

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

**21 March 2019 at 1.00pm  
Civic Centre, The Water Gardens, College Square, Harlow**

Members Present:

Councillor Robert Mitchell (Essex County Council) (Chairman)  
Councillor Richard Van Dulken (Braintree District Council)  
Councillor Mike Lilley (Colchester Borough Council)  
Councillor Nigel Avery (Epping Forest District Council)  
Councillor Danny Purton (Harlow District Council)  
Councillor Howard Ryles (Uttlesford District Council)

Apologies:

Councillor Fred Nicholls (Tendring District Council)

Also Present:

Liz Burr (Essex County Council)  
Samir Pandya (Braintree District Council)  
Qasim Durrani (Epping Forest District Council)  
Miroslav Sihelsky (Harlow Council)  
Ian Taylor (Tendring District Council)  
Simon Jackson (Uttlesford District Council)  
Richard Clifford (Colchester Borough Council)  
Jake England (Parking Partnership)  
Lisa Hinman (Parking Partnership)  
Michael Adamson (Parking Partnership)  
Paul Seabright (Parking Partnership)  
Richard Walker (Parking Partnership)  
Trevor Degville (Parking Partnership)

## **29. Declaration of Interest**

Councillor Mitchell, Essex County Council, declared a non-pecuniary interest, in respect of his membership of Braintree District Council.

## **30. Minutes**

*RESOLVED* that the minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2018 be confirmed as a correct record.

## **31. Have Your Say!**

Ruth Bartlett, Pear Tree Mead Academy, addressed the Joint Committee about road safety issues at Pear Tree Academy. The Academy had an entrance on Trotters Road, where there were no parking restrictions. Trotters Road was also a bus route. Parents were parking in an irresponsible manner, including parking on the pavement, which was unsafe and causing a road safety issue for pupils. School staff did patrol and ask parents not to park but had no powers to prevent or enforce this, and help was requested from the Parking Partnership in resolving this situation.

Councillor Purton expressed his support for the request as he had witnessed inconsiderate and selfish parking on Trotters Road and he believed there was a child safety issue. Whilst there maybe a need for the imposition of parking restrictions, this would not stop parents stopping to drop off children and he considered that there was a need for some infrastructure to be put in place to prevent cars mounting the pavement and this should be taken forward with the Local Highway Panel.

Councillor Mitchell explained that this might situation might be addressed under the 3PR scheme, or by the introduction of yellow School Keep Clear zig zags on Trotters Road. Whilst he noted the suggestion for the introduction of physical barriers, these were frequently damaged with a cost to repair and could also interfere with emergency access. He requested that Parking Partnership officers contact Ruth with the details of the 3PR scheme and the application process for parking restrictions and yellow zig zags.

### **32. Parking Management Policy Update Report**

Richard Walker, Parking Partnership Group Manager, introduced the report on the Parking Management Policy Update report. He explained that this followed on from the decision at the last Joint Committee meeting to make the Partnership's policies clearer and more accessible. The text of the Parking Management Policy had been updated and simplified, using clear and plain English. However, the policy had not changed in substance. It was proposed to publish the updated policy on the Parking Partnership's website.

Councillor Mitchell welcomed the updated Parking Management Policy. It recognised innovation and modernisation. It was important to raise public awareness of the Partnership's work and the scope of its agenda. The move towards making policies clear and accessible through digital means was to be welcomed. He considered that it would be useful to invite the public with a means to provide comments about the policy on the website.

*RESOLVED* that the revised Parking Management Policy with improved design be noted.

### **33. Reserve Fund Process Report**

Richard Walker, Parking Partnership Group Manager, introduced a report inviting the Joint Committee to agree a process for the allocation of funds for transport related projects. Following the decision at the last Joint Committee meeting on 13 December 2018 that partners be invited to submit schemes relating to parking for future funding from the Reserve Fund, the report proposed a process for allocating

funds to projects put forward by the partners and processing projects against funding in the future programme.

Parallels were drawn with the scoring system developed for Traffic Regulation Orders, which had been improved over time and now worked well. It was suggested it was important that the scoring system encouraged the funding of projects that related directly to parking or helped alleviate the impact on those affected by parking issues. Emphasis was given to the particular value in funding innovative technological projects through the Reserve Fund. This would be a sound investment for the future and could lead to improvements with a wider benefit. For example, there could be an opportunity to develop services based on artificial intelligence, or to better regulate blue badge usage.

