



North Essex

Parking Partnership

North Essex Parking Partnership Meeting

**Epping Forest District Council
Offices, Civic Offices, High Street,
Epping, Essex, CM16 4BZ
Thursday, 13 November 2025 at 13:00**

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.

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

Joint Committee Meeting – On-Street

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 who will or may attend:-

Trevor Degville (Parking Partnership)
Jake England (Parking Partnership)
Jo Heynes (Essex County Council)
Amelia Hoke (Epping Forest)
Owen Howell (Colchester City Council)
Dean James (Harlow)
Sarah Lewin (Uttlesford)
Esme McCambridge (Braintree)
Hayley McGrath (Colchester City Council)
Andrew Nepean (Tendring)
Charlotte Paine (Braintree)
Richard Walker (Colchester)
Danielle Wood (Parking Partnership)

AGENDA

THE LIST OF ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING

1 Welcome and Announcements

The Chair will welcome members of the public and members, and will ask that mobile phones be switched to silent. Committee members and officers will introduce themselves.

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 of Previous Meeting

The Councillors will be invited to confirm that the minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2025 are a correct record.

NEPP Joint Parking Committee Minutes 19 June 2025

7 - 18

6 Urgent Items

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

- | | | |
|----|--|---------|
| 7 | NEPP Financial Update – 2025/26 Q2 Position | 19 - 22 |
| | This report updates Members on the North Essex Parking Partnership's finances. | |
| 8 | Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Policy Update Report | 23 - 46 |
| | This report presents a revised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Policy for approval by the Joint Committee. The updated policy improves clarity, restructures content for public accessibility and includes the 5-year rule as previously agreed. The revised policy replaces the December 2022 version, and aligns with statutory guidance. | |
| 9 | Traffic Regulation Order and Application Decision Report | 47 - 56 |
| | -This report seeks a decision to either approve, defer or reject Traffic Regulation Order proposals from the list of applications that have been received on behalf of our local authority members.
- For member information, the report also highlights other traffic regulation order work performed by the Technical Team during 2025. | |
| 10 | Review of the NEPP Parking Management Policy | 57 - 70 |
| | - The NEPP Joint Parking Committee is asked to approve the recommended changes to the NEPP Parking Management Policy. | |
| 11 | NEPP Forward Plan 2025-2026 | 71 - 74 |
| | This report concerns the 2025-26 Forward Plan of meetings for the North Essex Parking Partnership. | |

NORTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE FOR ON-STREET PARKING

**19 June 2025 at 1.00pm
Grand Jury Room, Town Hall, High Street, Colchester CO1 1PJ**

Members Present:

Councillor Mick Barry (Tendring District Council)
Councillor Graham Butland (Braintree District Council)
Councillor Martin Goss (Colchester City Council)
Councillor Neil Hargreaves (Uttlesford District Council)
Councillor Paul Honeywood (Essex County Council)
Councillor Nicky Purse (Harlow District Council)

Substitutions:

None

Apologies:

Councillor Ken Williamson (Epping Forest District Council).

Also Present:

Paul Atkinson (Colchester City Council) via Zoom
Trevor Degville (Parking Partnership)
Matt Evans (Colchester City Council)
Jake England (Parking Partnership)
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)
Richard Walker (Colchester City Council)
Danielle Wood (Parking Partnership)

203. Appointment of Chairman

Councillor Goss raised concerns as to how a number of parking schemes had been pushed through earlier in 2025, which would likely need to return to the Joint Committee for further decision. Councillor Goss ventured that the Chairman's decision to let these proceed represented a judgement issue, and over 100 comments had been received through the subsequent consultation. There was a concern that this was harmful to the NEPP, and Councillor Goss hoped that this would not happen again, should Councillor Honeywood be re-elected to the chairmanship.

RESOLVED that Councillor Paul Honeywood be elected as Chairman of the Joint Committee for 2025-26.

204. Appointment of Deputy Chairman

RESOLVED that Councillor Neil Hargreaves be elected as Deputy Chairman of the Joint Committee for 2025-26.

205. Have Your Say

Mr Nick Chilvers attended and, with permission of the Chairman, addressed the Joint Committee to say that he had submitted a statement which was read to the Joint Committee at its meeting held on 23 January 2025, raising issues and suggestions regarding options being consulted on for on-street paid parking in parts of Colchester. These included concerns about the governance process. Mr Chilvers was unhappy that no response had been given at the meeting, and that he had not received any written response following the meeting. Mr Chilvers asked if this was because the NEPP did not like to be challenged publicly and why the Chairman, Joint Committee and officers had not responded. The reason for this was requested.

The Chairman stated that he had not been in attendance at the meeting on 23 January 2025 [this was clarified as an error; the Chairman had been in the chair for that meeting but had not been able to attend the subsequent meeting on 20 March 2025]. Jake England, Interim Head of NEPP, committed to provide a written response to Mr Chilvers' original statement but explained that it would be up to Joint Committee members to explain why they had not responded.

The Clerk, with permission from the Chairman, read out four statements from members of the public who were unable to attend.

Mr Bob Bloomfield wrote regarding the proposed Traffic Regulation Order [TRO] for red lines at the President Road/Oaklands Avenue junction, and to query the process whereby this had been brought forward for consultation. Mr Bloomfield stated that there was little parking experienced at that junction, with little need for a TRO of this type, and gave his concerns that he had been listed as a supporter of the scheme by Councillor Sue Lissimore when he had not been asked his view on this, having only been asked his views on the proposed TRO relating to the junction at Dugard Avenue. Mr Bloomfield informed the Joint Committee that the

Chairman had not named the County Councillor who had brought forward the potential TRO, and urged that the proposals be dropped as, in his view, they were based on inaccurate information regarding levels of support.

Mr Stuart Spindler wrote to formally state his objection, and that of A. Spindler to the proposed TRO for President Road/Oaklands Avenue, stating that Oaklands Avenue was a quiet residential road with no signage or traffic calming measures, no central lines or parking restrictions. The road was described as quiet, except during peak times, and Mr Spindler gave his view that no red route or junction restrictions were needed. The road was described as having no known accident black spots, with accident data not supporting the TRO application. Mr Spindler put forward that data on stationary road traffic accidents [RTCs] would not have any bearing on a red route TRO, and noted that the Council's scoring matrix did not support the application. It was suggested that restrictions instead be looked at for King Harold Road (by the community building, or on Ambrose Avenue around the GP surgery there. Mr Spindler described the proposal as having been enacted via the Chairman's authority and made an accusation that this was a party-political action, and that Councillor Lissimore had proposed the TRO without considering all reasonable options. A further accusation was stated that local residents' support was either lacking or had been falsified, and Mr Spindler requested that the Joint Committee acted according to its processes and the spirit of democracy.

Ms Laura Newman wrote regarding the Oaklands Avenue TRO proposals, laying out her objections and concerns regarding how the proposals had been brought forward. Ms Newman gave the timeline that she had pieced together from minutes, conversations and Freedom of Information [FoI] requests. Councillor Lissimore had submitted the two TRO applications without petitions of residents, leading to the NEPP rejecting the proposals and stating that they would not be scored if unaccompanied by petitions from local residents.

Councillor Lissimore, with permission from the Chairman, addressed the Joint Committee to say that she had received concerns from residents for years, and had surveyed, leafleted and door knocked across the area, sharing an email and telephone number for residents to use to contact her about their views. Street surgeries were stated to have been held, and Cllr Lissimore described her meeting with a group of Oaklands Avenue residents. The information collected had been provided to the NEPP, after which Councillor Lissimore noted that no response came from the NEPP for a year, and that she was then told that the lack of petition meant that the TRO proposals would go no further. Councillor Lissimore then raised this with the Chairman, explained the issue with the policy wording and the confusion it caused. Councillor Lissimore acknowledged that restrictions could have knock on effects and stated that she had listened to residents and explained the process, just wanting the area to be as safe as possible.

The Chairman thanked all for their views and explained the reasons for his adding the two TROs in question on to the list of TROs previously put to the Joint Committee when approval was sought to move to formal consultation. Councillor Lissimore had approached him with concerns regarding the TRO Policy, its wording and processes. Councillor Honeywood gave a brief timeline of the matter,

noting that Councillor Lissimore had been informed in October 2024 that the two applications she had proposed could be recorded, but were not likely to be approved by the Joint Committee to go to consultation, as they did not include petitions as evidence of support. Councillor Lissimore had stated that the TRO Policy had asked for evidence of local support, giving petitions as an example but not stating them as a requirement. This had led to confusion about the scoring criteria for TROs and the Chairman stated that this confusion had led to his decision to seek clarification of the Policy, so that the wording matched the intention to require a petition to show local support for any applications. This had now been done. In an effort to find a fair way to address the proposals from Councillor Lissimore, the Chairman explained that he had proposed that the two TRO applications be put to the Joint Committee, to decide whether they should go forward to formal consultation. The Joint Committee had then agreed that they should go to formal consultation. The Chairman gave assurances that there had been no use of loopholes in this matter, and that he had not been politically motivated in his actions and would have done the same for any elected member or member of the public who had raised a similar issue.

Jake England, Interim Head of NEPP, added that the policy had been extant for some time, developed over a number of years. Following discussions between the Chairman and Officers, the proposal had been made to amend the policy wording to be clear and consistent, and that the two TRO applications from Councillor Lissimore be put to the Joint Committee for decision as to whether to go to consultation, sponsored by Councillor Honeywood and Essex County Council.

The responses received from the consultees had now been received and the Interim Head of NEPP would now need to go through the report and decide whether to halt one or both TROs, or to approve them or bring back to the Joint Committee for decision. The report would be reviewed in the coming week and an approach decided. This would be communicated to all, including the Chairman and County Council member, Councillor Lissimore.

206. Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 20 March 2025 be approved as an accurate record.

207. NEPP Financial Update and 2024-25 outturn

Paul Atkinson, Deputy Section 151 Officer [Colchester City Council], presented the financial position of the NEPP as at the end of 2024-25. Outturn showed a £118k surplus, in excess of the projected £106k expected. The reserve balance had moved from a £39k deficit to a £79k reserve.

An overspend of £127k was detailed, with an overspend of £168k on data-led services, where no budget had been set for the year. The restructure of NEPP and consultation exercise had entailed some costs. The bad debt provision for the year was £117,200 higher than planned, and this was explained. There had been an underspend on Civil Enforcement Officers [CEOs] and their management, but an overspend on back office operations, mostly prior to the restructure. An increase in

the level of charges, approved by the Joint Committee previously, had led to an increase in income. There had been some issues with fee income, where some sites had been out of operation at periods.

The Deputy Section 151 Officer emphasised that there was a robust and achievable budget in place for the organisation, and paid tribute to the work done to achieve this by the Finance Team at Colchester City Council.

Councillor Michael Barry, Tendring District Council, explained that his Council had last year been budgeting to potentially leave the NEPP, but that over the year and with meetings of Section 151 Officers and improved transparency, the situation had improved. Councillor Barry welcomed the improved reporting and reserve position.

Another member of the Joint Committee ventured that the overspend and reserve position indicated that there was some fragility still. The vacancy factor for empty positions for CEOs and their management was detailed in the report, and officers were asked if there were plans to stabilise the frontline staffing and when this stability would be delivered.

The Interim Head of NEPP explained that the vacancy factor was an average for the full 2024-25 year, with peaks and troughs. Staffing levels had peaked near year end, and that level was being maintained. The Colchester City Council pay award had been made near the end of 2024-25 and then backdated. This had attracted more applicants to fill vacancies, and a campaign was ongoing to boost their work and numbers. The recruitment drive had brought CEO numbers almost back to pre-Covid levels. Staffing levels were now stable.

Thanks were given to officers for their work in taking difficult decisions. Praise was given to the CEOs for the work that they did.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE notes the outturn for 2024/25 and the impact of the Parking Reserve balance.

208. Annual Governance Review and Internal Audit

Hayley McGrath, Corporate Governance Manager [Colchester City Council], explained her role and the audit process. An annual governance review was not a statutory requirement but was conducted as it was best practice to do so. Items set out in the report were ones already raised at this meeting, such as TROs and finance matters.

With the NEPP reserve not yet having recovered to the required £400k level, this meant that some members of the Joint Committee had raised concerns that work on TROs had continued, even though the NEPP Agreement stated that such work should only go ahead if at least £400k was held in NEPP reserves. The Joint Committee had chosen to permit such work to continue in order to provide the best possible service in the NEPP area. There was no governance issue in this approach being taken, but a Joint Committee member welcomed the issue being

shown in the governance review.

The audit undertaken in December 2022 had resulted in a 'Reasonable' grade being given, and the results of the 2025 audit shown. Recommendations included those relating to the cash collection processes. There was an ongoing contract for this, so this should go out to tender but few organisations had the ability to do this work, so a tender process was unlikely to garner much interest. One option was to go to cashless charging.

Officers were asked what percentage of PCNs [Penalty Charge Notices] went unpaid and were passed to bailiffs, and whether the level of recovery (£13k of £124k passed to bailiffs) was an expected level.

The Interim Head of NEPP responded that he did not have the percentage to hand but could calculate this for the Joint Committee. Benchmarking was possible, and the NEPP could compare its collection rate to South Essex Parking Partnership [SEPP] and to Suffolk. As the PCN collection process went through its stages, there were diminishing returns to be had as the NEPP went through the recovery process. There were alternative options, and a business case for these was being prepared for consideration, looking at potential additional actions both before and after the bailiff stage.

The Corporate Governance Manager was asked how the NEPP ensured and monitored independence in its audit process, and what formal feedback processes there were for partners to feed into the formal audit process. This included a question as to whether Joint Committee members had the opportunity to challenge anything that concerned them.

