie removal of commuter parking and less inconvenience for residents and their visitors).

6. Important Notes

- 6.1. The Council has General Duties when considering any parking scheme:-
- 6.2. It shall be the duty of every local authority so to exercise the functions conferred on them by this Act as (so far as practicable having regard to the matters specified below) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway.
- 6.3. The matters referred to are—
 - a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;
 - b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected and (without prejudice to the generality of this paragraph) the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run;
 - c) the strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy);
 - d) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and
 - e) any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant.
- 6.4. The duty imposed above is subject to the provisions of Part II of the Road Traffic Act 1991

7. Standard References

- 7.1 There are no particular references to the Development Plan; publicity or consultation considerations; or financial; equality, diversity and human rights; community safety; or health and safety implications

8. Risk Management Implications

- 8.1 If members approve the proposals the traffic orders will be sealed. Any decision made by the Joint Committee can be called in by Essex County Council's scrutiny committee. Anyone who questions the validity of an Order on the grounds that it is not within the powers conferred by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 or on the grounds that any requirement of the Act, or any instrument made under it, has not been complied with in relation to the Order can take the case to the High Court. There is then the potential cost of defending the Order via QC's and costs being awarded against NEPP.
- 8.2 Members should be aware that it is highly unlikely that any traffic regulation order dispute where the correct process has been carried out will reach the High Court.

[Redacted]

Theydon Bois

Essex

CM16 7ED

[Redacted]



29th September 2021

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing regarding the threatened parking restrictions in Purlieu Way, Theydon Bois. Our household have strong objections for the following reasons:

Firstly, restrictions will mean that more residents will pave over their gardens which is not in keeping with modern environmental thinking and is very detrimental to the look of the area. Dukes Avenue is a case in point. It was a pretty road with attractive and environmentally friendly front gardens until parking restrictions were introduced but many houses now have front gardens that are concrete eyesores.

When this issue of possible restrictions first arose, several households took a regular tally of the parking. It is obvious that most cars on the road belong to residents and builders working on local properties. Another concern is that key workers and carers will be unable to park. We have quite a few elderly and unwell residents on our street and carers etc cannot choose when they call. As all the streets around us have restrictions, this will be a headache for all concerned.

My final concern is that there has been a great deal of bullying around this issue. The original proposer had engaged in dubious tactics to get everyone to agree to "his" project. Personally, we have been harangued in our front garden and told that we are selfish for having our doubts about changes to parking and I have been on the end of what I can only call a filibuster of a phone call which left me quite shaken at the time. It also doesn't sit well that this neighbour boasts of having the ear of a couple of District Councillors (who do not live in our road).

A survey that only asks for objections isn't a fair way of garnering public opinion. A lot of residents won't get round to objecting but will be pretty fed up when they get caught out as happened on Boxing Day on a nearby road a couple of years ago. Call me cynical but a Boxing Day parking penalty really has nothing to do with nuisance commuters,

[Faint, illegible text, possibly a signature or address details]

[Redacted signature block]

22nd September 2021

The Essex County Council (Epping Forest District) (Prohibition of Waiting, Loading and Stopping) and (On-Street Parking Places) (Civil Enforcement Area) (Amendment Number 16) Order 202

Purlieu Way, Theydon Bois

Dear Sir or Madam,

I wish to object to the proposal to introduce parking restrictions (yellow line) on Purlieu Way, Theydon Bois.

The proposed restrictions are unnecessary because there is not a parking problem on the road. In the [REDACTED] years that I have lived here, even when commuter parking was at higher levels, I have never had difficulty finding space to park on the road. I am not aware of any problem with refuse lorries or emergency vehicles getting through.

The proposed restrictions will, however, cause significant difficulty for a number of households including my own. We are reliant on on-street parking for our second car as our driveway only really fits one car. If the restrictions came into force, we would need to either pave over our front garden, get rid of our second car or park this car on a neighbouring street. None of these are acceptable options given that the restrictions are not needed in the first place. I am also concerned about a potential impact on my house value.

I would be willing to accept a residents parking scheme if needed but this option is not being made available.

Please note that the proposed restrictions appear to have been instigated by a single household on the road. This individual has persistently canvassed the support of the other households on the road in order to obtain the number of signatures needed to apply for restrictions. They now have the support of many households but not all. It is relevant that not everyone on the road will actually be affected by the restrictions - some houses have a larger driveway, only one car or no car, and so do not need to use on-street parking. Those who are affected, however, will be affected significantly.

I strongly object to the imposition of restrictions that I have not asked for, are unwarranted, and which will have an impact on my ability to go about my day-to-day life.

If the restrictions were to be imposed as a result of this consultation, I would have no option but to consider what other options are available to me, including taking legal action.

In that case, I would also wish to see, by way of a Freedom of Information Request (please note I am not yet making such a request at this time), what evidence exists for a parking problem on the road (eg complaints by residents, incidences of bin lorries or emergency services being blocked) and other information pertaining to the application that has made for parking restrictions, in order to better understand the reasons for imposing such restrictions.

Kind regards
/

TRO Comments
North Essex Parking Partnership
PO Box 5575
Colchester
CO1 9LT

4th October 2021

Dear Sirs,

My Wife and I wish to make it clear that we do NOT want ANY Traffic Regulation Order applied to Purlieu Way in Theydon Bois.

Our objection stems from the fact that perceived problems do not currently exist. There were commuters parking on Purlieu Way in the past but that has ceased since the onset of COVID-19. There were two vehicles causing irritation to some neighbours at either end of the street (one was silver, the other green). One was parked on the road and did not move for some considerable time. The other was parked in Purlieu Way daily causing a disturbance when parking and pulling away. Ironically, both owners are residents of Theydon Bois and reside in streets where a TRO is in force. This is two examples of "errant" parking caused by existing TRO's. This could have been avoided if the problem in their respective streets was addressed and not the symptom. Both owners have since dispensed with their vehicles so that local issue no longer exists.

Government enforced COVID-19 lockdowns and encouraging employees to work from home has all but removed the commuter "problem" for the time being from Purlieu Way. Are commuters a problem or are they people simply trying to get to work? We all have to acknowledge people have to get to work. Why are people commuting by car? The return peak-time rail fare from Harlow to London is £22.40, whereas the peak-time return tube fare from Epping to Liverpool Street (London) is £10.20 per day. It appears people are not prepared to pay an extra £12.20 per day to the rail operator when it will cost less than £12.20 per day to drive to an outlying tube station and continue their commute at far less expense. The cause is overpriced rail tickets which has impacted patterns of commuter travel and ultimately exposed the tube station as having insufficient parking spaces. As a direct result, people have resorted to parking in residential streets. Yellow lines will be addressing the symptom and not the cause.

07 OCT 2021

Given the flexibility in work start times now afforded to employees, it is not difficult to envisage commuters starting work later to avoid pinch points on public transport and avoid the proposed restriction period in Purlieu Way and TRO's in neighbouring streets.

Since the COVID-19 lockdowns, Purlieu Way has seen more large delivery vehicles than ever before. Daily supermarket food deliveries, weekly refuse collection and at no set frequency, removal vehicles and tradesmen's vehicles. The great majority navigate Purlieu Way without issue. Very occasionally a large vehicle may ride up on the pavement and straddle the grass verge. If large vehicles are encountering such insurmountable problems, why is it that the refuse collection vehicle reverses from Dukes Avenue and along Purlieu Way? The driver then retraces that route going forwards without issue. Has anyone contacted EFDC refuse collection to get the different drivers opinions? There is a possible argument that parking on the road is one cause of broken kerb stones. Broken kerb stones are a result of intransigent drivers, compounded by many of the kerb stones being surface mounted. Yellow lines will not curb some drivers bumping kerbstones with their vehicles, whether vehicles are parked on the street or not.

