

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

**13 November 2025 at 1.00pm  
Epping Forest District Council offices, High Street, Epping  
CM16 4BZ**

## **Members Present:**

Councillor Mick Barry (Tendring District Council)  
Councillor Neil Hargreaves (Uttlesford District Council)  
Councillor Paul Honeywood (Essex County Council)  
Councillor Ken Williamson (Epping Forest District Council)

## **Substitutions:**

Councillor James Leppard for Councillor Nicky Purse (Harlow District Council)

## **Apologies:**

Councillor Graham Butland (Braintree District Council)  
Councillor Martin Goss (Colchester City Council)  
Councillor Nicky Purse (Harlow District Council)

## **Also Present:**

Trevor Degville (Parking Partnership)  
Jake England (Parking Partnership)  
Jo Heynes (Essex County Council)  
Amelia Hoke (Epping Forest District Council)  
Owen Howell (Colchester City Council)  
Dean James (Harlow District Council)  
Esme McCambridge (Braintree District Council)  
Andrew Nepean (Tendring District Council)  
Caroline Parker (Colchester City Council)  
Richard Walker (Colchester City Council)  
Danielle Wood (Parking Partnership)

### **213. Declaration of Interests**

Councillor Leppard, by reason of being ward councillor for Church Langley South & Potter Street, declared a non-registerable and non-pecuniary interest in item 9 on the agenda [Traffic Regulation Order and Application Decision Report].

### **214. Have Your Say**

Councillor Janet Whitehouse attended and, with permission of the Chairman, addressed the Joint Committee to speak about Allnutts Stores, on Allnutts Road, Epping, the parking situation and its impact on the owners' use of a van to deliver supplies to the Stores, having often to park at distance. A loading bay was given as Councillor Whitehouse's preference to allow parking for the store deliveries [TRO application T1258859], but yellow lines were also mentioned as being acceptable and the Councillor asked for a discussion as to which option would be cheapest and best, and for this TRO [Traffic Regulation Order] application to be considered as soon as possible.

Amelia Hoke, Client Officer of Epping Forest District Council, explained that the Council was limited to being able to recommend six TRO applications each year, with each application being scored using the NEPP priority scoring system, to allow the six highest-scoring schemes to be recommended for approval. This application had been fully supported but was not one of the highest-scoring schemes and had therefore been recommended for deferral, with the chance it may go ahead if one of the six highest-scoring schemes were to be cancelled or postponed.

Councillor John Whitehouse attended and, with permission of the Chairman, addressed the Joint Committee to speak about Allnutts Stores, on Allnutts Road, to say that he felt that yellow lines would be an acceptable alternative to a loading bay for TRO application T1258859. Councillor Whitehouse also spoke regarding T2148321 concerning St John's Road in Epping, querying why it was described as having insufficient local support when this was not what was found when local residents collected views on it and found around 80% support for the proposals. Councillor Whitehouse ventured that the issue may be in how many houses in total are being considered to be affected, listing a range of flats and houses in the immediate vicinity which the scheme would not affect.

The Client Officer of Epping Forest District Council confirmed that at least 75% of households in the area affected must support a scheme for it to be progressed. Application T2148321 had to consider views from all of Zone G, which contained around 185 properties and from which around 110 responses were received, with support shown around 59%. Several residents had already lodged objections.

Julia Hornley attended and, with permission of the Chairman, addressed the Joint Committee to speak as a resident of St John's Road in Zone G, Epping regarding application T2148321. St John's Road was described, with terraced houses and most having to park on street. Surveys were carried out by residents of the area, meeting an extended deadline which had been set for responses to be collected by. The issue of levels of support was raised, with a possible explanation as to the

level of support recorded being that Chapel Road included a number of flats housing vulnerable or disabled adults who could not all be included in the collection of information on support levels for the TRO, due to their vulnerabilities. The attempts to collect support at that location were described, with some success gaining support from more active residents, before efforts were halted. 135 out of 185 addresses in Zone G were spoken with by the three residents conducting the surveying, with 111 surveys being returned, which was 78.5% of the 135 households contacted.

The Client Officer of Epping Forest District Council gave further explanation of the requirement for 75% support to be shown for any TRO application before it could be recommended for approval, to ensure that it would be what residents wanted. A number of residents of Chapel Road had indicated that they did not support application T2148321 and the 75% threshold of support had not been met. Jake England, Interim Head of the NEPP, added that when TRO applications then went on to formal consultation, support and objections had to be considered at that stage. The NEPP had found in the past that schemes put forward with lower levels of stated support had gone on to incur higher levels of objections at formal consultation. Six schemes had already been proposed for approval by Epping Forest District Council. This particular scheme had been recommended for deferral, rather than refusal, and further production of evidence of local support would be welcomed.

