



North Essex Parking Partnership

Joint Committee On-Street Parking

Town Hall, High Street,
Colchester, CO1 1PJ

23 January 2025 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: <https://north.parkingpartnership.org/joint-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/hybrid meetings of the Joint Committee, a written contribution of no longer than 500 words may be submitted to democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk, before noon on the working day before the meeting date.
- 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 2022 ‘A combined parking service for North Essex’ ” and in particular sections 32 and 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 23 January 2025. Meeting to be held at
Colchester Town Hall, High Street, Colchester CO1 1PJ

Agenda

Attendees

Executive Members:-

Cllr Mick Barry (Tendring)
Cllr Graham Butland (Braintree)
Cllr Martin Goss (Colchester)
Cllr Neil Hargreaves (Uttlesford)
Cllr Paul Honeywood (Essex) [Chair]
Cllr Nicky Purse (Harlow)
Cllr Ken Williamson (Epping Forest)

Officers:-

Megan David (Tendring)
Trevor Degville (Parking Partnership)
Jake England (Parking Partnership)
Jo Heynes (Essex County Council)
Amelia Hoke (Epping Forest)
Owen Howell (Colchester)
Dean James (Harlow)
Sarah Lewin (Uttlesford)
Esme McCambridge (Braintree)
Andrew Nepean (Tendring)
Charlotte Paine (Braintree)
Mel Rundle (Colchester)
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, or to present a petition.
- 5. Minutes** **7-16**
To approve as a correct record the draft minutes of the Joint Committee meeting held on 21 March 2024.
- 6. Urgent Items**
The Joint Committee will consider any urgent items of business raised.

Continues overleaf

North Essex Parking Partnership

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| 7. NEPP Financial Update (including the Month 6 forecast for 2024/25)
This report updates Members on the North Essex Parking Partnership's finances | Chris Hartgrove | 17-22 |
| 8. Traffic Regulation Order Update and Application Decision Report
This report seeks a decision to either approve, defer or reject Traffic Regulation Order proposals from the list of applications that have been received. | Trevor Degville | 23-38 |
| 9. On-Street Paid Parking Update
Update on the paid parking proposals that have previously been approved by the Joint Parking Committee. | Trevor Degville | 39-66 |
| 10. Agreement Wording Amendments Report
This report sets out the direction recommended for considering proposed alterations to the Operating Agreement. | Richard Walker | 49-50 |
| 11. Outside Agency Support Report
This report updates the Committee on a longstanding delegation and invites members to decide if any changes are needed, and to re-state the current delegation around Outside Agency Support into the North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP). | Richard Walker | 51-52 |
| 12. Forward Plan 2024-2025
This report concerns the 2024-25 Forward Plan of meetings for the North Essex Parking Partnership. | Owen Howell | 53-58 |

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

**18 July 2024 at 1.00pm
Town Hall, High Street, Colchester CO1 1PJ**

Members Present:

Councillor Mick Barry (Tendring District Council)
Councillor Martin Goss (Colchester City Council)
Councillor Neil Hargreaves (Uttlesford District Council)
Councillor Paul Honeywood (Essex County Council)
Councillor Tim Matthews (Epping Forest District Council) [substitute]
Councillor Nicky Purse (Harlow District Council)
Councillor Gabrielle Spray (Braintree District Council) [substitute]

Substitutions:

Councillor Spray for Councillor Butland
Councillor Matthews for Councillor Williamson

Apologies:

None.

Also Present:

Trevor Degville (Parking Partnership)
Jake England (Parking Partnership)
Chris Hartgrove (Colchester City Council)
Jo Haynes (Essex County Council)
Amelia Hoke (Epping Forest District Council)
Owen Howell (Colchester City Council)
Dean James (Harlow District Council)
Sarah Lewin (Uttlesford District Council)
Esme McCambridge (Braintree District Council)
Hayley McGrath (Colchester City Council)
Andrew Nepean (Tendring District Council)
Mel Rundle (Colchester City Council)
Richard Walker (Parking Partnership)

179. Election of Chair

RESOLVED that Councillor Honeywood be appointed Chair for 2024-25. FIVE votes in favour. ZERO votes against. ONE abstention.

180. Election of Vice Chair

RESOLVED that Councillor Hargreaves be appointed Vice Chair for 2024-25. SIX votes in favour. ZERO votes against. ZERO abstentions.

181. Have Your Say

A petition was presented to the Chair, from Witham Town Council. The petition opposed any introduction of paid-for on-street parking on Newlands Street, Witham. The Town Council's view was that such a move would contravene the policies of the North Essex Parking Partnership [NEPP] and would harm the local economy.

Mr Peter Green attended and, with the Chair's permission, addressed the Joint Committee to voice opposition to any introduction of charging for on-street parking in Witham. Mr Green explained his concerns and argued that such an introduction would only be to generate income for the NEPP. Many shops had left the Town already, and there were factors inhibiting the expansion of others, such as Tesco. Mr Green posited that traffic through Witham was not affected by parking currently, and voiced his opposition to having to pay to park on his own street.

Jake England, Group Operating Manager, explained that the initial proposals were for efficiencies in how parking was managed, and that informal consultations on any proposed sites would occur later in the year.

Mr Nick Chilvers attended and, with the Chair's permission, addressed the Joint Committee to raise questions. Mr Chilvers gave thanks for his statement to the last meeting of the Joint Committee being presented and recorded, and went on to ask for definitions to be given for 'enhanced consultation' and 'stakeholders' in the context in which they were used by the NEPP. Mr Chilvers noted that there had been no comments shown regarding Colchester proposals for areas for on-street parking charges, and asked if local groups had been consulted, including the Masonic Lodge, Nepalese community, Parent Teacher Associations and the landlord of the Abbey Arms. A targeted approach was suggested. Mr Chilvers asked whether consultations would only be on a model which only allowed payment via app, and requested that a free first hour be given, should parking charges be introduced. Mr Chilvers explained that he would be happy to receive a written response to his queries, but would welcome an answer in the meeting to his questions regarding definitions.

Jake England, Group Operating Manager, explained that payment options would be online, via an app, or by using a 'phone. Enhanced consultation was a concept which had been laid out as a response to the call-in which had been received relating to a previous decision of the Joint Committee on this subject.

Enhanced meant taking a locally tailored approach, including ward and county councillors, stakeholders and local groups felt to be relevant. Trevor Degville, Group Development Manager, expanded on this to say that letter drops to residents would be carried out, in addition to contacts with councillors. Initial informal consultation would be to decide whether to proceed to the formal, enhanced consultation stage and advertising of proposals. Informal consultation was not intended to decide whether or not to introduce charging schemes.

182. Minutes

Councillor Barry noted the resolution under minute 174, and apologised that there had not been enough time to work up suggestions for wording amendments to the NEPP agreement. Councillor Barry stated that these were expected to be ready for consideration at the next meeting of the Joint Committee. Councillor Hargreaves described work which had been done on suggested wording amendments, which were now being considered by the legal teams of the partners working on them. Councillor Hargreaves maintained that the NEPP was operating outside its contractual terms, and that there were parts of the Agreement wording which were incorrect. Councillor Hargreaves argued that the retention by Essex County Council of the right to use powers it had delegated to the NEPP was an issue.

Councillor Barry queried whether statements recorded regarding the forecasting for PCN [Penalty Charge Notice] income had been made, as recorded. Concern was expressed that PCN income had increased, but had not been reflected in the forecasts for future PCN income. Councillor Barry stated that, had this been known by Tendring District Council, this would have changed the conversations it had held regarding NEPP membership. Richard Walker explained that the points made were around the forecasts, and the NEPP needing to have confidence in what was happening

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 21 March 2024 be approved as an accurate record.

183. Annual Governance Review and Internal Audit

Hayley McGrath, Corporate Governance Manager [Colchester City Council], introduced her role, work, and the report, relating to governance arrangements at the NEPP. There was no statutory requirement for an annual governance statement, but one was produced as a matter of best practice. The Corporate Governance Manager explained that Joint Committee members could contact her to raise any questions or concerns they might have regarding governance.

Internal audit was carried out primarily by Colchester City Council, but all partners could conduct their own internal audits, should they wish to do so. Colchester City Council reviewed all governance areas, including political processes and payment procedures. No partner concerns had been raised during 2023-24, and there had been no additional findings of concern, so it had been concluded that the NEPP had adequate controls in place. The NEPP consistently achieved reasonable or substantial ratings, so there had been no need for a full

audit. A rolling programme of policy updates was in place, and a full audit would be carried out in 2024-25, which would be reported on at the next Annual Meeting.

Officers were asked how reconciliation was possible for the concern raised that the NEPP was operating outside of the terms of its Agreement, which required the maintenance of a reserve of at least £400k. The Corporate Governance Manager explained that the view taken was that the matter had been fully raised at Joint Committee meetings, with decisions made at those meetings regarding reasonable actions. This matter would have been raised as an issue if it had not been dealt with by the Joint Committee and if it were not being looked at. The Joint Committee could decide to add this to the NEPP's Strategic Risk Register. If the position failed to improve by the end of 2024-25, then this would become an issue to be considered then.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE:

- a) Notes the Annual Governance Review of the North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP), and;
- b) Has considered the progress on implementing Internal Audit recommendations for the North Essex Parking Partnership.

184. Annual Review of Risk Management

Hayley McGrath, Corporate Governance Manager [Colchester City Council], explained the management process for risk, relating to Colchester City Council and its partnerships. There was no formal requirement for a risk register and management process, however Colchester City Council's role was to look at strategic risks for the Partnership as a whole. The NEPP risk register covered strategic risks to the Partnership, not to individual partners. The Corporate Governance Manager first discussed risks and concerns with NEPP colleagues, and then with partner Client Officers.

The review of risk management had been completed, and the recommendations for changes to the register included within the report, but it was the Joint Committee's decision as to whether to make any changes to the register. There were three risks with decreased severity, and two recommendations for additional risks to be added to the register. There had been a lack of resilience noted with regard to specialist posts, and risks associated with difficulties in recruiting to front line posts.

The Joint Committee asked whether there were any 'single points of failure', where the leaving or incapacity of specific officers could see organisational breakdowns. The Corporate Governance Manager explained that the potential addition of an item to the risk register, to cover this, had been considered, where an issue might be encountered should required skills or knowledge not be available. Richard Walker, Head of Parking, explained that the transformation project had been used as an opportunity to address this potential issue. The Head of Parking had a deputy, who also had a deputy. Information was shared

between these officers, and the next tier of management also met regularly to share information. A succession plan was a necessity, especially now the organisation was a smaller entity.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE:

- a) Endorses the Risk Management Strategy for 2024/25, and
- b) Agrees the Strategic Risk Register, subject to any requested amendments.

