



North Essex Parking Partnership

Joint Committee On-Street Parking

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

16 March 2023 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. For online meetings of the Joint Committee, a written contribution to each meeting of no longer than 500 words may be made by each person which should be submitted via the form accessed by this link, before noon on the working day before the meeting date: [North Essex Parking Partnership Have Your Say!](#)
- 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

If you wish to address the Joint Committee directly, or 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 2022.

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 16 March 2023. Meeting to be held at Braintree
District Council, Causeway House, Bocking End, Braintree

Agenda

Attendees

Executive Members:-

Cllr Richard van Dulken (Braintree)
Cllr Richard Freeman (Uttlesford)
Cllr Martin Goss (Colchester)
Cllr Alistair Gunn (Harlow)
Cllr Sam Kane (Epping Forest)
Cllr Dan Land (Essex County)
Cllr Alex Porter (Tendring)

Officers:-

Jason Butcher (Parking Partnership)
Trevor Degville (Parking Partnership)
Rory Doyle (Colchester)
Jake England (Parking Partnership)
Jo Heynes (Essex County Council)
Amelia Hoke (Epping Forest)
Owen Howell (Colchester)
Linda Howells (Uttlesford)
Mike Kelly (Harlow)
Andrew Nepean (Tendring)
Samir Pandya (Braintree)
Ian Taylor (Tendring)
Richard Walker (Parking Partnership)

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 meeting held on 19 December 2022.
A non-substantive amendment is to be proposed.

7-20

6. Urgent Items

The Joint Committee will consider any urgent items of business raised.

Continues overleaf

North Essex Parking Partnership

- | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|
| 7. Permit Fees and Charges Report
Members will be asked to consider the circumstances following the issues experienced between the beginning of the Pandemic, and the time leading up to the end of the financial year 2022/23, as explained in the report, and debate and consider the fees and charges options and illustrations shown in the table. | Richard Walker | 21-32 |
| 8. 'No Stopping' Cones Policy Report
This report recommends a new policy for the provision of 'No Stopping' cones along with the setting of appropriate fees for this service. | Jason Butcher | 33-38 |
| 9. TRO Scoring Methodology Report
This report recommends a proposed new scoring methodology to enable the prioritisation of Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) applications by the Joint Parking Committee (JPC). | Jason Butcher | 39-42 |
| 10. Obstructive Parking
Verbal update on the situation regarding potential future changes relating to obstructive/pavement parking. | Richard Walker | N/A |
| 11. Forward Plan 2022-23
To note the North Essex Parking Partnership Forward Plan for 2022-23 and approve meeting dates for 2023-24. | Owen Howell | 43-48 |

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

**19 December 2022 at 1.00pm
Council Chamber, Uttlesford District Council Offices,
London Road, Saffron Walden CB11 4ER.**

Members Present:

Councillor Richard van Dulken (Braintree District Council)
Councillor Richard Freeman (Uttlesford District Council)
Councillor Alastair Gunn (Harlow District Council)
Councillor Kane (Epping Forest)
Councillor Dan Land (Essex County Council)
Councillor Alex Porter (Tendring District Council)

Substitutions:

There were no substitutions at the meeting.

Apologies:

Apologies were received from
Councillor Goss (Colchester Borough Council)

Also Present:

Richard Walker (Parking Partnership)
Jason Butcher (Parking Partnership)
Rory Doyle (Colchester City Council)
Jake England (Parking Partnership)
Amelia Hoke (Epping Forest District Council)
Owen Howell (Colchester Borough Council)
Linda Howells (Uttlesford District Council)
Michael Kelly (Harlow District Council)
Samir Pandya (Braintree District Council)
Ian Taylor (Tendring District Council)

129. Have Your Say

There were no speakers for the general Have Your Say section. Two speakers addressed the Committee, at the Chairman's discretion, ahead of the agenda item relevant to their points.

130. Minutes

Richard Walker, Group Manager, explained that figures given in the final paragraph of pg. 2 were incorrect, due to a mix-up in what was said at the meeting. The correct percentage division of surplus income was that 45% would go to Essex County Council, whilst 55% would be retained by the Parking Partnership.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 27 October 2022 were approved as an accurate record, subject to the aforementioned amendment.

131. Urgent Item

An urgent item was raised, relating to the proposed pilot traffic regulation order [TRO] for single yellow lines, which had been approved by the Joint Committee on 27 October 2022, relating to Purlieu Way and Harewood Hill, Theydon Bois. This decision had been called in when the notice of decision was published by Essex County Council [ECC] and a subsequent additional consultation exercise carried out to obtain residents' views. At the Chairman's discretion, a number of members of the public addressed the Joint Committee, with a further number of written statements from members of the public being read out by Owen Howell, Clerk to the Joint Committee.

Ms. Nicola Bishop attended remotely and addressed the Joint Committee to voice her opposition to the planned installation of single yellow lines in the two streets concerned, and to give the reasons for her opposition. Ms. Bishop referenced a statement made by a member of the Joint Committee in October 2021, which was an assurance that TROs would not be implemented if these would make things worse for people. Ms Bishop drew the Joint Committee's attention to the Parking Pressure Review Report of March 2022, which stated that 'we [NEPP] do not consider that the parking demand evidenced at this time provides a solid basis for recommending parking restrictions', and that 'the majority of on-street parkers are residents, or visitors to residents throughout the day.' Furthermore, the report observed that on-street parking was never observed to be at capacity, albeit that 'parking levels would prevent some residents from parking in close proximity to their own property, or make it less convenient to enter or exit their own driveway.' Ms Bishop referred to the Joint Committee's rules and policies in place to ensure that members of the public could respond to proposed changes which would directly impact them. The

current parking situation could not be challenged on grounds of safety, congestion or new developments, with the NEPP having a duty to heed residents concerns when managing parking in the area.

Ms Bishop referenced the NEPP's TRO Policy, which stated that if the majority of properties in a street or area had off-street parking (with 89% having such parking in the area concerned here), then 'any parking on the highway will not impact on the available off street parking for residents. If the residents with off-street parking finds they are in a position where they request to have a parking restriction implemented to prevent vehicles parking in the street, but are happy for relatives of visitors to park in the area this will be considered as preferred parking and therefore a recommendation to decline the requested scheme.' Ms Bishop argued that, if the Committee had adhered to this policy, the proposal for parking restrictions should have been rejected, which would have saved money and time on consultations and information gathering. No majority of residents existed in favour of restrictions in either road and Ms Bishop requested that the consultations and work be ceased and the proposed parking restrictions be rejected by the Joint Committee, in line with policy. Ms Bishop expressed concerns at the process undertaken with regard to this matter, but also expressed her hope that the Joint Committee would choose not to impose restrictions.

The Clerk read out a statement from Mr and Mrs Kingscote, who objected to the proposed restrictions on the following grounds. An independent report confirmed that there was no problem with commuter parking on these two roads, meaning that the only impact would be on residents, especially those with visitors, carers or tradesmen visiting. Some residents would be forced to pave over more of their front gardens, with associated financial and environmental costs to this action. The impact on residents would be significant, especially with many working from home and in regard to residents with infirmities who would struggle to move their car twice a day. The proposed restrictions would cause problems for a range of service providers and carers and potentially damage services and care upon which some residents relied. Mr and Mrs Kingscote expressed concern that an already-agreed decision to not impose restrictions had been overturned without those who opposed them knowing that this was planned. Concern was also expressed at how the process had gone ahead, with evidence and previous decisions being set aside, and at how the latest consultation exercise had counted abstention from the survey as a vote in favour of new restrictions, with the argument being that this would skew results unfairly.

The Clerk read out a statement from Ms. Mandy Davies, who emphasised that there was no commuter parking problem in the two roads in question, with empty parking space always available, and argued that the implementation of restrictions would cause more disruption for residents who relied on on-street parking and would require her family to have to look at overcoming significant challenges if they were to park their three vehicles off-street, including the current position of a tree on the roadside. Ms. Davies also argued that restrictions would harm those people who do need to park before using public transport to travel to London, potentially for vital medical treatments, condensing such parking into the remaining roads without restrictions, which would potentially cause disruption to

traffic. Ms. Davies referenced NEPP policy to only introduce such a restriction where commuter parking was a problem, and the survey report which stated that there was no such problem on Purlieu Way and Harewood Hill, and stated her family's opposition to the introduction of any parking restrictions there.

The Clerk read out a statement from Mr. Kevin Butler, who wrote to make known his and Mrs Butler's objection to any changes to the current parking arrangements, excepting where restrictions are to address safety concerns such as at junctions. Mr Butler noted that the NEPP and independent assessors had concurred that new restrictions were not needed and would impact on residents' parking. The NEPP report had confirmed that commuter parking was not a current problem, with reduced demand since the pandemic, and states that the main effect of restrictions would be on the residents of the two streets. Mr Butler noted the Guidance notes of the Traffic Management Act which stated that restrictions should not simply be about restricting parking in a way that makes responsible parking harder. The environmental impact of residents having to convert gardens into off-street parking was again raised and Mr Butler argued that restrictions should not be brought in against the wishes of most residents.

Mr Michael Palmer attended and, with permission from the Chairman, addressed the Joint Committee to state his objection to the proposed parking restriction. As a resident of Purlieu Way for the past 26 years, Mr Palmer explained that he had seen TROs as they had been deployed around that area over time, and how these had often displaced parking into neighbouring streets. Mr Palmer referred the Joint Committee to 2009, when residents of Purlieu Way rejected a TRO proposal. In 2019 a new TRO was proposed, citing issues with commuter parking, but ignoring issues of displaced resident parking, identified from TROs elsewhere. Mr Palmer informed the Joint Committee that, in 2019 and 2020, he had been told that he was the only objector to the proposal for parking restrictions to be implemented. Site surveys had been carried out by the NEPP and an independent review, both showing that most vehicles were resident-owned and not commuter cars. Both surveys concluded that restrictions were unnecessary, and the independent survey by Buchanan Order Management recommending an 18-month moratorium to allow time to monitor post-pandemic patterns of use.

In October 2022, the Joint Committee approved the piloting of a parking restriction scheme in Purlieu Way and Harewood Hill, seemingly ignoring the conclusions of both surveys/reviews. Mr Palmer noted that the member of the public who had led the request for restrictions had moved from arguments relating to commuter parking, and raised arguments regarding obstructive parking instead. The decision of the Joint Committee was then called-in, having been published by Essex County Council, and additional surveying/consultation was then carried out by Epping Forest District Council, which showed that neither street reached the necessary threshold of support for parking restrictions, even after non respondents were counted as being in favour of restrictions. Mr Palmer raised concern about the accuracy of the levels of support which had initially been stated regarding proposed restrictions, and explained his view that the experimental TRO would benefit no-one, as the problem it was designed to mitigate did not exist. Mr Palmer posited that the proposed restrictions would only

harm local residents and requested that the Joint Committee revoke them.

