

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

**18 October 2012 at 1.30pm  
Rowan House, Sheepen Road, Colchester**

Present: - Councillor Susan Barker (Uttlesford District Council)  
Councillor Penny Channer (Essex County Council)  
Councillor Peter Halliday (Tendring District Council)  
Councillor Martin Hunt (Colchester Borough Council)  
Councillor Robert Mitchell (Braintree District Council)  
Councillor Gary Waller (Epping Forest District Council)

Apologies: - Councillor Derrick Louis (Essex County Council)  
Councillor Pam Sambridge (Tendring District Council)  
Councillor Neil Stock (Tendring District Council)  
Councillor Jon Clempner (Harlow District Council)

Also Present: - Mr. Trevor Degville (Parking Partnership)  
Ms. Vicky Duff (Essex County Council)  
Mr. Qasim Durrani (Epping Forest District Council)  
Mr. Robert Judd (Colchester Borough Council)  
Mr. Joe McGill (Harlow District Council)  
Mr. Paul Partridge (Braintree District 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: - Ms. Liz Saville (Essex County Council)

## **9. Deputy Chairman**

Councillor Martin Hunt (Colchester Borough Council) was appointed Deputy Chairman for the ensuing Municipal Year.

## **10. 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 a regular customer to a shop in Drury Road) declared an interest in item 7, Traffic Regulation Orders for Adoption, where scheme 40035 Drury Road is listed for consideration, but is currently on-hold.

## **11. Minutes**

*RESOLVED* that the minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2012 was confirmed as a correct record.

## **12. Have Your Say**

Councillor Dennis Willetts (Colchester) addressed the Sub Committee to speak about the decision to purchase a CCTV (Councillor Barker later confirmed that the CCTV car would not be purchased, but would be introduced as a Joint Lease for a period of one year). Whilst Councillor Willetts was encouraged by the automated processes that will improve parking enforcement, and as reported in the local press, the principal use of a CCTV car will provide better enforcement outside of schools, there was a caveat to this. Councillor Willetts said there remained danger on roads outside schools, and balanced against the policies of Essex County Council who are closing rural schools; this resulted in greater car usage around the remaining schools (e.g. West Bergholt School). With the necessity to use cars for school journeys and no additional parking this did cause a dilemma, because there would be a greater need to drop children off at school. Councillor Willetts said the CCTV car enforcement would need to be carefully managed. Councillor Willetts referred the Sub Committee to Essex County Council's Parking Standards that said there should be provision for one parking space per fifteen school pupils, and suggested if a school was designed to this standard vigorous enforcement was a requirement, but caution should be taken if the school did not meet the parking standards, using enforcement a little more judiciously.

Councillor Barker thanked Councillor Willetts for his comments and said she would speak to Councillor Ann Brown (Essex County Council – Constable) about the issue raised.

## **13. Executive Arrangements**

In light of the recent conversations regarding the Committee's Executive Arrangements Councillor Barker circulated a timeline in respect of the recent NEPP meetings, the issues discussed, the decisions taken and the votes cast.

It was hoped this would clarify what had been agreed at meetings between 21 June 2012 and 4 October 2012 and that the decisions taken had been made in line with the governance arrangements.

Councillor Barker welcomed Councillor Mitchell to the meeting as a member with full executive powers.

Councillor Barker confirmed that the decision on the CCTV Car had been called-in by Councillor Mead. There would be a meeting at County Hall to discuss the decision taken with the Essex County Council Portfolio Holder, the Chairman of NEPP and Councillor Mead. Should these discussions not resolve the matter the decision will be referred to a Scrutiny Panel for review.

It was confirmed that until such time that the outcome is known, the decision could not be implemented.

## **14. Traffic Regulation Orders**

### **Have Your Say**

#### Councillor Laura Sykes

Councillor Laura Sykes (Colchester) addressed the Sub-Committee to thank the Portfolio Holder and officers for recommending the Winstree Road scheme (40044) for approval by the Committee.

Councillor Sykes said parking restrictions in Winstree Road would prevent parking on the road in the vicinity of the school and on the grass verges nearby. Councillor Sykes presented photographs of the area taken at 11.00 am that morning and illustrating the congestion and dangers caused by parked vehicles, and in part caused by the additional cars from the local Sure Start Scheme. The area was now so congested vehicles could only travel down the road in single file due to parked vehicles on both sides of the road.

Councillor Barker thanked Councillor Sykes for her comments.

#### Councillor Dave Harris

Councillor Dave Harris (Colchester) addressed the Sub-Committee to speak about the problems in the School Road area at Monkwick.

Councillor Harris said a 1,000 signature petition had been presented to the Portfolio Holder at Essex County Council concerning this issue, and he supported the recommendation for a change to the current school parking restrictions, to be extended by 30 minutes in the morning (scheme 40043).