The Corporate Governance Manager highlighted that Colchester City Council's internal audits were done by the independent company Tier. There was the opportunity for all partners' audit managers to raise any concerns. This opportunity had been taken at certain points in the past, and regular meetings were held with them. The Corporate Governance Manager emphasised that she was available to contact with any concerns that Joint Committee members or partner officers might have. Her meetings with Client Officers included bringing the governance review and audit report to the formal Client Officer Meeting prior to this Committee meeting, and it was underlined that the Joint Committee was not required to accept the report's findings if it disagreed with them. The Annual Governance Statement of Colchester City Council covered the NEPP, and any concerns could be included in that Statement. Other partners in the NEPP could do likewise if they felt this to be appropriate.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE has: -

- a) Noted the Annual Governance Review of the North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP), and;
- b) Considered the progress made on implementing Internal Audit recommendations for the North Essex Parking Partnership

209. Annual Review of Risk Management

Hayley McGrath, Corporate Governance Manager [Colchester City Council], explained the identification of risks looking forward. The Joint Committee had ownership of its risk register, so could make changes to the draft proposed. Recommendations for updates had been made, having been considered already at the latest Client Officer Meeting. Operational risks were not included, as these were handled within service areas. The register showed strategic risks regarding issues that could harm the overall ability of the NEPP to carry out its services. No significant changes were being recommended, and the register had been reviewed by Tier, as part of their internal audit work.

Risk 1.3 was recommended for a lowering of its impact rating as a result of previous conversations and discussions on the NEPP Agreement. Risk 1.21 was recommended for an increase in its probability rating, given that advancements in technology were continuing apace. Risk 1.23 was raised and Joint Committee asked to consider replacing it with new risk 1.29, which gave more specific details as to possible economic and wider environment impacts which might hamper service delivery, investment and financial position. Risk 1.27 was recommended for a reduction in its probability rating, as a result of the successful recruitment campaign. New risk 1.28 related to Local Government Reorganisation [LGR], and the danger that a lack of clarity on this could impact on the NEPP's ability to deliver above the baseline of service provision.

A Joint Committee member welcomed the work being done to anticipate LGR, and to highlight the constant change. The Corporate Governance Manager was asked whether control measures and lessons could be learned from local authorities which had already undergone LGR, and whether there were any which carried out parking services in the same way that these were done in Essex. The Corporate Governance Manager explained that she could provide a specific briefing on the risks of LGR, if the Joint Committee wanted one. This could be potentially scheduled at the half year point in 2025-26. The Interim Head of NEPP gave his understanding that the set up used by NEPP and SEPP was unique. Richard Walker, Colchester Client Officer (and current President of the British Parking Association), described the Essex approach as pioneering, devolving County Council functions to districts. There were enforcement partnerships operating in Nottinghamshire/Derbyshire and in Leicestershire, but these were not the same as NEPP and did not provide a service covering all parking matters.

In answer to questions, the Corporate Governance Manager stated that there were no current contingency plans regarding mitigation of the risk relating to LGR. Much work was being carried out by all NEPP partners to examine potential risks and what might happen. The Corporate Governance Manager would be working with the Interim Head of NEPP and Client Officers going forward, and reporting back to the Joint Committee.

A Joint Committee member asked if there was any budget provision for risk 1.21. The Interim Head of NEPP described the increase in budget for certain business-critical areas, including the purchase of new equipment. CEOs had been using handheld devices which were past their given operational lifespans which could no

longer be repaired, so new equipment had been needed. AI was being used more widely and effectively in the parking sector. Significant investments could be made in machine learning, and the longer this was delayed, the further behind the organisation would become. Technological advances needed to be incorporated into the NEPP so that it would be ready for the outcomes of LGR, but the Joint Committee was told that there would be prioritisation, as the NEPP could not afford all potential options for improved use of technology.

The Joint Committee discussed whether a lowering of the probability rating of risk 1.25 was premature. The Corporate Governance Manager explained that the current elevated rating had been agreed last year, due to work carried out, and that this was a return to the previous rating, with a recommendation to retain the risk on the register for consideration going forward. The elevated risk rating could be retained, if the Joint Committee thought it to be too early to reduce it.

A Joint Committee member asked whether a risk relating to cyber-attacks should be added at the next review. Attacks which might bring down online systems were of concern, alongside the desirability of having a mitigation plan for alternative ways to operate, should this be needed. The Corporate Governance Manager confirmed that this was a key strategic risk for Colchester City Council, alongside LGR. This fell within the City Council's business continuity plans, with all service areas having their own continuity plans, including the NEPP. These looked at likely things which might happen, their probability of happening and the impact if they did occur. This could be considered for inclusion in the Joint Committee's Risk Register, if the Joint Committee wished to add it in the future.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE: -

- a) Endorses the Risk Management Strategy for 2025/26, and;
- b) Agrees the Strategic Risk Register.

210. Traffic Regulation Order Application Decision Report – Tendring District

Danielle Wood, Group Development Manager, introduced the decisions to be made, which had been deferred from the Joint Committee meeting in January 2025. It was confirmed that the recommendations from Tendring District Council, as shown in the amended Appendix A, were for three of the schemes to be approved to go to formal consultation, and for one to be rejected. Andy Nepean, Tendring Client Officer, confirmed that consultation had been carried out with residents, local and neighbouring councillors, and that petitions had been received and the proposals formally published.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE: -

- a) APPROVES proposed Traffic Regulation Orders T19536977, T216727411 and T18562659;
- b) REJECTS proposed Traffic Regulation Order T18572871

- c) Notes 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.

211. NEPP Joint Committee Agreement 2022 (as amended Draft v4)

Jake England, Interim Head of NEPP, gave a summary of the scrutiny that had been made of the NEPP Agreement over several years, originating in large part from concerns stemming from the organisation’s financial provisions and how the related content within the Agreement oversaw these and directed how the organisation should act in various situations. In January 2025 the Joint Committee had not approved proposals for wording changes to be worked out by Client Officers, with some partners then continuing to lead on working on these in the background. Feedback and concerns raised by other partners at the Joint Committee’s meeting on 23 January 2025 had then been addressed by the partners working on the proposals.

If the Joint Committee were to approve today’s recommended decisions, the draft amended NEPP Agreement would be sent to Essex County Council’s Legal Team. Should the Legal Team then give their agreement in principle, then the executives of each NEPP partner would then need to approve the changes in order for them to be enacted. The Interim Head of NEPP underlined that all partners would need to agree at that stage, or the proposals would fall and could not be implemented.

The Joint Committee discussed the proposals and their ramifications and implications. A member described the process as being complex and certain to take a long time, with LGR in the near future. It was suggested that this work would not be a priority for the County Council’s Legal Team, given the amount of work that LGR would mean for them. The process would be costly, could be vetoed by any one NEPP partner, and LGR could be instigated before anything is finalised. A member raised the possibility that the County Council might have to incur costs to instruct outside counsel and experts. Another Joint Committee member gave assurance that he had spoken with Paul Turner, Head of the County Council’s Legal Team, who had told him that his team would deal with the agreement if instructed to do so.

A Joint Committee member laid out their aims in amending the Agreement, seeking to make it LGR-compliant. Currently it contained no clauses to govern what would happen to NEPP resources if it were to be broken up in LGR. There was also currently no content to stipulate specifically what was within the remit of the NEPP, which it was argued had caused difficulties when member of the Joint Committee and Client Officers had not known what duties were retained by Essex County Council [ECC]. Concerns had also been raised that the NEPP was working contrary to the Agreement, such as in carrying out TRO work whilst reserve levels were under £400k. It was argued by the Joint Committee member that the changes would rectify this situation, tidy up the appendices issues and addresses wording confusion which had led to issues.

Some Joint Committees member expressed unease that the changes did not appear to be simple, and that the possibly disproportionate cost of officer time in dealing with this matter needed to be weighed up. The Joint Committee discussed the suggestion that it should consider whether, instead of looking at Agreement changes, the NEPP was able to continue to operate up to LGR as it currently was. Views were expressed that the new unitary councils were unlikely to cover the same areas as the NEPP and SEPP.

The review of legal agreements was argued to not be the role of councillors, but should be left to trained and qualified officers, who should have been asked to look at this at the start of the process. The Joint Committee discussed members' views as to when councillor involvement was appropriate, and when it might be necessary. There was agreement around the need for qualified officers to examine the proposals which, it was argued by a Joint Committee member, was why the request was being made to send the draft amendments to ECC Legal for consideration.

A suggestion was made that perhaps the draft amended Agreement could be sent to ECC Legal, and their work on it be timeboxed in order to constrain how much officer time was expended. Some Joint Committee members expressed hopes that the changes could be adopted quickly.

Jo Heynes, ECC Client Officer, explained that the proposed changes would need to go through the full ECC governance process, including extra approvals and at a minimum requiring approval by the relevant Cabinet Member and Director. The Client Officer gave a commitment to check as to whether full Cabinet approval would be needed.

A motion was moved by Councillor Butland [seconded by Councillor Purse] to propose that the Joint Committee take no further action on the subject of this item. On being put to the vote, the motion was LOST [TWO voted FOR, THREE voted AGAINST and ONE ABSTENTION].

RESOLVED [THREE voted FOR, TWO voted AGAINST, ONE ABSTENTION] that the JOINT COMMITTEE: -

- a) Notes The North Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee Agreement 2022 (as amended Draft v4).
- b) Agrees to send The North Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee Agreement 2022 (as amended Draft v4) to ECC's Legal Department for consideration.

212. Forward Plan 2024-2025

Owen Howell, Clerk to the Joint Committee, confirmed that a six-month update on the LGR-related risks and risk management for the NEPP would be scheduled in, as requested by the Joint Committee.

RESOLVED that the JOINT COMMITTEE approves the North Essex Parking Partnership Forward Plan for 2025-26, subject to the addition of a half-year update on LGR risk management.



North Essex Parking Partnership

Joint Parking Committee

Meeting Date: 13th November 2025

Title: NEPP Financial Update – 2025/26 Q2 Position

Author: Caroline Parker – Senior Finance Business Partner

Presented by: Caroline Parker

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

1. Recommended Decisions

- 1.1. To note the Quarter 2 (Q2) 2025/26 year-to-date (YTD) financial position, the expected full year outturn for 2025/26, and the impact of the Parking Reserve balance.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decisions

- 2.1. To achieve good practice governance in terms of monitoring and controlling in-year expenditure 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. This report updates the Committee on:
 - The Q2 financial position and expected full year outturn of the NEPP for the year 2025/26.
 - The projected impacts on the NEPP Reserve balance.

4. Q2 YTD Financial Position 2025/26

- 4.1. The Q2 YTD financial position as of 30th September 2025, presented in Appendix A, shows a contribution to the surplus of £12,191.
- 4.2. Within the overall YTD surplus of £12,191 there was a small **underspend of £19,714 on expenditure budgets**. This includes:
 - **Staffing underspend of £14,116**. This trend is not forecast to continue, and is driven by savings on management and Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO's), albeit partially offset by slightly higher costs on Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) and back office staff.
 - **Other costs (direct) underspent by £5,599**. This is driven by small underspends on TRO works and DVLA fees. Transport costs also currently underspent, but this is expected

to be broadly on budget as we approach year end. Printing and postage costs have exceeded budget expectations and this trend is set to continue for the rest of the year.

4.3 For income budgets there was an under-recovery of £7,523 YTD. Variances within this include:

- **£89,402 under-recovery of income on Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs).** This is based on income to date, but the variance does reflect 2024/25 debtor adjustment. Is expected to exceed income target by year end.
- **£49,359 additional Parking Permits/Season Tickets income.** This is due to the increased take up in Residents and visitor permits.
- **£28,788 over recovery of income across other areas.** This is driven by ad hoc work for other local authorities.

5. Full Year Forecasted Outturn 2025/26

5.1. The forecasted outturn position for 2025/26, presented in Appendix A, is expected to provide a year-end surplus of £145,752, which is £81,159 above the assumed surplus of £64,593 in the 2025/26 Budget. The NEPP Reserve has a closing surplus balance of £78,982 as at 31st March 2025, and would therefore give a closing balance of £224,734 as at 31st March 2026.

5.2. The overall surplus is expected to be £145,752 for 2025/26, with a predicted overspend of £62,386 on expenditure budgets. Significant variances as follows:

- **£17,822 underspend on management.** This is driven by staff acting up into higher management roles but is partially worsened by higher than budgeted pay award.
- **£29,064 overspend on CEO's and direct supervision.** The overspend relates to existing staff opting into Pension scheme, Colchester Managed Grade 11 (CMG11) pay scale uplift and higher than budgeted pay award.
- **£20,654 overspend on Back Office staff.** Forecast overspend relates to PCN Recovery training, CMG 11 pay scale uplift and higher than budgeted pay award.
- **£9,769 overspend on TRO's.** Forecast overspend relates to pressure from budget setting on split coded posts within TRO and Off Street team and higher than budgeted pay award.

TOTAL PRESSURE ON EMPLOYEE COSTS IS FORECASTED TO BE £41,665 FOR 2025/26

- **£31,200 underspend on Premises / TRO maintenance.** Forecast underspend relates to TRO Repairs & Maintenance of £22k (lining works and weather dependant) and £9k on premises hire due to BDC agreeing to not charge for St Georges Yard MSCP facilities.
- **£56,634 overspend on supplies and services.** This is due to increased printing and postage costs for the year (£19k and £37.5k respectively). The significant increased cost is due to PCN debt registration to allow debt recovery - the increase makes good of a backlog from the previous financial year but more may be required towards year-end to minimise passing on further pressure into 2026/27.
- **£4,713 underspend on Transport costs and third party payments.** The expected positive variance is largely down to lower DVLA fees (£4050) with a small transport underspend (£663) making up the balance.