The Clerk, with permission from the Chairman, read a statement from a Mr Richard Bunce of Colchester, who was unable to attend. Mr Bunce wrote to express his concern regarding the recent increase in the cost of resident parking permits, stating that the six-hour permit had risen from 60p to 90p, and the 24-hour permit had increased from £1.20 to £1.70. Mr Bunce stated that these increases had been introduced without consultation or notice and described this, and the increasing of fees to raise income, as being unfair. Mr Bunce queried whether this was a way to circumvent caps on council tax rises and ventured that a proper equality impact assessment had not been carried out. Mr Bunce requested that the increases in permit fees be reconsidered and more consultation carried out.

Jake England, Interim Head of NEPP, informed the Joint Committee that permit prices had last been brought before the Committee in March 2023, proposing increases across all permit types and in a staged approach for the following four financial years, running to 2026-27. Inflation and salary pressures had impacted the NEPP considerably. The NEPP was required to be self-financing, and charges needed to cover the cost of operations across the six districts of North Essex. The structure and price of parking permits had been set to reflect the cost of delivering the service.

## **215. Minutes**

*RESOLVED* that the minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2025 be approved as an accurate record.

## **216. Urgent Items**

Councillor Hargreaves raised an urgent item regarding the ongoing work to seek agreement on revised wording for the NEPP Agreement. The current wording was described as not compliant with local government reorganisation [LGR] and not detailing how any reserves or deficit would be split if and when NEPP were to be dissolved. There were also views given that the NEPP was currently operating outside of its Agreement as currently written. A report was requested to detail what progress had been made, following the Joint Committee's previous decision to have a copy of the proposed amendments sent to Essex County Council's Legal Department to consider and give views upon.

Jo Heynes, Head of Network and Safety at Essex Highways, informed the Joint Committee that the proposed amendments had been sent to ECC Legal Services by Essex Highways earlier in this month, but there was no timescale yet known regarding when they were likely to report back. Jake England, Interim Head of NEPP expanded on the timeline thus far. Following the Joint Committee's agreement to have the amendments sent to ECC Legal Services on 19 June 2025, the Interim Head of NEPP had sent these to ECC Legal Services on 13 August 2025 and was then informed by Legal Services that they would first need to be instructed by the County Council before they could consider the document. The amendments were then passed to the Director of Essex Highways (who has since left the organisation) with a request to have the proper instruction made to ECC Legal Services.

Clarification was requested regarding the governance processes of ECC, and whether the proposed amendments would need to be approved by ECC's Cabinet prior to them being circulated for potential approval by the executive bodies of each of the partner councils. The Head of Network and Safety stated that an explanation of this would be provided as part of ECC Legal Services' review into the amendments.

## **217. NEPP Financial Update and 2025-26 Q2 position**

Caroline Parker, Senior Finance Business Partner [Colchester City Council], presented the financial position of the NEPP as at the end of Q2 2025-26, with a redesigned report format. Performance had been better than expected, and the projection was now that the surplus for 2025-26 would be around £81k better than had been budgeted. The NEPP had over-recovered on income, following investment in extra PCN [Parking Charge Notice] printing and training, and additional staffing costs.

The report and figures were welcomed, and the over-recovery of PCN income was noted as being given as £53k, with a request to clarify whether this was for year-to-date, and how it had been established that such a level of recovery was now shown to be a trend and what evidence had led to confidence in this being the case. The Senior Finance Business Partner clarified that the £53k over-recovery of PCN income was the expected position for year end of 2025-26. The Interim Head of NEPP explained that the upswing in PCN income was due to investment in officer recruitment and retention, with a level of staffing being maintained through the year. Recruitment of Civil Enforcement Officers [CEOs] was what was seen to make this over-recovery possible. Attrition was experienced but the NEPP was

constantly working to maintain staffing levels and thus to maintain the surge in recoveries that had been seen in the latter part of 2024-25. A Committee member expressed satisfaction with the outcome being shown on the balance sheet.

*RESOLVED* that the JOINT COMMITTEE notes 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.

## **218. Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Policy Update Report**

Owen Howell, Clerk to the Joint Committee, read out a statement from Councillor Martin Goss, endorsing the TRO Policy and the recommendations accompanying it, and referencing the successful operation of this particular policy over the years. Councillor Goss praised NEPP officers for being helpful and providing advice whenever this had been requested.

Danielle Wood, Group Development Manager introduced the Policy update, with amendments aimed at improving clarity for the public, following feedback on the current Policy. Improvements to wording, formatting and structure had been crafted, which would also assist the NEPP in fulfilling its requirements for regular reviewing of its policies.

Key changes included the inclusion of the 'five year rule' for new-build development sites, agreed by the Joint Committee in January 2025. There was also the adding of an additional percentage to the support requirements for new scheme applications.

The Joint Committee considered the 75% support requirement for new TRO applications, and whether this was a bar to applications being put forward to formal consultation. A suggestion was made that partner councils could exclude some residents (in the affected areas for TRO applications), where appropriate, from the number of total residents in those areas, which was used to then calculate the percentage level of support, based on the expressions of support provided for applications. An example would be in areas where care homes and housing for vulnerable individuals were sited.