The Clerk read out a statement from Ms. Sue Baxter, who wrote of her disappointment that the two parking surveys, which had shown there was no need for parking restrictions, had been ignored and that single yellow line restrictions were to be introduced, especially after a previous decision that restrictions would not be introduced. Ms. Baxter argued that the appeal to have restrictions introduced was based on one resident's views, whilst it would have an effect on many other residents. Ms. Baxter explained the effect such restrictions would have on her and her family, causing difficulties in meeting the terms of those restrictions, whilst meeting work commitments.

The Clerk read a statement from Ms. Cheryl Taylor who wrote that she had lived in the area affected for the past 26 years and had never experienced difficulty parking. Following the pandemic there were even fewer cars parking on the street, a point which had been demonstrated to the officers carrying out the NEPP survey. Ms. Taylor had relied on visits from carers and health professionals for her elderly, very ill mother, and restrictions on parking would make such visits very difficult. Restrictions would also mean a loss of hedges and gardens, repurposed as off-street parking spaces. Ms Taylor complained that there had been bullying and boasting from one quarter, regarding the proposed pilot restrictions, and that she had been informed that the issue would be reconsidered in early 2023, rather than at a meeting in October 2022 of which she had not been informed. Ms Taylor stated that her family were disappointed in the undemocratic way a decision had been made, and in the NEPP and the local Council.

Mr Radek Nešpor attended via Zoom and, with permission from the Chairman, addressed the Joint Committee, as a resident of Purlieu Way. Having followed the TRO process go forward since 2019, Mr Nešpor argued that the Joint Committee had been given misleading opinions and representations which exaggerated levels of support [for parking restrictions], both via written communications and in verbal presentation to the Joint Committee. This compared to the independently-produced reviews and consultation carried out, and Mr Nešpor expressed the Joint Committee's decision making would be guided by the review, the consultation, the facts and the wishes of the majority of local residents. The independent report, commissioned by NEPP in 2021, reported that there was not a parking problem on Purlieu Way, and no safety concerns, with most vehicles belonging to residents. Mr Nešpor noted that only 33% of residents in Purlieu Way actively voted in favour of restrictions in the latest consultation, and that even if households which had abstained were counted as being supportive, this would still not reach the supermajority threshold, which was 70%, set out as being necessary for a TRO to be granted. Mr Nešpor raised concern that households who did not respond to the consultation had been assumed to be in favour of restrictions, and argued that this was an improper assumption to make, skewing the results. Mr Nešpor noted that support for parking restrictions was even lower in Harewood Hill, that residents there would be negatively impacted if Purlieu Way was subject to parking restrictions, and that restrictions would violate residents' right to enjoy their properties.

The Clerk read a statement from Mr and Mrs Beeby, who strongly objected to any parking restrictions being introduced to Purlieu Way. No commuter parking problems were experienced, as shown by two surveys conducted by the NEPP, and Mr Beeby questioned the results of an early poll which had been conducted by a local resident with an interest in the matter. Mr Beeby described the difficulty and cost which parking restrictions would cause him and his wife, including the need to concrete their front garden and remove trees.

The Clerk read a statement from Mr and Mrs van der Westhuizen, who wrote to oppose the proposed restrictions, arguing that residents and visitors should be able to park on the street. Mr and Mrs van der Westhuizen emphasised dissatisfaction that the decision to approve a pilot restriction was at odds with the previous notification that a restriction would not be introduced, and that opponents of restrictions were not given the opportunity to have their say at the meeting on 27 October 2022. Mr and Mrs van der Westhuizen noted the review and surveying which had concluded that there was no major problem with parking in the area, and described the difficulty that restrictions would cause their household.

Mr Peter Davies attended via Zoom and, with permission from the Chairman, addressed the Joint Committee, as a resident of Harewood Hill. Mr Davies expressed his agreement with the objections which had already been made by resident's statements given to this meeting, and expressed his view that the overall view of residents had been clear and that the matter had been handled badly. Residents had participated in surveys and expressed their concerns.

Mrs Sue Palmer attended and, with permission from the Chairman, addressed the Joint Committee, as a resident of Purlieu Way for over 26 years, to voice her objections to the proposed restrictions. Mrs Palmer noted that the original rules had stipulated that 75% of residents would need to be in favour of implementing a TRO in order for one to be requested, or 36 out of 48 households. This meant that only 25% of households would need to oppose a potential TRO in order to prevent it from being implemented. An independent survey had now been completed which showed that 16 households had positively stated that they did not want a TRO for restrictions, with the potential that other households had responded likewise but had had their responses delayed in the postal strikes. Even with a total of 16 non-responding households being counted as being 'in favour' of the proposed TRO, the total does not reach the supermajority required for implementation. Mrs Palmer disputed the validity of assigning a 'for' or 'against' view to any household which had not responded as being unfair, especially given that some households may well have been dealing with crises and have been unable to respond in time. Mrs Palmer argued that no views should be assigned, for or against, by the NEPP to households from which responses had not been received and that, given the threshold of support had not been met, the TRO application should not proceed.

The Clerk read a statement from Ms Susan Pallett, who gave her concern that despite numerous surveys, including a recent NEPP survey which showed no need for restrictions, single yellow line restrictions were to be introduced on Harewood Hill. Ms Pallett remonstrated that residents had not been advised of

the meeting where this decision had been taken [NEPP Joint Committee meeting of 27 October 2022], meaning that residents had not been given the opportunity to raise their objections. Mrs Pallett gave the view that it would be unfair to impose restrictions on Harewood Hill, even if these were wanted by residents on Purlieu Way, and that there were significant differences between the two, with Harewood Hill being wider and straight.

Ms Pallett argued that there had been no sign of increased commuter parking in the area following the end of lock-down, had never been a problem before the pandemic and that this was unlikely to become a problem, with more people working from home more often. Arguments in favour of restrictions which cited an improved street aesthetic should be disregarded as insignificant, compared to the damage that would be done by widening driveway spaces. Ms Pallett stated that the majority of residents of Harewood Hill were against parking restrictions, that the cost of enforcing them would outstrip the income from enforcement, and that the local Council had wasted thousands of pounds in re-surveying the area for residents' views.

The Chairman explained that this item had been scheduled as an urgent item for this agenda due to the calling-in of a decision, taken by the Joint Committee on 27 October 2022 and relating to the item 'Purlieu Way and Harewood Hill, by Essex County Councillor Holly Whitbread, whom had been contacted by a number of residents regarding the matter. Talks had then been held to ascertain potential ways to resolve the call-in, involving Councillor Whitbread, ECC, members of the Joint Committee and NEPP officers. Additional context could be provided by officers on the background to the situation and on the recent additional survey work carried out by officers of Epping Forest District Council.

Jason Butcher, Group Development Manager, provided detail on the results of the survey conducted in the run-up to this meeting. The response rate had been 72.9% for Purlieu Way (following receipt of three responses delayed by postal strikes) and 84% for Harewood Hill. The first question asked had been whether residents wanted a one-hour no-waiting restriction during the day, asked of both streets. 66.7% support was recorded on Purlieu Way, falling beneath the 70% majority stipulated as being necessary. 28% of responses from Harewood Hill were in favour of restrictions. The second question, posed only to residents of Harewood Hill, asked whether they would support restrictions on that road, were restrictions to be imposed on Purlieu Way. A majority still did not support restrictions in such a situation. There was therefore no supermajority in favour of restrictions and the decision remained with the Joint Committee as to whether to approve the TRO to proceed with imposing restrictions. Owen Howell, Clerk to the Joint Committee confirmed that the Joint Committee could choose to uphold their original decision taken on 27 October 2022, withdraw that decision or amend the details of it.

Councillor Kane, the Joint Committee member representing Epping Forest District Council, noted that the NEPP had policies and rules and argued that the Joint Committee should revert to these in order to assure objectivity. Parking restrictions should only be implemented where there was both a need for them, and support for them. Two surveys had been conducted, neither finding a need

for restrictions, and the independent surveyors confirming that there was no need. The recent survey confirmed that the necessary supermajority had not been reached and therefore Councillor Kane urged the Joint Committee to withdraw its most recent decision [to implement an 18-month pilot parking restriction]. **Councillor Kane gave an option that the Joint Committee could revert to the prior decision to impose an 18-month moratorium on any consideration of restrictions, but expressed his preference that the Joint Committee instead resolve to rescind its decision relating to Purlieu Way and Harewood Hill, as taken on 27 October 2022.**

A member of the Joint Committee stated that the Joint Committee had, at its last meeting, been informed that the proposed restrictions had the majority of support, which had led him to agree for the restrictions to have been voted upon. The Committee member highlighted the right of residents to enjoyment of their properties as being guaranteed under the Human Rights Act and proposed that the decision taken on these restrictions by the Joint Committee at its meeting on 27 October 2022 be rescinded and withdrawn.

The Joint Committee discuss the situation, with the suggestion being made that, in light of additional evidence collected, it would be right to re-look at the decision which had been made. The survey conducted was discussed and it was confirmed that the most-recent survey had been conducted by officers of Epping Forest District Council.

RESOLVED that the decision taken by the Joint Committee on 27 October 2022 and relating to the item 'Purlieu Way and Harewood Hill Update Report' [as shown in minute 125] be rescinded, and that no parking restrictions be introduced on Purlieu Way and Harewood Hill.

132. Finance Update

Richard Walker, Group Manager, presented the report and the additional detail provided in the extra addendum circulated at the meeting. Financial pressures were described, including pay and pandemic issues. A pay settlement was being worked upon by Colchester City Council and was pending at the time of drafting this report. The Group Manager explained that the supplementary budget information provided at this meeting had not been available at the point of agenda publication.

The new budget was set to break even, allowing maintenance of some reserves. The relationship between reserves, service funding and potential reserve payback to the County Council were explained. The details were shown as to how reserves were divided with the County Council and how any future deficits would be addressed. The proposed fees and charges, drawn up in light of current inflation rates, were given. The Joint Committee was asked to decide whether to, in principle, raise fees and charges. More data could be given at the next meeting if the Joint Committee was willing to agree to increases in principle at this meeting.

Parking Charge Notices [PCNs] were discussed, including the scope for

Department for Transport to raise their value and the potential for the NEPP to lobby for this. NEPP forecasts for PCN numbers and income were necessary for budget setting, but the Group Manager stressed that the Partnership did not set targets for the issuing of PCNs.