Councillor Harris also mentioned the increased zig-zag lines outside the school needed extending by 4-5 car lengths and further support was needed to provide metal barriers at the kerbside. Barriers are already installed at the junior school and have been very successful in preventing motorists stopping to drop-off children.

Councillor Barker thanked Councillor Harris for his comments, but suggested the Local Highway Panel was the appropriate committee for requesting funding for kerbside barriers.

#### Councillor Marcus Harrington

Councillor Harrington (Colchester) addressed the Sub Committee saying he had submitted requests for parking restriction schemes in the West Bergholt / Eight Ash Green areas. Councillor Harrington said all the requests had been rejected, and this had led to anger and frustration by local residents.

Councillor Harrington requested that one request was reconsidered, for the area around the Holiday Inn junction (Halstead Road / Abbotts Lane), with congestion throughout every day due to the volume of parked cars around the junction.

Residents in the area frequently have their drives and entrances blocked by parked vehicles and at times the congestion prevents proper access for emergency service vehicles. Mr. Harrington said photographic evidence had been provided to show the extent of the congestion.

Councillor Harrington presented a petition to Councillor Barker signed by all but one resident in the area and requesting restricted parking around the junction of Halstead Road and Abbotts Lane. Councillor Harrington asked for this request to be reconsidered.

Mr. Edgington addressed the Sub-Committee to say the Manager of the Holiday Inn has said that the hotel is at times inconvenienced by the congestion.

Councillor Harrington also mentioned the problems at the vicinity of the Heathlands School at West Bergholt. Councillor Brown (Essex County Council) was aware of the problem, having

recently had a near accident at the site.

Requests had been submitted for parking restrictions but to no avail and Councillor Harrington asked that this problem was looked at again but in more detail.

Councillor Harrington said West Bergholt Parish Council has now adopted a Travel Plan for the village (copy provided to the Chairman), aimed at increasing safety in the village and focused on the school which is currently undergoing expansion. Councillor Harrington explained that of his 6 requests, numbers 1-4 (concerning New Church Road and School Lane) had been subsumed into points 1, 2 and 3 of the Travel Plan and asked for the Panel to reconsider requests for these parking restrictions in the context of the adopted Travel Plan.

Councillor Barker said she would speak to Councillor Brown concerning this issue.

#### Councillor Gerard Oxford

Councillor Oxford (Colchester) addressed the Sub-Committee concerning the Rawlings Crescent Scheme (outside the Brinkley Grove School). A 2010 resident's survey was supported by the Leader (Colchester) and local MP, Sir Bob Russell and showed local residents supported parking restrictions around the school.

Whilst the scheme is recommended for approval by the Sub-committee, to proceed to the next consultation stage, Councillor Oxford said there had already been a thorough history of consultation.

Councillor Oxford said there now was a problem outside the Gilbert School in Brinkley Lane, and the School Head had said parking restrictions did not appear to be adequate, and would be subject to a future request for review.

Councillor Oxford mentioned the need for cycle path diversions, but was advised this was an issue for the Local Highway Panel to consider.

Councillor Oxford thanked the Portfolio Holder and officers for recommending the Rawlings Crescent Scheme (40048 Introduction of School Based Restriction) for approval.

#### Councillor Martin Goss

Councillor Goss (Colchester) addressed the Sub-Committee saying that a previous request for a parking restriction scheme in the area close to the General Hospital was on-hold, but he asked that the scheme was reinstated as soon as possible.

Councillor Goss said previous survey questionnaires had not been clear and this had resulted in the scheme being refused. However, residents did their own survey that showed there was support for a restricted parking scheme in the area.

Councillor Goss asked that the area was re-surveyed, but with a questionnaire that was user friendly, asking fewer but more focused questions.

Councillor Goss said further investment in the Hospital complex will only increase staff and vehicle congestion and felt a further survey was needed, with the scheme brought forward on the programme for consideration and as soon as possible.

#### Councillor Lesley Scott-Boutell

Councillor Scott-Boutell (Colchester) addressed the Sub-Committee about the problems for residents in the Tollgate Drive area.

Councillor Scott-Boutell said that whilst car-sharing is a good idea, it was causing a problem in the area. Streets are becoming congested with cars (car sharers), creating noise pollution and parked inconsiderately for long periods of time.

Councillor Scott-Boutell requested that the area was submitted for assessment before reading details of an email by an exacerbated resident concerning this issue.

Councillor Scott-Boutell thanked the Portfolio Holder and officers for progressing the Winstree Road scheme (40044) for approval, and to the officers specifically for supporting residents and other interested parties by attending local meetings that had been arranged.