TOTAL PRESSURE ON DIRECT COSTS IS FORECASTED TO BE £20,721 FOR 2025/26

5.3. For income budgets there is expected to be an over-recovery of £143,545. Variances within this include:

- **£72,053 over-recovery on additional Parking Permits/Season Tickets income.** Increased resident and business permits are expected to generate an additional £64k compared to budget, and visitor permits to generate an additional £15k. Season tickets are expected to under-recover by approx. £7k.
- **£53,000 over-recovery on PCN's.** A trend has now been established, and it is anticipated to exceed budget as above.
- **£18,492 over recovery of income across other areas.** This is driven by ad hoc work for other local authorities. This work is not factored into the budget so any work undertaken will improve the income position.

NET EXPECTED OUTTURN FOR 2025/26 WILL SURPASS BUDGET BY £81,159

6. NEPP Reserve Movements/Balance

6.1. Following transfer of the £117,903 surplus the reserve balance as at 31 March 2025 is £78,982. Based on an estimated surplus of £145,752 in 2025/26, the balance as at 31 March 2026 is forecasted to be £224,734.

7. Standard References

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

NEPP Financial Update - 2025/26 Expected Outturn

North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP)						
2025/26 Budget Forecast						
30th September 2025 (M6)						
		2025/26				
		Budget (Profiled Month 6)	Actual Spending (Month 6)	Variance (Month 6)	Budget (Full Year)	Forecast Outturn (31 March 2025)
		£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
Expenditure						
	Employee Costs (Direct)					
	Management	68,388	63,392	-4,996	159,322	141,500
	CEOs & Supervision	890,827	874,776	-16,052	1,781,630	1,810,694
	Back Office	222,495	224,630	2,134	444,975	465,629
	TRO's	118,185	122,982	4,797	236,400	246,169
	Other Costs (Direct)					
	Premises / TRO Maintenance costs	53,026	51,383	-1,644	98,650	67,450
	Transport costs (running costs)	37,125	32,858	-4,267	61,030	60,368
	Supplies & Services	272,050	274,816	2,766	459,330	515,964
	Third Party Payments	5,625	3,171	-2,454	19,350	15,300
	Bad Debts	0	0	0	70,000	70,000
		1,667,722	1,648,007	-19,714	3,330,687	3,393,073
Income						
	Penalty Charges (PCNs)	-875,000	-785,598	89,402	-2,100,000	-2,153,000
	Parking Permits/Season Tickets	-578,805	-628,165	-49,359	-1,157,900	-1,229,953
	Parking Charges and other fees	-283,004	-286,735	-3,731	-566,000	-566,000
	Other income	-754	-29,542	-28,788	-1,500	-19,992
		-1,737,563	-1,730,040	7,523	-3,825,400	-3,968,945
DIRECT COSTS (NET)		-69,842	-82,032	-12,191	-494,713	-575,872
CORPORATE OVERHEADS (INDIRECT)*		215,060	215,060	0	430,120	430,120
TOTAL COSTS		145,218	133,028	-12,191	-64,593	-145,752
*Note - Corporate Overheads pro rated for illustration (e.g. 6/12 at Month 6)						
Forecast Movement on NEPP Reserve						
		£000's				
Opening Balance 01/04/23 (Actual B/Fwd.)		160,083	Deficit			
Actual Contribution 2023/24		-121,162				
Balance 31/03/24 (Outturn)		38,921	Deficit			
Opening Balance 01/04/24 (Actual B/Fwd.)		38,921	Deficit			
Actual Contribution 2024/25		-117,903		Reflects outturn surplus		
Balance 31/03/25 (Outturn)		-78,982	Surplus			
Opening Balance 01/04/25 (Actual B/Fwd.)		-78,982	Surplus			
Forecast Contribution 2025/26		-145,752		Reflects forecast surplus		
Forecast Balance 31/03/26		-224,734	Surplus			
Opening Balance 01/04/26 (Estimated B/Fwd.)		-224,734	Surplus			
Budgeted Contribution 2026/27		0				
Estimated Forecast Balance 31/03/27		-224,734	Surplus			
Column Totals may not agree due to roundings						



North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 13 November 2025

Title: Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Policy Update Report

Author: Danielle Wood, Group Development Manager

Presented by: Danielle Wood, Group Development Manager

This report presents a revised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Policy for approval by the Joint Committee. The updated policy improves clarity, restructures content for public accessibility and includes the 5-year rule as previously agreed. The revised policy replaces the December 2022 version, and aligns with statutory guidance.

1. Recommended Decision(s)

- 1.1 To agree the revised general NEPP Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Policy (October 2025), detailed in Appendix A, replacing the previous version dated December 2022.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)

- 2.1. The TRO Policy has been reviewed and updated to reflect current operational practices, improve clarity, and ensure alignment with statutory guidance and Essex County Council (ECC) criteria.
- 2.2. The revised policy introduces clearer expectations for applicants and a more structured assessment process.

3. Supporting Information

- 3.1 The current TRO policy and supporting documents can be viewed in the "Traffic Regulation Order Policies" section of NEPP's website at <https://north.parkingpartnership.org/policies-and-procedures/>
- 3.2 The revised policy has been developed in consultation with NEPP officers and reflects feedback from previous applications and Member discussions.
- 3.3 The updated document is intended to provide greater transparency for applicants and stakeholders, streamline internal processes, and ensure consistency across the Partnership area.
- 3.4 A copy of the revised policy is appended to this report and will be published on the NEPP website following approval.

4. Summary of key changes

4.1 The main purpose of updating this policy was to ensure clarity. The key changes include:

- Part One and Part Two swapped: the new policy begins with guidance on applying for new restrictions, followed by the right to challenge existing ones. This improves public accessibility and aligns with the natural flow of user engagement.
- Appendices expanded and integrated: previously linked documents, such as the TRO Flow Chart and Scoring Methodology, are now embedded for ease of reference.
- Improved formatting and clarity: headings, bullet points and sectioning have been refined for readability and professionalism.
- Evidence of support: clarity around the requester's responsibilities has been included. Applicants must demonstrate 75% support from affected residents/businesses for a request in order to be automatically progressed to scoring stage and prioritised, setting a clear threshold for community backing. This does not mean requests showing less than 75% will not be considered, though there have been past incidents where schemes which progressed without this evidenced support have received significant levels of objection and subsequently been withdrawn. This evidenced support helps to ensure funds are used wisely.
- Inclusion of the "5-year rule": as previously agreed at January 2025's Committee meeting, restrictions will not be considered for new developments within 5 years of adoption unless externally funded. Statutory guidance dictates that authorities must be flexible where substantial changes (such as housing developments) have taken place - the NEPP are in contact with partner authority planning teams and provide guidance at the relevant stage.
- Updates to NEPP's criteria for determining requests: the new policy reflects enforcement capabilities and clarifies preferred solutions.

5. Standard References

5.1 Other than set out above, there are no particular references to the Development Plan; publicity or consultation considerations; or equality, diversity and human rights; community safety; health and safety implications.

6. Appendices

Appendix A: Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Policy (October 2025)



Traffic Regulation Order Policy

October 2025



In partnership with:



Contents

Introduction and Background	2
Part One – New Parking Restrictions.....	2
Introduction.....	2
Types of TROs	3
The Requirement for Waiting, Red Line and Red Route Restrictions.....	3
ECC Criteria for Determining Requests for new Parking Restrictions	4
NEPP Criteria for Determining Requests for new Parking Restrictions	4
Management of Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Requests.....	8
Implementing TROs once the Order is Made.....	10
Funding for TRO Schemes	11
Types of Parking Restriction and the Responsible Authority	11
Part Two – The Right to Challenge Parking Policies	12
Broad Principles	12
Reviewing Parking Policy and Restrictions	12
Requirements for Petition Validity	13
Management of Petitions	13
Inappropriate Reviews.....	13
Review of Parking Policies in Response to a Petition.....	13
Contact Details	14
Appendices	15
Appendix One – Types of TROs	15
Appendix Two – Functional Route Hierarchy.....	17
Appendix Three – TRO Flow Chart Process.....	18
Appendix Four – Request for Parking Restrictions Application Form	19
Appendix Five – Assessment System & Scoring Methodology	20



Introduction and Background

The Traffic Management Act 2004 imposes an explicit duty on local authorities to manage their network so as to reduce congestion and disruption and provides additional powers to do with parking. As part of their Network Management Duty, local authorities must develop parking strategies, both for on and off-street parking, that are linked to local objectives and circumstances. These strategies need to take account of planning policies and transport powers, as well as considering the needs of all road users in the area, the appropriate scale and type of provisions, the balance between short and long-term provision and the level of charges.

Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are legal documents developed by the traffic authority, or its agents such as the North Essex Parking Partnership, allowing the police and/or local authorities (e.g. Civil Enforcement Officers) to enforce various matters to do with the speed, movement, parking and other restrictions of pedestrians and vehicles, by law.

Making the best use of our current road network is important for both the local economy and society. Potential conflicts will need to be carefully handled. The current system recognises the responsibility of Councils to put in place parking strategies that reflect the needs of all road users, including pedestrians, cyclists, residents and businesses.

The Traffic Management Act 2004 was amended in 2015 to enable greater transparency and understanding of the purpose of parking policies, the reasons for putting TROs in place, and an avenue to challenge whether existing TROs are required. This policy provides detail on the process for applying for new restrictions (via Traffic Regulation Order) in Part One, and for challenging existing parking policies in Part Two.

The rest of the North Essex Parking Partnership's policies can be found at north.parkingpartnership.org/policies-and-procedures/.

Part One – New Parking Restrictions

Introduction

Under an agreement with Essex County Council (ECC), NEPP is authorised to carry out on-street parking enforcement and charging, maintain associated signs and lines, and implement Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) in accordance with the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. This document sets out the operational framework and relevant policies of both ECC and NEPP that guide the implementation of TRO schemes across the Partnership area.

This policy outlines how the North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP) manages requests for new parking restrictions submitted by Parish or Town Councils and members of the public. A consistent and standardised approach is essential to ensure that TROs comply with statutory regulations and reflect a uniform standard across Essex, including the use of fully mapped TROs. This policy aims to promote fairness and transparency in the consideration of new parking scheme requests, while supporting the Partnership's traffic management objectives.

Across the Partnership area, demand for parking restrictions continues to grow. As vehicle numbers increase, competition for kerbside space intensifies, leading members of the public



In partnership with:



and organisations to seek solutions to perceived parking problems. The overarching aim is to avoid introducing unnecessary restrictions and to ensure that limited NEPP resources are directed towards schemes that deliver the greatest benefit. Priority will be given to locations where uncontrolled parking causes significant issues for residents or traffic flow.

Whilst it is recognised that all requests may offer benefits to their respective areas, funding for new schemes is limited, thus this policy outlines the criteria used to assess and prioritise requests for consideration by the NEPP Joint Committee. Schemes that meet all the criteria are more likely to be included in the forward programme of works, subject to statutory consultation. However, schemes that do not meet all criteria may still be considered, with higher-priority schemes taking precedence. In all cases, progression is subject to available funding.

Types of TROs

TROs can be introduced on any road to which the public has access, provided ECC is the designated traffic authority. The classification or status of the route is not a limiting factor; TROs may apply to footpaths, bridleways, byways open to all traffic, and other highways, including main carriageways.

A road does not need to be formally adopted or maintained by the highway authority for a TRO to be applied. However, if the road is privately owned, written consent from the landowner is required before implementation.

TROs may include restrictions based on:

- The type of user (e.g. vehicles, pedestrians),
- The extent of the road affected,
- The time period during which the restrictions apply.

The various types of TRO – Permanent, Temporary and Experimental – are explained in detail in Appendix One.

The Requirement for Waiting, Red Line and Red Route Restrictions

TROs for waiting restrictions may be proposed for a variety of reasons, typically falling into one of the following four categories:

- **Safety** – to address identified areas with a history of personal injury collisions involving vehicles and pedestrians.
- **Congestion** – to improve traffic flow on key routes where parked vehicles obstruct movement.
- **New Development or Improvement Schemes** – to support wider transport of infrastructure initiatives, such as traffic calming measures or new road layouts.
- **Local Concerns** – to manage parking pressures from commuters, shoppers or residents.

Requests relating to **Safety**, **Congestion**, and **New Development/Improvement Schemes** are primarily managed by ECC in accordance with their own policies and assessment criteria, detailed in the following section of this policy.

In some cases, red line or red route restrictions may be proposed where traditional waiting restrictions are unsuitable. These will only be considered on the grounds of **Safety** and **Congestion**, as defined above. A separate policy for Red Routes can be found on NEPP's website.

ECC Criteria for Determining Requests for new Parking Restrictions

This section details the ECC criteria for considering requests for parking restrictions on safety and congestion grounds.

Safety and Collision Intervention Criteria

When considering the need for a restriction on safety grounds, ECC identifies 'Single Sites' or 'Clusters' where there have been five or more Personal Injury Collisions (PICs) within a 50m radius of the requested area over a three-year period. Safety Engineers study the collisions and identify any treatable patterns. Where a safety need is identified, the sites are prioritised for funding through the relevant Local Highways Panel.

Congestion Criteria

ECC has adopted a functional route hierarchy. This splits the road network into three classifications; priority one County Routes (PR1), priority two County Routes (PR2) and local roads. PR1 roads have been identified as high volume traffic routes which are essential to the economy of Essex. PR2 routes perform an essential traffic management distributor function between the local network and the PR1 routes. Delays to the movement of traffic on the PR1 and PR2 network will be minimised, and restrictions considered if required to achieve this aim.

Further detail on the functional route hierarchy is explained in Appendix Two.

