

**NORTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP  
JOINT SUB COMMITTEE  
TRAFFIC REGULATIONS**

**12 July 2012 at 1.30pm  
Council Chambers, Weeley**

Present:- Councillor Susan Barker (Uttlesford District Council)  
Councillor Martin Hunt (Colchester Borough Council)  
Councillor Robert Mitchell (Braintree District Council)  
Councillor Nick Stock (Tendring District Council)  
Councillor Gary Waller (Epping Forest District Council)

Apologies:- Councillor Penny Channer (Essex County Council)  
Councillor Jon Clempner (Harlow District Council)  
Councillor Derrick Louis (Essex County Council)  
Councillor Pam Sambridge (Tendring District Council)  
Councillor Wendy Schmitt (Braintree District Council)

Also Present: - Mr. Trevor Degville (Parking Partnership)  
Mr. John Gilbert (Epping Forest District Council)  
Mr. Robert Judd (Colchester Borough Council)  
Mr. Joe McGill (Harlow District Council)  
Mr. Paul Partridge (Braintree District Council)  
Ms. Liz Saville (Essex County Council)  
Mr. Andrew Taylor (Uttlesford District Council)  
Mr. Ian Taylor (Tendring District Council)  
Mr. Shane Taylor (Parking Partnership)  
Mr. Richard Walker (Parking Partnership)  
Mr. Matthew Young (Colchester Borough Council)

Apologies: - Mr. Qasim Durrani (Epping Forest District Council)

**1. Chairman**

Councillor Susan Barker was appointed Chairman for the ensuing Municipal Year.

**2. Deputy Chairman**

The appointment of Deputy Chairman was deferred until the next meeting

**3. Urgent Item – Membership of the Joint Committee**

Following a request by Members at the On-Street Parking meeting on 21 June 2012, Members considered a briefing note from Essex Legal Services in respect of “Can Deputy Cabinet Members act as a substitute member of the Joint Committee?”

The briefing note concluded that “As a result if the appointed member of the member authority is unable to attend a meeting of the Joint Committee, if the member authority wishes to retain voting capabilities on decisions before the Joint Committee, the substitute must be someone to

who executive power can be delegated. As a result the persons able to act as a substitute in accordance with the statutory provisions would be another Cabinet Member only”.

Given this advice Councillor Mitchell tabled the following motion.

“For Partner Authorities to agree to formally change the constitution under which the Joint Committee operates to allow Deputy Cabinet/Executive Members to vote. This would be in the interests of all partner authorities and in accordance with the original spirit of the partnership and the mutual trust and respect placed on each other's views and opinions”

Councillor Mitchell said Braintree's view is that if the constitution of the Joint Committee needs changing to accommodate the above, every effort should be made to do so. This is about how we work together in the interest of one another whilst maintaining an effective working relationship.

Mr. Paul Partridge (Braintree) said there should be a degree of reasonableness in determining the membership of the Committee, in the spirit of the partnership.

Councillor Stock believed it should be a Cabinet Member that attended and would otherwise seem odd. He had not come across a situation before where Non-Cabinet Members attended such meetings.

Whilst it was agreed that it was not possible under the current arrangements to accept the proposed motion from Braintree District Council, it was suggested the Committee could write to Essex County Council to request them to consider the proposed motion from Braintree, and consider amending the NEPP JCA 2011 to allow Deputy Portfolio Holders to attend future NEPP meetings and be able to vote.

Whilst Councillor Waller was of the view that each partner authority should have a nominated Portfolio Holder to substitute for absent Members, he was not adverse to the proposal being made. Councillor Barker, supported by Councillor Hunt and Councillor Waller agreed to this suggestion.

*RESOLVED* that the Committee agreed that the Partnership write to Essex County Council to request them to consider the tabled proposal from Braintree, that asked for an amendment to the NEPP JCA 2011 to allow Deputy Portfolio Holders to attend future NEPP meetings and be able to vote.

Councillor Mitchell and Mr. Partridge left the meeting following the discussions about governance matters.

#### **4. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Barker (in respect of being a Member of Essex County Council), declared an interest in all the following items.

Councillor Hunt (in respect of being acquainted with representatives of the CCTV Car suppliers) declared an interest in the item CCTV – Further update.

#### **5. Minutes**

*RESOLVED* that the minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2012 was confirmed as a correct record.

## 6. Protocol update

Mr. Walker, Group Manager, North Essex Parking Partnership, introduced the report on the current and revised TRO protocol and scoring system that forms the overall TRO process.

Mr. Walker confirmed to Councillor Stock that points supporting local businesses are now covered by 'Viability' and the contribution to economic development. On that basis Councillor Stock said he felt the flow chart for the TRO process was complicated, the new one more so than the original one. Councillor Stock did not believe this priority worth 6% of the total allocation was adequate, and felt that section needed to be more descriptive.

Mr. I. Taylor said there would be occasions when emergency or urgent TRO were required, and it was important to ensure fairness and to try and avoid situations where some authorities may receive more TRO changes / implementation than others. Mr. I. Taylor also asked if the Partnership was keeping to the allocation of so many per authority as before, and requested an update on the cost or charge for TRO in view of the fact Colchester was able to purchase additional TRO changes previously.