185. NEPP Financial Update (including the Month 12 outturn for 2023/24 and the budget for 2024/25)

Chris Hartgrove, Service Director (shared) – Finance and Deputy Section 151 Officer [Colchester City Council], underlined the continuing stable position of the NEPP, and the achievement of a net surplus of £121k for the financial year. The NEPP's reserves were on track to return to surplus by March 2025, with the reserves deficit having been reduced to £39k by March 2024. The budget contribution to the reserves in 2024-25 would see a reserves reach a balance of £66k by the end of March 2025.

Budget variances were highlighted within the report, including an underspend on civil enforcement officers and supervision costs of £135k. The vacancy savings were explained, with successful recruitment now having a financial effect on reducing the surplus, but also increasing income.

There had been no budgeted contributions to bad debt provision in 2023-24, during which time an overspend of £178k on bad debt had been incurred. This had now been rectified in the approach to the 2024-25 Budget. There had been an increase in Penalty Charge Notices [PCNs], so this had shown that the increase in civil enforcement officers had had a positive impact.

There had been an income shortfall of £139k on parking charges. This budget line included a number of income streams, including pay and display parking. Two significant budget variances were explained; firstly, the assumption in the 2023-24 Budget that the NEPP would receive £107k from Essex County Council to expand the ParkSafe scheme for school cameras, which did not come to pass. Secondly, an expected income of £60k for parking consultancy work had been assumed, along with additional income from events such as 'Ride London', which did not materialise.

The Joint Committee welcomed the improved figures and forecast projections. A Committee member stated that the actual income from PCNs, up to end of P11, was £1,772k, with this report stating that the PCN income for the year was £2,350k, and queried how the PCN income from the final month of the year could have reached £578k, in comparison to an average PCN income per month for the first 11 months of around £161k. The Service Director (shared) – Finance confirmed that there had been an increase in PCNs in the final month, with a

steep increase in PCNs through the final quarter of 2023-24. Regarding the forecast PCN income for the final quarter of that year, the Service Director (shared) – Finance explained that, whilst there was positive news emerging in January regarding PCN income and a more optimistic projection could have been made, the risk had been that this projection might not have been met, so the decision had been made to release a more positive forecast when it was more certain, which was reported to the Committee at its March meeting, and then confirmed in the outturn for 2023-24.

A Committee member for Tendring District Council stated that their Council had been making critical decisions regarding the NEPP, but had not had access to the information which had indicated a more positive outturn than expected would be achieved. This could have resulted in this Council leaving the Partnership, based on the information which had been given to partners, and the Committee Member for Tendring expressed surprise that this approach had been taken to the reporting of forecasts. The Service Director (shared) – Finance argued that the alternative scenario could have been the earlier upgrading of forecasts, with the risk that these weren't then achieved. There had been an aim to avoid surprises, but a stable position was now being reported in recent months.

Jake England, Group Operating Manager, informed the Committee that, following its previous meeting, he had sent information to Andrew Nepean, Client Officer for Tendring, reporting the £1,772k income from PCNs for P1 – P11, with £501k then reported for P12. This far outweighed the income in any previous month from PCNs. The Group Operating Manager described the projections, and the year end debtor figure. £150k expected PCN income had been projected for P12, but the year end swing, which occurred each year, had caused misconceptions in the way it was reported at year end. Officers were looking to address this, and reflect the effects of the year end swing throughout the year, rather than giving one lump figure at year end itself. The Head of Parking added that it was very difficult to predict income when this swing occurs, and that the swing at year end of 2023-24 had been unprecedented, with a change from a downward trajectory to a steep upward trajectory in the last quarter of the year. The Group Operating Manager clarified that PCN income had been reported accurately in March, but that there may have been confusion caused by the year end debtor situation, as the amount for this was not known at the time, and could only be forecast. It had now been confirmed that the year end debtor total stood at £351k.

A Joint Committee member asked for clarification as to how the year end debtor situation was handled, and how the NEPP could assume that such debts would be paid off at year end. The Service Director (shared) – Finance explained that there was a year end debtor process in place. This amount used to be relatively small, as a percentage of PCNs issued. As PCN numbers went up, so did the year end debtor figure. The overall position was not much different to the forecasting made in accounting periods P9 – P11, and was not related to the reversal of overprovisioning for bad debt. Forecasts were given as estimated projections, and not as definitive amounts.

The Service Director (shared) – Finance was asked, in relation to the forecasts for the coming year, whether these and the 2024-25 Budget included the

projected £140k from on-street parking charges from potential new sites for such charging, given that there appeared to be opposition to some, and the doubt as to which schemes might proceed. The Head of Parking underlined that the Budget set had been very conservative and calculated on a seasonal basis. Pay to Park schemes were not intended to increase income, but an estimate had to be made on this.

Officers were asked whether vacancies would be filled, or whether they would be maintained, to continue to gain vacancy savings. The Group Operating Manager explained that there had been a reduction in total positions within the NEPP, as detailed in the transformation programme report on the agenda. A Committee member noted the report's expectation that the next staff pay award would exceed budget provision, which would be the third year in a row for this to occur. The Service Director (shared) – Finance was asked if an award of lump sums to staff on lower grades would result in underbudgeting for pay, and whether this had been factored into the Budget for 2024-25. The Service Director (shared) – Finance explained he could not give a guarantee but would consider what had been said, and noted that lump sum pay awards eroded pay scale differentials, so could not continue indefinitely.

A Committee member raised the issue of the income which had been expected for additional work discussed with Essex County Council [ECC], but which had never come to pass, asking whether this had now been removed from the Budget. The Group Operating Manager confirmed that this was no longer within the Budget. School camera work was postponed until certainty was given to the NEPP that this would proceed within budget. Jo Heynes, ECC Client Officer, stated that ECC and the NEPP had worked on a trial, but that it was not currently sustainable. The Committee member raised concern that the £107k expected additional income was a significant amount, and that the NEPP had recruited and prepared to carry out the work discussed. The Committee member urged for closer working and for work to be done to mend the situation. ECC's Client Officer informed the Joint Committee that the County Council had not issued any formal instructions to the NEPP to recruit.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE:

- a) Notes the outturn for 2023/24 as of 31st March 2024 (Month 12); and
- b) Notes the impact on the Parking Reserve balance.

186. Update on Fees, Charges, Delegations and Policies

Richard Walker, Head of Parking, introduced the item, setting it out as part of the ongoing rolling programme of policy updates. The fees and charges plan had been approved two years previously, with the NEPP now in year three of the four years in the plan. The policy review process was laid out, showing what had been done and what was to come.

A Committee member asked how delegations worked, such as where a NEPP partner might want on street parking charges to match off street charges, and

whether there was consultation. The Head of Parking confirmed that such a proposal would need to be advertised, and would go through a short consultation process.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE:

- a) Agrees that delegations made previously should continue.
- b) Notes the decision to match on-street tariffs to nearby car parks, to be made under existing delegations, and note the recent changes to be implemented (subject to 1.1).
- c) Notes the plan for fees and charges decided previously, currently in year 2, and continue its implementation.
- d) Notes the Policies which are in place and the plan and mechanism for updates.

187. On-Street Paid Parking – Update

Jake England, Group Operating Manager, introduced the report, which followed on from two prior reports considered at previous meetings. At the Joint Committee meeting on 21 March 2024, matters regarding enhanced consultations were clarified. Potential schemes for Colchester and Epping Forest were to be considered first, to ascertain how these fared. The Joint Committee was being asked to approve the sites for which formal consultations would then be carried out.

The Committee member for Braintree District Council described the concerns raised within Braintree, regarding the potential introduction of on street parking charges. Halsted Town Council had, as an example, raised concern that this would harm economic viability of local businesses; these concerns were shared by Witham Town Council, and seen in Colchester also. The suggestion of a first hour parking for free was supported by the Committee member, arguing this could be done and enforced with ease.

The Committee member for Colchester gave confirmation that the concerns that he had previously raised had all been addressed, stating that Colchester City Council was happy to proceed.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE approves the advertising of additional on-street paid parking sites in the Colchester and Epping Forest areas as outlined in the report.

188. NEPP Transformation Update Report

Jake England, Group Operating Manager, introduced the report, for noting, and gave details of the restructuring. The previous structure of 91.5 FTE [full time equivalent] employment across 28 different types of post had been superseded

by a structure of 76.5 FTE employment across 15 different types of post. There had been a 41% reduction in posts, with a 21.6% reduction in officers.

The Group Operating Manager noted that 'Appendix D' should have been titled 'Appendix C.'

19 officers had been at risk of redundancy. 13 were matched into roles in the new structure, one took a fixed-term position, one moved to Colchester City Council, whilst the remaining four were within their notice period, applying for other positions.

The Committee asked about the effect of this on the NEPP's finances. The Group Operating Manager explained that some posts were involved in off-street parking work, through agreements with partners, and that the cost of those roles had been shared between the two workstreams. Some of the removed roles had been vacant, so the actual saving to the organisation would not equal the total of the salaries and pensions from all of the removed roles.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE notes the changes to the organisational structure implemented under the NEPP Transformation programme.

189. Report setting out parking provisions in the Essex Act

Richard Walker, Head of Parking, explained the Essex Act and its provisions, focussing on the powers to prohibit parking, by notice, on mown and ornamental verges. These powers were similar to those of a Traffic Regulation Order [TRO], but did not require a TRO. There was no budget set aside for Essex Act prohibition and enforcement work, but this was a potential solution for NEPP partners to use in verge protection.

One Committee member outlined successful work that had been done in the Colchester area to stop damage to verges and allow enforcement. This had been found to be cheap and simple. Another member of the Committee suggested that the options under the Essex Act be publicised to the NEPP's partner councils, and to parish and town councils.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE:

- a) Notes the provisions in the Essex Act which relate to parking
- b) Directs the NEPP to produce a bulletin, for its partner councils, parish councils and town councils, to advertise the verge protection measures within the Essex Act

190. Forward Plan 2024-2025

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE approves the North Essex Parking Partnership Forward Plan for 2024-25, with an item on Agreement changes to be added to the meeting on 14 November 2024.