A claim has been made of the existence of a drive sharing scheme within Purlieu Way. If this is a formal scheme street wide, it is interesting to note that we are unaware of such a scheme. If this scheme existed, why are some residents parking on the street in Purlieu Way?

The manner in which we are now faced with the possibility of a TRO is of great concern. The initial "survey" of Purlieu Way was initiated in November 2019, at which point three houses were unoccupied. It appears after a significant period of persuasion and in one case doorstep haranguing, the application was submitted in July 2020. In that period, some people have changed their minds. In our opinion, NEPP were and are best placed to survey Purlieu Way, to maintain transparency, impartiality and complete the exercise in one month rather than near on eight months. This would provide a true point in time snapshot of resident's opinions within the street.

NEPP surveyed Purlieu Way and recommended a one year moratorium. A Residents Parking Scheme was offered. It appears the "offer" was challenged and successfully overturned. The year's moratorium seems to have vanished as well. This makes no sense given we are all living in a strange time with the spectre of COVID-19 hanging over everyone. The solution applied today could be a bigger problem in the future. Furthermore, does this decision mean the NEPP professionals who executed the survey on Purlieu Way got things so badly wrong that their entire decision has been dismissed out of hand and deemed totally irrelevant? Has this "judgement" declared the NEPP professionals who executed the survey in Purlieu Way incompetent?

Projecting forward to the possibility of a single Yellow Line TRO in Purlieu Way, the environmental and financial impact would be far more significant than many would imagine. The majority of houses in Purlieu Way have retained gardens at the front of their houses. With the introduction of a TRO, householders may seek to create additional off street parking, thereby paving over front gardens and consequently increasing the flood risk in the area – we understand Theydon Bois suffered severe flooding in 1982. The modification of

front gardens, for those who choose this option, will be subjected to the cost of obtaining planning permission and the expense of having the work carried out. Workmen's trucks and vans will be a regular feature for a while in Purlieu Way because it is highly unlikely every resident will be having modifications done at the same time. To make matters worse, some may opt for widening the drop in front of their houses, which will entail another round of workmen and further expense.

We ask ourselves, what the implementation of a TRO in Purlieu Way will achieve. Is there a desire for a utopian street scene in Purlieu Way for one hour per day? Contrast that with "parking-carnage" in adjoining streets catering for those in Purlieu Way who need to move their vehicles due to insufficient off street parking. Harewood Hill would be the immediate choice for many residents of Purlieu Way and would thereby feel the direct impact, given Harewood Hill currently has no TRO. The other twenty three hours will be 'business as usual' parking-wise. Negatively impacting adjoining streets is contra to one of the NEPP criteria for implementing a TRO.

Is this initiative really for the benefit of the residents of Purlieu Way or a politically driven aim with no real benefit ever accruing for the residents of Purlieu Way?

Can anyone explain why Bank Holidays have not been excluded from the proposed restriction?

We ask politely that you consider the objections raised and take a balanced view especially in the unusual circumstances the COVID-19 pandemic has created and reconsider the decision on the "moratorium" and if amenable, conduct further random site surveys to get a real feel for any supposed issues.

Yours sincerely

4

Regarding Scheme: EFDC16

Street name: PURLIEU WAY

Name: [REDACTED]

Contact preference: Email

Address [REDACTED] Purlieu Way Theydon Bois

Postcode: CM16 7EH

Phone [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Comment type: Object

Comment: The introduction of the yellow line restricted scheme will be of no benefit to those living in the street with reduced parking on their drive. It means that visitors cannot visit for the whole day and those with larger families with additional cars will suffer. I have spent the last year working from home and notably the street is not overrun by cars. The cars that are present are generally those visiting the people who live in the street or those owned by the people

living there with perhaps smaller drives. Surely in these times wherein stress and anxiety levels have increased, why would anyone be looking to introduce a one hour restriction that would then cause unnecessary aggravation and concern. It is accepted that residents permits may be an option as visitors permits can be purchased thus allowing for the above.

5

30-09-21

RE PURLIEU WAY CM16

DEAR SIRs,

I AM A RESIDENT OF PURLIEU WAY AND I WISH TO REGISTER MY OBJECTION TO ANY PARKING RESTRICTIONS THAT MAY BE IMPOSED BY NEPP IN PURLIEU WAY CM16. I BELIEVE THIS STEMS FROM LONDON UNDERGROUND CLOSING THE CENTRAL LINE A FEW YEARS AGO BETWEEN EPPING AND ONGAR, THUS FORCING COMMUTERS FROM FURTHER AFIELD TO DRIVE NEARER TO LONDON. I EXPECT L.U. AND NOW T.F.L. WOULD DENY ANY RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS. I ALSO BELIEVE WITH COVID LOCKDOWN & WORKING FROM HOME & EMPLOYERS ENCOURGING THIS TO CONTINUE INTO THE FUTURE, LESS THAN USUAL COMMUTERS ARE PARKING IN PURLIEU WAY, OF WHICH THERE WAS NEVER MORE THAN JUST A FEW ANYWAY.

I HAVE JUST RETURNED (MID MORNING, THURS 30-09-21) FROM COUNTING THE PARKED VEHICLES IN PURLIEU WAY. BECAUSE OF THE WIDTH OF THE ROAD, IT IS ONLY EQUALLY POSSIBLE TO PARK CARS ON EVEN NUMBERS OF ROAD. I COUNTED A TOTAL OF 8 VEHICLES PARKED. MOST OF THESE WERE RESIDENTS 2ND CARS AND THE REMAINDER WERE BUILDERS/WORKMENS WORK VEHICLES. NONE WERE RECOGNISED AS COMMUTERS CARS.

WE AS ARE A 2 CAR FAMILY BUT, WITH ONLY THE ORIGINAL ONE CAR OFF ROAD FACILITY SO, TWO LARGE TREES WOULD HAVE TO BE FELLED AND HARD STANDING LAID TO ACCOMMODATE OUR 2ND CAR, AT GREAT EXPENSE TO MYSELF. THIS NOT BEING VERY ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY.

I THINK THAT YELLOW LINES IN PURLIEU WAY WOULD BE UNSIGHTLY AND TAKE AWAY THE 'VILLAGE APPEARANCE'. THIS IS WHY I AND MAJORITY OF PURLIEU WAY RESIDENTS VOTED AGAINST YELLOW LINES/PARKING RESTRICTIONS SO MANY YEARS AGO, ALSO THE VILLAGE RESIDENTS IN GENERAL VOTING AGAINST THE INSTALLATION OF STREET LIGHTING.

WE LIKE OUR DARK SKYS AND OUR 'YELLOW LINE FREE' PURLIEU WAY.

I ALSO QUESTION THE LEGITIMACY OF ANY SURVEY OF RESIDENTS BY A FELLOW RESIDENT WHO CAN OF COURSE FURNISH NEPP WITH ANY UNSUBSTANTIATED NUMBERS TO SUIT HIS OWN PURPOSE.

6

Name

Contact preference: Email

Address Harewood Hill

Postcode: CM16 7EA

Phone

Email:

Comment type: Object

Comment: I OBJECT on the basis there are only two restriction-free roads in this half of Theydon Bois and losing the parking in Purlieu Way will push commuters into only remaining road which is the adjacent Harewood Hill. This will result in the reduction of Harewood Hill residents quality of life by having the noise associated with parking when commuters come early to search for a free space.

The space will then be tied up all day making it hard for trades and visitors. I would AGREE to the restriction IF the parking restriction was continued into the last unrestricted road, Harewood Hill which joins Purlieu Way at about the halfway point. This will make the whole area uniform with regard to timed restrictions and therefore keeping all day commuters away from this residential area. I would therefore request North Essex Parking Partnership consider either not putting the restriction in Purlieu Way OR continuing it into Harewood Hill.