The definition of an 'affected resident' or 'affected business' was queried, and it was suggested that a clearer definition might help. Richard Walker, Head of Parking (Colchester City Council), explained that the initial stages of application had to be seen as part of the entire process, with the next stage being to progress to full statutory formal consultation, which would be aided by the earlier demonstration of a supermajority in favour of the application. When considering who counted as being affected residents, consideration had to be given to people in areas where the proposed TRO would potentially cause extra 'displacement' parking.

The Group Development Manager confirmed that thought had been given as to whether to formally define 'affected resident,' but the view taken was that given the range of different areas covered by the NEPP, rural and urban, it would not be practical to define this by proximity to proposed TROs. The Policy wording

encouraged interested parties to contact the NEPP for advice and support regarding particular potential applications, and advice could be given on a case-by-case basis. A Committee member asked if this direction could be included on the TRO application paperwork, to assist people seeking to collect evidence of the required levels of local support. The Group Development Manager confirmed that this wording would be added to the paperwork.

The Group Development Manager noted that proposals which had not achieved evidence of 75% local support could be kept by the NEPP, with copies within the organisation's external SharePoint environment (accessible by partners) and which could be brought forward by partner authorities to the Joint Committee with a request that they be considered for approval to go to formal consultation, on a case-by-case basis. Shane Taylor, Interim Engineering Manager (NEPP), laid out that since 2010, the NEPP had introduced between 550 and 600 new TROs. The NEPP was seeking to make the process as simple as possible and to avoid wasting public funds, such as by derisking the TRO application process and encouraging localism through residents working to talk to each other over TRO proposals. Proposals in the past which had not made the bar of 75% support had proven to be the applications which generated the most problems and opposition.

A Client Officer asked if there should be more clarity as to when the NEPP might provide input on parking matters into planning applications where this was relevant. The Interim Engineering Manager emphasised that he had made considerable effort to liaise and work with all of the planning authorities covered by the NEPP, and with Essex Highways. Only sporadic responses were received from those authorities seeking views on proposed new developments. Only three of the partners provided regular information, and little was received from Essex Highways. The Interim Head of NEPP added that it was for the planning authorities to consider adding NEPP consultation into their planning processes, and encouraged the colleagues in attendance to take this back to their planning colleagues and to encourage them to approach the NEPP when appropriate.

*RESOLVED* that the JOINT COMMITTEE agrees the revised general NEPP Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Policy (October 2025), detailed in Appendix A, replacing the previous version dated December 2022, and subject to additional guidance being provided on TRO application paperwork, and where appropriate on the NEPP website, to direct interested parties to contact the NEPP for advice and guidance regarding how to evidence local support for an application and to meet the 75% support level requirement.

## **219. Traffic Regulation Order and Application Decision Report**

Shane Taylor, Interim Engineering Manager (NEPP) introduced the report, including a list of externally-funded schemes carried out by the NEPP.

*RESOLVED* that the JOINT COMMITTEE: -

- a) Prioritises 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) 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.
- c) Notes 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) Notes the new schemes NEPP has advertised in 2025 via the JPC process, in Appendix C.
- e) Notes the new schemes NEPP has advertised in 2025 outside the JPC process (externally funded), in Appendix D.

## **220. Review of the NEPP Parking Management Policy**

A Panel member who had raised queries regarding proposed wording changes around enforcement of zig-zag lines and crossings prior to the meeting raised this section and confirmed that he was content for the wording to be amended as suggested in the draft Policy.

Trevor Degville, Interim Group Operating Manager, introduced the Policy and explained that the review was an audit requirement, which necessitated the periodic review of the NEPP's policies. This Policy worked in conjunction with the County Council's Local Transport Plan, which ECC had now put out to consultation for a new Plan to be produced. Local Government Reorganisation meant that any successor to the NEPP would need to build their own policy framework so, with that in mind, a light touch approach was being taken to policy reviews at this time.

A Panel member who had raised queries regarding proposed wording changes around enforcement of zig-zag lines and crossings prior to the meeting raised this section and confirmed that he was content for the wording to be amended as suggested in the draft Policy.

The amendments included some removal of duplicated content, the content referred to regarding zig-zags at pedestrian crossings. A section of text was also recommended for removal, regarding resident parking schemes and simple majorities, as this was not in line with current legislation (Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984).

*RESOLVED* that the JOINT COMMITTEES approve the recommended changes to the NEPP Parking Management Policy (PMP) that are shown in the appendix to the report provided.

## **221. Forward Plan 2025-2026**

Jake England, Interim Head of NEPP, informed the Joint Committee that the intention was to bring an item on the work relating to Braintree District on-street parking to the 22 January 2026 meeting, but owing to the large volume of feedback relating to this, the item might potentially need to be delayed until the 19 March 2026 meeting.

*RESOLVED* that the JOINT COMMITTEE approves the North Essex Parking Partnership Forward Plan for 2025-26, subject to the addition of: -

- a) The half-year update on LGR risk management
- b) Items on Braintree District on-street paid parking, on Essex Act Policy, and on the Red Routes Policy, all scheduled to come to Joint Committee on 22 January 2026
- c) Clarification that the NEPP Budget will be presented on 19 March 2026, alongside the Business Plan