North Essex Parking Partnership

Joint Parking Committee

Meeting Date: 23rd January 2025

Title: NEPP Financial Update (including the Month 9 forecast for 2024/25)

Author: Chris Hartgrove FCCA – Service Director of Finance (Deputy Section 151 Officer)
Andrew Small CPFA – Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer)

Presented by: Chris Hartgrove

This report updates Members on the North Essex Parking Partnership's finances.

1. Recommended Decisions

- 1.1. To note the forecast outturn for 2024/25 as of 31st December 2024 (Month 9)
- 1.2. To consider and comment upon the emerging draft budget for 2025/26
- 1.3. To note the projected impact of the forecast outturn for 2024/25 and the emerging draft budget for 2025/26, on the Parking Reserve balance; and
- 1.4. To note the discussion on risk presented in Section 8 and specifically the potential impact on the financial projections presented in this report.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decisions

- 2.1. To achieve good practice governance in terms of monitoring and controlling in-year expenditure and setting a sustainable budget for the year ahead that supports the future delivery of the Partnership's objectives, whilst balancing the long-term financial sustainability of the NEPP and mitigating the financial risk exposure of partner councils.

3. Background and Introduction

- 3.1. The 2022/23 financial year proved extremely challenging for the NEPP with a budget overspend eventually resulting in a year-end deficit of £160,000 on the NEPP Reserve, which is £560,000 short of the recommended minimum Reserve balance of £400,000 contained within the adopted NEPP Agreement.
- 3.2. In contrast, the 2023/24 financial year was significantly more positive, with the NEPP eventually recording a budget underspend/surplus of £121,000 for the year. Consequently, the deficit on the Reserve was reduced to just £39,000, with an adopted Budget for 2024/25 built on an assumed surplus of £106,000, which – if achieved – would comfortably return the Reserve back into surplus by 31st March 2025 (although still short of the target balance assumed in the NEPP Agreement, a significant step in the right direction).

3.3. This report updates the Committee on:

- Progress against the 2024/25 budget, including the projected year-end position for 31st March 2025
- The emerging draft budget for 2025/26; and
- The projected impacts on the NEPP Reserve balance.

4. Financial Review Progress

- 4.1. The ongoing review of the NEPP finances by the Colchester City Council (Section 151) team, including its long-term financial sustainability, is an iterative process. The outcome from the 'first stage review' was reported to the Committee on 1st February 2024.
- 4.2. This established a robust forecast outturn for 2023/24 (as at Month 9) and a sustainable draft budget for 2024/25 and reflected a reset of some previous financial assumptions, most notably on Management Time Allocations (in the light of managerial changes within Colchester City Council that took effect in 2023/24), the Provision for Bad Debts (with the inclusion of a budget assumption in 2024/25 for the first time), and the 2024/25 Budget (with assumptions consistent with Colchester City Council budgets, and reflecting estimated cost reductions achievable from the planned service restructure).
- 4.3. The service restructure has now concluded with the full financial implications reflected in this report. This gives further clarity in financial reporting and provides a platform from which a '5-year view' in the form of a Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP) can be developed for presentation to the Committee on 20th March 2025.

5. Forecast Outturn 2024/25 (Month 9)

- 5.1. The forecast outturn position for 2024/25 as of 31st December 2024 (Month 9), presented in **Appendix A**, shows a year-end forecast surplus of £44,000, which is £62,000 below an assumed surplus of £106,000 in the 2024/25 Budget. If this materialises, the NEPP Reserve would have a surplus balance of £5,000 on 31st March 2025.
- 5.2. The forecast Budget shortfall of £62,000 is derived from a projected overspend of £43,000 on Expenditure, added to by a projected Income shortfall of £19,000. The most notable factors are:

EXPENDITURE

- **Data Led Services (Expenditure impact £158,000 Negative)** – the timetable for the 2023/24 service restructure – which included the deletion of the Data Led Services team – slipped slightly due to an extended staff consultation period. This led to some one-off associated restructuring costs (e.g. notice period payments, severance payments and pension costs) being incurred in 2024/25 (against a zero budget)
- **CEOs and Supervision (Expenditure impact £166,000 Positive)** – a limited number of staff vacancies – predominantly in the early part of the financial year – is driving an anticipated underspend in this area (therefore significantly compensating for the overspend on Data Led Services); but
- **Other (Net) (Expenditure impact £51,000 Negative)** – the combined impact of a range of other smaller negative variances are outweighing positive variances and are driving the overspend. The largest individual variance relates to Supplies and Services (impact £40,000), caused by two expenditure items. Firstly, income transaction charges paid to payment service providers – e.g. MiPermit – are expected to exceed budget by £25,000. And secondly, court fees are also expected to overspend due to a higher caseload than was originally assumed within the budget (impact £15,000).

INCOME

- **Parking Permits/Season Tickets (Income impact £69,000 Positive)** – the increase in Permit charges agreed by the Committee on 18th July 2024 is beginning to take effect, with a forecast budget underspend/surplus of £69,000 now anticipated on this budget line by the end of the financial year.
- **Parking Charges and Other Fees (Income impact £62,000 Negative)** – recently adopted Pay and Display sites were assumed to be operational for the full financial year when the budget was originally drafted. Following a delay, only partial implementation has been achieved so far. This has had a negative impact on income levels achieved in this financial year. However, early income levels achieved at operational sites are in line with expectations and appear to indicate that income budgets from this source should be met in full in 2025/26; and
- **Other (Net) (Income impact £26,000 Negative)** – a further shortfall on income of £26,000 is also expected, mainly driven by a forecast shortfall of £28,000 on PCN income, with income achieved *marginally* below expectations (monthly average PCN income April 2024 to December 2024 is within 2.0% of budget).

6. Emerging Budget 2025/26

- 6.1. At the time of preparing this report, the Colchester City Council Finance team are finalising the 2025/26 draft budget estimates for consideration by the Council's Cabinet on 29th January 2025; this includes the draft estimates for the NEPP. The On Street Parking/NEPP elements of the emerging draft budget for 2025/26 is presented in **Appendix A**. Most budget lines follow a very similar pattern, with a projected *surplus* of £65,000 anticipated for the financial year.
- 6.2. Members of the Committee should note that the emerging budget estimates presented include the full impacts of both the 2024/25 Pay Award (*see Paragraph 8.1 below for full discussion*) and the additional Employers' National Insurance Contributions (NICs) for 2025/26 announced in the Autumn Budget 2024.

7. NEPP Reserve Movements/Balance

- 7.1. As explained above in Sections 5 and 6, and summarised in **Appendix A**, the NEPP Reserve is – based on the numbers presented – currently projected to return to a positive balance by 31st March 2025 (*however, please note Section 8 below, and the potential impact of the 2024/25 Pay Award*).
- 7.2. A further update, reflecting the position as of 28th February 2025 (Month 11), will be presented to the Committee on 20th March 2025 (and will fully incorporate the impact of the 2024/25 Pay Award).

8. Risks

8.1. The consideration of risk forms a key part of the development of this report. As reported to the Committee on 1st February 2024, the Budget is based on a series of estimates and assumptions that are informed by a range of intelligence sources (some certain, some uncertain). The risks associated with Staff Pay Awards are especially noteworthy:

- **2024/25 Pay Award** – a 3.0% Pay Award was assumed for 2024/25 in line with the Colchester City Council assumption on inflation. However, Pay Settlements exceeded budget provision in both 2022/23 and 2023/24 (taking the form of a fixed sum for all pay grades, rather than a set percentage of pay). The locally approved Pay Award for 2024/25 was eventually determined in December 2024, with most staff set to receive a fixed sum of £1,290 added to their base pay (back dated to 1st April 2024). This exceeds the 3.0% assumption noted above. However, due to committee deadlines, it has not been possible to calculate the precise impact on the NEPP budget for 2024/25. But the overall impact on the On Street element of the Parking service is estimated to be approximately £30,000. Once the exact figure is determined, it will reduce the forecast surplus for 2024/25 by the same amount and (based on the other Month 9 estimates presented) would delay the elimination of the deficit on the NEPP Reserve; and
- **2025/26 Pay Award** – a 2.5% Pay Award is assumed within the emerging draft budget for 2025/26 in line with the Colchester City Council assumption on inflation.

9. Standard References

9.1. North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP) Joint Committee Agreement (2022).

NEPP Financial Update (Month 9)

2024/25

North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP)							
2024/25 Budget Forecast							
31st December 2024 (Month 9)							
2024/25							2025/26
	Budget (Full Year)	Budget (Profiled Month 9)	Actual Spending (Month 9)	Variance (Month 9)	Forecast Outturn (31 March 2025)	Variance	Emerging Draft Budget 2025/26
	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
Expenditure							
<i>Employee Costs (Direct)</i>							
Management	133	95	111	16	158	25	159
CEOs & Supervision	1,724	1,293	1,109	184	1,558	166	1,782
Back Office	389	292	307	15	420	31	445
Data Led Services	-	0	115	115	158	158	0
TRO's	282	212	185	27	250	32	237
<i>Other Costs (Direct)</i>							
Premises / TRO Maintenance costs	68	51	56	5	71	3	99
Transport costs (running costs)	48	43	39	4	49	1	61
Supplies & Services	452	343	299	44	492	40	459
Third Party Payments	30	22	4	18	15	15	19
Bad Debts	70	-	-	-	70	-	70
	3,198	2,351	2,226	125	3,241	43	3,331
Income							
Penalty Charges (PCNs)	- 2,100	- 1,575	- 1,548	27	- 2,072	28	- 2,100
Parking Permits/Season Tickets	- 1,037	- 777	- 854	77	- 1,106	69	- 1,158
Parking Charges and other fees	- 536	- 402	- 345	57	- 474	62	- 566
Other income	- 62	- 46	- 50	4	- 63	1	- 2
	- 3,734	- 2,800	- 2,797	3	- 3,715	20	- 3,826
DIRECT COSTS (NET)	- 536	- 449	- 571	122	- 474	62	- 495
CORPORATE OVERHEADS (INDIRECT)*	430	323	323	-	430	-	430
TOTAL COSTS	- 106	- 126	- 248	122	- 44	62	- 65
*Note - Corporate Overheads pro rated for illustration (e.g. 9/12 at Month 9)							
Forecast Movement on NEPP Reserve							
	£000's						
Opening Balance 01/04/23 (Actual B/Fwd.)	160	Deficit					
Actual Contribution 2023/24	- 121						
Balance 31/03/24 (Outturn)	39	Deficit					
Opening Balance 01/04/24 (Actual B/Fwd.)	39	Deficit					
Month 9 Forecast Contribution 2024/25	- 44						
Forecast Balance 31/03/25	- 5	Surplus					
Opening Balance 01/04/25 (Estimated B/Fwd.)	- 5	Surplus					
Budgeted Contribution 2024/25	- 65						
Forecast Balance 31/03/26	- 70	Surplus					



North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 23 January 2025

Title: Updated Traffic Regulation Order and Application Decision Report

Author: Trevor Degville – Interim Group Development Manager

Presented by: Trevor Degville – Interim Group Development Manager

-This is an update to the report that was first due to be presented at the November 2024 JPC. It seeks a decision to either approve, defer or reject Traffic Regulation Order proposals from the list of applications that have been received.