7

Street name: PURLIEU WAY

Name [REDACTED]

Contact preference: Email

Address [REDACTED] Purlieu Way

Postcode: CM16 7ED

Phone:

Email: [REDACTED]

Comment type: Object

Comment: The proposal is based on deterring long-term parking - however what it also does is deter visitors and tradespeople who are no longer able to park outside any home on Purlieu Way. I do not believe we have a commuter problem at the moment (this may have been arguably the case pre-covid, but is certainly not the case now) so I strongly object to this proposal

8

Name [REDACTED]

Contact preference: Post

Address [REDACTED] Purlieu Way, Theydon Bois

Postcode: CM16 7ED

Phone [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Comment type: Object

Comment: I object in the strongest possible terms to the parking regulation (yellow line) to be deployed in Purlieu Way, Theydon Bois. Many residents including myself rely on on-street parking for our cars and any guests' cars. For example, my household has 2 cars, but I do not have 2 off-road parking spaces, so we would have to give up one or both cars if this restriction came into place. The applicant's ([REDACTED]) brazen suggestion that people should pave over their front gardens to accommodate the restriction is unacceptable (and unenvironmental). Furthermore, there is a restrictive covenant on all the houses

in the street that prohibits parking on the drives, so this suggestion could not even be legally followed. Only some houses on the street have a garage (for one car), while others do not have a garage at all. Importantly, the reasons submitted in the application are either untrue or exaggerated. There is no problem finding parking spaces due to commuters. Since the covid pandemic I have not noticed any commuters parking on the road (and before it was not a significant number). There is also no problem of obstructing bin lorries or other vehicles that I have seen in the [REDACTED] years I have lived here. In other words, I think that the reasons are made up. In addition, I am concerned that this restriction would negatively impact my house value. Finally, I am concerned that the application is not being made in good faith. Firstly, residents who opposed the yellow lines have not been kept informed of the proceedings, including that an application has been submitted a year ago. Secondly, arguments presented at the Joint Committee meeting on 10/08/2021 in favour of the restriction are flawed: a residents' parking scheme was discouraged as an alternative based on cost, but this comparison doesn't make sense since a one-hour restriction would force residents to park off-street anyway, so they wouldn't incur the cost of a permit. An existing "drive-sharing scheme" was mentioned in support of the restriction, but I am not aware of any such scheme existing. I object to the proposed parking restriction. Furthermore, I would like reassurance that if the restriction is nevertheless put in place then residents who have not agreed to it are allowed an exemption.

9

Name [REDACTED]

Contact preference: Email

Address: [REDACTED] PURLIEU WAY, THEYDON BOIS

Postcode: CM16 7ED

Phone:

Email: [REDACTED]

Comment type: Object

Comment: Am writing to object to the proposed parking restrictions for Purlieu Way, Theydon Bois, Essex. I would like to make my objection to these parking restrictions clear. If the proposed yellow lines are enforced upon residents our visitors will have nowhere to park in the restricted time and will have to move their cars which would be an inconvenience. We would also have to look for alternative parking for our own car. Care workers visiting the elderly will have a problem with parking. There are several elderly people on our road, as well as my next-door neighbour, who make use of carers and NHS medical staff. It will severely complicate matters for them. I do not believe there is a major issue with

commuters parking their cars here for the whole day. I believe that the parking restrictions will be an added hindrance to parking in the area for the residents and visitors of Purlieu Way Some of the houses in Purlieu Way have only parking for one car. They will have to pave over their front gardens for parking space at a huge cost to them. It is also detrimental to the environment with the rainwater nowhere to go. Please reconsider your proposed parking restrictions for Purlieu Way

10

TRO Comments
PO Box 5575
Colchester CO1 9LT

30 SEP 2021

26/9/21

PARKING RESTRICTIONS PURLIEU WAY

I live in Harewood Hill. The parking at present is difficult, and, of course, this will make the situation worse.

However my strong objection is not for that reason. It is because this will make life even more difficult for the long suffering commuters trying to earn a living working in London. The city is this country's most important earner and , at present is struggling with Brexit and the fallout from covid. I cannot think of any other industry where the workers are penalized in this way by councils. The commuters were parking on Abridge Road, but they were hounded from there. The station car park is completely inadequate. Surely more station parking e.g behind the station could be provided instead. This plan should be reexamined.

Yours faithfully

11

Name [REDACTED]

Contact preference: Email

Address: [REDACTED] Purlieu Way

Postcode: CM16 7ED

Phone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Comment type: Object

Comment: I am very much opposed to this proposal for the following reasons: ~I do not feel there is a problem with commuter parking - there were very few commuter cars parked here at the original application time (most of the cars belonging to residents themselves) and this has further reduced during the pandemic ~I am deeply concerned about the impact environmentally if restrictions were to be put into place as this would undoubtedly mean that an even greater number of residents would turn their front gardens into off street parking and effect the environment (incidentally i believe that this is actually against the terms of the covenant put into place when the houses were originally built) ~ I am concerned for t he impact on those residents who have more than 2 cars , although this does not directly impact myself and husband as we have room for both our cars on our own drive but i am very aware of the amount of families with teenage children who are soon likely to be wanting to learn to drive and then therefore be likely to have cars ~I am very concerned about the impact of a possible 1 hour time period restriction on those people who need visits from carers or other forms of support at home - as a former peripatetic teacher for early years children with complex and profound needs I know from personal experience how difficult it is to access homes when there are parking restrictions .Staff that carry out these visits are often working to time constraints and it is very disappointing to think that the time allocated to an elderly or vulnerable individual could be cut into by the visitor not being able to park near ~ from my own personal perspective we have two cars and curr ently and following the pandemic my husband often works from home - the restrictions would mean that if friends or family were to visit me during my non working days they would not be able to arrive until after the restriction time was over - which limits time if people need to get back to collect older children from school I would like it clearly stated on record that I am very much against the proposal of any form of parking restriction in Purlieu Way and feel that I would be very adversely affected if this were to be carried out. I am also disappointed how the procedure has been carried out - the original survey being carried out by a resident who put the request in and was clearly not impartial and who then did not share any information with residents who did not agree with their own viewpoint!

12

Name [REDACTED]
Contact preference: No preference
Address [REDACTED] Purlieu Way, Theydon Bois
Postcode: CM16 7ED
Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Comment type: Object

Comment: Fundamentally there is not a parking issue in Purlieu Way. I work from home 2 days a week at present and there are always parking spaces in the road during the day. Today there were 6 spaces within a few yards of our house plus 3 work vans for a property carrying out home improvements. There were more available spaces in both directions down the road. Most other spaces were occupied by residents where they had either chosen to park on the road or had more cars than spaces on their drive, probably from other family members. Other headline issues that I would highlight are as follows: - Some residents would need to pave over their front garden to generate more parking (expensive and would cause more rainwater runoff into the drainage system rather than into the ground). It is also unfair to impose a high cost in the thousands upon residents who may be against the proposal. - No parking for workmen carrying out repairs or building works - Restricted parking for care visitors or relatives during the day. Some visits are essential and they would not be able to be there between 10-11am. Theydon has an older population than many areas so this could well become a greater issue in the future. - Introduces the need for some residents to move their vehicle to another road for that one hour period. This would also mean that they would have to be at home to do so every day. - If this is the issue that is being portrayed then the introduction of restrictions will just push the problem to the next road, eg Harewood Hill. - This would potentially also affect bank holidays, so potential fines at Christmans, Easter etc for visitors if they fail to comply or forget to move their car We had a similar application from a resident a few years ago who wanted to revert Theydon Bois to 'a clear street scene' with no parking on the road during the day. We carried out a survey of residents at the time and it showed that generally older residents with one car were in favour of the restrictions but the majority of others were against it for one or more of the reasons noted above. When the inspector visited the area he saw that there was not an issue and rejected the application. The situation has not changed in my view other than the increase in number of cars per house in Purlieu Way, The number of spaces available during the working days supports this (maybe there are less spaces at the far ends of the road but this is also due to some residents parking on the road). Finally I understand that the resident who is driving this application has met with Council representative(s), and even possibly since the original decision to reject the proposal. However this was not advised to those against the application, so we have not had the opportunity to present our views, so this is an unbalanced and obviously biased application. We should at least be allowed the same privilege. As I stated at the beginning, there is not a

fundamental parking issue in Purlieu Way, and there is not a need to spend taxpayers' money on introducing a scheme that is not required. I would be happy to discuss further by phone or in person if appropriate Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