The report noted the risks and pressures on the NEPP, and the Group Manager highlighted that the majority of NEPP staff were operational. Table two of the report showed potential changes caused by the movement of officer roles, and the Joint Committee were shown the tables which showed what would happen if reserves were entirely spent and a deficit incurred.

A Committee member voiced concern at the talk of increasing PCN income and of lobbying Government for PCN value to be increased and questioned how £2.2m of income from PCNs could be predicted for next year. The Group Manager clarified that the NEPP would not lobby Government if the Joint Committee did not want this to be done, but highlighted that evidence had been collected that the current rate charged for a PCN was not always a deterrent. When asked if the NEPP was intending to use a more weighty PCN level to increase deterrence but lower income to the NEPP, the Group Manager explained that the expectation was that the overall income from PCNs would not change greatly, with a forecast that if the cost of a PCN increased, this would balance the increase in deterrence that was expected to lead to a drop in PCNs being issued. A Joint Committee member emphasised that laws would be ineffective without enforcement. One member urged caution and noted that there was a risk associated with assuming an increased level for PCN value would balance out any reduction in overall income from PCN, whilst another member emphasised that PCNs were for deterrence, rather than primarily for use as a tool to raise income.

The Joint Committee noted that PCN income for the year was below the forecast level. The Group Manager acknowledged this and highlighted that there was always a lag in receiving income from people paying off PCNs, exacerbated by payments made through payment plans for amounts incurred during recent lockdowns. In answer to questions as to whether PCN income covered enforcement costs, the Group Manager explained that this would not be simple to ascertain and would require examination of deployments and their costs, the different costs for enforcing different types of restrictions and different costs for different types of enforcement. A case study had however been carried out in Aberystwyth in 2011 to examine the effects of no enforcement. Councillor Sam Kane queried how financial data were compiled for offences and enforcement operations in Epping Forest. The Group Manager explained that this would necessitate the analysis of patrol data and enforcement costs.

The Group Manager was also asked what constituted 'other income.' The Group Manager explained that 'other income' referred to extra income from performing additional duties for the County Council. The NEPP was awaiting expected work from the County Council at this time. In response to queries as to why the figure for 'other income' was lower in the updated budget than the budget report published, the Group Manager explained that this was due to the original figure being split between parts one and two of the supplementary budget. The extra

work from the County Council consisted of work such as school schemes, country park enforcement and delivering of disability parking spaces for residents who required them. The figures given were projected income and were awaiting confirmation from the County Council that the work would be given the go-ahead.

The Joint Committee discussed the finance sheets, noting that the total on-street budget was net to zero, and concern was raised that the County Council might use the NEPP as an income generation tool, potentially limiting the NEPP's ability to use reserves to improve services. An additional concern was raised that, were the Partnership to incur losses, the partner local authorities would be expected to share the cost of this and be forced to provide extra funding for the NEPP. Such a possibility was raised by several members as being a concern. A Committee member asked whether a deficit would mean that staffing levels might be reduced, a reduction in Traffic Regulation Orders [TROs] introduced and enforced or the loss of the Partnership's electric vehicles. The Group Manager gave assurance that the County Council had clarified that they would only withdraw their 45% of profit for the year from the NEPP's reserve. Regarding the making of savings, the Joint Committee was informed that vacancy factor savings from unfilled posts had helped improve the financial position, as had income from visitors and kerbside payment options.

The Joint Committee discussed the income from Service Level Agreements for off-street parking and how that and the service to which they related fitted in with the on-street budget and services. The Group Manager clarified that off-street finances were kept separate, but the enforcement of off-street parking restrictions/sites was carried out by the same officers who enforced on-street parking restrictions. Off-street parking services were contribution-based.

A Committee member asked for clarification as to how management functions were split between on- and off-street parking services, expressing concern as to whether time and resources were being taken from on-street work and deployed to off-street functions instead.

Queries were raised regarding the line items on transport costs, projects and project management. The Group Manager gave assurance that more granular information on these could be provided, if the Joint Committee wished this, on line items within the budget. The reduction in transport costs was as a result of additional cars having been provided to Civil Enforcement Officers, in order to ensure social distancing whilst working during lockdowns. The additional usage had reduced, allowing for reduced future transport costs to be forecast. A Client Officer noted that there was no ambiguity regarding project costs, as the details of the projects had already been given to the Joint Committee when the Joint Committee approved those projects. Jason Butcher, Group Development Manager, expanded on this to explain that much of the project costs were wrapped up in work done for the NEPP by the County Council, such as operation of ParkSafe cameras. A large percentage of the costs stemmed from a project for Uttlesford District Council, which was coming to completion. Other projects included the cost of employing a full-time officer to work on the 3PR [Three Parking Rules] scheme.

The Group Manager was asked what the Partnership's plan was, should income fall short of the forecast for the coming year, and gave assurance that a reserve would be maintained to cushion such an eventuality. The current reserves level was £336,000. Other sources of income were also expected. More Civil Enforcement Officers had been recruited, which would allow more patrolling where contraventions were identified.

In response to questions regarding the separation of budget information for TROs from the main budget, the Group Manager explained that this was to satisfy Essex County Council's wish to have this information managed and shown separately.

A Committee member requested a full breakdown of all costs and their sources.

The Joint Committee discussed whether it wished to receive a report at its next meeting as to whether to increase permit prices in 2023-24.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE: -

- a) Notes the North Essex Parking Partnership's Joint Parking Committee (JPC) financial position at the end Period 7 (October) 2022, including the implementation of the decision on fees and charges already made for 2022 and 2023.
- b) Notes the interventions to date to keep the finances within budget this year.
- c) Notes the wider issues which face service delivery now and in the longer term.
- d) Notes that JPC reserves total £336k, and the proposed use of them, after which the measures in Appendix E of the Agreement will apply.
- e) Notes the other measures being taken to reduce spend on TRO schemes in 2023/24 (subject of a separate report).
- f) Approves the draft budget for the Joint Committee for 2023/24, on the understanding that additional information and detail requested will be made available to the Joint Committee, regarding the setting of this budget and the finances of the Partnership
- g) Would receive a report at its meeting on 16 March 2023 to allow it to consider whether to make any further interventions changes in fees or charges of:-
 - (i) First resident permits;
 - (ii) Second resident permits;
 - (iii) Third resident permits;
 - (iv) Digital resident daily visitor permits;
 - (v) Digital resident six-hour permits;
 - (vi) Paper resident visitor permits;
 - (vii) Paper six-hour visitor permits;
 - (viii) Carers permits;
 - (ix) Roadside pay to park/pay & display;
 - (x) Providing a dispensation;
 - (xi) Providing a parking suspension.

133. Traffic Regulation Order Application Decision Report

The Joint Committee considered the Traffic Regulation Order applications and the recommendations from the respective local authorities as to which should be approved, which rejected, and which deferred.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE accepts and approves the recommendations as detailed in the report.

134. Traffic Regulation Order [TRO] Policy

Jason Butcher, Group Development Manager, introduced this item as the first policy to be reviewed by the Joint Committee in this current round of policy reviews. The report outlined the review process, looking at content and wording. Much of the content of the flowchart for the Policy could not be amended, as it was set by statute. A draft was shared at an early stage with Client Officers, with two previous drafts being drafted before the final draft was produced for this meeting.

The report gives a range of the main options open to the Joint Committee. Officer recommendations were for the Policy to stipulate that each partner authority can put forward three 'normal' TRO schemes and three Tier Four schemes per year.

The Joint Committee discussed the options given, with a consensus being reached that Option 2 [at 3.3 of the report] was the best option to approve, and would provide necessary flexibility.

The officers were asked why an equality impact assessment [EqIA] was not provided for this policy, following on from a report presented to the JPC meeting on 27 October which included a broken link to its EqIA. The Group Manager clarified that this broken link had resulted from the Assessment's host webpage moving, and confirmed that a separate EqIA could be produced for each policy, and that the standard paragraph content where no implications were found could be listed individually, rather than in one section.

In response to questions, The Group Development Manager informed the Committee that the costing work was being done up-front, with investigations into income vs expenditure relating to TROs for residents' parking.

A Committee member asked whether, regarding scoring for prioritisation, greater weight could be assigned to the views of those most affected, to avoid the imposition of unpopular schemes. The member suggested that weighting could be rebalanced by lowering the weighting of political backing to five percent. Officers were also asked if the cost of schemes should affect their scoring, i.e. cheaper schemes receiving a higher weighting.

The Group Development Manager suggested that he return to the Joint Committee with a new draft of the scoring document, separate from the main Policy.

After a discussion regarding finding additional funds for TRO schemes, the Group Manager confirmed that Parish and Town Councils could help fund TROs, and the Group Development Manager explained that section 106 funding was separate to the TRO process, but that some local authorities did require funds to be set aside to help fund measures which they felt new developments would require.

Officers were asked whether there would be any way to have more flexibility, if partners required it. The Group Development Manager suggested that, at the October meeting of the Joint Committee, the Committee could be asked to decide whether to allow greater flexibility. The setting of TROs would be difficult to manage if no restrictions are in place, but the Joint Committee would have the chance to decide what, if any, flexibility to give.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE approves: -

- a) The new TRO procedure flowchart as detailed in Appendix B
- b) A new agenda item to consider a new Prioritisation Scoring Methodology, as detailed in Appendix C, at its meeting on 16 March 2023
- c) A reduction in the total overall number of new TRO scheme allocations, including 'Tier 4' schemes, to 36 per year and the prioritisation mechanism shown as 'Option 2', as outlined in the 'TRO Prioritisation Options' section of the report.
- d) The new general NEPP Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Policy, as detailed in Appendix A

135. Obstructive Parking

Councillor Freeman highlighted problems in the Uttlesford area (specifically in Great Dunmow), where residents felt enforcement efforts would be needed following Christmas. Councillor Freeman gave the view that officer presence was needed, over time, to dissuade contraventions or obstructive parking.

Councillor Jones, Uttlesford District Council, attended and, with permission for the Chairman, addressed the joint Committee to describe the issue affecting two streets in Great Dunmow, which were both narrow in places and experienced obstructions, near-misses for traffic and frustration for users of the roads. Councillor Jones urged that deterrence was needed and praised the enforcement actions which had been carried out and apologised for where these actions had attracted ire from some individuals. Councillor Jones suggested that double red lines at pinch points may ease problems where the issues were concentrated.

The Group Manager gave an overview of the situation where, in Great Dunmow, there were limited parts not subject to loading provisions, and agreed to look at potential options. Councillor Jones noted that there were three car parks run by Uttlesford District Council within 30 seconds walk of the town centre, which people should be persuaded to use.

The Joint Committee discussed the difficulty of balancing safety considerations with the needs of local businesses when considering restrictions on parking.

There were no resolutions on this item.