-The Committee is requested to reintroduce the NEPP “5-year” rule regarding newly adopted highway and new developments.

- The Committee is requested to alter the wording of the TRO Scoring Methodology to clarify when officers can score proposals.

- For member information, the report also highlights other traffic regulation order work performed by the Technical Team during 2024.

1. Recommended Decision(s)

1.1 The Joint Committee is requested to:

- a) Prioritise proposed Traffic Regulation Order schemes from the applications that have been received by the North Essex Parking Partnership (applications can be found in Appendix A). Members may choose to either ‘approve’, ‘reject’ or ‘defer’ schemes.
- b) Note that any applications that are “Approved” may not become sealed Traffic Regulation Orders. Any proposal will need to be formally advertised as set out in the relevant legislation and any objections made during the formal consultation process considered before a Traffic Regulation Order is made.
- c) Note that applications that have been received but do not meet the NEPP scoring criteria are shown in Appendix B.
- d) Note the new schemes NEPP has advertised in 2024 via the JPC process, in Appendix C.
- e) Note the new schemes NEPP has advertised in 2024 outside the JPC process, in Appendix D.
- f) To amend the wording of the TRO Scoring Methodology to clarify that a scheme/restriction must be supported by a petition before it can be scored by officers. This concerns standard applications received from outside NEPP that are to be considered by the Joint Committee.

- g) Agree the reintroduction of the 5-year rule for NEPP TROs on new builds/recently adopted highway areas.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)

- 2.1. To allow NEPP officers to draft prioritised Traffic Regulation Orders. These would be advertised during 2025.
- 2.2. To allow officers to advise applicants of the outcome of their applications.
- 2.3. For the TRO scoring methodology, to clarify when officers can score applications that have been received.
- 2.4. For the 5-year rule, to ensure that NEPP does not face funding new traffic regulation orders on recently adopted highway.

3. Alternative Options

- 3.1 The NEPP Joint Committee does not prioritise any proposals. The result of this will be that no new proposals from the list are advertised unless the NEPP Chairman delegation is used for specific proposals. The estimated costs of each proposal are shown in the report.
- 3.2 It should be noted that Partner Authorities may wish to fund individual schemes themselves if the JPC do not approve them, and this may include those that do not meet the current Traffic Regulation Order policy and scoring methodology. Externally funded Traffic Regulation Orders are not subject to the current NEPP Traffic Regulation Order Policy but the cost to deliver these would need to include any officer time associated with the delivery of the scheme. Examples of the use of this process can be seen in some of the schemes in Appendix D.
- 3.3 In relation to the scoring methodology wording, to leave the current wording unchanged. This would mean that all applications would need to be scored no matter what their merit or the level of support shown and would increase the workload for officers at both NEPP when scoring proposals and partner authority officers when schemes are prioritised locally. It may also make it more difficult for members to consider the merit of proposals that are not within their partner authority area.
- 3.4 In relation to the 5-year rule, for this not to be reintroduced. This would potentially leave NEPP open to additional costs if ECC/partner planning departments do not ensure that sufficient restrictions are in place on new builds and highway that is to be adopted.

4. List of applications by authority

- 4.1 The proposals that meet the NEPP scoring criteria are shown in Appendix A. These applications have been scored by a NEPP officer against the agreed criteria and so are consistent across the NEPP area. This officer score is shown along with a predicted cost to implement the scheme. It is not the purpose of new traffic regulation orders to generate income. Nonetheless, it is unlikely that any of the proposed schemes will generate an overall surplus for NEPP in the short term.
- 4.2 Proposals that have not met the scoring criteria are also shown in Appendix B, for full transparency.
- 4.3 Minimal details are provided in the table as Members of the committee are able to view all application and scheme information and to interrogate individual applications in any

area if they wish to do so through the NEPP Member SharePoint site. The client officers for the area where the application is concerned have been sent officer reports through the year on the proposed areas and it is assumed that these have been shared with the relevant councillors as part of the local prioritisation process.

- 4.4 The proposals relating to the Tendring District Council area are being deferred to be considered at a later meeting.
- 4.5 On this occasion the NEPP Chairman has requested that a proposal in the Colchester City area is considered for prioritisation by the NEPP Joint Committee. For clarity, this is being proposed by Essex County Council not Colchester City Council.

5. TRO work outside the JPC process

- 5.1 The technical team has also undertaken additional works outside of the JPC approval process. These works generate income for NEPP as well as allowing partner (or other) authorities to pay for additional traffic regulation order works. These are shown in Appendix D. In addition, the team also operates an H-bar introduction service and can introduce Essex Act (no stopping on mown verge) restrictions when requested if appropriate. These are chargeable services.

6. Change to wording of TRO Prioritisation Scoring Methodology

- 6.1 At the 23 March 2023 NEPP JPC a “TRO Scoring Methodology Report” was tabled. This report proposed a new TRO scoring methodology. One of the aims of this report was that “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”. The full report can be viewed on the Parking Partnership’s website at [NEPP-Joint-Committee-Agenda-16-March-2023.pdf](#). The report advises that the “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.”
- 6.2 Appendix A to the 2023 report shows the current TRO scoring methodology with the pre-scoring criteria which must be satisfied before officers score a proposal. Further guidance and an on-line application form is also available for applicants on the website.
- 6.3 When the report was presented to the JPC it was intended that a signed petition would be required before a proposal could be scored and examples are given in the Pre-scoring criteria “(e.g resident & business petition(s) available to evidence this)”.
- 6.4 Unfortunately, when the methodology was amended the wording used e.g. (exempli gratia) and not I.e. (Id. est.). During the course of the TRO scoring process leading to this meeting, attention has been drawn to the meaning of these abbreviations and that the current wording does not prevent an application that fails to include a signed petition from being scored.
- 6.5 To close the gap between the intention of the TRO scoring methodology and the current meaning of its wording, the JPC is asked to amend the wording of the TRO scoring methodology from the current wording to the following:

Scheme/restriction is supported by relevant parties affected Yes/No
(i.e, resident & business petition(s) available to evidence this. A petition must include handwritten not electronic signatures).

- 6.6 It should be noted that it is not the intention of the policy to prevent applications that do not meet the scoring criteria from being prioritised by the Joint Committee. It may be the case that partner authorities consider that there is a need for the application to be progressed even without evidence of support. This is shown on page 6 the current policy

“Schemes that do not meet all the criteria can still be progressed and considered by the Joint Committee, but schemes with a higher priority will take precedence. Any approval of a scheme will be subject to funding being available.”

7. Reintroduction of 5-Year rule

- 7.1 NEPP has previously operated a 5-year rule on new builds and other land that has been recently adopted by ECC. The 5-year rule was an agreement by the JPC that NEPP would not spend its own funds on new build areas or other recently adopted land for a period of 5 years starting with the adoption date. If external funding is available for any traffic regulation orders that are required NEPP would still be available to offer its services to undertake any works, as long as NEPP’s costs can be met.
- 7.2 The rule was originally introduced as it was felt that adequate restrictions should be part of either the planning agreements or criteria before land is adopted as highway. It was considered that it should not be the role of NEPP to backfill traffic regulation orders for areas where this could have been arranged by other authorities prior to the land being adopted or developed.
- 7.3 NEPP officers are currently building relationships with partner authorities planning departments to encourage relevant traffic regulation orders on new build sites to try to reduce the risk of parking or traffic flow issues after adoption.

8. Finance and risk management

- 8.1 In the current agreement there is a requirement within the Joint Committee Agreement that work to support the delivery of the Traffic Regulation Order function should come from the NEPP surplus fund.
- 8.2 As there are no current surplus funds to draw upon, this work would need to be funded within the 25/26 Financial Year and be budgeted alongside other elements of the NEPP operation, as has happened in the current Financial Year.
- 8.3 The estimated costs to introduce each proposal are shown for the scored proposals.

8. Standard References

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

10. Appendices

Appendix A: List of Proposed Scored Schemes

Appendix B: List of Unscored Schemes

Appendix C: List of Schemes advertised in 2024 by the JPC decision process

Appendix D: List of Schemes advertised in 2024 outside of the JPC decision process

Appendix A - List of Proposed Scored Schemes

Proposal Number	Authority Area	Name of proposal	Type of proposal	Reason for proposal	NEPP Office score max (score 105)	Approx. cost	Prov. decision
T24449387	Uttlesford	Rylestone Way/Thaxted Road	Waiting restrictions on junction	Safety issue caused by parking on a junction	45	£1230	Approve
T18605608	Braintree	Clifffield Shalford	Either waiting or stopping restrictions on the junction	Safety issue caused by parking on a junction	30	£1312	Approve
T197889210	Braintree	Fennes Road Bocking	Waiting restrictions	Parked vehicles causing traffic flow issues, narrowing of carriageway into a single lane and pedestrians being unable to use footway due to parked vehicles.	35	£1375	Approve
T23451049	Braintree	Stoneham Street Coggeshall	Reduction in operating times of waiting restriction	The market that is in place finishes several hours prior to the restriction ending. Altering the restriction times would create additional on-street parking places.	5	£1190	Approve but request 25% payment from Coggeshall PC
T17416315	Braintree	Tilkey Road, Coggeshall	Waiting restrictions on a new junction	Safety issues caused by parking on the junction	20	£1250	Reject