13

Name: Mr [REDACTED]

Contact preference: Email

Address: [REDACTED] Harewood Hill, Theydon Bois,

Postcode: Cm16 7EA

Phone:

Email: [REDACTED]

Comment type: Object

Comment: This is just another convenient money making decision (where a van can drive around at an allotted time and rack up the fines) without considering residents. I object to another a time specific restriction for all. Why not make the area a "residents & tradesmen permit only" parking scheme, with Daily permits available for guests (and / or tradesmen). I am pretty sure most residents would agree to pay a small annual fee for a permit if required.

14

Name: [REDACTED]

Contact preference: Phone

Address: [REDACTED] Harewood Hill

Postcode: CM16 7EA

Phone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Comment type: Agree

Comment: Parking restrictions on this road are long overdue. My only concern is that this will push commuter parking to the surrounding roads especially Harewood Hill. HH is a very narrow road which is already stacked full of cars every morning. People already have their driveways regularly blocked and the junction with Woodland Way is dangerous as a result of cars parking on that junction. Could I ask what considerations have been made on the impact of surrounding roads and what action is been taken to mitigate them? A solution to a parking issue is not simply to push that problem onto other roads which already suffer from similar issues as Purlieu Way. Personally I would support "No waiting Mon to Fri 10-11am" restrictions on all residential roads in the village.

15

Name

Contact preference: Email

Address: [REDACTED] Harewood Hill

Postcode: CM16 7EA

Phone [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Comment type: Object

Comment: If restrictions are put in place on Purlieu Way then that will only leave Harewood Hill available in virtually the whole of Theydon Bois for all day parking. In the past we have found that especially commuters have caused problems by parking inconsiderately (right on the edge or even partly across driveways) and by parking opposite another car or (dangerously) on the corner of Harewood Hill with Woodland Way which meant the refuse lorry or delivery lorries were unable to get through or turn right from Woodland Way into Harewood Hill. There has not as yet been a problem with emergency vehicle access but that possibility should also be considered. The owners of these vehicles couldn't not be located to move them which caused delay and frustration. There is also the annoyance of cars driving up and down looking for a parking space in the early morning plus the slamming of car doors and boots and sometimes bleeping of car alarms at 6.30/7.30am. Therefore I object on the basis that parking (especially commuter) will migrate into Harewood Hill. BUT I would AGREE if yellow line restrictions were introduced/extended into Harewood Hill.

TRO Comments
North Essex Parking Partnership,
PO Box 5575
Colchester CO1 9LT

OBJECTION TO PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTION ORDER 202
PURLIEU WAY, THEYDON BOIS

Sir/Madam,

Having just wasted a lot of time trying to find some sense with the web address given in the Notice to Harewood Hill residents, only to find a detailed map of Colchester and no way of changing it, or objecting to it any other way on the website, I am forced to send a quick written objection.

There are very few parking spaces available in Harewood Hill, which is a narrow, fairly short road with parking on one side only. Commuters, residents from Purlieu Way with extra vehicles and Harewood Hill residents with more than two vehicles already clog it. If the proposed restrictions come in in Purlieu Way, Harewood Hill will be the only road in the vicinity without restrictions, and it will be a nightmare for residents. There is no extra space for the cars which normally park all day in Purlieu Way.

Please reconsider this proposal.

Sincerely,



RECEIVED
12 OCT 2021



North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date:	28 October 2021
Title:	Finance Report – to end of Period 5 (August)
Authors:	Richard Walker, Group Manager / Lou Belgrove, Business Manager
Presented by:	Richard Walker

The report sets out the current financial position for NEPP from 2020/21 to the end of period 5, August 2021.

1. Recommended Decisions Required

- 1.1. Note the NEPP's financial position at the end Period 5 (August) 2021.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decisions

- 2.1. For good governance, to ensure the future running of the service, and that NEPP on-street funds are allocated in line with its priorities and goals set out in the Development Plan.

3. Alternative Options

- 3.1. Legislation dictates that on-street funds are ring-fenced in accordance with s.55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended).

4. Supporting Information

- 4.1. Following the National Government lockdowns of the last financial year, Service levels have returned to pre-pandemic levels and income is slowly showing signs of recovery.
- 4.2. With the previous year's (2019/20) £286k in-year surplus being added, the Reserve stood at approx. £1.6m at the start of 2020/21.
- 4.3. An in-year deficit of £372k was recorded at the end of the Financial Year 2020/21 and was drawn from the Reserve to ensure a breakeven position at year end.
- 4.4. The usual £185k TRO costs, agreed project spend, and end of year deficit (as described above) were all included and were also drawn from the Reserve.
- 4.5. At Financial Year 2020/21 close, the Reserves stood at just over £1m.
- 4.6. Expenditure remains consistent and as expected due to the level of service being provided.
- 4.7. Details of the current NEPP financial position are set out in Appendix 1.

5. Financial Implications

- 5.1. As a result of the National Lockdowns, NEPP experienced a 38% reduction in Penalty Charge Notices, nonetheless, with people returning to town centres and the workplace, we are beginning to see numbers gradually coming back to pre-pandemic levels.
- 5.2. Income relating to “the debtor” (Penalty Charge Notice income from Notices issued late this financial year but which won’t be recovered until next financial year) has been included in the PCN income figure in Appendix 1.
- 5.3. The budget is set each year in line with the medium-term plan, particularly in support of the TRO (Traffic Regulation Order) programme from reserves, alongside investments in operational projects.
- 5.4. Permit income continues to be monitored. The previously reported extensions to the end of expiring parking permits (to assist during the Government lockdowns), caused a temporary cashflow issue where income which would normally be expected to come within the year will now appear in this year.
- 5.5. Casual visitor permit income has reduced, and the same is true of pay and display at the kerbside stays. These purchases can be seen as “one-off” types of income and, once lost, is unrecoverable.
- 5.6. Without a wider return to the workplace it maybe that the pre-pandemic levels of kerbside stays will not return but will be monitored for trends.
- 5.7. Despite the draw on the Reserve last financial year, little impact will be had on the planned project spend with many projects being initiated and delivered as expected.
- 5.8. Expenditure in areas for employees is currently under budget for the year due to a number of vacancies in the Operations teams. Recruitment is ongoing, however.
- 5.9. The Supplies and Services costs are expected to come in under budget based on previous year spend and level of service provision remaining unchanged.

6. Standard References

- 6.1. There are no particular publicity or consultation considerations; equality, diversity and human rights; community safety; health and safety or other risk management implications.