136. Forward Plan 2022-23

RESOLVED that the Joint Committee notes and approves the North Essex Parking Partnership Forward Plan for 2022-23, and the meeting dates for 2023-24.



North Essex Parking Partnership

Joint Parking Committee

Meeting Date:	March 2023
Title:	Permits, Fees and Charges Report
Author:	Richard Walker, NEPP Group Manager
Presented by:	Richard Walker

This report requests that the Committee considers increasing the fees and charges, for permits and other services, in light of the present financial situation in order to maintain the work programme of the Partnership.

1. Recommended Decision(s)

- 1.1. TO DECIDE all fees and charges under Part 1 of the Service, by selecting from Options 1, 2 & 3 (A, B & C) in the report, or deciding otherwise, insofar as this relates to:
 - fees for first permits; fees for second permits, fees for additional and visitor permits;
 - fees for exemption certificates, season tickets and dispensations; and
 - administrative charges for other services;as shown in the table, as part of the forecast presented by the Treasurer in their capacity set out in Article 3 of Appendix E, relating to the Annual Business Plan for 2023/24, being mindful of the Articles in Appendixes E and F of the Agreement.
- 1.2. TO DECIDE to introduce an administration charge for making a change to a vehicle registration mark on any permit.
- 1.3. TO DECIDE to introduce a transaction fee of 10p per transaction to cover the cost of the On-Street MiPermit Pay to Park, and Visitor Permit services.
- 1.4. TO DECIDE to introduce any changes after the relevant statutory notices have been given – for implementation between weeks commencing 29 May and 12 June 2023.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)

- 2.1. For good governance and to ensure the effective future operation and maintain the work programme of the Partnership.

3. Background

- 3.1. At the last Joint committee Meeting in December 2022, Members were appraised of the financial situation of the Parking Partnership post Covid and following some substantial increases in the costs being experienced by the operation.
- 3.2. Members were presented with both a copy of the financial table and a list and table of pricing options, over which the Joint Committee has powers, that might be considered for future years in time for this meeting.

- 3.3. Discussion at the last meeting centred around restructuring prices relating to fees and charges for the coming years. It was agreed that several options for the pricing of these elements would be costed and brought to, and be decided at, the March 2023 Joint Committee Meeting.
- 3.4. Members are therefore asked to consider the circumstances following the issues experienced between the beginning of the Pandemic, and the time leading up to the end of the financial year 2022/23, as explained in the report, and debate and consider the fees and charges options and illustrations shown in the table.
- 3.5. Further information is summarised in the report below, and more history is explained in the Appendix, and Members are asked to decide what the future pricing structure should be.

4. **Alternative Options and Risk Management**

Failure to decide a further uplift to fees and charges to balance budgets in accordance with the forecast and estimates produced by the Treasurer.	Fails to balance NEPP finances	Appendix E states that any total deficit in relation to a specific partner authority not exceeding £15k shall be carried forward to the next year (i.e. a total of no more than £105k in one year – presumed to be Part 1)
		Under Article 37.1, any Authority may give 12 months' notice to leave the Partnership by giving one year's notice coincident with the end of a financial year. Appendix E shall apply at the point of notice.
		Authorities in deficit will be required under Appendix E of the Agreement, to produce a plan to reduce the deficit in their account to zero within 12 months.
		Appendix F Article 2.1.2 states that all authorities will be responsible to cover any remaining deficit in equal shares if it is not able to be contained within the Annual Business Plan.
To cease parts of the service and invoke costs such as redundancy	Fails to balance NEPP Finances	A cessation of any part of the service would bring with it significant additional costs and is unlikely to close the budget gap in time to avoid the clauses of Appendix E and F being invoked.

5. **Supporting Information**

- 5.1. The Office for National Statistics measures for the Consumer and Retail Price Indices (CPI and RPI) have been increasing consistently since February 2021.
- 5.2. The measures stand at 10.5% (annual) and 13.4% (annual) respectively at the time of writing, CPI (annual) having been as high as 11.1% in October and RPI 14% in November 2023.
- 5.3. Energy, Supplies and Services, and Employee costs have risen severalfold during the last year, and the Parking Partnership has not escaped these increases.
- 5.4. The most recent first permit increase decisions were taken more than three years ago now, although these did not keep inflation increases contained at that time. An

illustration of the impact of inflation on 2017 prices, to date, using the Bank of England's inflation calculator, has indicated that the price has failed to keep up with increases.

6. Permit Pricing Components

- 6.1. Resident Permit pricing consists of two parts:
- 6.2. the base cost to cover the patrols by CEOs, the cost of making and mapping the regulations and maintaining the system, which is the same across all areas, and
- 6.3. a further value relating to the differing competition for kerbside parking space due to the varying levels of housing density and car ownership in each district and the associated social value attached to this.
- 6.4. The Options and Illustrations include for all of these components in one permit price.
- 6.5. Resident Parking for Disabled Badge Holders (Blue Badges) remains free of charge under an exemption in separate legislation; the Badge requires proof of disability from a GP.

7. Permit Price Review

- 7.1. At the Joint Committee meeting in June 2020 the Chairman requested a report be circulated to Committee members on the likely effects of changes to permit prices, once it became possible to identify the effects of the Covid-19 crisis. With this recommendation in mind, a full review of permit prices and financial impacts of the Pandemic, and subsequent cost inflation, is now presented.
- 7.2. A review of second and third permit prices was undertaken in 2022 and implemented on 06 February 2023. This change would yield c.£90.6k in a full year. On the same date, kerbside parking prices were updated to match nearby car parks.

8. Options for forthcoming years:

- 8.1. Two options are given for the next permit price increase.
- 8.2. It is recommended that either Option 1 or Option 2 is selected for implementation from June 2023. This would realise an additional part-year yield for 2023/24 in addition to the uplift introduced in February 2023.
- 8.3. After that, there is an illustration of harmonising the permit prices between districts, as close as reasonably can be within three years. Descriptions of the yields for each intervention are given below, (also see a summary at Table 1, further below).

Either : Option 1 for 2023/24

- This option corrects prices for inflation at the prevailing Consumer Price Index (CPI) rate. This would yield :
- if implemented in June 2023, up to £276k in the part-year 2023/24;
- then £368k for each subsequent full year (year on year) or, against the baseline 2022/23 prices a total increase of £459k by the end of 2024/25).

Or: Option 2 for 2023/24

- This option corrects prices for inflation at the prevailing Retail Price Index (RPI) rate. This would yield :
- if implemented in June 2023, up to £371k in the part-year 2023/24;

- then £495k for each subsequent full year (year on year) or, against the baseline 2022/23 prices a total increase of £585k by the end of 2024/25).

Then: Illustration of further Option 3 A/B/C for 2024/25 – 2026/27

- This set of options shows the effects of permit price increases year-on-year for the following three years (2024/25, 2025/26 & 2026/27) on top of Option 1, so the prices could again approach harmony across the district pricing in coming years, in the same vein as the 2018 plan (see Appendix B). Note that this is an illustration of a set of changes which harmonises prices across all districts, and not a CPI or RPI multiplier.
- This set is based upon having already implemented Option 1 (CPI inflator) in June 2023 for the 2023/24 financial year as the basis for the future Illustration and, provided it was implemented by 01/04/2024 would, in comparison with 2022/23 prices implemented at 6 February, bring additional yields as follows:-
- a full-year yield of £356k year on year over Option 1 (and an increase over the 2022/23 baseline of £815k in the first full year, 2024/25);
- a full-year yield of £251k year on year over Illustration A (and an increase over the 2022/23 baseline of £1,066k in the full year, 2025/26);
- a full-year yield of £248k year on year over Illustration B (and an increase over the 2022/23 baseline of £1,314k in the full year, 2026/27);

Table 1

Yield	Decided Oct 2022 Implemented 06/02/23	EITHER		OR		
		Option 1 CPI	Option 2 RPI	THEN Option 3 Future Years (full years)		
				A (Option 1 base)	B (Option 1 base)	C (Option 1 base)
	2022/23	2022/23 (part year)		2023/24	2023/24	2024/25
Year-on-year	£90k	£276k (part yr)	£371k (part yr)	£356k	£251k	£248k
Cumulative (against 2022 base)	£90k	£367k	£462k	£815k	£1,066k	£1,314k

9. Other changes

- 9.1. To dissuade residents from making successive vehicle changes, it is recommended an administration charge be implemented for each vehicle registration mark change carried out. As an option, this fee could be waived for the first two changes in any year.

10. Kerbside Paid Parking

- 10.1. Another source of income is from On-Street Pay & Display areas, where a fee to park is set at a level to encourage space availability for short stays, primarily in support of turnover providing custom for nearby businesses, to provide a turnover of spaces to dissuade unnecessary vehicle circulation by providing available spaces, and to regulate all-day use of kerb space by supporting use of nearby off-street car parks for longer stays.

- 10.2. Parking Management policy, especially at the kerbside, aims to reduce congestion, helping drivers find spaces quickly and easily. Park to Park bays on the street are not designed for long-term parking but the prices are set at a point to encourage the use of car parks.
- 10.3. Members have previously agreed to delegate powers to officers allowing for timely variation of the on-street prices in pay to park areas in order to maintain at least parity with car parks in the relevant areas. Increases to Pay to Park (“Pay & Display”) areas have therefore been set by Officers (implemented 06/02/2023) and will continue to be kept under review and amended again as necessary.
- 10.4. Every digital transaction attracts a fee, and it is recommended that this be charged to the customer as a fee of c.10p and added to the MiPermit receipt as a convenience charge.
- 10.5. Any income which is surplus to the operating costs can only be used for the purposes set out in s.55 of the Act. The service sets out to operate within a balanced budget.

11. Standard References

- 11.1. Other than set out above, there are no particular references to the Development Plan; publicity or consultation considerations; or financial; equality, diversity and human rights; community safety; health and safety or risk management implications
- 11.2. An Equality Impact Assessment for the operations is set out at this link:
[Colchester.gov.uk](https://www.colchester.gov.uk)

Appendix A

Options for Fees and Charges

(spreadsheet has been circulated previously to accompany)

Graphics pasted overleaf.

Either Option1 (CPI, recommended)

or Option 2 (RPI, not recommended) increases for 2023/24; and

then Option A, B & C for years 2024/25, 2025/26 & 2026/27, (recommended).