NEPP Criteria for Determining Requests for new Parking Restrictions

The NEPP will receive all parking restriction requests that do not meet the criteria of ECC's safety and congestion policies. Although these requests do not meet the ECC criteria, the Partnership may decide to implement parking restrictions to improve safety and sight lines, if the Partnership consider that the restriction will be beneficial to the area.

The NEPP is likely to receive requests for restrictions to tackle the following issues:

- Commuter parking in a residential street (preferred parking),
- Short term invasion parking (outside schools, organisations, etc.),
- Provision of customer on-street parking for local shops and businesses,
- Driveway obstruction,
- Parking around industrial areas,
- Parking on verges, pavements and green areas.

Historically, many parking restrictions have been introduced with the aim of resolving particular local issues. However, it should be noted that the purpose of the highway is the passing and re-passing of vehicles, and that no right of parking exists. Parking provision is therefore a concession and, however desirable, should not be at the expense of the purpose of the highway. Where it is safe and desirable, parking can be allowed.



In partnership with:



The NEPP will avoid introducing unnecessary parking restrictions to combat minor short stay invasion parking problems or to address a preferred parking situation. The allocated funds will be concentrated on essential schemes where major parking issues exist and have fully evidenced local support where necessary.

Furthermore, the NEPP will not consider implementing restrictions on, or relating to, new-build sites for 5 years post-build/adoption, unless external funding is provided. In these cases, the NEPP will have provided their professional advice during planning stages and, as such, should not incur any costs where this advice was not followed. The NEPP will, however, be flexible, particularly where a policy may have been substantially affected by an external change since the last review (for instance, major housing or commercial developments or population shifts). Requests will then be considered on a case-by-case basis.

The NEPP requires any application for new parking restrictions to include evidence of support from at least 75% of those affected by any proposed changes to the highway, in order to be automatically progressed to scoring stage and, subsequently, to Committee for a decision. It will be the responsibility of the requester to carry out an informal survey and provide evidence with their application; if advice on the area to survey is required, NEPP's Technical Team can provide support and guidance. Any application which does not include this support will be held as 'pending' for 12 months, until either evidenced support is provided, **or** the relevant partner authority provides mitigating reasoning as to why the application should be progressed without support, **or** provides external funding.

Commuter parking in a residential street (preferred parking)

The majority of residential estates were not designed for the level of car ownership or the volume of traffic using them today. It is necessary to investigate and prioritise each request received so that those areas in most need are given greater priority. The criteria set out below provides the basis for priority.

The preferred traffic management solution for parking issues in residential areas is the introduction of a residents parking scheme. This type of scheme will only allow residents and their visitors to park within a designated area throughout the period of the restriction and exclude all other vehicles.

The criteria for prioritising requests for restrictions in residential areas are as follows:

- **The parking by non-residents must be sufficiently severe so as to cause serious inconvenience to residents.**

Vehicles parked for the whole length of the road, taking all available space for long periods of the day, will be considered sufficiently severe. Any parking which is deemed as short-term invasion (school drop-off/pick-up etc) will not necessarily be considered.

- **The majority of residents are in favour of such a scheme.**

Any proposed parking scheme will require a consultation with all parties involved, including residents of the street(s) affected. If there is no evidenced majority of 75% or above in support of the scheme, it is highly unlikely that the scheme will progress.

- **The introduction of a scheme must not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads.**

When surveying an area it is essential that, if displacement parking is considered likely, there should be evidenced support for consideration of restrictions to mitigate the risk of displacement parking in affected roads.

- **The NEPP is satisfied that a reasonable level of enforcement can be maintained.**
For every new restriction that is introduced, a level of enforcement will be required. This can impact upon the amount of resource available and the cost of the overall enforcement account. Therefore, the future price structure of residents' permits will need to reflect the overall operation.
- **The majority of residents have no off-street parking facilities available to them.**
If the majority of properties have no off-street parking, then any amount of parking by non-residents will have an impact on the available space for residents of the area. If the majority of properties have off-street parking, any parking on the highway will have less impact on residents. If residents with off-street parking request implementation of parking restrictions to prevent vehicles parking on the street, but are happy for visitors to park in the area, this will be considered 'preferred parking', and will likely result in a recommendation to reject the requested scheme.

Short-term invasion parking (outside schools, organisations etc)

Short-term invasion parking refers to vehicles parking briefly to drop off or pick up passengers or goods at locations such as schools, convenience stores, or other known organisations. While these instances are typically short in duration, they can cause significant disruption, particularly during peak times.

If this type of parking restriction request does not meet ECC's safety of congestion criteria, it is unlikely that NEPP will propose the introduction of parking restrictions as a high priority. The enforcement of any restriction that is introduced to tackle short-term parking issues requires a concentrated enforcement presence and is therefore not practical or cost-effective.

However, enforcement capabilities have progressed, with NEPP now able to monitor and enforce certain restrictions using approved devices such as camera-equipped vehicles or static cameras. NEPP may therefore consider the introduction of red route restrictions in areas where traditional zig-zag markings are unsuitable or ineffective. These routes are designed to improve safety and traffic flow and can be enforced more robustly, without requiring constant on-foot presence.

Whilst requests for restrictions related to short-term invasion parking may still be considered low priority unless they meet ECC's safety or congestion criteria, NEPP will assess each case on its merits. Where there is clear evidence of persistent disruption, safety concerns, or strong local support, NEPP may recommend appropriate measures.

Provision of customer on-street parking for local shops and businesses

Designated areas of on-street parking can be created to serve the needs of local businesses and the retail sector, to ensure these areas are not subjected to all day commuter parking.

The Partnership's preferred method of traffic management for this type of request is a pay and display scheme, most likely managed via a digital payment system. Enforcement of a pay and display scheme is considered more effective than limited waiting schemes and ensures the necessary turnover of parking space for customer availability. The by-product of a pay and display scheme is income, which can help financially support the daily enforcement operation.

An important part of the criteria for assessing such a request would include the capital cost of implementing a pay and display scheme, including revenue costs such as daily maintenance. Consultation with local traders and other local interest groups would also form part of the pre-feasibility work.

Driveway Obstruction

If a vehicle is parked across an approved dropped kerb and obstructing the driveway, a Civil Enforcement Officer (CEO) can issue a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) for obstruction of a dropped kerb, provided the vehicle is not parked in a designated parking place. Enforcement of this type will only take place if the resident of the property reports the obstruction to NEPP. In all cases, obstruction of the highway is the jurisdiction of Essex Police, who have the necessary powers to remove vehicles that are considered to cause an obstruction.

A white H-bar marking can be placed on the highway, indicating access to the driveway. This type of marking is advisory only and is chargeable to the customer. There is a separate [application form](#) for this. These markings will not be maintained by NEPP or ECC; if it wears away or is removed as part of any highway works, the property owner would be liable for any replacement costs.

Parking around industrial areas

There are areas within industrial sites where the workforce relies on long stay parking on the highway. Provided ECC confirm that the parking in these areas does not cause safety or congestion concerns, the NEPP will consider this type of parking acceptable. Furthermore, cars parked in these areas can act as a natural speed calming measure. Any introduction of parking restrictions in these types of areas will do no more than to potentially displace parking to an alternative location.

Requests for new restrictions will therefore be considered a very low priority.

Parking on verges, pavement and green areas

There are many variations of this type of parking issue and each case will be taken on its individual merit. Enforcement of verges, pavements and green areas can only be enforceable under the Traffic Management Act 2004 if the area is confirmed as public highway and is supported by a relevant TRO. It is impractical to provide a TRO and the relevant signage for every instance of verge or pavement parking. This would result in unnecessary street furniture clutter and unacceptable administration costs.

Until such time legislation permits a blanket order for this type of issue, or powers to enforce pavement parking where an obstruction is evident are given to Local Authorities, then NEPP advice will be for alternative solutions to be pursued as follows;

- If it is deemed obstruction of a footpath/pavement, referral to Essex Police who may issue a Fixed Penalty Notice and remove the vehicle if necessary,
- If the parking is causing damage to the surface/green area, and the area is public highway, referral to ECC to consider the introduction of a waiting restriction,
- Upon determination of land ownership (via ECC), preventative measures such as wooden posts or bollards may be installed to prevent vehicles accessing the area. ECC will be responsible for this decision,
- If the land is maintained by a local authority, and the area is ornamental, mown or maintained to a high standard with the relevant licenses in place, the Essex Act may be a practical alternative. This involves installation of signage which allows enforcement to take place, though installation costs must be borne by the requester. A separate policy is available in relation to the Essex Act.

Taxi Ranks

Requests for taxi rank provision will be considered on their individual merits and will need to complement the wider aims and interests of:

- Local transport development plans,
- Planning criteria and new development (S106 funding),
- Maintain the safe, free flow of traffic,
- Taxi associations.

NEPP will prioritise the requests according to need and will rely highly on local input from Lead Officers and Member representatives.

Loading and unloading provision

To ensure the vitality of local business and retail, NEPP has a commitment to ensure that delivery and goods vehicles have the opportunity to deliver goods in suitable locations.

Requests for the introduction of loading and unloading provision will be considered on their individual merit, but overall will be considered as a medium-high priority. Each request will need to complement the wider aims and interests of:

- Local transport development plans,
- Planning criteria and new development (S106 funding),
- Maintain the safe, free flow of traffic,
- Local business and retail organisations.

Junction Protection, Red Routes and Red Lines

Requests for junction protection through red or yellow lines will be considered on their individual merits. However, these will not constitute a priority as safety-related issues should be handled by Essex County Council.

Where a need is identified or sufficient local support is evidenced, an application will be assessed and prioritised in line with other applications received. Any scheme must address the need to maintain safe free flow of traffic and be able to be enforced effectively.

Management of Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Requests

The implementation of permanent TROs is subject to the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996. These impose various legal requirements prior to making an order. The TRO process typically takes 12 to 18 months from the initial request to completion, though it can take longer in some instances.

The TRO process flow chart (see Appendix Three) details the arrangements.

All new requests for parking restrictions should be submitted through our [online service](http://north.parkingpartnership.org) at north.parkingpartnership.org. If online access is not possible, alternative arrangements are outlined in Appendix Four.

Note: Before submitting a request for a new parking restriction, it is necessary to gather local support from those directly affected by the issue. Support from local Councillors and Parish, Town or City councils is also recommended. Requests from individuals will be considered as personal views unless accompanied by clear evidence of wider community support. **The NEPP requires applicants to provide evidence demonstrating support from at least 75%**



In partnership with:



of those affected by the proposed changes, in order to be automatically progressed to scoring stage and, subsequently, to Committee for a decision. Requests which do not meet this figure will be stored as 'pending' for 12 months, until either evidenced support is provided, or the relevant partner authority provides mitigating reasoning as to why the application should be progressed *without* support, or provides external funding. If an applicant requires, or would like, advice as to which properties constitute "affected addresses" in their individual circumstances, our Technical Team will be able to provide this support.

Once a request is received, the NEPP TRO team will review it on the grounds of safety and congestion considerations, in accordance with ECC policy criteria, and refer it to them where applicable.

For those which don't meet ECC criteria, the first stage of the process is a pre-feasibility assessment. A member of the NEPP team will gather information related to the request, which may include a site visit and, where appropriate, informal consultation with local stakeholders such as residents, traders and community groups. This helps assess whether there is a clear parking issue that warrants formal regulation.

Regardless of the outcome of any informal consultation, the NEPP reserves the right to implement a scheme if it is deemed essential – for example, to meet emergency services' requirements, specific traffic management needs, or on a temporary basis.

As part of the assessment process, the NEPP Technical Team will produce a report for each request. This report will include a recommendation to either approve or decline the proposal, details of any site visits, and outcomes of informal consultations, where applicable. Each report will include a formal quantitative score (see Appendix Five), along with qualitative considerations relating to social need. These reports are then reviewed by NEPP lead officers and elected Member representatives for a local decision on whether to proceed.

Schemes that receive local approval to proceed will then be referred to the NEPP Joint Committee for consideration. A report will be prepared for the Committee outlining the proposal, its assessment score, and an estimated cost to ensure transparency. The Committee will then decide whether to approve, defer or reject the scheme, considering funding. Information on funding options for new parking restrictions can be found on page 11.

For all approved proposals, a draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be prepared and then proceed to statutory consultation, in accordance with *The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996*. NEPP will work with the relevant Partner Authority to identify key local stakeholders for each proposed TRO scheme, ensuring consultations reach the appropriate parties. This stakeholder analysis will be completed and confirmed prior to all consultations.

Depending on the nature of the scheme, this consultation may include:

- The Highway Authority,
- Emergency Services,
- Freight Transport Association and Road Haulage Association,
- Local public transport operators.

In addition to these statutory consultees, NEPP may also seek feedback from local stakeholders, such as:

- County/City/District/Parish Councils and Councillors,
- Local Highways Panels and similar organisations.

If NEPP agrees to proceed with the TRO, the scheme must be publicly advertised. This includes on-site notices and at least one notice in the local press. NEPP typically displays notices on all affected roads and may deliver notices directly to key premises likely to be impacted.

For a minimum of 21 days from the start of the notice, the proposal and a statement of reasons for the TRO can be viewed at a nominated council office during normal hours or online via the NEPP website.

During this period, any person may submit objections or support through the relevant online portal, or in writing to the addresses specified in the notice. If objections are raised and remain unresolved after consideration by the Parking Partnership Group Manager, a report will be submitted to the Joint Committee. It is possible for part of the Order to proceed while other objections are still under review.

The Joint Committee will consider all representations and may approve, reject, or request modifications to the Order. Any modifications arising from objections may require further consultation, which can take several months. Due to the significant advertising and legal costs involved in this, TRO schemes typically need to be planned as part of the Annual Programme and cannot be implemented on an ad-hoc basis.

Once approved by the Committee, the TRO will be formally sealed and published in a local newspaper with an operational date. In the interim, signs and road markings are installed in preparedness for the new restrictions to become enforceable.