Appendix 1 – On-Street Account at end of Period 5, August 2021

	A	B	C	D	E	FY DL	G	
2021/2022 - Period 5	2020/2021	2021/2022	2021/2022	2021/2022	2021/2022	2021/2022	2021/2022	Notes
Provisional Outturn	Last Year	Current Year	Current Year	Current Year	Current Year	Current Year	Current Year	
	Actual	Actual to date	Budget to date	Variance to date	Forecast outturn	Annual budget	Projected variance	
On-street Account								
Direct costs								
Expenditure								
Employee costs:								
Management	123	35	38	(3)	87	92	(5)	Parking Services Mgt Team staff costs and management a/c
CEOs & Supervision	1,399	581	597	(16)	1,296	1,434	(138)	CEOs & Supervisor staff & costs; small vacancy u/spend
Back Office	425	180	185	(5)	423	444	(20)	Back Office staff costs
Data Led Services	0	72	86	(14)	217	207	10	
TRO's	134	66	58	8	160	138	22	TRO team staff costs
Premises / TRO Maintenance costs	329	93	95	(2)	234	228	6	R&M budget (seasonal: small expenditure anticipated)
Transport costs (running costs)	54	9	14	(5)	36	33	3	Fuel, public transport etc
Supplies & Services	437	177	271	(94)	540	651	(111)	General expenditure; includes ParkSafe car IT & TRO costs
Third Party Payments	13	3	24	(21)	55	57	(2)	Chipside and TEC bureau costs
	2,914	1,215	1,368	(152)	3,049	3,284	(235)	In Year Service expenditure total
Income								
Penalty Charges (PCNs)	(1,313)	(560)	(935)	375	(2,281)	(2,245)	(36)	PCNs - revised due to CEO deployment (£1,965 Last Yr) - weather
Fines (Blue Badge/Permits)	0	0	(16)	16	(22)	(38)	16	
Parking Permits/Season Tickets	(641)	(388)	(380)	(8)	(891)	(911)	20	Visitor Permits - includes new areas and fee increase last yr
Parking Charges (P&D etc)	(181)	(97)	(147)	50	(273)	(353)	80	Pay & Display - includes additional area and new fees
Other income	(18)	(16)	(10)	(7)	(24)	(23)	(1)	Misc - other works undertaken - billed at end of work
	(2,153)	(1,061)	(1,487)	426	(3,492)	(3,570)	79	In Year Service income total
Total Direct Costs	761	154	(119)	274	(443)	(286)	(156)	In Year Service net expenditure
Total Non-direct Costs	458	471	471	0	471	471	0	Corporate costs added (see table)
Sub total (in year operation)	1,219	625	352	274	28	185	(156)	Red is surplus = to be added to reserve
	(847)				In Year Outturn	Base Budget	In Year Swing	
from Reserve	372							
								29 to/from Reserve (net)



North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 12 October 2021
Title: Annual Report 2020/21
Author: Richard Walker, Group Manager
Presented by: Richard Walker

This report provides information for members on the work of the Parking Partnership during the Financial Year 2020/21.

1. Recommended Decision(s)

1.1. To note the contents of the NEPP Annual Report 2020/21.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)

2.1. Statutory Guidance recommends the production of a retrospective Annual Parking Report within six months of the end of the financial year and published as soon as practicable.

3. Annual Report

3.1. The required statistical information was published at the NEPP Joint Committee Annual Meeting in June 2021.

3.2. The Annual Report has been published to the NEPP website at this location - <http://www1.parkingpartnership.org/north/annualreports>

3.3. Annual Reports (starting with that from 2017/18) have been completed in parts throughout the year, with a summary at the year-end. This way the content can be more current and the operation more transparent, with less of a lag in publishing information.

3.4. To this end, note that Part 1 of the 2021/22 Report has already been published.

3.5. Reports are published on the website and distributed to Members through the existing e-Briefing channel on a quarterly basis.



North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 28 October 2021
Title: Essex Parking Partnerships post 31 March 2022
Author: Richard Walker, Group Manager
Presented by: Richard Walker

This report provides information from Essex County Council about the future operation of the Essex Parking Partnerships from 1 April 2022 and invites the existing Partners to join a new Agreement.

1. Recommended Decision(s)

- 1.1. To note the contents of the Essex County Council Cabinet Report.
- 1.2. To decide to support the future parking partnership arrangements from 1 April 2022.
- 1.3. To recommend to the Partner District and Borough Councils of the North Essex Parking Partnership in the North Essex Area to support the establishment of arrangements set out in the Essex Offer Letter.
- 1.4. To recommend their joining up to the new Agreement at the earliest opportunity.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)

- 2.1. Due to the ending of the current Agreement in March 2022, and for continued good governance of parking in Essex.

3. Parking Partnerships

- 3.1. Essex County Council considered a report at their Cabinet of 21 September 2021, which set out options for the future operation of the Parking Partnerships, beyond the end of the current term which expires on 31 March 2022.
- 3.2. A letter setting out the County Council's position and its offer to the Districts [See Appendix].
- 3.3. Borough and District partners will be invited to decide – and have their own decision to make – to sign up to a new Parking Partnership – which will draw extensively from the current operation, but along slightly different lines, to the existing Agreement.
- 3.4. The main features of the proposed new Partnership include:-
 - a) continuation of the Joint Committee approach for managing operations, and proposing new schemes;
 - b) share of any surplus being paid to a new Essex County Council Panel which will decide on its investment in either NEPP, SEPP or ECC parking schemes, or other transport projects (in accordance with uses set out in legislation);
 - c) a different approach to TRO provision, where this is budgeted in advance and supported from a surplus share, being underwritten in the even if no surplus;
 - d) a new option to take on other work for Essex County Council.

Background Papers

- A. The Essex County Council Cabinet Report, which can be found online [here](#).
- B. A letter of offer from Essex County Council [See Appendix].

Forward Plan reference number: FP/106/07/21

Report title: The future of on-street parking in Essex - Delegation of Civil Parking Enforcement	
Report to: Cabinet	
Report author: Councillor Lee Scott, Cabinet Member for Highways Maintenance and Sustainable Transport	
Date: 21 September 2021	For: Decision
Enquiries to: Andrew Cook, Director, Highways and Transportation, andrew.cook@essex.gov.uk	
County Divisions affected: All Essex	

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The Council is the authority responsible for the enforcement of decriminalised on street parking contraventions. Since 2011, these functions have been discharged jointly with district councils – who deal with off street contraventions - via two Joint Committees – one in the north of Essex and one in the south of Essex.
- 1.2 The current agreements come to an end in March 2022. This report asks the Cabinet to agree that these arrangements should be renewed.
- 1.3 The proposals fit with the authority’s aspirations around climate change by continuing to have effective regulation of disruptive parking and encouragement of sustainable travel, thus helping to reduce carbon emissions in Essex.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 Agree to enter into joint committee agreements under which the Council delegates civil parking enforcement to two area Joint Committees with the same areas as the current joint committees with effect from 1 April 2022 for a period of five years with an option to extend for a further twelve months on three consecutive occasions.
- 2.2 To agree that the Director, Highways and Transportation is authorised to agree the terms of the two new Joint Committee Agreements in consultation with the Monitoring Officer.

3. Summary of issue

Background

- 3.1 The County Council’s emerging strategy includes within it a focus on providing a high-quality environment for all our residents and transport’s role within this

as an enabler of sustainable travel across the county growing passenger transport and active travel options for residents so that there are practical alternatives to car journeys.


- 3.2 The management and enforcement of on street parking is fundamental to the network management duty of the Traffic Management Act 2004 to facilitate safe and efficient movement on the road network. The appropriate management of on street parking can support safer neighbourhoods, school zones and the viability of local shopping areas by encouraging a modal shift to keep roads free from obstructions. Although enforcement results in a requirement to pay for contravention, this is not a power to raise revenue – the aim must be to deter motorists from contravening restrictions. The money raised through contraventions has to be spent on the cost of enforcing the restrictions with any surplus being spent on parking or highways or transport schemes. The Council's functions with respect to the enforcement of on street parking contraventions along with power to introduce and vary on street parking contraventions are exercisable by two joint committee arrangements.
- 3.3 Essex Highways Network Management has a critical role to play in supporting the Council to achieve its net zero climate ambitions. Encouraging people to walk to school, work and for leisure and to use public transport or to cycle requires routes which are not obstructed by poor parking. Car use not only emits CO₂, but emits NO_x, which has a direct impact on individual's health. Car journeys in local neighbourhoods where engines are idling or stopping and starting, rather than journeys being free-flowing, increases emissions and affects air quality, therefore preventing obstructions on the route is an important part of improving the environment for everyone. Essex is a rural county and for many there is (at present) no practical alternative to the car, but where people can leave their car at home, they should be supported to make this switch to more active travel, which reduces congestion, improves poor air quality, enables public transport to flow smoothly and prevents delays to emergency vehicles attending incidents. The Parking Partnerships directly support this work with revenues raised from enforcement utilised to improve sustainable transport planning across the County which benefits all our residents.
- 3.4 The two 'parking partnerships' were launched on 1 April 2011; one called South Essex ("SEPP"), and one called North Essex ("NEPP"). Two lead authorities were appointed; Chelmsford in the south, and Colchester in the north. The Parking Partnerships are each governed by Joint Committees and a Joint Committee Agreement is in place for each partnership. As Lead Authority for each partnership, Chelmsford City Council and Colchester Borough Council are responsible for all employment and financial management of the Parking Partnerships.