Table of Prices - Agreed pricing strategy to 2022 and proposed strategy

First permits highlighted

2023/24

Braintree Area						
Scale of Existing Charges	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Resident Permit	£48.00	£50.00	£53.00	£55.00	£55.00	£55.00
Second Resident Permit (where available)	£65.00	£70.00	£75.00	£80.00	£85.00	£90.00
Third Resident Permit	By discretion only on application				£110.00	£120.00

Colchester Area						
Scale of Existing Charges	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Resident Permit	£64.00	£65.00	£67.00	£68.00	£68.00	£68.00
Second Resident Permit (where available)	£80.00	£80.00	£83.00	£85.00	£88.00	£90.00
Third Resident Permit	Not available in Colchester Area					
Business Permit - Annual	£ 440.00	£ 440.00	£ 450.00	£ 460.00	£ 470.00	£480.00
Business Permit - 3 months	£ 110.00	£ 110.00	£ 114.00	£ 118.00	£ 120.00	£122.00
Dedham Exemption Certificate	£ 24.00	£ 24.00	£ 25.00	£ 25.00	£ 25.00	£ 25.00
Colchester & Tendring Womens Aid Permit	£ 104.00	£ 104.00	£ 105.00	£ 105.00	£ 105.00	£105.00
Colchester High School Permit	£ 33.00	£ 33.00	£ 34.00	£ 35.00	£ 38.00	£ 40.00
Hamilton School Permit	£ 104.00	£ 104.00	£ 105.00	£ 105.00	£ 105.00	£105.00
Kingswode Hoe School Permit	£ 104.00	£ 104.00	£ 105.00	£ 105.00	£ 105.00	£105.00
Walsingham Road resident season ticket - Yearly	£ 203.00	£ 203.00	£ 204.00	£ 206.00	£ 208.00	£210.00
Walsingham Road resident season ticket - 6 months	£ 110.00	£ 110.00	£ 102.00	£ 103.00	£ 104.00	£105.00
Motorcycle	£ 25.00	discontinued				

Highway Order for Harlow Area						
Scale of Existing Charges	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Resident Permit	£38.00	£40.00	£42.00	£43.00	£43.00	£43.00
Second Resident Permit (where available)	£75.00	£80.00	£85.00	£90.00	£90.00	£95.00
Third Resident Permit	By discretion only on application				£120.00	£130.00

Highway Order for Tendring Area						
Scale of Existing Charges	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Resident Permit	£55.00	£58.00	£60.00	£63.00	£63.00	£63.00
Second Resident Permit (where available)	£68.00	£70.00	£75.00	£80.00	£85.00	£90.00
Third Resident Permit	By discretion only on application				£100.00	£110.00

Highway Order for Uttlesford Area						
Scale of Existing Charges	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Resident Permit	£70.00	£70.00	£70.00	£70.00	£70.00	£70.00
Second Resident Permit (where available)	£105.00	£105.00	£103.00	£102.00	£103.00	£105.00
Third Resident Permit	By discretion only on application				£170.00	£180.00

Highway Order for Epping Forest Area						
Scale of Existing Charges	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Resident Permit	£48.00	£50.00	£53.00	£55.00	£55.00	£55.00
Second Resident Permit (where available)	£80.00	£80.00	£83.00	£85.00	£88.00	£90.00
Third Resident Permit	By discretion only on application				£170.00	£180.00
Business Permit - Annual					£ 454.00	£454.00
Business Permit - 3 months						£130.00
Business Permit - 1 month						£ 50.00

All areas where available						
Scale of Existing Charges	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Visitor Permits pack of 10 (paper permits) up to 24hr	£ 15.00	£ 15.00	£ 20.00	£ 20.00	£ 25.00	£ 30.00
Visitor Permits - MiPermit (digital system) 24-hour	£ 10.00	£ 10.00	£ 11.00	£ 11.50	£ 12.00	£ 12.50
Visitor Permits - MiPermit (digital only) 6-hour	£ 6.00	£ 6.00	£ 6.00	£ 6.00	£ 6.00	£ 6.00
Trader's Permit (annual) - valid all areas of NEPP	£ 300.00	£ 300.00	£ 250.00	£ 230.00	£ 220.00	£210.00
Discretionary permit(s) (subject to conditions) (eg Carer)	£ 30.00	£ 30.00	£ 30.00	£ 30.00	£ 30.00	£ 30.00
Dispensation/Suspension Permit - First Day	£ 22.00	£ 22.00	£ 23.00	£ 24.00	£ 25.00	£ 25.00
Dispensation/Suspension - other days (up to 7 days)	£ 10.00	£ 10.00	£ 11.00	£ 11.50	£ 12.00	£ 12.50

Administration charge for Replacement for lost or stolen permit	£ 15.00	£ 15.00	£ 22.00	£ 23.00	£ 24.00	£ 25.00
Administration charge for Vehicle Registration Mark change					to be introduced	
Administration charge for Vehicle Registration Mark change					to be introduced	

Previous 2022/23 in-Year increases Yield (06/02/23)	2023/24		2023/24		Number of permits of each type	Option 1 proposal inflationary increase: Yield	Option 2 proposal inflationary increase: Yield
	Option 1 Inflationary increase CPI (in-yr 11.1%) on 2022/23 figure (rounded up to nearest £1)	Extra in-year increase, implemented now (full income by end 2023/24)	Option 2 Inflationary increase RPI (in-yr 13.4%) on 2022/23 figure (rounded up to nearest £1)	Extra in-year increase, implemented now (full income by end 2023/24)			
£0	£62.00	£7.00	£63.00	£8.00	648	£4,536	£5,184
£840	£100.00	£10.00	£103.00	£13.00	168	£1,680	£2,184
£90	£134.00	£14.00	£137.00	£17.00	9	£126	£153
Yield	New Permit Price	Inflationary increase	New Permit Price	Inflationary increase	Number of each	Yield	Yield
£0	£76.00	£8.00	£78.00	£10.00	2,744	£21,952	£27,440
£1,182	£100.00	£10.00	£103.00	£13.00	591	£5,910	£7,683
						£0	
£750	£ 534.00	£ 54.00	£ 545.00	£ 65.00	75	£4,050	£4,875
£0	£ 136.00	£ 14.00	£ 139.00	£ 17.00		£0	£0
£0	£ 28.00	£ 3.00	£ 29.00	£ 4.00	28	£84	£112
£0	£ 117.00	£ 12.00	£ 120.00	£ 15.00	4	£48	£60
£50	£ 45.00	£ 5.00	£ 46.00	£ 6.00	25	£125	£150
£0	£ 117.00	£ 12.00	£ 120.00	£ 15.00	45	£540	£675
£0	£ 117.00	£ 12.00	£ 120.00	£ 15.00	4	£48	£60
£4	£ 234.00	£ 24.00	£ 239.00	£ 29.00	2	£48	£58
£0	£ 117.00	£ 12.00	£ 120.00	£ 15.00	-	£0	£0
Yield	New Permit Price	Inflationary increase	New Permit Price	Inflationary increase	Number of each	Yield	Yield
£0	£48.00	£5.00	£49.00	£8.00	951	£4,755	£5,706
£1,375	£106.00	£11.00	£108.00	£13.00	275	£3,025	£3,575
£150	£145.00	£15.00	£148.00	£18.00	15	£225	£270
Yield	New Permit Price	Inflationary increase	New Permit Price	Inflationary increase	Number of each	Yield	Yield
£0	£70.00	£7.00	£72.00	£9.00	327	£2,289	£2,943
£550	£100.00	£10.00	£103.00	£13.00	110	£1,100	£1,430
£30	£123.00	£13.00	£125.00	£15.00	3	£39	£45
Yield	New Permit Price	Inflationary increase	New Permit Price	Inflationary increase	Number of each	Yield	Yield
£0	£78.00	£8.00	£80.00	£10.00	221	£1,768	£2,210
£118	£117.00	£12.00	£120.00	£15.00	59	£708	£885
£30	£200.00	£20.00	£205.00	£25.00	3	£60	£75
Yield	New Permit Price	Inflationary increase	New Permit Price	Inflationary increase	Number of each	Yield	Yield
£0	£62.00	£7.00	£63.00	£8.00	2,307	£16,149	£18,456
£976	£100.00	£10.00	£103.00	£13.00	488	£4,880	£6,344
£170	£200.00	£20.00	£205.00	£25.00	17	£340	£425
£0	£505.00	£51.00	£515.00	£61.00	289	£14,739	£17,629
£0	£145.00	£15.00	£148.00	£18.00		£0	£0
£0	£56.00	£6.00	£57.00	£7.00		£0	£0
Yield	New Permit Price	Inflationary increase	New Permit Price	Inflationary increase	Number of each	Yield	Yield
£34,400	£ 34.00	£ 4.00	£ 35.00	£ 5.00	6,890	£27,520	£34,400
£49,905	£ 14.00	£ 1.50	£ 15.00	£ 2.50	99,810	£149,715	£249,525
£0	£ 7.00	£ 0.00	£ 7.00	£ 1.00	#####	£101,750	£101,750
	£ 234.00	£ 24.00	£ 239.00	£ 29.00	8	£192	£232
£0	£ 34.00	£ 4.00	£ 35.00	£ 5.00		£0	£0
£0	£ 28.00	£ 3.00	£ 29.00	£ 4.00		£0	£0
£0	£ 14.00	£ 1.50	£ 15.00	£ 2.50		£0	£0
Yield	New Charge	Inflationary increase	New Charge	Inflationary increase	Number of each	Yield	Yield
£0	£ 28.00	£ 3.00	£ 29.00	£ 4.00		£0	£0
£0	£ 5.00	£ 5.00	£ 7.00	£ 7.00		£0	£0
£0	£ 5.00	£ 5.00	£ 7.00	£ 7.00		£0	£0

Table of Prices - Agreed pricing strategy to 2022 and proposed strategy

First permits highlighted

2023/24

2023/24

2024/25 2025/26 2026/27

Braintree Area						
Scale of Existing Charges	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Resident Permit	£48.00	£50.00	£53.00	£55.00	£55.00	£55.00
Second Resident Permit (where available)	£65.00	£70.00	£75.00	£80.00	£85.00	£90.00
Third Resident Permit	By discretion only on application				£110.00	£120.00

Previous 2022/23 in-Year increases Yield (06/02/23)	Option 1 Inflationary increase CPI (In-yr 11.1%) on 2022/23 figure	Number of permits of each type
£0	£62.00	648
£840	£100.00	168
£90	£134.00	9

Illustration to Harmonise (future years)		
Illustration 3A 2024/25	Illustration 3B 2025/26	Illustration 3C 2026/27
In-year increases	In-year increases	In-year increases
£65.00	£70.00	£75.00
£107.00	£118.00	£125.00
£139.00	£150.00	£150.00

Illustration 3A annual inflationary increase:	Illustration 3B annual inflationary increase:	Illustration 3C annual inflationary increase:
Yield 2024/25	Yield 2025/26	Yield 2026/27
£1,944	£3,240	£3,240
£1,176	£1,848	£1,176
£45	£99	£0