T20546989	Colchester	Anchor Road, Tiptree (Both ends of Anchor Road only)	Waiting restrictions	Safety issues caused by parking on the junctions	40	£1130	Approve
T18395068	Colchester	California Drive and Eastwood Close, Colchester	Waiting restrictions to junctions and extension of current measures	Safety issues caused by parking on the junction	25	£1870	Approve
T16561273	Colchester	Cannock Mill Rise/Old Heath Road, Colchester	Waiting restrictions near to access to Cannock Mill Rise development	Inconsiderate parking near entrance causing safety issues	25	£1260	Approve
T184849610	Colchester	Holt Drive, Colchester	Red Lines	Maintaining sight lines near a school and allowing clear areas where pedestrians can cross the carriageway	40	£1560	Approve
T14410108	Colchester	Knevet Close and Wallace Road, Colchester	Extend current waiting restrictions	Improved sight lines.	30	£1264	Approve
T196725210	Epping Forest	Beatrice Court, Buckhurst Hill	Permit Parking Zone	Commuter parking causing inconvenience to residents	35	£1500	Approve
T214996011	Epping Forest	Great Lawn, Ongar	Stopping restrictions in turning circle and to prevent parking on grass verge	Parking causing inconvenience and access/egress issues for residents	35	£1690	Approve
T19512384	Epping Forest	Langston Road, Loughton	Upgrade current waiting restrictions	Junction protection	30	£8730	Defer

			to red lines to improve enforcement.				
T18534019	Epping Forest	Princes Road, Buckhurst Hill	Upgrade current waiting restrictions to no loading or red lines to improve enforcement efficiency	Vehicles parking on double yellow lines which narrows road. Drivers moving vehicles during observation period and then reparking when CEO has left the vicinity	35	£1405	Approve
T26762019	Epping Forest	River Road, Buckhurst Hill	Replace yellow lines with red lines on south side of carriageway	Maintain traffic flow as parked vehicles in effect turn the road into a single carriageway	35	£1395	Approve
T9630783	Epping Forest	Riverside Avenue, Nazeing	Double yellow lines on junction of Old Nazeing Road and Riverside Avenue	Parked vehicles causing inconvenience to residents and sight line issues	30	£1262	Approve
T20617952 Previously Deferred	Epping Forest	Brooker Road, Waltham Abbey	Red lines	To prevent parking on bends at an industrial estate	30	£1250	Approve
T23492869 Previously Deferred	Epping Forest	Langston Road, Loughton	Red lines	Vehicles parking on pavement causing business issues. Current waiting restrictions are ineffective	35	£1965	Reject as superseded by T19512384
T24342858 Previously Deferred	Epping Forest	Pyles Green, Loughton	Permit parking	Priority parking for residents due to inconvenience caused by non-residential based parking	45	£1515	Approve – externally funded

T14232804	Epping Forest	Sedge Green and Dodds Weir Road, Nazeing	Red lines	To prevent parking on the verge at the junction of the two roads	30	£1530	Defer
T19410579	Harlow	Ram Gorse and Hoding Road	Permit parking	To provide priority parking for residents.	60	£1676	Approve
T19410579ii	Harlow	Old Road	Permit parking and waiting restrictions	Non-residential parking associated with river use and nearby businesses causing inconvenience to residents	35	£1825	Approve
T144298210	ECC	Oaklands Avenue & Dugard Avenue	Red lines on junction	Parking near to junction causing sight line problems and back log of vehicles	10*	£1450	Approve
T14432659	ECC	Oaklands Avenue & President Road	Red lines on junction	Parking near to junction causing sight line problems and back log of vehicles	10*	£1450	Approve

* - handwritten signed residents petition not provided with applications

Appendix B – List of applications received that do not meeting the scoring criteria

Proposal Number	Authority Area	Name of proposal	Type of proposal	Reason for proposal	NEPP Officer score max (score 105)	Approx . cost	Prov. decision
T17551226	Uttlesford	Church Hill, Radwinter	Waiting restrictions	To Prevent parking near residential driveways	N/A	N/A	
T17483684	Uttlesford	East Street, Saffron Walden	Inclusion of additional property into resident permit scheme	Moving to property not in scheme catchment area	N/A	N/A	
T23369357	Uttlesford	George Street, Saffron Walden	Upgrade single yellow line to double yellow lines	To prevent vehicles parking to aim emergency vehicle access	N/A	N/A	
T17727018	Uttlesford	Harvey Way, Saffron Walden	Resident permit parking	Priority parking for residents	N/A	N/A	
T23731565	Uttlesford	High Street & Margaret Way	Conversion of bays in Margaret Way to resident permit parking for High Street properties	Priority parking for residents	N/A	N/A	
T16636997	Braintree	Broton Drive, Halstead	No waiting restriction removal	Waiting restrictions on dropped kerb	N/A	N/A	
T12754078	Braintree	Conrad Hill, Witham	Waiting restrictions	Improve the safety of pedestrians crossing the carriageway	N/A	N/A	

T18598976	Braintree	Kestrel Rise, Halstead	Waiting restrictions in Hammerhead	Allow large vehicles to turn	N/A	N/A	
T18497169	Braintree	Mansion Garden Close, Braintree (private road)	Waiting restrictions	Prevent parking near junction	N/A	N/A	
T205254011	Braintree	Russell Close/Baker Way, Witham	Various restrictions suggested	Obstructive parking and bins not being collected	N/A	N/A	
T18457693	Braintree	Tilkey Road, Coggeshall	Red lines	Create passing spaces	N/A	N/A	
T25631687	Braintree	Water Lane, Bures	Waiting restrictions	To prevent parking on the corner of Water Lane and Station Road – Farm machinery and large vehicles having difficulty.	N/A	N/A	
T15495417	Colchester	Crome Close & Cotman Road	Red lines on junction	Parking associated with new cafe	N/A	N/A	
T14443084	Colchester	Ambrose Avenue & The Commons	Red lines on junction	Parking near to junction causing sight line problems	N/A	N/A	
T13430731	Colchester	Cotman Road and Prettygate Road	Red lines on junction	Parking associated with new cafe	N/A	N/A	
T15499384	Colchester	Cotman Road & Van Dyck Road	Red lines on junction	Parking associated with new cafe	N/A	N/A	
T14782369	Colchester	Exeter Drive & Lincoln Way	Alter single yellow line to resident	Additional parking spaces for residents	N/A	N/A	

			permit parking				
T15504743	Colchester	Gainsborough Road & Landseer Road	Red lines at junction	Improved sight lines	N/A	N/A	
T15514524	Colchester	Landseer Road	Double red lines in turning bay at end of Landseer Road	To prevent parking and so allow vehicles to turn around.	N/A	N/A	
T20692327	Colchester	Mill Road	Double yellow lines on Mill Road between Severalls lane round about and Brinkley road roundabout	Improved sight lines and traffic flow	N/A	N/A	
T15492393	Colchester	Munnings & Cotman Road	Red lines on junction	Parking near to junction causing sight line problems	N/A	N/A	
T15368729	Colchester	Paget Road-Rowhedge	Waiting restrictions	Parked vehicles preventing elderly residents leaving their homes	N/A	N/A	
T20430485	Colchester	Plume Avenue	Upgrade yellow lines to red lines	Parking on yellow lines for nearby shops	N/A	N/A	
T15511605	Colchester	Rembrandt Way & Landseer Road	Red lines on junction	Parking near to junction causing sight line problems	N/A	N/A	
T15508147	Colchester	Reynolds Avenue & Landseer Road	Red lines on junction	Parking near to junction causing sight line problems	N/A	N/A	
T24786645	Colchester	St Peters Road & Victory Road, West Mersea	Waiting restrictions on junction	Parking near to junction causing sight line problems	N/A	N/A	

T14436966	Colchester	Straight Road & Oaklands Avenue	Red lines on junction	Parking near to junction causing sight line problems	N/A	N/A	
T13434505	Colchester	The Commons and Prettygate Road adjacent to the Co-op	Red lines on junction adjacent to the Co-op and the disabled badge holder bays	To improve sight lines	N/A	N/A	
T15322223	Colchester	Thornwood	Controlled parking zone	To prevent parking associated with the hospital	N/A	N/A	
T13415104	Colchester	Van Dyck Road and Gainsborough Road	Red lines	To improve sight lines near the junction	N/A	N/A	
T15481391	Colchester	Van Dyck Road and The Commons	Red lines	To improve sight lines near the junction	N/A	N/A	
T15523192	Harlow	Brooklane Field	Waiting restrictions in turning circle	To allow vehicles to turn and prevent reversing down road	N/A	N/A	
T15748739	Harlow	Rivermill	Parking bays allocated to eight properties in Rivermill	Priority parking for residents	N/A	N/A	
T23558635	Harlow	South Road	Waiting restrictions outside factory gates	To prevent parking outside the factory gates which causes issues for large vehicles entering and exiting.	N/A	N/A	
T19168054	Epping Forest	Albert Road,	Waiting restrictions	Parked vehicles	N/A	N/A	

		Buckhurst Hill		causing pedestrians to walk in the road			
T18640536	Epping Forest	Chapel Road, Theydon Bois	Waiting restrictions	Parked vehicles are causing vehicles to swerve and bad driver behaviour	N/A	N/A	
T14458354	Epping Forest	Coppice Road, Theydon Bois	Waiting restrictions	To improve traffic flow and prevent traffic build up	N/A	N/A	
T23428751	Epping Forest	Rowans Way, Loughton	Extend waiting restrictions	Traffic flow improvements and parked vehicles causing pedestrians to walk in the carriageway	N/A	N/A	
T13427746	Epping Forest	The Broadway - Eversley Close & Torrington Drive	Waiting restrictions	Sight lines, obstruction of driveways and pavements	N/A	N/A	
T21743248	Epping Forest	Victoria Road, Waltham Abbey	Permit holder parking	Priority parking for residents	N/A	N/A	

Applications that do not have the necessary support to be scored by officers are deleted from NEPP records after 12 months.

Appendix C - List of JPC Schemes Advertised in 2024

For committee member information, below is a list of the proposals advertised to date in 2024 and the status of the scheme.