NEPP

Epping Forest
Harlow
Uttlesford
Colchester
Braintree
Tendring

SEPP

Rochford
Chelmsford
Brentwood
Maldon
Basildon
Castle Point



- 3.5 The existing Joint Committee Agreements which commenced in 2011 were for an initial seven-year term. In 2018, these were extended for a further four-year term, taking the total term for each of the agreements to eleven years, expiring on 31 March 2022.
- 3.6 When NEPP and SEPP were set up, the on street parking enforcement arrangements were operating with a total annual deficit of around £900,000 (this unfunded pressure had to be met by the Council) but one of the key aims of the development of NEPP and SEPP was to change the outturn position, with the partnerships moving from an operational deficit to a cost neutral position, and ultimately a surplus position.
- 3.7 In recent years, both NEPP and SEPP have each significantly improved their financial position, resulting in a surplus being created. The surplus must be spent on traffic improvements. To date the use of the surplus has been retained under the control of the relevant parking partnership and they have spent the money on the implementation of new Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) and other parking related activity such as smart bay sensors and the 3PR initiative (the 'Three Parking Rules').
- 3.8 A review of the future of the current arrangements has been undertaken.

Benchmarking

- 3.9 Within the UK, civil parking enforcement is commissioned by local authorities in different ways. The service may be provided in-house, delivered by a contractor or, as in Essex, by a partnership model. The table below is the latest available CIPFA benchmarking information showing the financial performance of civil parking enforcement.

Table 1: Local Authority Benchmarking Analysis 2018/19

Local authority	Total Expenditure (2018/19) £,000	Total Income (2018/19) £,000	Net Current Expenditure	Surplus Generating	Surplus as a percentage of income
Gloucestershire	2,098	5,365	-3,267	Surplus Generating	-61%
Essex*	5,108	8,306	-3,198	Surplus Generating	-39%
Cambridgeshire	2,818	5,797	-2,979	Surplus Generating	-51%
Devon	5,499	8,419	-2,920	Surplus Generating	-35%
Warwickshire	1,880	4,084	-2,204	Surplus Generating	-54%
Lancashire	1,975	3,266	-1,291	Surplus Generating	-40%
East Sussex	3,388	4,505	-1,117	Surplus Generating	-25%
Oxfordshire	3,289	4,317	-1,028	Surplus Generating	-24%
West Sussex	3,287	4,303	-1,016	Surplus Generating	-24%
Northamptonshire	1,626	2,549	-923	Surplus Generating	-36%
Dorset	1,237	1,701	-464	Surplus Generating	-27%
Nottinghamshire	66	271	-205	Surplus Generating	-76%
Leicestershire	1,822	1,927	-105	Surplus Generating	-5%
Somerset	1,338	1,430	-92	Surplus Generating	-6%
Lincolnshire	1,180	1,254	-74	Surplus Generating	-6%
Cumbria	1,418	1,392	26	Deficit	2%
Staffordshire	1,094	1,011	83	Deficit	8%
Derbyshire	960	872	88	Deficit	10%
North Yorkshire	4,990	4,884	106	Deficit	2%
Surrey	5,158	5,041	117	Deficit	2%

*NB For comparative purposes Bus Lane Enforcement (which is not commissioned through the partnerships) has been included

**Data taken from 2018-19 – also due to the impact of Covid

- 3.10 The analysis demonstrates that Essex generates the second highest surplus of those authorities included in the data, although Essex is by far the largest authority included in the data. These figures include bus lane enforcement which is not undertaken by the parking partnerships and is not being considered for change.

Market research and intelligence

- 3.11 A market research provider ('Porge') was used to provide insight to the market for civil enforcement of on-street parking across local authorities. Table 2 lists third-party supplier spend for enforcement and parking activities (including bus lane enforcement) by local authority. For the year 2018-19 (pre-Covid), the key market players were; NSL Services Group (£90m), APCOA (£26m), OCS Legion (undisclosed) and Serco Group (£6m).

Table 2: Third-party supplier invoice spend by local authority 2018/19, Source: Porge Research

Local authority	3rd Party Supplier	3rd Party Supplier Spend 2018-19*
Nottinghamshire	NSL Services Group	£754,283
Essex	N/A	N/A
Gloucestershire	APCOA	£1,339,353
Cambridgeshire	OCS Legion	Unknown
Warwickshire	NSL Services Group	£1,424,561
Dorset	Unknown	Unknown
Oxfordshire	NSL Services Group	£2,809,639
East Sussex	NSL Services Group	£2,409,615
Devon	Unknown	Unknown
Lancashire	NSL Services Group	£1,527,344
West Sussex	NSL Services Group	£3,594
Northamptonshire	NSL Services Group	£1,604,493
Leicestershire	Unknown	Unknown
Somerset	NSL Services Group	£1,512,555


- 3.12 Officers also held informal discussions with several local authorities including Oxfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Gloucestershire, and Maidstone, under an

agency arrangement with Kent CC to understand how respective on-street parking arrangements are currently delivered and innovations being considered. These did not identify any further business opportunities which are not currently being explored within the existing partnership arrangements.

- 3.13 During the discussions we received feedback that NEPP is considered by other local authorities as being a national leader in enforcement with whom other local authorities consult for best practice advice and have been recognised in the industry for multiple awards (some jointly with SEPP), for example the British Parking Awards.
- 3.14 One local authority mentioned a new supplier entrant to the UK market whose focus is on innovation via data management and utilising fewer ‘feet on the ground’ than the more traditional approaches used by other established UK service providers. As this was a new entrant it is too early understand the impact this has had on the effectiveness of services provided, however the Council are maintaining communication with the local authority using this supplier to observe how the service develops and will look to incorporate any best practice within the partnerships.
- 3.15 From discussions with other local authorities, it was noted that where enforcement activities are outsourced to a third-party supplier, this could lead to an increased cost base of circa 10-20%. This appears to be because third party suppliers have to set up or adapt systems and processes specifically for this purpose.
- 3.16 To ensure continuity and encourage the successful delivery of key projects within the term of the agreement, Cabinet are asked to agree to enter into a five-year agreement with each Parking Partnership with an option to extend each agreement for twelve months on three consecutive occasions.

Proposed operational model

- 3.17 A proposed operational model has been developed as illustrated in the diagram below. This introduces two financial models for different aspects of the services being provided.



3.18 For current services it is proposed that the surplus generated at the end of every financial year will be applied as follows:

- (a) The first use of the surplus will be to ensure that the partnership has a reserve of £300,000 to use against any deficit arising in future years (both partnerships already have this funded reserve in place).
- (b) The second use will be an agreed sum to be spent by the parking partnership on local schemes and innovations. The amount available for 2022/23 is as set out in the table below and any changes will be agreed on an annual basis between the joint committee and ECC.