Implementing TROs once the Order is Made

For TROs agreed and funded by ECC to address issues of Safety, Congestion or New Development, ECC will either:

- Approach NEPP with a fully-designed scheme, ready for implementation; or,
- Identify a known issue and work collaboratively with NEPP to develop an agreed solution, including provision of sufficient funding for design and delivery.

In response, the NEPP Technical Team will:

- Implement the scheme, which may include design (as required), drafting the TRO, undertaking consultation and advertisement, reviewing objections, sealing the TRO, and installing the necessary signs and lines; or
- Decline to undertake the scheme, in which case ECC may commission the work through an alternative provider.

For TROs agreed and funded by NEPP – either directly or via an individual authority or local panel – to address local concerns, social needs, or strategic priorities, the NEPP Technical Team will be responsible for implementation or may commission delivery through other service providers.

Funding for TRO Schemes

ECC has a commitment to fund any schemes that meet the criteria of the ECC safety and congestion criteria and this is typically through the Local Highways Panels set up for each district. ECC will not provide funding for all other parking related schemes and will therefore need to be either funded by the Parking Partnership account or from other avenues.

Potential funding can be sourced from the following areas;

- The Parking Partnership account. Budget is allocated by ECC according to the current Joint Partnership Agreement – schemes will need to meet NEPP policy criteria to receive funding and this will be subject to the availability of funds and agreement by the JPC. The aim is for the Parking Partnership account to create sufficient surplus to be able to invest back into the TRO function.
- The Local Highway Panels. These LHPs have limited funding available for highway improvements. Any schemes would have to be presented to the local panel and funding for the scheme would have to be agreed by them and the ECC Cabinet Member.
- The borough / district / city and parish councils. Local councils can contribute to any schemes that are considered beneficial to the local area that do not receive funding from NEPP.
- Section 106 funding for new developments. Funding will be agreed at the planning development stage following consultation with NEPP.

Unless sufficient funding otherwise allows, the number of TRO schemes per district/city to be funded from the Parking Partnership account and allocated TRO budget will be six schemes per year. This includes those that meet the 'fourth tier' category of restriction (being those not considered as socially necessary, such as junction protection or school entrance markings). The Joint Committee may decide to approve more schemes in one District and fewer in another, providing the net number of schemes remains the same. This limit is in place to ensure that there is a balance between delivering new schemes and reviewing and maintaining existing ones, within the available budget.

Additional schemes may be approved where third-party funding is provided, or where a business case suggests that the scheme will self-finance, such as on-street payment parking or permit schemes.

Types of Parking Restriction and the Responsible Authority

NEPP will be responsible for the implementation and ongoing maintenance of the following type of parking restriction:

- No waiting and No Loading
- School Keep Clear
- Limited Waiting
- On-street Pay and Display
- Resident Parking Schemes
- Taxi Ranks
- Loading and Goods Vehicle Bays
- Red Routes and Red Lines



In partnership with:



ECC will continue to be responsible for the implementation and ongoing maintenance of the following type of parking restriction:

- On-street Blue Badge Bays
- Bus Stops
- Pedestrian Crossings

However, ECC may choose to delegate and fund the implementation of these restrictions to NEPP.

Part Two – The Right to Challenge Parking Policies

This section refers to the Network Management Duty Guidance (2004), as well as the “Right to challenge parking policies” statutory guidance, issued by the Secretary of State under Section 18 of the Traffic Management Act 2004. Local Traffic Authorities (LTAs) in England must have regard to this guidance when exercising their Network Management Duty under this Act.

Broad Principles

In order to provide the public with a greater say in the development and implementation of parking policies, and to enable Councils to respond to changes in local circumstances, the Government introduced powers for challenging decisions on parking restrictions in the aforementioned statutory guidance.

This system intends to make it easier for local residents and businesses to challenge any parking arrangement which they believe to be unfair, disproportionate or unreasonable. This could include the provision of parking availability, parking charges, or the use of restrictions such as yellow or red lines.

National guidance provides detail on how the Government considers this system should work and advises local authorities on best practice. It is recommended that local authorities have a system in place which allows residents to raise petitions about the parking restrictions in place for a specified location.

Reviewing Parking Policy and Restrictions

Parking restrictions, such as red and yellow lines, parking zones and bays, are backed up by legal documents called Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). Combinations of these lines and bays are often part of much wider schemes. Councils often review these schemes on a planned basis, and these reviews may lead to the amendment or revocation of orders that are no longer suitable for local conditions. When implementing any changes, Councils consult as widely as is necessary to ensure that all of those affected by the Orders have the opportunity to comment.

This section outlines the petition scheme which applies to the North Essex Parking Partnership area. This scheme helps to ensure that those affected by TROs can raise issues, including changed circumstances or unintended consequences, between regular reviews. This petition scheme does not apply to requests for new parking restrictions, which can be requested by individuals as set out in Part One of this document.

Requirements for Petition Validity

Whilst it is the right of any individual to contact us about any aspect of parking in their area, we do expect those who raise a petition to demonstrate the existence of local support for their challenge amongst others affected by the parking policy. Under this TRO Policy, a petition will be considered provided it has representation from at least 75% of affected addresses. If a petitioner requires, or would like, advice as to which properties constitute “affected addresses” in their individual circumstances, our Technical Team will be able to provide this support.

A valid petition should state:

- The location of the restriction,
- The current restriction which the petition seeks to challenge,
- The proposed remedial action,
- A full name, address and contact details for each signatory.

If the location or point for review is not clear, the NEPP will seek clarity from the lead petitioner, and assist in accurately defining their challenge to ensure that the Council and petitioners have an agreed understanding of what aspects are being challenged.

Management of Petitions

Inappropriate Reviews

Local authorities have a responsibility to manage their resources to the best effect in performing all aspects of their duties, and to do this they must balance the resources necessary to review policies with their ongoing responsibilities. Repeated or inappropriate petitions from vexatious individuals or groups can impact negatively on this and, as such, the NEPP will not normally undertake a reviewed based on a petition in the following scenarios:

- A new restriction which has been in place for less than six months,
- A restriction which has been reviewed during the previous 12 months,
- An aspect of a parking restriction which applies across a wide area (or is part of a group of petitions which, taken together, seek to achieve this),
- A restriction on, or relating to, new-build sites, until 5 years post-build/adoption,

In the case of the final scenario, the NEPP will have provided their professional advice during planning stages and, as such, should not incur any costs where this advice was not followed. The NEPP will, however, be flexible, particularly where a policy may have been substantially affected by an external change since the last review (for instance, major housing or commercial developments or population shifts).

In any case where the NEPP refuse a petition on the above grounds, advice will be provided as early as possible, including any ways in which the petition could be validly submitted.

Review of Parking Policies in Response to a Petition

Once it has accepted a petition, the NEPP will ensure that the petitioner has a clear understanding of what aspects of its parking policies will be reviewed, and what that review will involve, including any requirement for public consultation.

Large or complex reviews could take considerable time, and the NEPP will only be able to manage and progress schemes within available resources. The NEPP will ensure that the Lead petitioner has a clear understanding of the timescale, provide regular progress updates, and in particular provide details on the timing and nature of any public consultation. The Lead petitioner will be the person responsible for communicating with other petitioners.

Following a review of a parking policy or restriction, the NEPP will provide a clear report, with justification for any recommendations or conclusions. The lead petitioner will be provided with a copy of this report and, if the NEPP does not agree to the proposals in full, have an opportunity to consider and respond to the report before a final decision is made.

Wherever possible, the NEPP will ensure that:

- Decisions on the local authority's response to a petition will be taken to the Joint Parking Committee for approval,
- This committee meeting will be public, with petitioners having the ability to watch and address the meeting.

In all cases, reports and decisions will be published on the NEPP website, so that the community can see what areas of parking policy have been challenged, scrutinise the decisions of their local authority, and hold them to account.

Contact Details

Address:

TRO Enquiries – Technical Team

North Essex Parking Partnership

PO Box 5575

Colchester

CO1 9LT

Email: techteam@colchester.gov.uk



In partnership with:



Appendices

Appendix One – Types of TROs

Permanent TROs

A TRO can be permanent. There may be formal objections to Permanent TROs which must be addressed (and may ultimately be resolved at a Public Inquiry). A Permanent TRO stays in place unless it is revoked or a new Order is introduced to replace/amend it.

Temporary and Experimental TROs

Occasionally, temporary or experimental orders are introduced (by either NEPP or ECC), which follow a slightly different process in terms of consultation.

A temporary traffic order is made under Section 14 (1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Temporary Orders:

- may be used when works affecting the highway require short-term traffic restrictions,
- are usually short-term but may last up to a maximum of 18 months; and,
- are generally used to allow for works, protect the public from danger, to conserve, or allow the public to better enjoy a route.

A Temporary Order may also be made under Section 16A, for special events such as cycle races, carnivals etc. These can introduce, suspend or change parking restrictions both on the road on which the event is taking place and/or other roads which are affected by the event. These Orders may be for up to three days, but are limited to one occurrence in any calendar year for any length of road.

An Order made under section 14 or 16A is required to be advertised for 14 days in local press, as given in s.16(2)/16C(2) – to notify the public of such regulations by virtue of Part II of The Road Traffic (Temporary Restrictions) procedure Regulations 1992, unless intention is given by Notice only, under Part III.

An Experimental Order, made under sections 9 and 10 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, is like a permanent TRO in that it is a legal document which imposes traffic and parking restrictions such as road closures, controlled parking and other parking regulations indicated by yellow lines etc. The experimental order can also be used to amend existing restrictions. Experimental orders can be introduced quickly and are utilised to test the success of a scheme before deciding whether to make it permanent. Experimental Orders:

- are used in situations that need monitoring and reviewing.
- usually last no more than eighteen months before they are either abandoned, amended or made permanent.
- may be made for any purpose for which permanent TROs can be made, and as such cannot be made for speed or parking places.

During the first six months of the experimental period, changes can be made to any of the restrictions (except charges) if necessary, before the Council decides whether to continue with the changes brought in by the Experimental Order on a permanent basis.

It is not possible to lodge a formal objection to an Experimental TRO until it is in force. Once it is in force, objections may be made to the TRO being made permanent and these must be made within six months of the day that the Experimental Order comes into force. If feedback or an objection is received during this period which suggests an immediate change to the experiment, that change can be made and the experiment can then proceed. If the Experimental TRO is changed, then objections may be made within six months of the day that it is changed.



In partnership with:



Appendix Two – Functional Route Hierarchy

The Traffic Management Strategy adopted by the County Council in 2005 identified and defined a Functional Route Hierarchy divided into County Routes and Local Roads.

The County Routes provide the main traffic distribution function in any area and give priority to motorised road users. The Traffic Management Strategy splits County Routes into Priority 1 (PR1) and Priority 2 (PR2).

Priority 1 County Routes may be inter-urban or connecting routes, radial feeder or town centre access routes. What is important is the need to maintain free flowing traffic movement on them due to the function they perform within the network. Priority 2 County Routes are all those County Routes which do not fall into the Priority 1 category.

The Traffic Management Strategy defines Local Roads as being all non-County Routes, further subdividing into developed roads (generally residential) and rural roads (unclassified routes linking developed areas). Local roads support a different balance of motorised and non-motorised road users. Account must be taken of the differences in form and function of local urban roads and local rural roads.

The following web site link provides access to a map of the Essex County road network which details the road network forming the Functional Route Hierarchy.

<https://essex.traffweb.app>



The below flow chart provides the usual route for applications to NEPP. In other circumstances NEPP may deal with schemes generated by or through Essex County Council, including Local Highways Panel schemes, or schemes of its own, including schemes determined under delegated powers.

Procedure flowchart for the introduction of TRO showing approval by Localism Panel or district Committee/Cabinet to support schedules going forward.



Colchester
City Council



Appendix Four – Request for Parking Restrictions Application Form

An online application can be made via the North Essex Parking Partnership website at <https://northtro.parkingpartnership.org/pages/home.aspx>. Please note that the online application form is the usual route for applications to NEPP.

A paper application form may be provided where an applicant requires a reasonable adjustment due to disability or accessibility requirements.



In partnership with:



Appendix Five – Assessment System & Scoring Methodology

This scoring methodology is designed to strengthen the assessment of applications that have evidenced local support. Please note that the scoring methodology will usually be applied to assess applications to NEPP. In other circumstances NEPP may deal with schemes generated by or through ECC, including LHP schemes, or schemes of its own, including schemes determined under delegated powers, where this process may not be applied.

Prioritisation Scoring Methodology

Location: **Total Points:** **/105**

Pre-scoring Criteria – Local Support (must be obtained to proceed)	
Scheme/restriction is supported by at least 75% of affected parties (i.e. resident & business petition(s) available to evidence this)	Yes/No
Scheme/restriction is supported politically (either ECC or Ward Member)	Yes/No

Viability/Finance	/25 points
Economic contribution to NEPP (Residents or P&D Parking)	10 points
Funded externally and not from NEPP budget	10 points
Low cost of ongoing maintenance	5 points
Localised Impact	/25 points
Parking regularly occurs within 10-15 metres of site request	5 points
Personal injury collision recorded and attributed to parking (only relevant for requests relating to safety e.g. yellow/red lines)	5 points
Parking request related to an A or B routed classified road	5 points
Parking occurs on a bus route	5 points
Parking occurs by non-residents in a residential area	5 points
Accessibility	/30 points
Parking inhibiting emergency services etc & is evidenced	10 points
Parking issues close to school	10 points
Parking issues close to Town Centre, Hospital, Railway Station etc	5 points
Parking causes localised congestion in peak periods (rush hours). Congestion impact not relevant at school sites.	5 points
Enforcement	/25 points
Parking occurs during day (8am-6pm)	5 points
Parking of a long duration (in excess of 4 hours)	5 points
Parking close to existing restrictions	5 points
Ease of enforcement	10 points



North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 13th November 2025

Title: Traffic Regulation Order and Application Decision Report

Author: Shane Taylor – Interim Engineering Manager

Presented by: Shane Taylor – Interim Engineering Manager

-This report seeks a decision to either approve, defer or reject Traffic Regulation Order proposals from the list of applications that have been received on behalf of our local authority members.