Colchester Area						
Scale of Existing Charges	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Resident Permit	£64.00	£65.00	£67.00	£68.00	£68.00	£68.00
Second Resident Permit (where available)	£80.00	£80.00	£83.00	£85.00	£88.00	£90.00
Third Resident Permit	Not available in Colchester Area					
Business Permit - Annual	£ 440.00	£ 440.00	£ 450.00	£ 460.00	£ 470.00	£480.00
Business Permit - 3 months	£ 110.00	£ 110.00	£ 114.00	£ 118.00	£ 120.00	£122.00
Dedham Exemption Certificate	£ 24.00	£ 24.00	£ 25.00	£ 25.00	£ 25.00	£ 25.00
Colchester & Tendring Womens Aid Permit	£ 104.00	£ 104.00	£ 105.00	£ 105.00	£ 105.00	£105.00
Colchester High School Permit	£ 33.00	£ 33.00	£ 34.00	£ 35.00	£ 38.00	£ 40.00
Hamilton School Permit	£ 104.00	£ 104.00	£ 105.00	£ 105.00	£ 105.00	£105.00
Kingswode Hoe School Permit	£ 104.00	£ 104.00	£ 105.00	£ 105.00	£ 105.00	£105.00
Walsingham Road resident season ticket - Yearly	£ 203.00	£ 203.00	£ 204.00	£ 206.00	£ 208.00	£210.00
Walsingham Road resident season ticket - 6 months	£ 110.00	£ 110.00	£ 109.00	£ 103.00	£ 104.00	£105.00
Motorcycle	£ 25.00 discontinued					

Yield	New Permit Price	Number of each
£0	£76.00	2,744
£1,182	£100.00	591
£750	£ 534.00	75
£0	£ 136.00	
£0	£ 28.00	28
£0	£ 117.00	4
£50	£ 45.00	25
£0	£ 117.00	45
£0	£ 117.00	4
£4	£ 234.00	2
£0	£ 117.00	-

New Permit Price	New Permit Price	New Permit Price
£78.00	£78.00	£78.00
£108.00	£119.00	£125.00
£ 551.00	£ 557.00	£ 563.00
£ 141.00	£ 143.00	£ 145.00
£ 30.00	£ 31.00	£ 32.00
£ 122.00	£ 124.00	£ 126.00
£ 47.00	£ 48.00	£ 49.00
£ 122.00	£ 124.00	£ 126.00
£ 242.00	£ 245.00	£ 248.00
£ 122.00	£ 124.00	£ 126.00

Yield	Yield	Yield
£5,488	£0	£0
£4,728	£6,501	£3,546
£1,275	£450	£450
£0	£0	£0
£96	£28	£28
£20	£8	£8
£50	£25	£25
£225	£90	£90
£20	£8	£8
£16	£6	£6
£0	£0	£0

Highway Order for Harlow Area						
Scale of Existing Charges	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Resident Permit	£38.00	£40.00	£42.00	£43.00	£43.00	£43.00
Second Resident Permit (where available)	£75.00	£80.00	£85.00	£90.00	£90.00	£95.00
Third Resident Permit	By discretion only on application				£120.00	£130.00

Yield	New Permit Price	Number of each
£0	£48.00	951
£1,375	£106.00	275
£150	£145.00	15

New Permit Price	New Permit Price	New Permit Price
£56.00	£63.00	£75.00
£110.00	£120.00	£125.00
£157.00	£150.00	£150.00

Yield	Yield	Yield
£7,608	£6,657	£11,412
£1,100	£2,750	£1,375
£180	£-105	£0

Highway Order for Tendring Area						
Scale of Existing Charges	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Resident Permit	£55.00	£58.00	£60.00	£63.00	£63.00	£63.00
Second Resident Permit (where available)	£68.00	£70.00	£75.00	£80.00	£85.00	£90.00
Third Resident Permit	By discretion only on application				£100.00	£110.00

Yield	New Permit Price	Number of each
£0	£70.00	327
£550	£100.00	110
£30	£123.00	3

New Permit Price	New Permit Price	New Permit Price
£72.00	£74.00	£75.00
£107.00	£118.00	£125.00
£135.00	£150.00	£150.00

Yield	Yield	Yield
£654	£654	£327
£770	£1,210	£770
£36	£45	£0

Highway Order for Uttlesford Area						
Scale of Existing Charges	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Resident Permit	£70.00	£70.00	£70.00	£70.00	£70.00	£70.00
Second Resident Permit (where available)	£105.00	£105.00	£103.00	£102.00	£103.00	£105.00
Third Resident Permit	By discretion only on application				£170.00	£180.00

Yield	New Permit Price	Number of each
£0	£78.00	221
£118	£117.00	59
£30	£200.00	3

New Permit Price	New Permit Price	New Permit Price
£80.00	£80.00	£80.00
£122.00	£124.00	£125.00
£200.00	£200.00	£200.00

Yield	Yield	Yield
£442	£0	£0
£295	£118	£59
£0	£0	£0

Highway Order for Epping Forest Area						
Scale of Existing Charges	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Resident Permit	£48.00	£50.00	£53.00	£55.00	£55.00	£55.00
Second Resident Permit (where available)	£80.00	£80.00	£83.00	£85.00	£88.00	£90.00
Third Resident Permit	By discretion only on application				£170.00	£180.00
Business Permit - Annual				£ 454.00	£454.00	
Business Permit - 3 months					£130.00	
Business Permit - 1 month					£ 50.00	

Yield	New Permit Price	Number of each
£0	£62.00	2,307
£978	£100.00	488
£170	£200.00	17
£0	£505.00	289
£0	£145.00	
£0	£56.00	

New Permit Price	New Permit Price	New Permit Price
£65.00	£70.00	£75.00
£107.00	£118.00	£125.00
£205.00	£205.00	£205.00
£ 521.00	£ 527.00	£ 533.00
£ 150.00	£ 152.00	£ 154.00
£ 58.00	£ 59.00	£ 60.00

Yield	Yield	Yield
£6,921	£11,535	£11,535
£3,416	£5,368	£3,416
£85	£0	£0
£4,624	£1,734	£1,734
£0	£0	£0

All areas where available						
	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Visitor Permits pack of 10 (paper permits) up to 24hr	£ 15.00	£ 15.00	£ 20.00	£ 20.00	£ 25.00	£ 30.00
Visitor Permits - MiPermit (digital system) 24-hour	£ 10.00	£ 10.00	£ 11.00	£ 11.50	£ 12.00	£ 12.50
Visitor Permits - MiPermit (digital only) 6-hour	£ 6.00	£ 6.00	£ 6.00	£ 6.00	£ 6.00	£ 6.00
Trader's Permit (annual) - valid all areas of NEPP	£ 300.00	£ 300.00	£ 250.00	£ 230.00	£ 220.00	£210.00
Discretionary permit(s) (subject to conditions) (eg Carer)	£ 30.00	£ 30.00	£ 30.00	£ 30.00	£ 30.00	£ 30.00
Dispensation/Suspension Permit - First Day	£ 22.00	£ 22.00	£ 23.00	£ 24.00	£ 25.00	£ 25.00
Dispensation/Suspension - other days (up to 7 days)	£ 10.00	£ 10.00	£ 11.00	£ 11.50	£ 12.00	£ 12.50

Yield	New Permit Price	Number of each
£34,400	£ 34.00	6,880
£49,905	£ 14.00	99,810
£0	£ 7.00	#####
£0	£ 234.00	8
£0	£ 34.00	
£0	£ 28.00	
£0	£ 14.00	

New Permit Price	New Permit Price	New Permit Price
£ 36.00	£ 37.00	£ 38.00
£ 16.00	£ 17.00	£ 18.00
£ 8.00	£ 9.00	£ 10.00
£ 242.00	£ 245.00	£ 248.00
£ 36.00	£ 37.00	£ 38.00
£ 30.00	£ 31.00	£ 32.00
£ 16.00	£ 17.00	£ 18.00

Yield	Yield	Yield
£13,760	£6,880	£6,880
£199,620	£99,810	£99,810
£101,750	£101,750	£101,750
£64	£24	£24
£0	£0	£0
£0	£0	£0
£0	£0	£0

	2017	2018	2019	2021	2022	2023
Administration charge for Replacement for lost or stolen permit	£ 15.00	£ 15.00	£ 22.00	£ 23.00	£ 24.00	£ 25.00
Administration charge for Vehicle Registration Mark change	to be introduced					
Administration charge for Vehicle Registration Mark change	to be introduced					

Yield	New Charge	Number of each
£0	£ 28.00	
£0	£ 5.00	
£0	£ 5.00	

New Charge	New Charge	New Charge
£ 30.00	£ 31.00	£ 32.00
£ 8.00	£ 9.00	£ 10.00
£ 8.00	£ 9.00	£ 10.00

Yield	Yield	Yield
£0	£0	£0
£0	£0	£0
£0	£0	£0

Appendix B

Background Information

History

The Committee noted at the inception of the Partnership that fees for an annual Resident Parking Permit then ranged from £17 to £70, for what was ostensibly the same thing across the area.

The income range which could be achieved was shown, and it was noted that a substantial revenue was being forgone due to differential pricing (at the time, in the range £180k to £450k, the upper figure only being achieved if permits were increased to prices representative of the cost of the service (either £70 or £80 RRP)).

2011-2015

At the meetings in 25 June 2011 and 20 October 2011, in April 2012, 4 October 2012 and again at its meeting on 31 October 2013, Members considered permit pricing and harmonisation.

In terms of income, the previous Partnership outlined increases to Resident Parking Permits, based on the costs of the service provided, with a plan to bring these into line (as far as possible, given socio-demographic differences between local areas), eventually.

NEPP agreed in its 2011 Business Plan that increases to Resident Parking Permits should cover the costs of the service, with a plan to bring these into line as far as possible (given socio-demographic differences between local areas) in line with previous ECC guidance on permit pricing – which had been recommended at £70 even prior to 2011; prior to this, prices were agreed on an ad-hoc basis.

As a brief aside, at its meeting of 26 June 2014, the Partnership also considered Free Permits and it was decided that free-issue would be ended replaced by an administration fee (then, £20 – which is worth £24.35 at 2022 prices if inflation is taken into account).

2015-2018

Returning to the main permit prices, these were agreed in the 2015 Development Plan which ran to 2018, which was the extent of the Agreement at that time. A plan for the resident parking prices was therefore agreed in 2015 with a plan to conclude by 2018.

The pricing was to be representative of the real costs of the service – given that this cannot be provided at a loss.

At the outset, the Committee decided that the cost will be calculated from the basis of: administration, enforcement, signs and lines maintenance, maintaining Orders, consultations, management and all other true costs of running the scheme, such as restriction mapping and including staff recruitment, training, uniform and other overhead costs.