Part 2 breakdown	NEPP	SEPP
a. TRO delivery (operational and funding costs plus essential maintenance of parking related signs and lines)	£339,000	£372,000
b. Innovation to manage on street parking	Nil	£56,000
TOTAL ANNUAL CAP	£339,000	£428,000

- (c) The remaining money will be paid to ECC to fund strategic highways projects which would not otherwise be funded. The strategic highways projects will be decided in consultation with a new panel to be chaired by the Cabinet Member.

3.19 It is important to point out that any surplus will only be spent in the following financial year, meaning that there is no risk of spending surplus which does not in fact arise.

3.20 It is proposed that in some cases new activities may be added to the partnerships. The funding for these will be operated differently with all of any surplus being passed to ECC. It is proposed that there will be a different model for NEPP and SEPP for this work as follows. For agreed projects which do not generate income and the only funding available is from PCNs, the Council will provide the investment costs and all PCN income will pass to ECC for both NEPP and SEPP. For projects which generate both revenue and PCN income, the position will be different between NEPP and SEPP. In NEPP both revenue and PCN income will pass to ECC, with NEPP taking an agreed management fee; in SEPP the revenue would pass to ECC and any PCN income will pass to SEPP in lieu of a management fee.

4. Options

4.1 A review of the options for civil parking enforcement was undertaken to determine whether to outsource the on-street parking enforcement and charging activity to a third-party provider, bring the enforcement in-house or enter into new Joint Committee agreements. Doing nothing is not a realistic option as no one else can enforce restrictions on parking (including yellow line contraventions). Good, clear, enforced parking management is likely to result

in reduced congestion in town centre areas and fewer access problems in residential areas.

Three options were considered:

Option 1 – Outsource to a third-party supplier (not recommended)

- 4.3 Outsourcing services to a third-party supplier could increase the costs by up to 20% (see 3.15), therefore reducing the surplus available to the Council. This could also be potentially complex and costly due to the need to transfer staff from both partnerships to the new provider. This would also lose the benefit of current savings such as shared premises and system costs with the parking partnerships. There would also be reduced local engagement and transparency.

Option 2 – Extend Parking Partnerships arrangements on slightly different terms (recommended)

- 4.4 The current parking partnership model effectively delivers the policy objectives through an integrated service that joins enforcement, signs and lines maintenance and TRO activity, and has both delivered and exceeded the objectives set at the outset of the agreements. This option also minimises the need for new investment costs as the arrangements are already established.
- 4.5 Negotiating a new agreement with the Parking Partnerships would retain the existing delegation of control for local parking policies and the management of the associated functions to the NEPP and SEPP joint committees.
- 4.6 The Council have identified the parking partnership is a proven working model which delivers the service in a cost neutral manner with any surplus deployed in line with legislation.
- 4.7 Further it would provide the opportunity for invest to save initiatives which meet other organisational aims such as helping to create great places to grow up, live and work through the appropriate management of on-street parking, for example, outside of schools.
- 4.8 A new agreement also enables shared income initiatives between the parties and builds on existing successful collaborative activity, facilitating a win-win-win between the Council, parking partnerships and the district authorities.
- 4.9 Experience working with the parking partnerships shows they are already bringing forward innovation.

Option 3 – Provide the service in-house (not recommended)

- 4.10 Providing the services in-house has the advantage of direct control of the service, and potentially being able to affect changes more easily.

4.11 Further, it could cost less than outsourcing and it would give ECC more direct control over the surplus.

4.12 However, the disadvantages of providing services in-house include;

- liability for any deficit would immediately land with ECC
- lack of synergies for collaborative working
- currently all enquiries and complaints regarding parking are managed by the partnerships – the Council would become responsible for responding to and resolving all these enquiries.

5. Links to Everyone's Essex

5.1 This report links to the emerging ECC organisational strategy 2021-2025 (Everyone's Essex).

The surplus that is generated could be put towards highways initiatives that supports our ambition around safer greener and healthier and the provision of more sustainable transport options across the county.

5.2 This links to the following strategic aims in the Organisational Plan:

- Enable inclusive economic growth through the appropriate management of on-street parking.
- Help create great places to grow up, live and work through the appropriate management of on-street parking for example, outside schools.
- Transform the council to achieve more with less.

6. Issues for consideration

6.1 Financial implications

6.1.1 Any surplus income at the end of each financial year will be deployed in accordance with Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which sets out how any surplus funds are to be deployed.

6.1.2 In the unlikely event that either partnership should fall into long term deficit which cannot be met from the reserve then the deficit will be apportioned with each partner to a partnership being liable to a seventh of the deficit of that partnership. As part of the current and proposed arrangements a deficit reserve is held by both partnerships and is detailed in 3.18.

6.1.3 Any one-off investment costs, surplus income associated with expansion of existing on-street parking enforcement activities and in accordance with 6.1.1 above have been taken account of as part of the Local Authorities Medium Term Resource Strategy (MTRS) position. Furthermore, in the unlikely event that Essex did need to support any deficit for either partnership on a 1/7th basis, the

service would be expected to fund this from existing budgets in the first instance by reprioritising spending.

6.1.4 Below is an extract from the NEPP and SEPP partnership accounts providing an overview of their financial position in recent years.

	SEPP - Outturn 2017-18	SEPP - Outturn 2018-19	SEPP - Outturn 2019-20		NEPP - Outturn 2017-18	NEPP - Outturn 2018-19	NEPP - Outturn 2019-20
	Total £	Total £	Total £		Total £	Total £	Total £
Direct Expenditure							
- Employees	1,078,230	1,092,090	1,117,062		1,562,447	1,580,227	1,785,904
- Premises	1,870	4,080	27,629		27,327	29,989	14,978
- Supplies and Services	114,360	101,460	140,995		295,491	369,040	371,266
- Third Party Payments	164,680	167,280	155,726		44,788	28,350	35,410
- Transport costs	94,010	121,500	103,626		33,092	28,583	33,567
- TRO Recharges					(40,722)	(38,471)	(47,834)
Total Direct Expenditure (Excl TRO Costs)	1,453,150	1,486,410	1,545,037		1,922,424	1,997,717	2,193,291
Indirect Expenditure							
Central Support	121,680	125,060	127,146		423,000	440,853	458,035
Total Indirect Expenditure	121,680	125,060	127,146		423,000	441,000	458,035
Total Expenditure	1,574,830	1,611,470	1,672,183		2,345,424	2,438,717	2,651,326
Income received to 31st March 17							
PCN's	(1,454,920)	(1,615,960)	(1,596,525)		(1,900,391)	(1,964,770)	(1,994,499)
Residents' Parking Permits/Season Tickets	(624,520)	(659,950)	(678,379)		(659,702)	(807,249)	(882,732)
Pay & Display	(160,960)	(161,070)	(169,637)		(310,035)	(348,160)	(369,297)
Other	(19,840)	10,320	(5,228)		(97,108)	(43,142)	(23,648)
Total Income	(2,260,240)	(2,426,660)	(2,449,769)		(2,967,235)	(3,163,320)	(3,270,176)
Net (Surplus) / Deficit - Cash Basis (PRE TRO COSTS)	(685,410)	(815,190)	(777,585)		(621,811)	(724,602)	(618,850)
TRO COSTS	295,430	266,180	404,832		399,423	465,753	517,863
Net (Surplus) / Deficit - Cash Basis (Post TRO COSTS)	(389,980)	(549,010)	(372,754)		(222,388)	(258,849)	(100,987)

6.1.5 The current MTRS identifies the budget gaps facing the Council over the coming years. Within the proposed agreement for the parking partnerships there are opportunities for the Council to share in financial surpluses to benefit the MTRS. As part of the new proposed agreement two opportunities are available;

- The Council could fund and receive all income by the expansion of on-street parking enforcement activities and park safe cameras (as shown in the table in section 3 of this report where the Council funds expansion and all net surplus income flows to the Council after deduction of operating costs by the partnerships.
- Through creating a Strategic Highway Investment fund across Essex to support key strategic investment priorities that would not otherwise be funded.