- For member information, the report also highlights other traffic regulation order work performed by the Technical Team during 2025.

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. These will be retained for a maximum period of 12 months from the date of request.
- d) Note the new schemes NEPP has advertised in 2025 via the JPC process, in Appendix C.
- e) Note the new schemes NEPP has advertised in 2025 outside the JPC process (externally funded), in Appendix D.

2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)

- 2.1. To allow NEPP officers to draft prioritised Traffic Regulation Orders. These would be advertised during 2026.
- 2.2. To allow partner authority officers to advise applicants of the outcome of their applications if updates are requested or sought.

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.

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 many 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 In some instances there are no applications to defer, reject or approve for some local authority areas. Communication with all partners has been maintained in relation to this.

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 and a Policy Document in relation to the use of the Essex Act will be presented at a future meeting for consideration and approval.

6. Finance and risk management

- 6.1 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.

6.2 As there are no current surplus funds to draw upon, this work would need to be funded within the 26/27 Financial Year and be budgeted alongside other elements of the NEPP operation, as has happened in the current Financial Year.

6.3 The estimated costs to introduce each proposal are shown for the scored proposals.

7. Standard References

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

8. Appendices

Appendix A: List of Proposed Scored Schemes

Appendix B: List of Unscored Schemes

Appendix C: List of Schemes advertised in 2025 by the JPC decision process

Appendix D: List of Schemes advertised in 2025 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 Officer score (max score 105)	Approx. cost	Prov. decision
T1240687	Braintree	East Street - Braintree -	Either waiting restrictions or a Restricted Parking Zone (RPZ)	Safety issue caused by parking along the road	25	£2930 or £2310	Approve
T2439070	Braintree	Water Lane & Station Hill - Bures	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	£2200	Approve
T2247260	Colchester	Monkwick Avenue	Waiting restrictions	Safety issues caused by parking close to a bend	35	£1410	Approve

T1861819	Epping Forest	Colson Road, Loughton	Extension to existing Permit Parking Zone	Commuter parking causing inconvenience to residents	55	£3390	Approve
T1648345	Epping Forest	Knighton Lane, Buckhurst Hill	Extension to existing restrictions	Parking outside times of existing measures causing inconvenience with access/egress for residents	25	£1590	Reject - Forms part of a wider scheme - see application T2558449
T2066649	Epping Forest	Roding Lane, Buckhurst Hill	Extension to existing restrictions	Parking close to entrance of sports field obstructing local traffic	35	£1145	Approve
T2175400	Epping Forest	Rue De St Lawrence (Cleall Avenue), Waltham Abbey	Permit Parking	Parking pressures from nearby Town Centre and businesses	40	£1440	Approve
T2454690	Epping Forest	The Drummonds, Buckhurst Hill	Extension to current measures in place	Parking outside times of existing measures causing inconvenience with access/egress for residents	30	£1190	Reject - Forms part of a wider scheme - see application T2558449
T1258859	Epping Forest	Allnutts Road, Epping	Loading bay	Creation of a singular loading bay to service a local shop	10	£1900	Defer
T2148321	Epping Forest	St Johns Road, Epping	Extension to operational timings of permit scheme	To prevent parking from new Leisure Complex under construction	50	£1700	Defer - insufficient residential support
T243110	Epping Forest	Church Lane/The Street, Sheering	Double red lines	Issues with school-based parking on the junction	50	£1220	Approve
T2558449	Epping Forest	Knighton Lane, Buckhurst Hill	Permit parking	Priority parking for residents due to inconvenience caused by non-residential based parking	40	£4440 (£2850 removal cost of existing lines)	Approve
T2859830	Epping Forest	Ladyfields & Lushes Road, Loughton	Extension to current operational times of	To prevent non-residential parking outside of	40	£1925	Approve

			scheme in place	existing scheme times			
T2742924	Epping Forest	Lodge Close - Chigwell	Permit parking and double yellow lines	To prevent short- and long-term invasive parking from nearby tube station and shops	40	£1605	Defer
T2737114	Harlow	Potter Street	Double yellow lines	To prevent pavement and junction parking	30	£1230	Approve

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)
T12592689	Uttlesford	Rickling Green Road & the B1383	Waiting restrictions	To prevent parking opposite a junction	N/A
T1843084	Braintree	Kings Acre - Coggeshall	Permit parking	Displacement from nearby car park	N/A
T1637431	Braintree	Russell Close - Witham	Waiting restrictions	Alleged access issues	N/A
T1959356	Braintree	Ushers Meadow - Braintree	Junction protection	Improved access	N/A
T1824899	Braintree	Walnut Drive - Witham	Permit parking	Commuter parking	N/A
T2666682	Braintree	Kestrel Rise - Halstead	Waiting restrictions	Turning point parking	N/A
T1557982	Colchester	Ishbourne Close -	Double yellow lines	Pavement parking	N/A
T2036065	Colchester	New Town permit	Latimer - Request for	To allow residents to park	N/A

		parking scheme	parking permits		
T1340690	Colchester	Paxman Park Estate	Yellow lines	Alleged inconsiderate residential parking	N/A
T1742314	Harlow	Bishopsfield	Removal of current measures in favour of permits	To allow residents to park	N/A
T1238855	Harlow	Newstead Way	Unspecified measures requested	To deter commute parking	N/A
T2443568	Epping Forest	Ambleside - Epping	Extension to existing measures	Gaps in single yellow lines	N/A
T2076485	Epping Forest	Barrington Road - Loughton	Permit parking	Commuter parking	N/A
T2034718	Epping Forest	Beacondfield Road - Epping	Waiting restrictions	Driveway access issue	N/A
T2241094	Epping Forest	Gladstone Road - Buckhurst Hill	Permit parking	Commuter parking	N/A
T1830484 & T2359564	Epping Forest	Homecroft Gardens - Loughton	Permit parking	Commuter parking	N/A
T1675247	Epping Forest	Kings Wood Park - Epping	Extension to existing measures	Improved access	N/A
T1862717	Epping Forest	Ollards Grove - Loughton	Single yellow line	Driveway obstruction	N/A
T1939424	Epping Forest	Rous Road – Buckhurst Hill	Double yellow lines	Parking on a bend	N/A
T1767065	Epping Forest	Sycamore House (Albert Road- Buckhurst Hill)	Intro of Mipermits to replace limited Waiting	Abuse of limited wait parking	N/A
T1962350 & T89970755	Epping Forest	The Avenue - Loughton	Permit parking	Commuter parking	N/A
T1565124	Epping Forest	The Gladeway - Waltham Abbey	Permit parking to replace red lines	School based parking issue	N/A

T1959096	Epping Forest	Theydon Park Road - Theydon Bois	Replace single yellow line with permits	Inconvenient for one household	N/A
T1952782	Epping Forest	Torrington Gardens - Loughton	Change of times for permit parking	Inconvenient for one household	N/A
T1445638	Epping Forest	Nazeing Common	Double red lines	Parking issues at new play park site	N/A
T1863904	Tendring	Bromley Road - Elmstead Market	Permit parking	Issues with local business parking	N/A
T1937373	Tendring	Brooklyn Road - Harwich	Permit parking	Issues with non residential parking	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 2025

For committee member information, below is a list of the proposals advertised to date in 2025 and the status of the scheme.

Reference number	Authority area	Name of Scheme	Type of Restriction	Current Work Status
T24449387	Uttlesford	Rylestone Way/Thaxted Road – Saffron Walden	Waiting restrictions on junction	Operational
T18605608	Braintree	Clifffield - Shalford	Either waiting or stopping restrictions on the junction	Operational
T197889210	Braintree	Fennes Road - Bocking	Waiting restrictions	Operational
T23451049	Braintree	Stoneham Street - Coggeshall	Reduction in operational times of waiting restriction	Operational
T20546989	Colchester	Anchor Road - Tiptree (Both ends of Anchor Road only)	Double red lines	Operational
T18395068	Colchester	California Drive and Eastwood Close	Waiting restrictions to junctions and extension of current measures	Operational
T16561273	Colchester	Cannock Mill Rise/Old Heath Road	Waiting restrictions near to access to Cannock Mill Rise development	Operational
T184849610	Colchester	Holt Drive	Red Lines	Operational

T14410108	Colchester	Kneveitt Close and Wallace Road	Extend current waiting restrictions	Operational
T144298210	ECC	Oaklands Avenue & Dugard Avenue	Red lines on junction	Operational
T14432659	ECC	Oaklands Avenue & President Road	Red lines on junction	Not installed after consideration of objections
T196725210	Epping Forest	Beatrice Court - Buckhurst Hill	Permit Parking Zone	Operational
T214996011	Epping Forest	Great Lawn - Ongar	Stopping restrictions in turning circle and to prevent parking on grass verge	Operational
T18534019	Epping Forest	Princes Road & Queens Road - Buckhurst Hill	Upgrade current waiting restrictions to no loading or red lines to improve enforcement efficiency	Operational
T26762019	Epping Forest	River Road - Buckhurst Hill	Double yellow lines to fill gap between current measures	Operational
T9630783	Epping Forest	Riverside Avenue - Nazeing	Double yellow lines on junction of Old Nazeing Road and Riverside Avenue	Operational
T20617952 Previously Deferred	Epping Forest	Brooker Road - Waltham Abbey	Red lines	Operational
T2058055	Epping Forest	Trent Road area – Buckhurst Hill	Permit parking zone	Operational
T19410579	Harlow	Ram Gorse and Hoding Road	Permit parking	Operational
T19410579ii	Harlow	Old Road	Permit parking and waiting restrictions	Not installed after consideration of objections
T18562659	Tendring	North Road – Clacton on Sea	Alter yellow lines to red lines	Operational
T19536977	Tendring	School Road & Colchester Road – Elmstead Market	Alter yellow lines to red lines	Operational
T216727411	Tendring	Brighton Road & Frinton Road – Holland on Sea	Double yellow lines	Operational
T18551685	Tendring	Sherwood Drive – Holland on Sea	Double yellow lines	Operational

Appendix D - List of Non - JPC Schemes advertised in 2025

For committee member information, below is a list of the proposals that are outside of the usual JPC process that were advertised in 2025 along with the status of the scheme. These are schemes that are not necessarily 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, Town/Parish Councils or other external party.

Authority Area	Name of scheme	Type of restriction	Current Work Status
Braintree	St Peters View – Sible Hedingham	Waiting restrictions	Advertised
Colchester	St Nicholas Street & Culver Street East	Reconfiguration of existing measures on behalf of ECC	Operational
Colchester	Middleborough	Introduction of limited waiting for buses/coaches on behalf of ECC	Operational
Colchester	Parsons Heath	Double yellow lines on behalf of ECC	Operational
Colchester	Junctions off Anchor Road - Tiptree	Waiting restrictions on behalf of Parish Council	Operational
Tendring	Station Road – Clacton on Sea	Bus stop and yellow lines on behalf of ECC	Operational
Tendring	Main Road - Dovercourt	Bus stop and yellow lines on behalf of ECC	Operational
Tendring	The Avenue - Lawford	Single red line on behalf of Parish Council	Operational
Tendring	Colchester Road - Ardleigh	Red lines on behalf of developer	Operational
Tendring	Cotman Drive - Lawford	Double yellow lines	Advertised
Epping Forest	Farm Hill Road – Waltham Abbey	Bus stop and yellow lines on behalf of ECC	Operational
Epping Forest	Lindsey Street - Epping	Waiting restrictions on behalf of ECC Councillor	Advertised
Epping Forest	Back Lane – Buckhurst Hill	Alter limited wait bays on behalf of developer	Operational
Epping Forest	Kings Avenue – Buckhurst Hill	Alter bays to accommodate loading bay on behalf of developer	Operational
Epping Forest	Princesfield Road – Waltham Abbey	Red lines on behalf of ECC	Operational
Epping Forest	Grange Farm Lane - Chigwell	Red lines on behalf of ECC Councillor	To be advertised
Epping Forest	Pyrles Green - Loughton	Permit parking on behalf of EFDC	Operational

Harlow	Post Office Road	TTRO in relation to taxi parking bays on behalf of HDC	Superseded by ECC scheme
Harlow	Horsecroft Road	Waiting restrictions on behalf of developer	Operational
Harlow	Partridge Road	Restricted parking zone on behalf of HDC	Advertised
Harlow	Cooks Spinney, Fold Croft, Great Plumtree, Ladyshot, Radburn Close, Rundells, Moorfield, Joyners Field, Quarry Spring & Sycamore Field	Red lines on behalf of HDC	Operational
Uttlesford	Walson Way - Stansted	Double yellow lines on behalf of ECC	Operational
Uttlesford	The Street – Takeley	Permit parking on behalf of resident's association	Advertised



North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 13 November 2025

Title: Review of the NEPP Parking Management Policy

Author: Trevor Degville – Interim Group Operating Manager

Presented by: Trevor Degville – Interim Group Operating Manager

- The NEPP Joint Parking Committee is asked to approve the recommended changes to the NEPP Parking Management Policy.

1. Recommended Decision(s)

- 1.1 The Joint Committee is requested to approve the recommended changes to the NEPP Parking Management Policy (PMP) that are shown in the appendix to this report.