Reference number	Authority area	Name of Scheme	Type of Restriction	Current Work Status
T19403786	Uttlesford	Church Street/Lime Hill, Great Dunmow	Red lines	Operational
T23850138	Uttlesford	The Pastures, Takeley	Red and yellow lines	Operational
T11992100	Braintree	Bocking End, Braintree	Bay use altered from limited waiting to resident permits	Operational
T17622067	Colchester	Brunel Way	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T14427861	Colchester	Melrose Road, West Mersea	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T11569173	Colchester	Parr Drive, Colchester	Red lines	Operational
T16621307	Colchester	Westwood Drive, West Mersea	Permit Parking	Operational
T38914791	Colchester	Stanford Road and Cowper Crescent	Red lines	Operational
T19289487	Tendring	Vicarage Lane, Walton on the Naze	Permit bay removal	Operational
T13720652	Tendring	Golf Green Road, Jaywick	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T20393424	Tendring	Brindley Road, Clacton on Sea	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T20412902	Tendring	Louise Close, Walton on the Naze	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T20381792	Tendring	Old Road and Cotswold Road, Clacton	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T15395038	Tendring	Collingwood Road, Clacton on Sea	Resident permit parking	Not installed after consideration of objections
T18448456	Epping Forest	Cloverly Road, Ongar	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T13293549	Epping Forest	Forest Avenue and High Road Chigwell	Red lines	Operational
T15499454	Epping Forest	The Summit, Loughton	Red lines	Operational
T114626310	Epping Forest	Upland Road/Thornton Common	Red lines	Operational

T22351807	Epping Forest	Station Road, Chigwell	Permit parking	Not installed after consideration of objections
T19330519	Epping Forest	Station Road, Loughton	Alter yellow lines to red lines and limited waiting to paid parking	Operational
T19505427	Epping Forest	Devon Close, Buckhurst Hill	Permit parking	Operational
T10433259	Epping Forest	Town Mead, Waltham Abbey	Permit parking	Operational
T14348214	Epping Forest	Tycehurst Hill, Loughton	Permit parking and paid parking bays	Operational
T15444049	Harlow	Peldon Road	Overnight weight restriction	Operational
T154279310	Harlow	Tawneys Road	Red lines	Operational
T24640523	Harlow	South Road	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T154279310	Harlow	Pinewood Close	Permit parking	Operational

Appendix D - List of Non-JPC Schemes advertised in 2024

For committee member information, below is a list of the proposals that are outside of the usual JPC process that were advertised in 2024 along with the status of the scheme. These are schemes that are designed to be self-financing and so are at no overall cost to NEPP or are not paid for using NEPP funds, for example, funded by ECC or Town/Parish Councils.

Authority Area	Name of scheme	Type of restriction	Current Work Status
Braintree	Trinity Street, Halstead	Waiting restriction	To be installed
Braintree	East Street, Coggeshall	Permit parking	Operational
Braintree	Colchester Road, Halstead	Waiting restrictions	Operational
Colchester	Crouch Street, Vineyard Street and Osborne Street	Bus stop/stand/loading and taxi rank changes	To be installed
Colchester	Simons Lane/Magdalen Green	Waiting restrictions	Operational
Colchester	Mascot Square, Colchester (TTRO)	Waiting restrictions	Operational
Tendring	Ipswich Road, Ardleigh	Red lines	Operational
Tendring	Bemerton Gardens, Kirby Cross	Waiting restrictions	Operational
Tendring	Orwell Road	Waiting and Loading restrictions	To be introduced
Epping Forest	Roebuck Lane, Buckhurst Hill	Red lines	Operational
Epping Forest	Homefield Close, Epping	Permit parking	Operational
Epping Forest	The Drummonds	Permit parking	Operational
Epping Forest	Manor Square, Ongar	Waiting restrictions	Operational
Epping Forest	High Street, Epping	Alter Police parking bay to limited waiting bay	Operational



North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 23 January 2025
Title: On-Street Paid Parking Update
Author: Trevor Degville
Presented by: Trevor Degville

- To provide an update on the paid parking proposals that have previously been approved by the Joint Parking Committee.
- To consider whether proposals in the Braintree District should be advertised

1. Recommended Decision(s)

- 1.1 The Joint Committee is requested to note the status of the paid parking sites that have been approved at previous meetings.
- 1.2 The Joint Committee is asked to agree to formally advertise proposed changes to the three locations in the Braintree District. (Explained further in point 5.5)

2. Reasons for Report

- 2.1 To provide an update on the implementation progress of the paid parking sites that have previously been agreed by the committee.
- 2.2 To allow officers to draft proposals for sites in the Braintree District or to discontinue informal discussions with stakeholders.

3. Background

- 3.1 The reasons for the introduction of additional on-street paid parking sites were the subject of reports and discussion at the February, March and July 2024 Joint Parking Committee meetings. The reports and minutes can be found on the Parking Partnerships website at [Joint Committee - North Essex Parking Partnership](#).
- 3.2 Limited waiting restrictions are more difficult to enforce due to the additional patrols that are required to reasonably assume that a contravention has taken place, as the vehicle must be visited at least twice. These visits are often several hours apart, which ties scarce Civil Enforcement Officer resource into one area when those officers may be more efficiently deployed elsewhere. On-street ticketed parking is therefore a more effective way of patrolling and enforcing limited waiting restrictions.
- 3.3 Other efficiency changes could be a reduction in the amount of enforcement of the limited waiting bays in those areas to its minimum and focusing on higher priority (from a traffic flow and safety viewpoint) or removing the limited waiting restrictions and allowing unrestricted parking in those areas.

- 3.4 At the July 2024 Joint Parking Committee meeting it was decided that the proposed sites in Epping Forest and Colchester areas would be formally advertised, following a previous enhanced informal consultation.
- 3.5 The formal advertising for both areas took place in late August and September. In view of the nature of the proposals, relatively few objections or comments were received. The objections were considered and no reasons to prevent the proposals going ahead were found, although changes to two of the sites in the Colchester area were made to accommodate opinions made in some objections relating to school opening and closing times.
- 3.6 Copies of the objections can be found in Appendix A, which can be viewed via the member access SharePoint Site only. The number of objections by site are shown in Appendix B, although it should be remembered that when considering objections, it is the strength of argument against the proposals that should be considered rather than simply the number of objections that are made.
- 3.7 The traffic regulation orders for the paid parking sites advertised in August/September in Epping Forest and Colchester City became operational on Monday 18th November. For information, data from paid parking sites that were introduced in 2024 can be seen in Appendix C. The data provided is to the end of December 2024. The Station Road and Tycehurst Hill paid parking sites were introduced earlier in 2024 as part of wider proposals for those two areas.

4. Additional Sites – Harlow District

- 4.1 The committee will be aware that it was previously decided to consider some locations for paid parking in the Harlow and Braintree districts.
- 4.2 After further investigation and discussions it has been decided not to pursue the sites within the Harlow District. These sites are already being considered for alternative restrictions as part of other changes within Harlow, such as Sustainable Transport Corridor schemes and town improvements. In view of this it would not be appropriate to alter the sites to paid parking at this time.

5. Additional Sites – Braintree District

- 5.1 Investigation of the three potential paid sites in the Braintree District has continued. NEPP officers have sought views from various stakeholders in the areas to judge if amended proposals can be taken forward for further consideration or if other actions are required to ensure that the efficiencies NEPP is seeking can be accomplished.
- 5.2 Matching the procedure that was used prior to the advertising of paid parking proposals in Epping Forest and Colchester areas, NEPP officers have first approached relevant ECC councillors before approaching district councillors for the wards before finally contacting town councils for Witham and Halstead. NEPP officers have also held meetings with Braintree District Council officers to update them on the proposals.
- 5.3 At the time of writing, no specific objections have been received by NEPP officers from County or District members during the informal consultation (this excludes the call-in to the NEPP decision that was made by some ECC councillors after the initial paid parking

decision at the February 2024 Joint Committee meeting). Although e-mails have been sent to provide further information about the proposals following clarification requests.

- 5.4 NEPP officers have attempted to come to agreement with both Witham and Halstead Town Councils prior to proposals being advertised. However, despite the changes that have been offered following comments from both councils, we have been unable to gain their support. Whilst the views of both councils are noted, their opposition does not mean that NEPP should not proceed to advertise the proposals.
- 5.5 If proposals are advertised this does not necessarily mean that they will become sealed traffic regulation orders. Advertising proposals starts the formal legal process where there is an objection period where formal objections can be made. Any objections would need to be considered and can lead to changes to the proposals being made or the withdrawal of the proposals. Objections to the paid parking proposals in Colchester led to changes being made before new restrictions were introduced. In 2024 proposed schemes were withdrawn in both the Tendring and Epping Forest areas after consideration of the objections that were received when the proposals were formally advertised.
- 5.6 Copies of correspondences between NEPP and both Halstead and Witham Town Councils are included in appendices D and E to this report. These can be accessed via the Member SharePoint site.

6.0 **Bocking End, Braintree**

No specific objections received about this site.

7.0 **Newland Drive, Witham**

- 7.1 On 22nd March NEPP received a petition from Witham Town Council against paid parking proposals on Newland Drive. The Town Council also announced on their website that they were "writing to the Braintree District Council Financial Scrutiny Panel querying their agreement with the North Essex Parking Partnership". Whilst officers noted the contents of the petition, just introducing paid parking was not an option that was still being considered when the petition was received.
- 7.2 On 6th November NEPP officers wrote to Witham Town Council with initial proposals. These showed the limited waiting bays being altered to ticketed parking. The first hour being free of charge, with customers able to pay for a second hour parking if they wished to stay for longer. Parking stays being offered by the MiPermit system.
- 7.3 This proposal was discussed at Witham Town Council's planning committee. The response sent to NEPP was the below:

Members discussed the proposed changes and noted that of NEPP's priority areas, the fourth was not to adversely affect trade ("improving access to services and the economic vitality and vibrancy of town centres and high streets.") and yet it appeared that NEPP had done no work to prove that the proposal would meet this key policy and therefore justify the change. On the contrary Members felt strongly that the proposal would be detrimental to local business at a time when the High Street was struggling and it would prevent many residents from making brief trips to the town which many businesses relied on. Members further considered that they were being forced into agreeing to the changes by the threat of withdrawing parking enforcement on Newland Street, which was the organisation's core responsibility. Concern

was also raised about the elderly, an important customer base for the town, who do not have smart-phones and many that do, would struggle to understand the MiPermit app.

RESOLVED to strongly object to the proposed changes.

7.4 On 19th November NEPP officers replied to Witham Town Council. In this correspondence NEPP Officers offered to amend the proposal by the installation of a payment machine. It was hoped that this concession would allay councillors concerns for those motorists who are unable to, or experience difficulties in using, the applicable payment app.

7.5 The response received by NEPP is shown below:

An email was received from the North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP) regarding its proposals to introduce payment parking in Newland Street. Members were informed that the Partnership had suggested the installation of a parking machine for those unable to use an app.