#### Mr. Chinnery

Mr. Chinnery addressed the Sub-Committee to support the Councillor Goss's request for the Hospital Scheme to be brought forward for reconsideration as soon as possible.

Mr. Chinnery said congestion was so bad that it was now blocking access for emergency service vehicles, and on one occasion he witnessed an ambulance parking in the middle of the road to gain access to a property, and in doing so, completely blocked the road.

#### Mr. John Heath

Mr. Heath addressed the Sub-Committee to endorse the comments made by Councillor Harrington in respect of the congestion and parking problems at the junction of Halstead Road and Abbots lane.

Mr. Heath said the problem has grown over recent years, but with 20 of the 21 local residents in the area supporting action to resolve the problems the need for immediate action was paramount.

It was understood that the Police are not addressing the problem of illegal parking in the area.

Councillor Barker said the Committee will communicate with the Police to see if some action could be taken.

### **Traffic Regulation Orders**

Councillor Mitchell said many of the issues raised by the speakers needed to be considered locally before coming to the North Essex Parking Partnership for an outcome. At Braintree the issues raised at this meeting would ordinarily be reviewed locally before being presented to the Committee for decision.

#### Ice Pack Schemes

Ms. Vicky Duff (Essex County Council) explained 'Ice Pack Schemes' to the Sub-Committee.

Ms. Duff said the Cabinet Member at Essex County Council have a block of funding to be used to finance Traffic Order Schemes that had been subject to semi-formal discussions prior to the inception of the North Essex Parking Partnership.

Where this had been the case, but the scheme had not progressed, lost in time even though assurances had been given that it would be considered, these schemes would if agreed be progressed as 'Ice Pack Schemes' through this block of funding.

The process will not circumnavigate the North Essex Parking Partnership, would be completed as normal, funded by Essex County Council and implemented by either Essex County Council or the Partnership, whatever is appropriate.

In response to Mr. I. Taylor (Tendring), Ms. Duff said this was about schemes where there had been vocal agreements made for the introduction of such schemes. There are instances where Parish Councils are saying they were given firm commitments for schemes both during and before the inception of Highways Panels, going back as far as 2008.

Mr. S. Taylor (Parking Partnership) said the Partnership is assessing requests that had involved Essex County Council at the time of the changeover, but in these cases there would be no automatic approval for progression.

### Scoring Matrix

Mr. S. Taylor (Parking Partnership) said as the assessment of traffic scheme requests progressed it has become apparent that there is a need to tweak the scoring matrix.

In general, the scoring matrix did work very well, but some of the scoring headings needed to be updated to properly reflect the problem e.g. school congestion and junction parking / protection.

Councillor Halliday said more clarity is needed around the scoring matrix, though Mr. I. Taylor (Tendring) said by and large Tendring was pleased with the scoring of requested schemes completed by the Parking Partnership.

Councillor Barker said that it was the job of the Parking Partnership to provide the expertise in assessing requests for Traffic Orders, but there needed to be local arrangements in place for each district to assess the scores provided by the Parking Partnership and prioritise their schemes for approval as appropriate.

It was agreed that a revised scoring matrix should be drafted to be presented to the next meeting of the TRO Sub-Committee for approval.

### Schemes for Adoption

The report by Mr. Richard Walker, Group Manager, North Essex Parking Partnership outlining the requests for parking and waiting restrictions received between April and October 2012 was considered by Members and Client Officers.

Members, having considered the list of schemes within appendix A were asked to nominate four schemes from within their respective district for approval, to be progressed to full consultation. The following schedule notes the decision taken on each individual scheme as follows, Approved (A) or Deferred (D).

Having considered the views of Councillor Halliday, Members were in agreement that all future schedules should be drawn-up that showed indicative costs for implementing Traffic Regulation Orders, and this together with a budget statement showing a balance sheet in

respect of the money spent and the funds remaining should be attached to all future reports requesting the approval of schemes to be progressed.

Councillor Mitchell said indicative costs did not need to be in great detail, but should provide a rough cost per metre / scheme. When future schemes are considered and approved it would be helpful if Members and Client Officers could see a rough value of the schemes concerned.

Mr. Walker confirmed that the scheme numbers within the schedule will forever remain unique to the scheme.

Councillor Barker suggested that at the next meeting of the TRO Sub-Committee each district put forward two schemes for approval, with all remaining outstanding schemes prioritised on the basis of points scored, but taking account of the cost and scale.

Whilst Councillor Mitchell agreed with this suggestion in part, he felt it did not sit well with the localism agenda. The assessments made by the Parking Partnership are impartial, but districts, when putting forward schemes for approval needed some leeway to take account of local issues.

Councillor Halliday said there needed to be a mixture put forward by districts, those prioritised by score, but others put forward for inclusion due to other factors.