2. Reasons for Report

- 2.1 It is an audit recommendation and good practice that NEPP regularly reviews its policies. The PMP was last reviewed in 2022.
- 2.2 The NEPP have policies and procedures in place to provide guidance and controls on the services rendered by the partnership.

3. Background

- 3.1 NEPP's PMP should be read in conjunction with Essex County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP)
- 3.2 The PMP outlines a framework which sets out how NEPP will normally manage parking on the roadside and in car parks. A copy of the current policy is available for public viewing on the Parking Partnerships website – <https://north.parkingpartnership.org/parking-management-policy/>
- 3.3 It should be noted that ECC is currently in the process of developing a new LTP, version 4, "A Better Connected Essex". NEPP may need to review its PMP when LTP4 is published depending on the results of the current ECC consultation. Members of the committee will also be aware that Local Government Reform (LGR) is taking place and the successor to NEPP will need to consider its own policies and procedures. In view of this, it is a light touch rather than a comprehensive review that is presented to members of the committee.

4. Suggested alternations to the policy

- 4.1 The current policy is shown as a Word document in the appendix to this report. Suggested changes are shown in red font.
- 4.2 Many of the changes are suggested to correct slight grammatical errors or to acknowledge that there is now also a city in addition to towns and other urban areas within the NEPP operational area.
- 4.3 In the Parking Controls section the following has been removed:

“Any proposals for resident parking and on street pay and display will only be determined by consultation with affected persons with the decision to go ahead with a scheme being based on a simple majority of those responding and being agreed by the Joint Committee.”

This is because objections should always be considered based on the strength of argument that is made rather than a simple majority. This ensures compliance with section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which sets out a local authority’s duties in this respect.
- 4.4 Other changes relate to a duplication of a paragraph (In Part 2, The Partnership’s Parking framework).

5 Standard References

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

6. Appendix

Parking Management Policy

We have a parking policy to provide a framework which sets out how we normally manage parking at the roadside and in car parks

- **Part 1** of this document explains how the policy framework links the work of the Parking Partnership to the county council's long-term plans.
- **Part 2** sets out how district and city councils of the Parking Partnership can set local priorities for patrols and pricing which support the long-term plan.

The policy framework explains our duties and compliance with Statutory Guidance issued by the Department for Transport. The guidance requires authorities to publicise both the policies and management system to ensure that the public is aware of the legislation and how it is to be applied.

This webpage was created in November 2022

Content – Part 1

- [The County's long-term plans](#)
- [Main Priorities – The County's long-term plans](#)

Content – Part 2

- [The Partnership's Parking Framework](#)
- [Key Priorities](#)
- [Policy Framework](#)
- [Scope and benefits of parking management](#)
- [Operational Priorities](#)

Part 1: The County's long-term plans

This part sets out the long-term plans and principles **and** of Essex County Council with regard to the management of roadside parking in Essex. The county council's plans are designed to ensure that a consistent approach is taken to roadside parking across Essex, so that it benefits the public, the city and district councils in the two Parking Partnerships and the county council.

Through its Local Transport Plan, the county council has the aims of tackling congestion; improving accessibility; improving safety; and reducing air pollution. Essex County Council is the Highway Authority and it has a responsibility under the Traffic Management Act as Traffic Manager, so it is important that the Parking Partnerships share the same plans for the service.

Part 1: The County's long-term plans – how the framework links Essex County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) sets out its long-term plan:

The County Council, working jointly with these partnerships, will develop an Essex Parking Strategy in order to ensure the management of parking across Essex is consistent with the aims of the Essex Transport Strategy.

Through the development of an Essex Parking Strategy, our Parking Policy supports the LTP Traffic Management Objective of Congestion and Network Resilience: The County Council will facilitate the improved reliability of journeys.

The LTP Traffic Management Strategy also includes:

- Working in partnership with the Essex **district** councils to improve the management of parking within urban areas, including the possible development of Park & Ride facilities to remove traffic from congested corridors.

- Stronger parking enforcement, particularly where illegally parked vehicles impede traffic flows or block access by public transport.
- Working with partners to improve the management of goods deliveries, ensuring that appropriate vehicles are used, and that delivery and loading does not inhibit traffic flows.

Main Priorities – The County’s long-term plans

Tackling Congestion

The County Council has defined a functional road hierarchy of routes where the focus should be predominantly to facilitate the movement of through traffic. The Parking Partnerships should ensure that each route is treated as required through that hierarchy.

Improving Safety

Parking restrictions should be used to enhance the safety of road users, for example, protecting visibility at junctions, bends, crossing points, or in areas with high numbers of pedestrian movements where pedestrians could be masked by parked cars; preserving road space required for large vehicles such as buses to make manoeuvres safely and without delay. Alternately, the presence of parked vehicles can also enhance safety, acting as a form of “traffic calming” slowing vehicles in low speed residential roads.

Improving Accessibility

The management of parking charges and availability of parking spaces can have a positive impact on the levels of congestion in town centres, encouraging drivers to use alternative forms of transport. On key routes and junctions, parking restrictions should be used to allow the free-flow of traffic on through and radial routes, particularly where these form part of a passenger transport corridor. In narrow streets, restrictions should also be used to facilitate the safe passage of passenger transport and emergency vehicles.

Improving Air Quality

Overall, management of congestion and delays, as well as the encouragement of modal shift to forms of transport other than the private car, have benefits in terms of reducing carbon, emissions and improving air quality.

Part 2: The Partnership’s Parking Framework – putting plans into practice locally

The North Essex Parking Partnership’s Parking Management Policy provides a framework which helps the Partnership to manage on-street parking. The framework provides for effective parking management activities and seeks to put the county policy and long-term plans into a local context.

~~The North Essex Parking Partnership’s Parking Management Policy provides a framework which helps the Partnership to manage on-street parking. The framework provides for effective parking management activities and seeks to put the county’ policy and long-term plans into a local context.~~

This helps meet the needs of all road users by clearly prioritising the different parking management needs across the Partnership area. The aim is to manage parking in the Partnership area on a fair and consistent basis.

- The framework identifies the ways that the policy will guide the Parking Partnership’s patrols and operations, including pricing where deemed necessary, to help manage kerbside parking.
- The Parking Protocols document explains how the Parking Partnership will normally carry out these policies.

Together the two documents will ensure that a clear but fair policy is applied to operations that combine to support efficient and effective parking management against local needs.

The framework prioritises clearly the county’s parking management, giving emphasis to the needs of people with disabilities, residents, visitors and businesses, helping to manage parking in the Partnership’s council areas. The Partnership’s framework includes the core principles of fairness, transparency and consistency.

The framework helps to create a better and safer environment and aims to provide effective on-street parking management across the Partnership area by supporting the following county-wide Parking Policy strategic outcomes.

Policy framework key priorities:

1. **Congestion** – Reducing congestion, helping drivers find spaces quickly and easily
2. **Safety** – Improving road safety, reducing the severity and number of traffic collisions
3. **Air Quality** – Improving air quality, reducing congestion and dwell time in finding spaces
4. **Accessibility** – Improving access to services and the economic vitality and vibrancy of town/city centres and high streets
5. **Working Together** – Providing a more efficient and accessible road network
6. **Technology** – Supporting a more mobile society by embracing new technology
7. **Fairness** – Delivering a more effective, efficient and consistent parking management service

Key Priorities: In more detail

1. CONGESTION

Reducing congestion, helping drivers find spaces quickly and easily.

Making it easier to park – reducing congestion and delays caused by vehicles looking for parking spaces

- Suitable parking restrictions in town ~~or other urban~~ centre areas will ensure free flow of traffic and to encourage visitors ~~to the town~~ to park in the designated parking areas available, preventing unnecessary congestion and obstruction and the potential for road traffic accidents.
- Restrictions around junctions will allow traffic to flow more freely, further reducing the potential for congestion.
- Emergency and service vehicles will be able to operate more effectively along roads and low floor buses will be able to reach the kerb at bus stops since fewer inconsiderately parked vehicles will be in their way.

2. SAFETY

Improving road safety, reducing the severity and number of traffic collisions.

Making Roads Safer – by reducing the number and severity of collisions caused by poorly parked vehicles

- Research shows that improperly or inappropriately parked vehicles can be a ~~common cause of~~ contributory factor in Road Traffic Collisions; parking restrictions can help to reduce the occurrence of the type of parking.
- The positioning of parking bays can also be a major contributor to reduction in traffic speeds in what should be low speed residential or retail areas.
- It will be safer for drivers and pedestrians since the new focus on enforcement means clearer roads and pavements.
- With fewer illegally parked cars there will be fewer accidents, better traffic flow and accessibility, because the focus of enforcement will be on lessening inconsiderate and dangerous illegal parking to improve safety and minimise congestion.
- Sensible and safe parking within the Partnership area will be encouraged – as will greater compliance with Traffic Regulations.
- Road safety initiatives (especially for pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users), and emergency access requirements.
- The Partnership will manage local parking problem areas, e.g. for child safety near schools caused by the school run (including Safer Routes to School initiatives) and associated short-stay on-street parking activity.

3. AIR QUALITY

Improving air quality, reducing congestion and dwell time in finding spaces.

Making it easier to breathe – by reducing congestion, a major contributor to air pollution.

- Reducing the effect of transport on the environment.
- Traffic is a major contributor to reduced air quality levels, particularly traffic which is queuing in areas of limited capacity or obstructed by parked vehicles.
- As well as reducing the wasted engine running time (idling), simply reducing the number of vehicles will have positive effects.
- The general environment will improve by providing a more environmentally efficient transport system in terms of reducing congestion, energy conservation; use of other modes of transport will be encouraged such as walking and cycling (healthy options).

4. ACCESSIBILITY

Improving access to services and the economic vitality and vibrancy of **city/town** centre high streets.

Making high streets and town urban centres more appealing and vibrant – by making them more accessible, less congested and easier to navigate.

- Improves access to jobs and services.
- Secures public transport availability for those without their own transport or who choose not to use it because of the parking restrictions.
- It will be better for local businesses since areas of short-term parking such as those outside local shops will receive more attention, increasing the potential for local trade.
- Legitimate parking and loading requirements of businesses, considering commercial needs for delivery and servicing movements and the opportunity for changing delivery schedules and vehicle sizes.
- Supporting the safe and efficient operation of the public transport network, especially on low-floor bus corridors.

5. WORKING TOGETHER

Providing a more efficient and accessible road network.

Making the UK's road network more efficient and effective – through joined up thinking and sharing of good practice nationwide.

- Encourage healthier travel choices and employer travel plans.
- Some drivers will switch to alternative travel methods such as walking and cycling, either for recreational or commuting purposes.
- Former car drivers will create an increased demand for public transport which if acted upon will increase the viability of public transport services generally, with benefits for all users.
- Depending on the availability of parking facilities at the place of work, parking restrictions may encourage companies to take a look at their employees travel habits.
- Companies may assist in reducing the overall level of dependence on the private car by assisting in car sharing arrangements or they might provide facilities such as cycle parking, changing rooms and showers.
- Single responsibility for parking means greater clarity to the public.
- The Council's integrated transport strategy can be linked to local issues in enforcement.
- Since income will come to the Council, any surpluses after reasonable running costs can be spent on transport projects in the local area.
- Coordinating on- and off-street parking management to ensure a comprehensive and complementary approach.

6. INNOVATION

Supporting a more mobile society by embracing new technology.

Making journeys smarter – by adopting new payment and journey planning technologies.

- Parking provision will become more responsive to the public's needs because the local Council will control both provision and management of parking.
- Maximising the potential of information technology (IT) to support an effective and efficient parking management operation.

7. FAIRNESS

Delivering a more effective, efficient and consistent parking management service.

Making parking management fairer – by helping people to understand parking regulations and how to follow them.

- Raising revenue is not the objective of the Parking Partnership, nor are targets set for Civil Enforcement Officers to issue a set number of PCNs.
- The purpose of issuing PCN's is not to generate revenue but rather to discourage dangerous, careless and negligent parking, to deter motorists from breaking the parking regulations and promote greater compliance.
- Ideally parking operations should be self-financing through running patrols effectively and economically when practicable. CPE need not be self-financing providing a Local Authority can meet the cost from existing funding.
- It will increase parking for residents by discouraging commuters from parking in permit only areas.
- It will increase Blue Badge benefits since the increased enforcement of existing parking spaces for Blue Badge Holders will improve availability for Blue Badge holders.
- It will support town/city centre needs by encouraging commuters and other drivers to use long stay car parks where appropriate thereby freeing up short stay car park spaces for drivers who need them.
- The needs of disabled people and effective enforcement of parking regulations to enable easy access to activities and facilities.
- Enforcement against observed parking patterns of demand to allow targeting of known problem areas.
- Allocating parking permits/waivers with clear conditions of use based on transparent and consistent principles, which give priority in accordance with the defined hierarchy of parking management.

Policy Framework – Purpose of Parking Management

Parking management includes the patrol and operation of on and off-street parking regulations. Its aim is to speed the journey of traffic to a suitable parking space.

As part of parking management, patrols are carried out to maximise compliance with regulations to make our streets safer for all road users, particularly vulnerable road users; to prevent obstruction and delays (especially for buses and emergency vehicles); to ensure that parking bays are available for their intended use and to improve the general street scene.

Policy framework – detail and context

Inconsiderate parking contravenes the Highway Code, which requires drivers to show consideration for all road users. Certain parking contraventions remain the responsibility of the Police (~~zig-zag pedestrian crossings~~, obstruction and restriction of access where there are no yellow lines) and the Parking Partnership will work together with Essex Constabulary to communicate relevant information between both stakeholders.

Under the framework the Partnership is responsible for parking management including patrols and operations in its Special Parking Area under an agreement with the County Council. The County Council has delegated the powers in North Essex via a Joint Committee to the Parking Partnership to the lead authority of Colchester City Council.