The email was discussed at length and Members agreed that the app was not inclusive. An email was read out from a resident who did not have a smart phone and did not know what an app was. Members considered the installation of one machine on a half mile stretch of road to be expensive to implement and ill thought out. Questions were raised about asking residents to walk up to half a mile to get a ticket, especially as the road is on a slight hill and it was thought some residents would have reservations about using a credit card if no payment was to be taken and would be put off if they only intended to stop for few minutes anyway. Members unanimously agreed that obtaining a ticket, even if it was free, would be a disincentive to use the High Street and would be another nail in the coffin of a small town whose shops were already struggling. Witham's shops were trying to compete with on-line retail and out-of-town stores and it was agreed that they did not need any additional hinderance. Furthermore, Members considered that the proposal still went against one of NEPP's core principles which was not to adversely affect trade and no evidence had been provided to show that local businesses had been consulted on the proposals. Members were keen to hear what the Scrutiny Panel at Braintree District Council would decide when considering the district's future with NEPP.

Members felt very strongly that there was a need to make Witham more attractive to potential shoppers and that ticketing and charging would be a disincentive to stopping in the town and lead to the local economy dying.

RESOLVED That Witham Town Council would strongly reject the proposal and demand the status quo was retained with 1 hour free parking without a ticket with no return within 3 hours.

7.6 In view of the wording of the resolution, NEPP officers have acknowledged the latest e-mail and advised that the matter will be considered by the NEPP Joint Committee.

7.7 It is noted that the Town Council demand that the status quo is maintained. However, Witham Town Council are not the authority that is funding the costs of patrolling the current limited waiting regulations and the inefficiencies this brings.

7.8 There is no such thing as free parking, even when parking is free at the point of use, there are still costs involved. The costs associated with the overall running of NEPP are likely to increase in the next few years, but the penalty charge for contravention of restrictions has

not risen since the introduction of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and there is no indication that any change in charges is likely to happen in the foreseeable future. If NEPP is to operate in a sustainable way there is a need to look at efficiencies throughout NEPP and this includes the way Civil Enforcement Officers patrol restrictions, particularly ones that are of a lower priority.

- 7.9 Witham Town Council have raised a petition and there have been various media reports about their objections to paid parking. To counteract these concerns NEPP have offered to maintain the current free of charge period and allow motorists to extend their stay by paying if needed. Once Witham Town Council were advised of this they advised NEPP that they objected to the use of MiPermit only, although this payment system is widely used throughout the district for resident permits and in Braintree District Council's car parks. Nonetheless, NEPP have offered to install a machine to allow motorists to obtain a ticket if they did not want to use the MiPermit system. These match the way customers can pay in the nearby Newland Drive car park which is operated by Braintree District Council.
- 7.10 The Town Council has now suggested further reasons why they object to changes that differ from their original objections. They have suggested that one machine would not be enough, which is something that can be considered and further machines can be installed if that was felt necessary. The Town Council has suggested that motorists would be put off attending the High Street if they had to obtain a ticket. It is unclear what evidence, if any, the Town Council has to make this assertion but obtaining a ticket does not seem to prevent motorists using the nearby Braintree District Council car parks or other parking spaces across NEPP.
- 7.11 The problems for local businesses that have been raised by Witham Town Council are not unique to Witham but are faced by businesses of all sizes across the NEPP area. NEPP does not look to negatively affect trade with this proposal but to improve efficiencies. In the latest version of the proposal motorists are still offered the same amount of free of charge parking that they currently receive, with the further option of staying for longer by purchasing additional parking rather than having to return and move their vehicles. It may be suggested that this improves the parking offer to potential customers of the nearby businesses as any motorists nearing the end of a free hour stay would not need to return to their vehicle but could instead extend their stay allowing them more time in Witham without needing to move their vehicle.
- 7.12 NEPP has not contacted businesses separately yet as this is something that would happen during the formal consultation process, as it has been in other areas where paid parking has been introduced. There is also the option of working with the businesses by using the MiPermit system to offer incentives for motorists to park and use local businesses as was previously attempted in Colchester with the piloted MiPermit discounts scheme.

8.0 High Street/The Centre Halstead

- 8.1 NEPP officers have been involved in similar negotiations with Halstead Town Council regarding proposals to alter the current limited waiting on High Street and The Centre to ticketed parking.
- 8.2 The initial NEPP proposal that was sent to Halstead Town Council suggested 1 hour free of charge parking with a second paid parking hour being available if required. A reply was

received from the Town Council on 12th November. The main objections to the initial proposal were:

- the present arrangement of one hour of free parking suits the town well.
 - If people want to park for longer they can use the car parks.
 - If people wanted a free short stay under the system they propose, it's unlikely that they could be bothered to use MiPermit, the retailers would lose trade and the spaces would remain empty.
 - As Halstead Town Council owns and manages 4 off-street car parks in the town, and it may be too costly for NEPP to continue to monitor the High Street on-street parking areas, it makes sense for us to manage the High Street parking in future
- 8.3 The Town Council have suggested that they would like the opportunity to take over monitoring of the High Street restrictions rather than NEPP. It is unclear from where Halstead Town Council is seeking its guidance but there is a clear difference in the way that Halstead Town Council should be enforcing its car parks (using criminal law) and the way that on-street decriminalised parking enforcement must take place (using decriminalised parking laws). NEPP has IAAs with various Town/Parish Councils, including Coggeshall and Hatfield Peverel in the Braintree District, but these relate to off-street parking. Halstead Town Council cannot legally take over the on-street enforcement of the limited waiting restrictions in Halstead, as is explained in the Outside Agency Support Report which is also tabled at this meeting. NEPP officers have advised Halstead Town Council of this, but it continues to be suggested by the Town Council in their correspondences to NEPP.
- 8.4 On 19th November NEPP officers wrote to Halstead Town Council to advise that we would also install a parking machine to allay concerns about motorists who are unable or unwilling to use the MiPermit system and asked that this was considered by the Town Council.
- 8.5 NEPP received further correspondence from Halstead Town Council (HTC) on 12th December. In this the Town Council advised that:
- *HTC continues to reject proposals put forward by NEPP to start charging for parking on the High Street.*
 - *HTC is keen to take over the monitoring of the parking on the High Street.*
 - *HTC agrees to update its Parking Order to allow it to monitor the on-street parking in the High Street*
- 8.6 The latest response from the Town Council has been acknowledged and the Town Council has been advised that their views will be included in a report to the JPC, although no specific reasons for the Town Council's continued objections have been received by NEPP. NEPP officers have also again informed the Town Council that HTC cannot legally take over enforcement of the High Street.
- 8.7 The Halstead Town Council Off-Street Order is uniquely worded, and whilst the Town Council may well wish to clarify aspects of their current Order, it is not possible to add the Halstead on-street restrictions into the Town Council's off-street Order. This is not something that is possible under the current local government arrangements in most of Essex, outside of the unitary authorities.

8.8 If NEPP were to introduce free of charge ticket parking with the opportunity to purchase an additional hour, NEPP would be offering motorists more choice about where they can park. Halstead Town Council also offers parking places and charges in some of its car parks. Halstead Town Council currently charges between 8am and 3pm Monday to Saturday in its Butler Road and Chapel Street car parks. The published tariffs are shown below. The payment options available to customers in the two car parks include the MiPermit system and using the manufacturers pay and display machines as are widely used across the NEPP area.

Time	Charge
Up to 90 minutes	£1.00
Up to 3 hours	£2.00
Up to 6 hours	£3.00
Over 6 hours	£5.00

8.9 In April 2022, Halstead Town Council increased its tariffs in its car parks. The press release from the Town Council explained that “Increased costs have, however, led to the need to reluctantly increase car park charges for the first time in three years”. NEPP has also faced increased costs for many reasons as has been explained to the Joint Committee in reports since the 22/23 financial year, which is why we are now looking to modernise the way certain restrictions are patrolled.

9 Standard References

9.1 There are no particular references to the Development Plan; publicity or consultation considerations; community safety; health and safety implications.

10 Equality

10.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out and will be published on the Colchester City Council website.

11 Appendices

Appendix A – Copies of objections and other comments received during paid parking proposal advertising in Colchester and Epping Forest for the November 2024 site introductions (accessed via the Member Sharepoint site only)

Appendix B – Number of objections received by location

Site for Consideration	Local Authority Area	Traffic Regulation Order	No. of Objections
Traps Hill, Loughton	Epping Forest	Paid parking max stay 4 hours	4
Hartland Road and Kendal Road, Epping	Epping Forest	Dual use permit holders and paid parking	8
Middleborough, Colchester	Colchester City	Paid parking	1
Clarendon Way, Colchester	Colchester City	Resident permit and paid parking	2
Oxford Road, Colchester	Colchester City	Resident permit and paid parking	11
St Johns Green, Colchester	Colchester City	Resident permit and paid parking	10
General Objections to Colchester proposals	Colchester City	Objections not specific to one site	9

Appendix C: - Information about paid parking sites introduced in 2024 up to 1st Jan 2025. The Station Road and Tycehurst Hill locations became operational on 5th August 2024, the remaining sites became operational on 18th November 2024. These sites are all MiPermit only payment sites.

Operational hours	Tariffs	Number of bookings	Total Income (£)	Average Stay Value (£)
Station Road Loughton				
09.30 – 17.30 Mon to Sat	1 hour - £1.20 2 hours - £2.20	13648	20464.40	1.50
Tycehurst Hill				
07.00 – 16.00 Mon - Fri	Up to 2 hours - £1.80 Up to 4pm - £3.20	105	295.00	2.81
Clarendon Way Colchester				
08.00 – 20.00 Mon - Sat	Up to 1 hour - £2.30 Up to 2 hours - £3.40 Up to 3 hours - £4.20 Up to 4 hours - £4.40 Up to 6pm - £8.50	187	832.40	4.45
Hartland Road Epping				
All hours Mon - Sat	Up to 1 hour - £1.00 Up to 2 hours – £2.00	1406	2167.00	1.54
Kendal Avenue Epping				
All hours Mon - Sat	Up to 1 hour - £1.00 Up to 2 hours – £2.00	743	1106.90	1.49
Middleborough Colchester				
08.00 – 18.00 Mon - Sat	Up to 1 hour - £2.30 Up to 2 hours - £3.40	241	832.40	2.77
Oxford Road Colchester				
Various Mon - Sat	Up to 1 hour - £2.30 Up to 2 hours - £3.40	170	472.20	2.78
Traps Hill Loughton				
09.30 – 17.00 Mon - Sat	Up to 1 hour - £1.00 Up to 2 hours - £2.00	691	834.90	1.21
St Johns Green Colchester				
Various Mon - Sat	Up to 1 hour - £2.30 Up to 2 hours - £3.40	528	1488.10	2.82
Total		17719	28330.33	

Appendix D Correspondences between NEPP and Witham Town Council (accessed via the Member SharePoint site only)

Appendix E Correspondences between NEPP and Halstead Town Council (accessed via the Member SharePoint site only)



North Essex Parking Partnership

Joint Parking Committee

Meeting Date:	January 2025
Title:	Outside Agency Support Report
Author:	Richard Walker, Head of Parking
Presented by:	Richard Walker, Jake England

This report updates the Committee on a longstanding delegation and invites members to decide if any changes are needed, and to re-state the current delegation around Outside Agency Support into the North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP).