The Partnership planned to cover its costs by having a strategy to harmonise resident parking prices by continuing to increase by 10% p.a. until costs are covered (note, this was not an inflationary increase, but a move to cover existing costs).

The following principles were adopted:

- When costs for an area are covered then any surplus will be invested in TROs, and the permit price reduced if savings can be made by using new technology.

- Increase by 10% p.a. those permit prices which are less than £65. In future the price will be reviewed (downwards) if new technology makes savings.
- More schemes are being implemented all the time. JPC agreed the cost for a permit in a new scheme should be £70. New schemes now to be £65 unless this is an extension to an existing zone. All schemes, in time, will become the Standard Price of £65.
- Prices will be mirrored for the Second Permit which should have a premium of 30%. The Third Permit will remain discretionary and be at a 50% premium, with special attention given to narrow, crowded streets where parking is already difficult (including Colchester which has previously opted out of a Third Permit because of the lack of space) or where there are local socio-demographic or geographic reasons to deviate.
- New Resident Parking schemes provide an income to support themselves and new and Pay & Display schemes, which may be funded by capital receipts from the county council, could provide an additional revenue income to fund other schemes. Aside from this, externally funded schemes help provide extra income to assist funding the Development Plan.

During the transitional period, the Partnership stated that it would look at ways of reducing its costs in administering the scheme with a view to passing on efficiencies over time (although, it noted, efficiencies would probably be restricted to not increasing fees as would have been necessary with otherwise increasing costs, at a future date). This would be achieved by converting permits to a digital system and reducing costs of printing and posting.

Considerable savings were made originally in the efficiency of operational delivery via MiPermit (approx. £48k p.a. savings in administration were made on its introduction), especially in the cost of delivering online visitor permits, and there had been no change to these prices for a considerable time; the only change again was in the operational patrol costs.

At the time it was recommended that the plan was carried through to its agreed conclusion (2018). The Agreement was then extended by the optional four years and the plan was to implement the new plan up to the end of the term of that Agreement – i.e. up to 2022, pending any further technical innovations with the scheme which could impact pricing structure in future (either up or down) although future cost inflation was to be a part of the plans, for instance to keep permit prices representative of the cost of scheme provision.

2018-2020

In March 2018, Members agreed a future plan of charges over coming two years (up until 2020) both in the interests of transparency so that residents requesting a new scheme would be able to see the charges, and also to enable service financial planning. The previously-agreed plan was carried through to its conclusion and as agreed with Members at the 2018 meeting, a review to set out prices for 2020 onwards would be submitted.

During 2019/20, the cost of the scheme was being adequately covered by the current level of permit pricing and other income, resulting in a proposal to keep the price of the first permit static until 2022. What was not known at that time, after a period of very stable costs and low inflation, was that all operating costs were about to rise beyond all recognition.

2020

Permit costs are built on a range of measures explained in the report to Committee due to be presented in March 2020 but which, due to Covid restrictions at the time, was deferred eventually presented to the online Committee Meeting via Zoom in June 2020. At that meeting, in light of the previous plan coming to an end, Members were asked to decide the future pricing structure for the Parking Partnership.

Only limited increases were proposed - prices for the first permit in a household were frozen, but where space is limited or an area oversubscribed, prices for additional permits were proposed to increase. The price for paper permits, such as visitor permits, was also recommended for an increase. It was noted that all permits had been extended for three months, due to the Covid-19 situation.

Resident Parking zones had not been enforced since the end of March, due to extensive working from home. The only enforcement carried out had been to ensure that emergency access is maintained. This extension and the associated reduction in patrols was to dramatically affect the income to the Partnership, and the full impact of this has only recently been fully calculated.

A member of the Committee posited that any increase in tariffs would not be advisable, given the certainty that the UK was about to enter a bad recession. Second and visitor permits were widely used and the Committee member argued that the prices of these permits should not increase. The Committee discussed one member's recommendation that prices be left as they are and then reviewed next year.

It was suggested that a price freeze could help individuals and businesses to return to normal, and that a likely increase in unemployment would make an increase in prices unpalatable.

Committee members stressed the need for central government pressure to decrease the number of cars in use, and further work by the County Council to improve and expand on alternative transport methods and infrastructure.

The increased cost for both second and third permits is set at a level to act as a deterrent against the introduction of additional vehicles in areas which are already at capacity. Demand for kerbside parking continues to rise and consideration has to be given to the environmental impact that this may have.

Third Permits will remain discretionary and will also be at a significant premium. Officers will give special consideration to narrow, crowded streets where parking is already difficult (including Colchester which has opted out of a Third Permit because of the lack of space) or where there are local socio-demographic or geographic reasons to consider.

An increased premium is applied to paper visitor permits due to the environmental impact paper products can have over that of the digital alternative. Digital visitor permits are available on the MiPermit platform and are accessible 24/7.

In addition to these measures, it is proposed in future to introduce Electric Vehicle Charging Point Charges, however none are presently implemented on-street. Essex County Council is working on the strategy required by recent legislative changes, and this falls outside the remit of NEPP – although NEPP may be called upon to make changes to the parking regulations to enable EV points. Future consideration will also be given to offering discounted permit prices for Electric Vehicles or not.

The sensitive approach to enforcement taken by the Parking Partnership was praised. It was Resolved that Residential Parking Permit prices be frozen at this time.

The report at the time also mentioned that permit prices will be kept under review, especially in light of new technology. Prices may later be reviewed if new technology allows for efficiency savings to be made. This is particularly relevant where permits are converted to the virtual system and patrolling is made more efficient by using automatic number plate recognition.

Another suggestion was for a full review of permits, including the reasons as to why each residential parking zone had been instituted, and their maintenance and enforcement. The Chairman requested a report be circulated to Committee members on the likely effects of changes to permit prices, once it became possible to identify the effects of the Covid-19 crisis. With this recommendation in mind, a full review of permit prices is now proposed.

To dissuade residents from making successive vehicle changes, it is recommended an administration charge be implemented for each vehicle registration mark change carried out.



North Essex Parking Partnership

Joint Parking Committee

Meeting Date: 16 March 2023
Title: 'No Stopping' Cones Policy Report
Author: Jason Butcher, Group Development Manager
Presented by: Jason Butcher

This report recommends a new policy for the provision of 'No Stopping' cones along with the setting of appropriate fees for this service

1. Recommended Decision(s)

- 1.1. To consider the approval of the proposed Temporary 'No Stopping' cones policy as detailed in Appendix A.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)

- 2.1. For good governance and to ensure appropriate consideration of NEPP policies
- 2.2. To ensure that the NEPP Technical Team charges appropriately for the services it offers.
- 2.3. To protect the current cone stock as NEPP assets and ensure accountability for those loaning them.

3. Alternative Options

- 3.1. Members may wish to decide that the loaning of cones to customers as a service is withdrawn completely
- 3.2. Members could decide to retain the existing policy without amendment

4. Supporting Information

- 4.1. The existing policy is available to view at <https://north.parkingpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/temporary-no-waiting-cones-policy.pdf>
- 4.2. There is currently no fee applicable to customers wishing to loan cones from NEPP for what is a discretionary service that NEPP currently chooses to offer.
- 4.3. This officer time, often including a requirement to deliver and collect cones due to the number of cones required, is currently absorbed by the service which has an 'opportunity cost' as other duties could be performed, given the other operational requirements of the Technical Team.

- 4.4. Cones are often provided, at discretion, for a wide range of instances such as for funerals and weddings but also for larger-scale events.
- 4.5. Whilst the existing policy details an application procedure, this is not currently practiced and there is a need to ensure that the process that customers follow to apply for loaning cones, and the processing of the application, thereafter, is clear and enables NEPP to make customers accountable for the cones they loan.

5. Financial

- 5.1. Cones often go missing or are stolen whilst on loan and the cost of supplementing the existing stock is currently absorbed within the TRO budget. This is unsustainable under the new Partnership Agreement, especially as this is a discretionary service.
- 5.2. Over the past three financial years, around 1,200 cones have been purchased amounting to £12,000 – covering lost cones and an overall expansion of the service we have been providing.
- 5.3. Ensuring Officer time, in terms of the administration, arrangement and opportunity cost are covered by the cone loan fee is important to ensure longer term viability of the service.
- 5.4. A modest amount of income is expected if this policy is agreed and will not be budgeted for as it is anticipated the fees will reduce the number of requests currently received. The full impact will only be realised with the implementation of the policy and setting of the fees and can be reported on for future review of the agreed new policy.

6. Equality Impact Assessment

- 6.1. An Equality Impact Assessment for the TRO Policy has been carried out and will be available online if the policy is agreed.

7. Standard References

- 7.1. Other than set out above, there are no particular references to the Development Plan; publicity or consultation considerations; or diversity and human rights;

Appendix A

Supply of 'No stopping' Cones Policy

The Parking Partnership can provide 'No Stopping' Cones for special or planned events. This is permitted under TRA1984 c.27 s.67 (signage may be placed in emergency and for temporary obstructions).

Applications must be received 10 working days prior to the hire date.

All organisations and individuals wishing to borrow cones must allocate a lead signatory who will be required to read and understand this policy and sign a waiver agreement, taking responsibility for the placing of any cones and the costs of any loss of cones.

Please note that there are no exceptions for charitable events as this is an administration function relating to traffic management.

Enforcement

Placing cones onto the highway by individuals has no legal bearing and cannot be enforced by way of Penalty Charge Notice if other road users choose to ignore them. They are purely a deterrent unless supported by a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) or parking suspension.

Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders and Suspensions

Event organisers who require road closures to stage an event, or the suspension of waiting and parking restrictions in the neighbouring roads as a part of the traffic management plan for an event will need to either apply for a suspension or a TTRO.

A parking bay suspension is when a bay is suspended for use of those usually permitted to use it and prevents parking by all vehicles. This is commonly used in limited waiting and residential permit bays. A bay suspension can be applied for [\[here\]](#)

A TTRO is a temporary parking restriction and would most commonly be used where either no restrictions currently apply, and a restriction is required, or where an existing restriction needs to be altered temporarily. Further details on how to apply for a TTRO can be found [\[here\]](#).

Both options have variable costs but are more formal ways to prevent parking where it is necessary to do so.

Fees and Charges

A fixed administration fee of £25 inc. VAT, applies to any cone loan agreement and covers the cost of processing the application, taking payment, and arranging the loan of the cones.