Mr. I. Taylor felt that with a lack of democratic representation, there is a real danger of alienating local parishes and local communities where TRO requests more often than not come from, by rejecting applications before they are even considered. Mr. I. Taylor said this issue needed clarification. Councillor Hunt and Mr. A Taylor (Uttlesford) also said they were concerned with the removal of engagement with the public services and other organisations from the Prioritisation Methodology (PM), Councillor Barker said the revised PM needed to show democratic representation and public involvement.

Mr. Walker said there clearly needed to be certainty in achieving local support to the scheme, the engagement process was now dealt with in full, as part of the Local Decision identified as stage B on the procedure flow-chart.

Mr. McGill (Harlow) said whilst it is in the best interests of all concerned to make the Traffic Regulation Order process simple, it is inherently complicated. Mr. McGill said at district level Local Panel members are aware of what is happening and do have an opportunity to consider TRO and recommend proceeding or deferment back to the NEPP Committee for further action.

Mr. I. Taylor and other officers said some of the terminology within the revised PM was not considered clear, and in some areas considered more subjective than the existing PM and in some cases made little sense. It was suggested 'Impact' could be replaced with 'Safety – local support and concerns'.

Mr. Young (Colchester) said the process had to have accountability, and that was provided through the scoring within the PM and the processes set out in the procedure flow-chart.

In response to Mr. I. Taylor who said the process of providing agenda papers and discussion points only seven days in advance of NEPP meetings did not allow sufficient time for districts to discuss issues and to consult widely, and placing things, e.g. the CCTV Car item on the TRO Sub Committee agenda, only makes the situation worse, Councillor Barker said the CCTV Car report was requested following the presentation at the June meeting. Whilst it was acknowledged that the Sub-Committee's remit was to consider work concerning TRO, and the separating of duties and appropriate reports had to this point worked well, in this case the item was needed to be considered as a matter of urgency, to enable officers to complete any further work before the September meeting and subsequent implementation. The point about

providing sufficient pre-meeting briefing time for agenda papers was agreed, and Councillor Barker also requested that Mr. Walker and Mr. Judd draft a Forward Plan, to include all (On/Off/Sub) future meetings and a schedule of all reports, to be updated as required and reported to all future meetings.

It was further agreed following the meeting that Mr. Judd would arrange Client Officer Pre-meetings, preferably a clear week before each Committee meeting, providing an opportunity for local briefings and for any amendments to be made to papers as a result of the meeting.

*RESOLVED* that the Joint Committee;

- i) Approved the revised TRO Protocol with the 'decision' points outlined, but requested officers to take account of the comments from Members of the Committee.
- ii) Approved the revised scoring system for the Prioritisation Methodology, to become a component of the TRO process, but requested officers to take account of the comments from Members of the Committee.
- iii) Approved the on-line implementation of the application process and TRO progression system and the development and implementation of a database to provide public access to information on the progress of cases.
- iv) Agreed that officers draft a Forward Plan, to include all (On/Off/Sub) future meetings and a schedule of all reports to be regularly updated, and reported to all future meetings.

## **7. Verbal update on progress of Parking Schemes**

Mr. Trevor Degville (Parking Partnership) presented the Parkmap Tiles for New Restrictions, and gave a verbal update on the progress of each scheme. The schemes had been approved by the Committee for implementation.

The schemes that were discussed are as follows:

Brise Close (Braintree), Chalks Road (Braintree), High Street, Dedham (Colchester), Coventry Close (Colchester), Eudo Road (Colchester), Victoria Esplanade, West Mersea (Colchester), Villa Road (Colchester), Kendal Avenue (Epping Forest), Torrington Drive and Gardens (Epping Forest), Frobisher Drive (Tendring), Wellington Street (Tendring), Queensway (Tendring), Wix Cross (Tendring), Cambridge Road (Uttlesford) and Common Hill (Uttlesford).

*RESOLVED* that the Joint Committee considered and noted the progress made with the new restrictions.

## **8. CCTV Car – Further Update**

Mr. Walker (Parking Partnership) gave a brief introduction on the reasons for considering the introduction of a CCTV Car and the benefits that would accrue.

Equita was offering to provide the facility at no cost to the Council, for receiving income of £17.50 (half the discounted rate of £35 per PCN) for each PCN issued.

Despite the financial benefits from implementing a CCTV Car, some members and officers still had reservations about this form of additional parking enforcement. Though they were in

agreement on the principle to make area outside schools safe, they wondered if there are not any other solutions.

Whether or not this form of parking enforcement was used in the future, Councillor Barker could not see a reason for not agreeing to a CCTV Car on a one year trial at no cost to the Partnership and an opportunity to gauge its effectiveness, a point echoed by Councillor Waller. Councillor Stock said if a CCTV Car is going to catch those motorists obstructing public transport it was a good reason to consider this as a form of enforcement.

Mr. Walker confirmed that since Equita went public with there CCTV Car model that there are now a small number of other suppliers now on the market, of which at least three of these provide a similar service.

*RESOLVED* that the Joint Sub Committee agreed that further project work was needed, whereby further information could be obtained, including a cost-benefit model on the different procurement options. The Joint Sub Committee asked for the information to be presented to the next NEPP Joint Committee meeting for On-Street Parking.