6.2 Legal implications

6.2.1 The Council must comply with the Traffic Management Act 2004 and relevant statutory guidance when discharging its civil parking enforcement duties.

- 6.2.2 The Council is able to delegate to a Joint Committee the responsibility for civil parking enforcement.
- 6.2.3 The Joint Committees shall consist of the Partner Authorities listed in this report.
- 6.2.4 The NEPP and SEPP Joint Committees manage the Parking Partnerships in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972, the Local Government Act 2000, the Local Authorities (Arrangements for the Discharge of Functions) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 6.2.5 Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 requires the council to maintain a parking account and that any surplus on the account must be used on parking places or, if it is not desirable to provide more parking places on transport or highways schemes.
- 6.2.6 Section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 places the council under a duty to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives—
- (a) securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network; and
 - (b) facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority.
- 6.2.7 In order to perform that duty we may take any action which they consider will contribute to securing—
- (a) the more efficient use of their road network; or
 - (b) the avoidance, elimination or reduction of road congestion or other disruption to the movement of traffic on the road network.

7. Equality and Diversity implications

- 7.1 The Public Sector Equality Duty applies to the Council when it makes decisions. The duty requires us to have regard to the need to:
- (a) Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other behaviour prohibited by the Act. In summary, the Act makes discrimination etc. on the grounds of a protected characteristic unlawful
 - (b) Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
 - (c) Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.
- 7.2 The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion or belief, gender, and sexual orientation. The Act states that 'marriage and civil

partnership' is not a relevant protected characteristic for (b) or (c) although it is relevant for (a).

- 7.3 The equality impact assessment indicates that the proposals in this report will not have a disproportionately adverse impact on any people with a particular characteristic.

8. List of appendices

Equality Impact Assessment

9. List of Background papers

The South Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee Agreement 2011
The North Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee Agreement 2011

Essex County Council
Cabinet Office
County Hall
Chelmsford
Essex
CM1 1YS



Date: 17 October 2021

Dear Cllr Cloke

The Future of On Street Parking

I wanted to contact you, following the approval of the Future of On Street Parking at Essex County Council's Cabinet Meeting in September to thank you for your involvement and support to develop a proposal that meets the needs of all the parties involved.

To create an agreement that meets the differing needs of all the city, district and borough councils across a county as diverse as Essex was not easy and I and the ECC officers very much appreciate your support.

The paper was well-received at our Cabinet Meeting, with no challenges and was supported by the Leaders of all parties recognising the hard work that has seen this become a successful partnership.

In terms of the next steps in the formal process, we now need this proposal put to the NEPP and SEPP Boards so that it can go through the appropriate governance process for each partnership. I would ask that you inform us when this is completed.

In parallel, ECC officers will be starting work to develop the proposal in more detail and to being to work through a new Joint Committee Agreement which we are aiming to have in place by 31 March 2022 and will be in touch as they progress this work.

Once again, thank you for your support and I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lee Scott".

Lee Scott

Cabinet Member, Highways Maintenance and Sustainable Transport,
Essex County Council

c.c. Liz Burr, Head of Network and Safety/Traffic Manager Essex County Council
Nick Binder, Parking Partnership Manager



North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 28 October 2021
Title: **Forward Plan 2021-2022**
Author: Owen Howell – Democratic Services, Colchester Borough Council
Presented by: Owen Howell – Democratic Services, Colchester Borough Council

This report concerns the 2021-22 Forward Plan of meetings for the North Essex Parking Partnership.

1. Recommended Decision(s)

1.1 To note and approve the North Essex Parking Partnership Forward Plan for 2021-22.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)

2.1 The forward plan for the North Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee is submitted to each Joint Committee meeting to provide its members with an update of the items scheduled to be on the agenda at each meeting.

3. Supporting Information

3.1 The Forward Plan is reviewed regularly to provide an update on those items that need to be included on future agendas and incorporate requests from Joint Committee members on issues that they wish to be discussed.

4. Meeting venues for 2021-22

4.1 The revolving hosting of Joint Committee meetings by the Partnership local authorities has recommenced, with the next meeting to be hosted by Tendring District Council. Hosting authorities will abide by any health and safety measures required by law at the time they are held.

5. Appendices

5.1 Appendix A: NEPP Joint Parking Committee Forward Plan 2021-22.

**NORTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP (NEPP)
FORWARD PLAN OF WORKING GROUP AND JOINT COMMITTEE MEETINGS 2021-22**

COMMITTEE / WORKING GROUP	CLIENT OFFICER MEETING	JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING	MAIN AGENDA REPORTS	AUTHOR
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	3 June 2021, Microsoft Teams - online	24 June 2021 1.00pm, Venue: Colchester Town Hall, High Street, Colchester	Annual Governance Review and Internal Audit Annual Review of Risk Management NEPP Financial Update NEPP Annual Report Data Forward Plan '21/22	Hayley McGrath (CBC) Hayley McGrath (CBC) Lou Belgrove (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Owen Howell (CBC)
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	7 October 2021, Microsoft Teams - online.	28 October 2021 1.00pm, Venue: Braintree District Council, Causeway House, Bocking End, Braintree, CM7 9HB	Technical report and Traffic Order Scheme Prioritisation Financial Report Annual Report New NEPP Agreement Obstructive Parking Update Forward Plan '21/22	Trevor Degville (PP) Lou Belgrove (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Owen Howell (CBC)
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	18 November 2021, Microsoft Teams - online	9 December 2021 1.00pm, Venue: Council Chamber, Tendring District Council Offices	NEPP Financial Update Use of Reserves Obstructive Parking Update Forward Plan '21/22 and' 22/23 Dates	Lou Belgrove (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Owen Howell (CBC)

COMMITTEE / WORKING GROUP	CLIENT OFFICER MEETING	JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING	MAIN AGENDA REPORTS	AUTHOR
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	24 February 2022, Microsoft Teams - online	17 March 2022 1.00pm, Venue: Harlow District Council, Civic Centre, Harlow	Finance Update and 2022/23 Budget Obstructive Parking Update Forward Plan '22/23	Lou Belgrove (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Owen Howell (CBC)
	2 June 2022, Microsoft Teams - online	23 June 2022 1.00pm, Venue: Colchester Town Hall, High Street, Colchester	Annual Governance Review and Internal Audit Annual Review of Risk Management NEPP Financial Update NEPP Annual Report Data Obstructive Parking Update Forward Plan '22/23	Hayley McGrath (CBC) Hayley McGrath (CBC) Lou Belgrove (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Owen Howell (CBC)

* These meeting venues are subject to change and may be replaced with online meetings, if required, in order to comply with social distancing measures and advice from central government.

CBC / Parking Partnership Contacts

Parking Partnership Group Manager, Richard Walker	richard.walker@colchester.gov.uk	01206 282708
Parking Manager, Lou Belgrove	Christine.Belgrove@colchester.gov.uk	01206 282627
Area Manager, Michael Adamson	michael.adamson@colchester.gov.uk	01206 507876
Area Manager, Lisa Hinman	lisa.hinman@colchester.gov.uk	01376 328451
Parking Projects, Jason Butcher	Jason.butcher@colchester.gov.uk	
Technical Services, Trevor Degville	trevor.degville@colchester.gov.uk	01206 507158
Technical / TROs, Shane Taylor	shane.taylor@colchester.gov.uk	01206 507860
Service Accountant, Louise Richards	louise.richards@colchester.gov.uk	01206 282519
Governance, Owen Howell	owen.howell@colchester.gov.uk	01206 282518
Media, Harry Taylor	Harry.Taylor@colchester.gov.uk	01206 506167