Confirmation was sought about a number of aspects of the scoring system proposed, such as the difference in the definitions for “funding stream replaced” and “makes a contribution to future project budgets”. Some concern was expressed about the high weighting that could be allocated to additional qualitative measures, which were subjective. However, it was stressed that this was a range and the maximum number of points for this criterion would not always be awarded.

Some concern was expressed by members of the Committee that it would be difficult and time consuming to administer the process and that some of the criteria were very subjective. It needed to be borne in mind that the current Agreement was only due to last for a further three years. Therefore, the processes should prioritise smaller schemes that could be delivered quickly or which had match funding, possibly with an allocation to each authority. However, this might not provide value for money or meet strategic objectives. Whilst the argument for allocations for each authority was noted, this was not the general approach of the Partnership. It delivered schemes where they were needed and according to strategic priorities instead of concentrating on an even spread across the partners.

*RESOLVED* that the Framework Process set out in the report for allocating funds to projects put forward by the partners and processing projects against funding in the future programme be agreed (Three voted for, two voted against).

**Councillor Purton declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item in respect of being a resident in a street adjacent to the Chase.**

### **34. Technical Report**

Trevor Degville, Parking Partnership Technical Manager, introduced a report inviting the Joint Committee to note the location of Traffic Regulation Orders installed in 2018/19 and to consider the introduction of a traffic regulation order for waiting and loading restrictions on The Chase, Harlow, following public submissions of opposition and support.

It was explained that, whilst most schemes are handled under delegated powers, where substantial objections were received to a proposed Traffic Regulation Order in the pursuance of transparency, the Parking Partnership Group Manager could request that the proposal be determined by the Joint Committee. A proposal to

introduce no waiting/no loading restrictions on The Chase was originally advertised in April 2018. Following objections and other issues being raised Harlow District Council requested that an amended proposal be advertised. This saw a reduction in the amount of carriageway that would be restricted and was advertised in November 2018. This had generated a number of objections. A summary of the objections received from members of the public and the letter of support from the Ambulance Service were included in the report to the Joint Committee, who were invited to determine the proposal.

Councillor Purton explained some of the background that had led to the proposal for a Traffic Regulation Order. Newhall had been a proposed development for 20,000 dwellings but up until three years ago, only a quarter of the development had been built. It was always intended that The Chase would be the main entrance to the development. Houses on The Chase had been built with parking spaces for 2-3 cars to the rear. They were also subject a covenant which prevented parking on The Chase, but this had never been enforced. Therefore, residents on The Chase had parked on the roadside. Now further development was proceeding, more traffic was using The Chase and parking on the roadside was impeding the flow of traffic. The frustration of residents with the introduction of restrictions was understood. However, there would still a section of roadway for use by residents and there was considerable parking space to the rear of houses on The Chase. The proposed traffic regulation order would significantly improve the flow of traffic.

Members of the Joint Committee indicated their support for introduction of the Traffic Regulation Order. In particular the Joint Committee took account of the representations made by the Ambulance Service in support of the Order. It was noted that the Covenant preventing parking on The Chase could still be legally enforced.

*RESOLVED* that: -

- (a) The Traffic Regulation Order for scheme 30777 be introduced and the Objectors informed of the outcome;
- (b) The Traffic Regulation Orders introduced during the 2018/19 financial year be noted;
- (c) The progress on the Commuter Parking Review be noted.

### **35. Financial Report**

Richard Walker, Parking Partnership Group Manager, introduced a report setting out the financial position of the Parking Partnership to the end of period 10 2018-19. It was reported that the Partnership was in a strong financial position. Income was presently forecast to exceed expectations, helped by the good weather over winter (in particular, a lack of snow), and expenditure was also on budget. It had been budgeted to take £250k out of the reserve to fund technical services which may not now be required, and £50k to fund 3PR schemes. Even with those deductions, it was still anticipated that there would be a small operating surplus.

*RESOLVED* that the financial position to the end of period 10 of 2018/9 be noted.

**36. Forward Plan 2018-19 and 2019-20 Dates**

Richard Clifford, Democratic Services Officer, introduced the Forward Plan for 2018-19 and 2019-20.

*RESOLVED* that the North Essex Parking Partnership Forward Plan 2018-19 and 2019-20 be noted;