1. Recommended Decision(s)

- 1.1. To decide that delegation made for appointing Outside Agency CEOs as previously should continue.
- 1.2. To note the prerequisites for Outside Agency Support.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)

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

3. Background

- 3.1. Outside Agencies might constitute workers from other Local Authorities who are already trained or other Agency Workers.
- 3.2. If a Council had Officers trained as Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) who are available to assist outside hours and, on occasion, between other tasks, then they may be able to assist.
- 3.3. Under Statutory Guidance, Parking Contraventions can only be progressed by officers who have been appointed as a CEO, are trained to the appropriate standard for Civil Parking Enforcement and identifiable as working in parking enforcement for the authority.

4. Prerequisites

- 4.1. NEPP would appoint as CEOs for on-street enforcement which would undertake the work against the existing policy (including having received the relevant training and systems) and assign only parking enforcement duties to the roles when this work is being undertaken.
- 4.2. Officers must be identifiable in the same way as NEPP CEOs including a badge number.
- 4.3. The Parking Partnerships are operated by a lead authority to whom the parking enforcement function is delegated, via the Joint Committee. It is defined beat areas and out of hours duties which are being considered, so that the enforcement provided can be in addition to, and supplement, the existing usual NEPP patrols.

- 4.4. All follow-up work has to remain within the NEPP system in order to be compliant with Parking Appeal, Adjudication and Traffic Enforcement Centre requirements.
- 4.5. A scheme based on the amount of work completed, regardless of the outcome of PCNs (thus not being an incentive scheme as required by Guidance), is proposed in order to judge success and for the purpose of road safety, tackling congestion and providing access to local properties.
- 4.6. Resources will need to be provided by the Outside Agency to cover the hardware needs for the officers (equipment by the Authorities providing the officers and systems amendments and enforcement follow up as required by NEPP).
- 4.7. The income from, and any work to follow up, Penalty Charge Notices will pass to NEPP.
- 4.8. It is noted that parking enforcement powers cannot pass to third-tier authorities.

5. Delegation

- 5.1. To restate the delegation, that is:
 - To delegate powers to the Head of Parking in order to appoint Civil Enforcement Officers from other Authorities to act on behalf of NEPP, with any powers necessary to act on NEPP's behalf in this role.

6. Local Government Reform

- 6.1. It may be that Local Government Reform (LGR) – where such an agreement is no longer necessary under a Unitary Authority setting – overtakes the timescale for introducing such a mechanism where outside agencies could help; but it is felt useful to restate the delegation in the event that LGR does not progress swiftly.

7. Standard References

- 7.1. 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
- 7.2. An Equality Impact Assessment for the operations is set out at this link: [EQIA Link](#)



North Essex Parking Partnership

Joint Parking Committee

Meeting Date:	November 2024
Title:	Agreement Wording Amendments Report
Author:	Richard Walker, Head of Parking
Presented by:	Richard Walker, Owen Howell

This report sets out the direction recommended for considering proposed alterations to the Operating Agreement.

1. Recommended Decision(s)

- 1.1. It is recommended that the JPC resolves to delegate, to be considered by a working group of the Client Officers in the partnership authorities, the details of suggested amendments to the NEPP Agreement.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)

- 2.1. To enable discussions to take place within the partnership authorities allowing the partners to identify a final form of wording.
- 2.2. To enable a substantive report to a future JPC, recommending a final set of suggestions that are agreeable to all partners, for each partner to then consider approving formally through their executive arrangements.

3. Background

- 3.1. Some wording updates have been suggested by partner authorities to the Joint Committee Agreement.
- 3.2. All of the Partners need to agree a form of words to recommend which is agreeable to all and to the County Council.
- 3.3. To facilitate this, a working group is proposed.

4. Timeline and Process

- 4.1. The recommended decision is that a group be formed to discuss the proposals presented on a form of words to be presented in order to prompt a decision to change the Agreement.
- 4.2. Agreement would first be needed amongst all Joint Parking Committee Members on the actual form of words for the changes proposed – or otherwise make different suggestions for amendments which could be agreed upon – that would be acceptable to all of the Partners.

- 4.3. Those amendments would need to be taken through the governance processes of each Partner Authority (i.e. at Cabinet level) in parallel, to gain local agreement for any amendments to be presented to Essex County Council.
- 4.4. Those amendments could be presented to the County Council by the Joint Parking Committee Partners.
- 4.5. The County Council would need to agree to carry out whatever legal process was deemed necessary in order to present the changes for agreement under the County Council Governance Process.
- 4.6. The County Council would then need to agree, by decision, to amend the Agreement.
- 4.7. This timeline might take up to two years.

5. Local Government Reform

- 5.1. It may be that Local Government Reform (LGR) – where any Agreement, or even a Joint Committee, may be no longer necessary under a Unitary Authority setting – overtakes the timescale for introducing such a change; but it is felt useful to set out the process in the event that LGR does not progress swiftly.

6. Standard References

- 6.1. 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
- 6.2. An Equality Impact Assessment for the operations is set out at this link: [EQIA Link](#)



North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 23 January 2025
Title: **Forward Plan 2024-2025**
Author: Owen Howell – Democratic Services, Colchester City Council
Presented by: Owen Howell – Democratic Services, Colchester City Council

This report concerns the 2024-25 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 2024-25.
- 1.2 To approve the suggested dates for Joint Committee meetings in 2025-2026

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. Additional items can be added at the Joint Committee's request, and when issues which arise during the year require consideration by the Joint Committee.
- 3.2 It is suggested that the meeting dates for the Joint Committee to meet in 2025-2026 be set as follows:
 - 19 June 2025 Annual Meeting (date already approved by Joint Committee)
 - 13 November 2025
 - 22 January 2025
 - 19 March 2025
 - 18 June 2025 Annual Meeting
- 3.3 Please note that the above dates (with the exception of the first one) are suggested dates only. Members may wish to consult with Client Officers as to whether alternative dates might work better, in light of past comments about trying to avoid school half term

weeks, and to seek a better balance of meetings throughout the year. Joint Committee members may wish to consider whether the Annual Meetings might be better scheduled to take place in July instead of June.

4. Appendices

4.1 Appendix A: NEPP Joint Parking Committee Forward Plan 2024-25.

**NORTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP (NEPP)
FORWARD PLAN OF WORKING GROUP AND JOINT COMMITTEE MEETINGS 2024-25**

COMMITTEE / WORKING GROUP	CLIENT OFFICER MEETING	JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING	MAIN AGENDA REPORTS	AUTHOR
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	4 July 2024, 3pm Microsoft Teams - online	18 July 2024 1.00pm, Venue: Colchester Town Hall, High Street, Colchester	Annual Governance Review and Internal Audit	Hayley McGrath (CCC)
			Annual Review of Risk Management	Hayley McGrath (CCC)
			NEPP Financial Update	Chris Hartgrove (CCC)/ Andrew Small (CC)
			Fees and Charges 2024/25	Richard Walker (PP)
			Restructure of NEPP	Richard Walker (PP)
			Potential changes to NEPP Agreement: Withdrawal clauses	Richard Walker (PP)
			Potential changes to NEPP Agreement: Appendices wording and treatment of deficits	Richard Walker (PP)
			On-street parking charges - Update	Jake England (PP)
			Essex Act	Richard Walker (PP)
Forward Plan 2024/25	Owen Howell (CCC)			
Joint Committee for On Street Parking MEETING CANCELLED AT CHAIRMAN'S REQUEST	31 October 2024, 10am Microsoft Teams - online.	14 November 2024 1.00pm, Venue: Uttlesford District Council's offices (CB11 4ER)	Technical report & Traffic Order Regulation Prioritisation	Trevor Degville (PP)
			Financial Report	Chris Hartgrove (CCC)/ Andrew Small (CCC)
			Update on paid parking [on-street] proposals	Trevor Degville (PP)
			Suggestions for variations to the NEPP Agreement, from NEPP partners	Richard Walker (PP)

COMMITTEE / WORKING GROUP	CLIENT OFFICER MEETING	JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING	MAIN AGENDA REPORTS	AUTHOR
			Forward Plan 2024/25	Owen Howell (CCC)
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	9 January 2025 – 10am Microsoft Teams - online	23 January 2025 1.00pm Venue: Epping Forest District Council's Civic Offices (CM16 4BZ) New venue: Colchester Town Hall, High Street, Colchester, CO1 1PJ	NEPP Financial Update Technical report & Traffic Order Regulation Prioritisation Update on paid parking [on-street] proposals Suggestions for variations to the NEPP Agreement, from NEPP partners Partnership working with partner authorities, and potential for partner authority officers to work under delegated authority to act on NEPP's behalf Forward Plan 2024/25 and 2025/26 Dates	Chris Hartgrove (CCC)/ Andrew Small (CC) Trevor Degville (PP) Trevor Degville (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Richard Walker (PP) Owen Howell (CCC)
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	6 March 2025, 10am Microsoft Teams - online	20 March 2025 1.00pm, Venue: Braintree District Council's offices (CM7 9HB)	NEPP Financial Update Forward Plan 2024/25	Chris Hartgrove (CCC)/ Andrew Small (CC) Owen Howell (CCC)
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	5 June 2025, 10am Microsoft Teams - online	19 June 2025 1.00pm, Venue: Colchester Town Hall, High Street, Colchester	Annual Governance Review and Internal Audit Annual Review of Risk Management NEPP Financial Update Forward Plan 2025/26	Hayley McGrath (CCC) Hayley McGrath (CCC) Chris Hartgrove (CCC)/ Andrew Small (CC) Owen Howell (CCC)

Colchester City Council / Parking Partnership Contacts

Head of Parking, Richard Walker richard.walker@colchester.gov.uk

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

Business Manager, Lou Belgrove - christine.belgrove@colchester.gov.uk

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

Civil Operations Manager, Lisa Hinman - lisa.hinman@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