Councillor Hunt said schemes put forward for approval by Colchester are done so based on scoring priority. If schemes are approved that scored lower than some rejected schemes local residents will consider the process to be flawed and unfair.

Councillor Waller said there needed to be a county-wide approach with an agreed ratio of schemes approved locally and based on prioritising by score, plus an agreed number of schemes that could take account of local priorities as well as score.

Mr. I. Taylor said the most likely way to resolve this would be to speed-up the process, with schemes falling off the schedule by way of a consistent scoring approach, ultimately leading to no outstanding schemes. To this end, Mr. Taylor suggested improvements in the effectiveness of the processes will increase the speed of reduction.

Members and Client Officers discussed the decision (5.3) to be taken in respect of delegating the power to implement TROs at all existing school zig-zags to officers etc. It was explained to members that there remains some schools that have zig-zags that are not enforceable.

In response to Councillor Halliday, Mr. Degville (Parking Partnership) said the cost to advertise these schemes would be minimal (per scheme). A single blanket advertisement per district would list the schools where parking enforcement would be introduced, spreading the cost of advertising, making the unit cost a fraction of the normal cost per scheme.

Councillor Mitchell was happy to progress on this basis, it made business sense to do so. Councillor Hunt and Councillor Waller concurred with Councillor Mitchell adding that the decision would prevent any delay in enforcement outside these schools. Councillor Barker said the introduction of a CCTV car would then be able to monitor all schools where enforceable restrictions are in place. Ms. Duff said where there are schemes in this category that will require relining, there is a budget retained by the Partnership for such work.

Whilst Councillor Halliday understood the valid reasons for undertaking this process he was still minded not to support this decision.

*RESOLVED* that the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Sub Committee;

- i) Considered all new schemes and deferred schemes to date as illustrated in Appendix A of the report.
- ii) Decided the individual schemes to be 'approved' for implementation, pending the successful outcome of the Full Consultation process. An 'approved' scheme is noted as 'A' in the final column of the attached schedule.
- iii) Agreed that each district would review the overall schedule and advise the North Essex Parking Partnership of the schemes they recommend for removal from the programme, to be rejected on-block at the next meeting of the TRO Sub-Committee.
- iv) Agreed to delegate the power to implement Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) at all existing school zig-zags to officers in order to introduce TROs at school sites for the purpose of expediency in validating advisory-only restriction markings thereby allowing enforcement to be carried out (FOUR voted FOR and ONE voted AGAINST).
- v) Agreed that officers would draft a revised scoring matrix to reflect where changes are required, to be presented to the next meeting of the TRO Sub-Committee for approval.
- vi) Agreed that all future schedules will show indicative costs for implementing Traffic Regulation Orders, together with a budget statement showing a balance sheet in respect of the money spent and the funds remaining, to be attached to all reports requesting the approval of schemes to be progressed.

## **15. Progress of Traffic Orders**

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.

*RESOLVED* that the TRO Sub-Committee considered and noted the progress made with the new restrictions.

## **16. Traffic Orders Objections**

Mr. Shane Taylor (Parking Partnership) presented the Traffic Regulation Order Objections report concerning objections that had been received following the publication of notices of intention in the Colchester Borough.

*RESOLVED* that the TRO Sub-Committee;

- i) Considered and noted the objections to the schemes outlined in the report.
- ii) Agreed to progress with the schemes despite the formal objections that had been received.

## **17. Lining Reinstatement Work**

Mr. Shane Taylor (Parking Partnership) presented the progress report on Reinstatement in the last six months.



Mr. S. Taylor (Parking Partnership) confirmed to Mr. I. Taylor (Tendring) that the reason for the Tendring District showing little re-instatement work was due to the schedule being for the last six months only, that over a longer period of time Tendring had received a larger share of the overall work completed.

*RESOLVED* that the TRO Sub-Committee noted the progress being made with Lining Reinstatement work.

## **17. Urgent items**

Mr. Paul Partridge (Braintree) informed the Sub-Committee of a local issue concerning a Clearway in Guithavon Street, Witham.

Mr. Partridge said the Traffic Order at this site needed to be addressed in order that enforcement could take place. Because the site has been subject to two Traffic Orders (2009 and 2011) that do not tie-up with the road markings and signage, there was little point in continuing to enforce on the parking restrictions because the orders could be legally challenged.

Ms. Duff said whilst Essex County Council officers will assist officers in the process of changing the orders and subsequent road markings and signage to suit, the Parking Partnership did hold a budget purposely for funding such changes.

*RESOLVED* that the TRO Sub-Committee agreed that the aforementioned scheme should be subject to a change of order, with the subsequent implementation funded from the North Essex Parking Partnership Budget.