A schedule of fees also applies for the delivery and collection of cones by our Technical Team if this service is required. This will be agreed and added to the total fee which must be paid prior to delivery being confirmed:

- Up to 10 cones - £30 incl. VAT
- 11-25 cones - £50 incl. VAT
- 25+ cones - £100 incl. VAT

For any cones not returned, there will be an additional charge of £15 for every cone not returned which NEPP will invoice the applicant for, post collection or return.

The loan will require the loanee to sign confirming they understand the costs, the legal responsibilities of placing cones and acknowledgement of the number of cones being provided.

Loan arrangement

Once an application for cones is received via the NEPP website [*link to be included in final policy*], this will be considered within 2 working days. If there are any queries, a member of the team will contact the applicant by telephone or email. Once the application is agreed, payment will be obtained by telephone at which point confirmation of the arrangement will be sent to the customer.

Cones can be collected from one of the Partnership hubs (located in Colchester and Braintree) and must be returned to the same location on pre-agreed dates. If delivery and collection is required the location, date and time will also be agreed prior to payment being made.

The partnership cannot agree to the long-term loan of cones, unless a TTR0 or Bay Suspension is arranged. This includes for instances such as weekly markets, regular boot sales or similar events. In these circumstances it will be the responsibility of the District Council or event organisers to supply their own cones.

Using no stopping cones for roadworks

If you need to work on a highway, such as for utility works, you will need to obtain an Essex Works Permit from Essex Highways. This includes for works on footways and verges, as well the carriageway itself. More information can be found on the Essex Highways website.

Provision of cones can then be applied for if a permit has been granted, or cones may be used by the contractor if they have their own.

Temporary Cones for	Power under which cones placed	Enforcement by virtue of	Notes
Unforeseen Emergency	Under RTRA1984 c.27 s.67, signage may be placed in emergency and for temporary obstructions Town Police Clauses Act 1847 (which likewise makes similar provision for areas to which that Act is applied) (relates to prevention of obstruction on public occasions or in the neighbourhood of public buildings)	Police have powers under s.36 of RTA1988 to enforce traffic sign.	7 days or fewer from the time placed, but no longer
s.14 Temp Orders/Notices	RTRA1984 c. 27 Part V General Provisions s.66-7 Signage may be placed giving effect to Orders etc.	This is an offence under RTRA1984 s.16 (relating to Orders under s.14); 16C (1)...A person who contravenes, or who uses or permits the use of a vehicle in contravention of, a restriction or prohibition imposed under section [14 (16)]/[16A (16C)] of this Act shall be guilty of an offence ...	such as s.14 (temp restrictions to prevent danger to public or at works)... ..up to 18 months in most circumstances.
s.16A Temp Restriction for Street Fairs etc	RTRA1984 s68 ...place and maintain... such traffic signs as the authority may consider necessary in connection with ... any order made or notice issued ...	CPE contravention by virtue of TMA 2004. Sched 7 Part I (2) (b) ...there is a parking contravention in relation to a vehicle if it is stationary in circumstances in which any of the offences listed below is committed... .. an offence under section 5, 11, 16(1) or 16C of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (c. 27) (contravention of certain traffic orders) of contravening a prohibition or restriction on waiting, or loading or unloading, of vehicles	s.16 (Street Fairs etc) by Notice. Maximum 3 days or fewer as per Notice under s16A ...and only once per road per calendar year (s16C)
Other setting out of cones	Under RTRA1984 c.27 s.67, signage may be placed in emergency and for temporary obstructions	Advisory – non-enforceable if not backed by regulations.	To reserve bays for instance at funerals or to make space for removals



North Essex Parking Partnership

Joint Parking Committee

Meeting Date: 16 March 2023
Title: TRO Scoring Methodology Report
Author: Jason Butcher, Group Development Manager
Presented by: Jason Butcher

This report recommends a proposed new scoring methodology to enable the prioritisation of Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) applications by the Joint Parking Committee (JPC).

1. Recommended Decision(s)

- 1.1. To agree the proposed new TRO application scoring methodology as detailed in Appendix A.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)

- 2.1. For good governance and to ensure the correct application of the NEPP TRO Policy as agreed at the December JPC meeting.
- 2.2. The new scoring methodology should ensure that only TRO applications that warrant approval are prioritised and that there is the best use of available funding
- 2.3. The existing scoring methodology is outdated and should reflect the changing needs in the use of the kerbside

3. Supporting Information

- 3.1. The main TRO policy was agreed at the December 2022 JPC meeting however the proposed scoring methodology presented within the report was requested by members to be revised and returned for consideration at this meeting.
- 3.2. A scoring methodology is a way to quantitatively assess applications on a range of important criteria including the level of local support, available funding, safety concerns, accessibility requirements and ability to enforce any restrictions effectively.
- 3.3. Pre-qualifying criteria to indicate sufficient local support from stakeholders including residents and businesses as well as for Councillors is now included and if not obtained then scoring will not be undertaken until such time as support is evidenced.
- 3.4. It is intended that a threshold score will be identified to qualify schemes at an appropriate level. This will mean that only schemes that warrant approval are considered by the Joint Committee. This threshold could be determined perhaps after 1-2 years when we have a gauge on the level of scores applied under this new system.

4. Equality

- 4.1. An Equality Impact Assessment for the wider TRO Policy has been carried out and will be available online if the policy is agreed.

5. Standard References

- 5.1. Other than set out above, there are no particular references to the Development Plan; publicity or consultation considerations; or financial; diversity and human rights;

Appendix A

Prioritisation Scoring Methodology

Location:

Total Points: /105

Pre-Scoring Criteria - Local Support (must be obtained to proceed)

Scheme/restriction is supported by relevant parties affected..... Yes/No (e.g resident & business petition(s) available to evidence this)
Scheme/restriction is supported Politically.....Yes/No (either ECC or Ward Member)
Proceed to scoring assessment?.....Yes/No

Viability/Finance

25 points

Economic contribution to NEPP (Residents or P&D parking)	10 points
Funded externally and not from NEPP budget	10 points
Low cost of ongoing maintenance.....	5 points

Localised Impact

20 points

Parking regularly occurs within 10-15 metres of site request	5 points
Personal injury collision recorded and attributed to parking.....	5 points (only relevant for requests relating to safety e.g yellow/red lines)
Parking request relates to an A or B routed classified road	5 points
Parking occurs on a bus route	5 points
Parking occurs by non-residents in a residential area.....	5 points

Accessibility

30 points

Parking inhibiting emergency services etc & is evidenced	10 points
Parking issues close to school.....	10 points
Parking issues close to Town Centre, Hospital, Railway Station etc...	5 points
Parking causes localised congestion in peak periods (rush hours)	5 points (congestion impact not relevant at school sites)

Enforcement

25 points

Parking occurs during day (8am-6pm).....	5 points
Parking of a long duration (In excess of 4 hours).....	5 points
Parking close to existing restrictions	5 points
Ease of Enforcement.....	10 points

Maximum Score

105 points



North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 16 March 2023
Title: **Forward Plan 2022-2023**
Author: Owen Howell – Democratic Services, Colchester Borough Council
Presented by: Owen Howell – Democratic Services, Colchester Borough Council

This report concerns the 2022-23 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 2022-23.
- 1.2 To note and approve proposed amended dates for meetings of the Joint Committee during 2023-24.

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 2022-23

- 4.1 The revolving hosting of Joint Committee meetings by the Partnership local authorities means that the next meeting is to be hosted by Colchester City Council on 22 June 2023.

5. Date for 2023-24 meetings of the Joint Parking Committee

- 5.1 It is proposed that, to avoid clashes with meetings of the South Essex Parking Partnership's Joint Committee, the following amended dates be approved for meetings of the Parking Partnership's Joint Parking Committee:

- 21 December 2023 (changed from 14 December 2023)
- 21 March 2024 (changed from 14 March 2024)

6. Appendices

6.1 Appendix A: NEPP Joint Parking Committee Forward Plan 2022-23.

**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	1 June 2022, (3pm) 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 Traders' Permits Forward Plan '22/23	Hayley McGrath (CBC) Hayley McGrath (CBC) Lou Belgrove (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Owen Howell (CBC)
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	6 October 2022, Microsoft Teams - online.	27 October 2022 1.00pm, Venue: Dining Hall at The Latton Bush Centre Southern Way, Harlow CM18 7BL.	Technical report and Traffic Order Scheme Prioritisation Update on Purlieu Way and Harewood Hill, Theydon Bois Financial Report Partnership Update Report Project update report Obstructive Parking Update Forward Plan '22/23	Jason Butcher (PP) Jason Butcher (PP) Lou Belgrove (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Danielle Northcott (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Owen Howell (CBC)
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	17 November 2022, Microsoft Teams - online	19 December 2022 1.00pm, Venue: See next page.	NEPP Financial Update Traffic Regulation Order Policy Technical report and Traffic Order Scheme Prioritisation	Lou Belgrove (PP) Jason Butcher (PP) Jason Butcher (PP)

COMMITTEE / WORKING GROUP	CLIENT OFFICER MEETING	JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING	MAIN AGENDA REPORTS	AUTHOR
		Uttlesford District Council, London Road, Saffron Walden CB11 4ER	Traders' Permits Use of Reserves Obstructive Parking Update Forward Plan '22/23 and' 23/24 Dates	Lou Belgrove (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Owen Howell (CBC)
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	23 February 2023, Microsoft Teams - online	16 March 2023 1.00pm, Venue: Braintree District Council, Causeway House, Bocking End, Braintree CM7 9HB	Finance Update and 2023/24 Budget Obstructive Parking Update Forward Plan '22/23	Richard Walker (PP)/ Lou Belgrove (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Owen Howell (CBC)
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	1 June 2023, Microsoft Teams - online	22 June 2023 1.00pm, Venue: Colchester Town Hall, High Street, Colchester	Annual Governance Review and Internal Audit Annual Review of Risk Management NEPP Financial Update Obstructive Parking Update Forward Plan '23/24	Hayley McGrath (CBC) Hayley McGrath (CBC) Lou Belgrove (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

Group Operating Manager, Jake England - Jake.England@colchester.gov.uk

Group Development Manager, Jason Butcher - Jason.Butcher@colchester.gov.uk

Business Manager, Lou Belgrove - Christine.Belgrove@colchester.gov.uk

Technical Manager, Trevor Degville - trevor.degville@colchester.gov.uk

Project Manager, Danielle Northcott - Danielle.Northcott@colchester.gov.uk

Civil Operations Manager, Lisa Hinman - lisa.hinman@colchester.gov.uk

Digital Operations Manager, Christopher Greenslade - Christopher.Greenslade@colchester.gov.uk

Service Accountant, Louise Richards - louise.richards@colchester.gov.uk

Governance, Owen Howell - owen.howell@colchester.gov.uk

Media, Lexie Tuthill - alexandra.tuthill@colchester.gov.uk