Scope and benefits of Parking Management

Illegal parking is inconsiderate; it can be dangerous. Illegal parking on double yellow lines and footways can cause a serious road safety hazard. The basis for effective parking management is fair, consistent, transparent, policy-driven and quality-led and evidence-based operational patrols.

As competing parking demands intensify and conflict, the need for skilled and effective on-street parking management based on clearly defined priorities increases.

Patrols will be organised and reallocated to tackle problem areas. The framework specification provides a schedule and prescribes the hierarchy of operations including patrol visits (high priority, medium or low), dependent upon the location

type, whilst providing freedom to vary according to temporary or local circumstances as directed by the Committee. This will ensure a good parking management regime that is both consistent and transparent.

The Parking Management Policy framework focuses on customer needs by:

- Ensuring an efficient, robust and customer-friendly parking system.
- Effective tackling of parking fraud, and abuse of the Blue Badge Scheme.
- Ensuring an effective, fair and consistent enforcement operation to maximise compliance with the Partnership's parking regulations and the Traffic Management Act 2004.
- Consulting and communicating with both internal and external stakeholders to inform parking management issues.

Parking Controls

Effective traffic management relies on suitable implementation of parking controls. There are many different forms of parking control and careful consideration must be given when designing new schemes. The Partnership will review existing and new parking restrictions to ensure the schemes are necessary and suitable for purpose. More details are contained in the Traffic Regulation Orders Policy.

Requests for new schemes will be processed through the North Essex Parking Partnership using the Policy and forms for Traffic Regulation Orders.

The preferred Partnership option for residents who experience commuter parking problems is to introduce a resident parking scheme. The cost of the annual permit to park in these designated areas will help fund the implementation of the scheme and the continued daily patrols of the area. Residents Parking permits are issued to compliant applications by the Parking Partnership for the use of designated parking places in resident parking zones.

In areas where limited waiting parking is available, serving local businesses and shops, the preferred option to provide effective and efficient operations is to introduce short stay on-street pay and display. This method ensures greater compliance of the parking control and ensures the spaces are available for the intended use. A by-product of this type of control is pay and display income which will help fund the implementation of the scheme and the continued daily patrols of the area.

~~Any proposals for resident parking and on street pay and display will only be determined by consultation with affected persons with the decision to go ahead with a scheme being based on a simple majority of those responding and being agreed by the Joint Committee.~~

Fees and charges

Within the North Essex Parking Partnership, a single financial account is maintained for on-street parking, including resident permits or parking bays (cashless or pay-and-display). Charging levels for residents parking and on-street pay-and display will be determined at a local level, through the Joint Committee, in order to achieve the aim of a balanced budget, and in line with legislation.

A County wide parking policy strategic outcome is to operate the service with financial sustainability. Future charging levels will also need to take account of the cost of delivering robust and efficient operations, considering future investments for new equipment, vehicles, and technology.

Methods of operation

The Traffic Management Act 2004 provides local authorities options for issuing a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN). The preferred options of the Parking Partnership are;

- A CEO in person, issuing a PCN via a handheld device and printer
- Issuing a PCN via post (in instances where a CEO was prevented from serving a PCN or the vehicle drove away)

- A mobile patrol vehicle fitted with a camera, or a fixed camera, using an approved device and operating within the requirements of the Deregulation Act 2015. The Partnership utilises a CCTV vehicle to effectively enforce Clearways at bus stops, school keep clear markings **and red lines**.

The TMA 2004 enables local authorities to make use of Immobilisation and Removal Powers, principally to remove obstructions on the highway or at special events. In some circumstances, the North Essex Parking Partnership will carry out these activities. In doing so, the Statutory Guidance and all relevant legislation will be followed.

The scope of general hours of operation will generally be between 07.30 to 20.00 Mondays to Sundays with additional hours as and when required from early morning to late evening on occasion – in order to patrol of “at any time” restrictions. The Partnership will regularly review operation hours and patrol provision and operations.

Dispensation Parking

The Parking Partnership will consider requests for parking dispensation and suspension from contractors to ensure necessary development works can progress. Each application will be considered on merit and will take into account location, safety, traffic flow and alternative parking provision.

Footways

In parts of the Partnership area, footway parking currently takes place. In these areas parked vehicles dominate the street scene and can cause dangerous obstruction to other road users, such as parents with pushchairs and visually/mobility impaired people and wheelchair users.

Footway parking also results in higher maintenance costs for local Councils since footways are not designed to take the weight of motor vehicles and, as such, damage to the pavement can occur.

The Parking Partnership will seek to minimise inappropriate footway parking in the Partnership area where enforceable, (i.e. where there are parking restrictions or at places where dropped kerbs can be enforced, or other regulations introduced) to ensure that local pedestrian access and amenity is not adversely affected.

Abandoned Vehicles

Abandoned vehicles are an environmental nuisance and can be associated with anti-social behaviour. Abandoned vehicles not only cause an unnecessary hazard wherever they are dumped, they also have a serious impact on residents' quality of life and fear of crime in the local area; Civil Enforcement Officers will report potential abandoned and untaxed vehicles on the street.

Blue Badges

The Essex County Council's Social Services administers parking permits for disabled people under the Blue Badge Scheme, which allows Blue Badge Holders considerable flexibility in where they can park on street.

Badge holders can park free of charge without time limit in many areas, provided a valid Blue Badge is displayed, the bay has not been suspended and the vehicle is being used to transport the Blue Badge holder.

Blue Badge holders are also allowed to park for a maximum of 3 hours on single and double yellow lines, except where there is a loading ban or where a bus or cycle lane is in operation.

Operational Priorities

[The parking operational priorities are set out here and in more detail below:](#)

Hierarchy for Managing Parking

- Near accident locations such as junctions
- Near Pedestrian Crossings causing danger by double parking or on Pedestrian Footways
- Aid to movement, preventing obstruction and congestion on:

- Main access roads into major urban centres (Principal Roads)
- Town/**City** Centre shopping streets, Public Transport routes, main traffic routes (Non-principal Road) and other busy streets (Access Roads to Residential Areas/Local Shopping Parades)
- Preventing hindrance to road users at bus stops, vehicle accesses, pedestrian access routes, taxi **r**anks, special entertainment events.
- Management of the conveyance and delivery of goods in town and neighbourhood centres balanced against the movement and convenience of residents and tourists.
- Designated parking bays.

Control effective use of permitted parking areas:

- Encouraging the use of ~~City/District Council and private~~ car parks, designated use **b**ays, time limited and Pay & Display bays, Permit parking.
- Tackling fraudulent use of **B**lue **B**adges

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Preventing dangers due to parking:

Near Accident locations such as junctions	PRIORITY HIGH	Mainly patrols of single and double yellow line restrictions and loading restrictions at or close to junctions and bends particularly where visibility is poor to minimise dangers to moving traffic, pedestrians and other road users.
Near Pedestrian Crossings	PRIORITY HIGH	Mainly preventing danger to pedestrians at crossing places. (This does not include the offence of stopping on white zigzag markings, where police enforcement action takes precedence).
Dangerous or double parking	PRIORITY HIGH	Mainly where drivers are parked on the carriageway but in a manner that is likely to cause a hazard to other drivers and road users.
On Pedestrian Footways	PRIORITY MEDIUM	Mainly patrols of single and double yellow line restrictions and loading restrictions where drivers are using the footway causing obstruction and hazard to pedestrians, wheelchair and

		pushchair users. This also applies where there are no yellow line restrictions in the Traffic Regulation Orders
--	--	--

AID TO MOVEMENT

Preventing obstruction and congestion on:

Main access roads into towns/ cities (Principal Roads).	PRIORITY HIGH	Mainly patrols of single and double yellow line restrictions and loading restrictions to enable traffic to flow freely and not be hindered by parked vehicles.
Town Urban Centre shopping streets	PRIORITY HIGH	Mainly patrols of double yellow line restrictions and loading restrictions to enable essential traffic to access the town/ city centre and not be hindered by illegally parked vehicles.
Public Transport routes	PRIORITY MEDIUM	Mainly patrols of single and double yellow line restrictions and loading restrictions to enable bus traffic to flow freely and not be hindered by illegally parked vehicles.
Main traffic routes within towns/ cities (Non-principal Road)	PRIORITY MEDIUM	Mainly patrols of single and double yellow line restrictions and loading restrictions to enable traffic to flow freely and not be hindered by illegally parked vehicles,
Other busy streets (Access Roads to Residential Areas/ Local Shopping Parades)	PRIORITY LOW	Mainly patrols of single and double yellow line restrictions to enable traffic to flow freely and not be hindered by illegally parked vehicles

OBSTRUCTION & NUISANCE

Preventing hindrance to road users at:

Bus Stops	PRIORITY HIGH	Patrols of No Stopping Except Buses restriction in marked Bus Stop locations (where there is a wide yellow line marking) to prevent obstruction of bus stops.
Vehicle Accesses	PRIORITY HIGH	Mainly prevention of obstruction to private driveways that have yellow line restrictions. This is particularly important where residents are in the process of trying to enter or exit their premises. Dealing with obstruction of dropped kerbs. Other footway obstruction without yellow line or other restrictions is a police function.*
Pedestrian access routes	PRIORITY MEDIUM	Mainly patrols of single and double yellow line restrictions where numbers of pedestrians are walking, such as shopping areas and pedestrian prioritised streets.
Taxi Ranks	PRIORITY MEDIUM	Mainly patrols of single and double yellow line restrictions at Taxi Ranks to prevent obstruction.
Grass verges	PRIORITY LOW	Mainly patrols of single and double yellow line restrictions where drivers are using the grass verge and causing damage. This does not apply where there are no yellow lines.
Special entertainment events	PRIORITY LOW	This is primarily where large organised events such as shows or firework displays cause short term visitors to park vehicles in side/residential streets contravention of waiting

		restrictions, where covered under temporary restrictions and No Waiting Cones are placed. This excludes Police No Waiting temporary cones which may also be placed at events; where there is no temporary restriction, the enforcement of which remains a police function.* For main traffic routes see AID TO MOVEMENT
--	--	---

Note: * indicates that this is a function of Police authority unless other parking regulations are in force. Other operational requirements that follow will be balanced and prioritised on an as required basis depending upon resources available

DELIVERIES & SERVICING

Control and enable the conveyance of goods at:

Servicing yards	PRIORITY MEDIUM	Patrols of single and double yellow line restrictions to enable effective use and access to service yards.
Permitted loading areas	PRIORITY MEDIUM	Patrols of single and double yellow line restrictions to enable effective use and access to loading bays.

PARKING BAYS

Control effective use of permitted parking areas in:

City/District Council Car parks	PRIORITY MEDIUM	Issue PCN for infringement of car park Orders.
On-street Pay & Display	PRIORITY MEDIUM	Issue PCN for infringement of on street parking Orders.
Blue Badge Holder Bays	PRIORITY MEDIUM	Issue a PCN for infringement of on street Blue Badge Holder only parking places where there is time a restriction and where vehicle is not displaying a Blue Badge.
Residents Parking	PRIORITY MEDIUM	Issue a PCN for infringement of on street residents parking places where a vehicle is not displaying a current residents

		parking or visitor badge for the appropriate Zone.
Limited waiting	PRIORITY LOW	Issue a PCN for infringement of on street parking Orders where there is no fee but parking is time restricted.



North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 13 November 2025

Title: **Forward Plan 2025-2026**

Author: Owen Howell – Democratic Services, Colchester City Council

Presented by: Owen Howell – Democratic Services, Colchester City Council

This report concerns the 2025-26 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 2025-26.

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.

4. Appendices

- 4.1 Appendix A: NEPP Joint Parking Committee Forward Plan 2025-26.

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	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	Hayley McGrath (CCC)
			Annual Review of Risk Management	Hayley McGrath (CCC)
			NEPP Financial Update	Paul Atkinson (CCC)
			Tendring District Council Traffic Regulation Orders [TROs]	Danielle Wood (PP)
			Suggestions for variations to the NEPP Agreement, from NEPP partners	Jake England (PP)
			Forward Plan 2025/26	Owen Howell (CCC)
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	30 October 2025, 10am Microsoft Teams - online.	13 November 2025 1.00pm, Venue: Epping Forest District Council's Civic Offices (CM16 4BZ)	Technical report & Traffic Order Regulation Prioritisation	Shane Taylor (PP)
			Financial Report	Caroline Parker (CCC)
			TRO Policy Clarification	Danielle Wood (PP)
			Forward Plan 2025/26	Owen Howell (CCC)
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	8 January 2026 – 10am Microsoft Teams - online	22 January 2026 1.00pm Venue: Uttlesford District Council's offices (CB11 4ER)	NEPP Financial Update	Caroline Parker (CCC)
			Forward Plan 2025/26 and 2026/27 Dates	Owen Howell (CCC)

COMMITTEE / WORKING GROUP	CLIENT OFFICER MEETING	JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING	MAIN AGENDA REPORTS	AUTHOR
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	5 March 2026, 10am Microsoft Teams - online	19 March 2026 1.00pm, Venue: Essex Hall, Clacton Town Hall, Clacton-on-Sea CO15 1SE	NEPP Financial Update NEPP Business Plan Forward Plan 2025/26	Caroline Parker (CCC) Jake England (PP) Owen Howell (CCC)
Joint Committee for On Street Parking	4 June 2026, 10am Microsoft Teams - online	18 June 2026 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 2026/27	Hayley McGrath (CCC) Hayley McGrath (CCC) Caroline Parker (CCC) Owen Howell (CCC)

Colchester City Council / Parking Partnership Contacts

Head of Parking, Jake England - jake.england@colchester.gov.uk

Group Development Manager - Danielle.Wood@colchester.gov.uk

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

Interim Group Operating 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