

Norfolk County Council & District Councils Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee

Date: **Thursday 25 September 2014**

Time: **10.00am**

Venue: **Edwards Room
County Hall
Martineau Lane
Norwich**

Membership

County Councillors

Awaiting Appointment

District Councillors

Mr Keith Kiddie	South Norfolk District Council
Mr D Pope	Kings Lynn & West Norfolk District Council
Mr M T Jeal	Great Yarmouth Borough Council

Substitute

Mr G Plant	Great Yarmouth Borough Council
Awaiting Appointment	Kings Lynn & West Norfolk District Council
Awaiting Appointment	Norfolk County Council

Non-Voting District Council Representatives

Mr M Stonard	Norwich City Council
Mr M Kiddle-Morris	Breckland District Council
Mr R Oliver	North Norfolk District Council
Awaiting appointment	Broadland Council

**For further details and general enquiries about this Agenda
please contact Nicola LeDain, Committee Officer on:
01603 223053 or email committees@norfolk.gov.uk**

A G E N D A

1. **Election of Chairman**
2. **Election of vice-Chairman**
3. **Apologies for Absence**
4. **Minutes**

(Page 4)

To receive the minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2013.

5. **Declarations of Interest**

If you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest** in a matter to be considered at the meeting and that interest is on your Register of Interests you must not speak or vote on the matter.

If you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest** in a matter to be considered at the meeting and that interest is not on your Register of Interests you must declare that interest at the meeting and not speak or vote on the matter.

In either case you may remain in the room where the meeting is taking place. If you consider that it would be inappropriate in the circumstances to remain in the room, you may leave the room while the matter is dealt with.

If you do not have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest you may nevertheless have an **Other Interest** in a matter to be discussed if it affects:

- your well being or financial position
- that of your family or close friends
- that of a club or society in which you have a management role
- that of another public body of which you are a member to a greater extent than others in your ward.

If that is the case then you must declare such an interest but can speak and vote on the matter.

6. **Items of Urgent Business**

7. **Annual Report 2013/14**

(Page 8)

Report by the Interim Director of Environment, Transport and Development.

8. **Financial Performance 2013/14**

(Page 20)

Report by the Interim Director of Environment, Transport and Development.

9. Revisions to Civil Parking Enforcement Business Plan (Page 23)

Report by the Interim Director of Environment, Transport and Development.

10. Date of the next meeting

19 March 2015

Agenda published: 17 September 2014

Chris Walton
Head of Democratic Service
Norfolk County Council
County Hall
Martineau Lane
Norwich
Norfolk
NR1 2DH



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Democratic Support on 0344 800 8020 or minicom 01603 223833 and we will do our best to help.

Norfolk County Council & District Councils Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee

Minutes of the Meeting Held on Friday 20 September 2013

Present:

Mr B Hannah (Chairman)	Norfolk County Council
Mr M Castle	Great Yarmouth Borough Council
Mrs E Nockolds	King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council
Mr M Stonard	Norwich City Council

Also Present:

Mr R Bird	Local County Councillor for the North Coast Division (and a substitute member of the Joint Committee) whom spoke about the Hunstanton Parking Management Review.
-----------	--

Officers Present:

Jane Beck	Great Yarmouth Borough Council
Martin Chisholm	Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk
David Collinson	Norfolk County Council
Tim Durrell	South Norfolk Council
Tim Edmunds	Norfolk County Council
Duncan Ellis	North Norfolk District Council
Robert Ginn	Norfolk County Council
Gary Hewett	Norwich City Council
Phil Reilly	Norfolk County Council

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Mr M Jeal, Mr K Kiddie, Mr M Kiddle-Morris, Mr B Long and Mr R Oliver.

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 March 2013 were agreed by the Joint Committee and signed by the Chairman as a correct record of the meeting.

3. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

4. Items of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

5. Annual Report 2012/13

The Joint Committee received a report that provided the Annual Report for the first full financial year of operation of CPE in Norfolk and asked Members to approve the financial and statistical returns required by the Government. The report proposed that the funding previously approved by the County Council to develop CPE, together with the surplus that occurred in 2012/13, should be used to deliver a forward work programme to improve the long-term financial sustainability of the scheme and to help the County Council meet its responsibilities to manage traffic on its local road network.

During discussion, the following key points were made:

- It was important to ensure that CPE continued to achieve a financial break-even as a minimum so as to avoid financial dependence on other funding streams. The CPE also had to continue to follow Government guidance that stated that a CPE operation must not be seen as an income generator.
- In Great Yarmouth, the CPE operation was concentrated in a geographical area that was approximately half a mile wide by one mile long. In order to move forward with a more sustainable long-term solution to its financial needs, CPE had to achieve an increase in on-street revenue streams from locations other than Great Yarmouth. The Great Yarmouth Borough Council had plans to put in place infrastructure improvements in the town that could in time include the Borough Council's own new off-street multi-storey car park.
- Where CPE had recently been introduced in Kings Lynn town centre it had made it easier for people who were looking to go shopping for a short period of time to find short term parking.
- While under CPE the enforcement of on-street parking restrictions had ceased to be the responsibility of the Police there remained a regular and constructive dialogue with the Police to ensure there was a clearly understood division of responsibilities, given that the Police were still responsible for enforcing moving traffic offences as well as where there was a physical obstruction of the carriageway, footway or an exit from premises.

Resolved

- (a) That the Annual Report be noted.
- (b) That the financial and statistical returns for the operation of CPE in Norfolk (excluding Norwich City) for 2012/13, that were set out in paragraphs 2.1 – 2.4 of the report and also at Appendix 1, should be submitted to the Government as required.
- (c) That the scope and nature of the Joint Committee's Forward Work Programme be agreed as set out in the report, including the transfer of the operational financial surplus from on-street parking in 2012/13, to deliver the Forward Work Programme and to improve the long-term financial sustainability of the CPE in Norfolk.
- (d) To note that without funding from on-street parking schemes elsewhere in Norfolk, CPE was currently being financed from an increase in on-street parking in Great Yarmouth, money which could be used to put in place infrastructure improvements to regenerate the town. The sustainability of the current approach to CPE was an issue that had to be addressed at a future date.

6. Hunstanton Parking Management Review – Verbal Overview of Review

Phil Reilly gave a verbal presentation as to why Hunstanton had been selected for a review of on-street parking. He said that the aim of the review had been to support the economic vitality of the town and to compliment new income generation proposals, set out in the Hunstanton Southern Seafront and Town Centre Master Plan.

In the course of discussion, the following key points were noted:

- The review was partly in response to complaints from some residents along Cliff Parade, mostly regarding over night parking by motor homes and caravans, but also obstruction of the disabled dropped crossing points along Cliff Parade which regularly got parked across.
- Some residents of Cliff Terrace and of the Boston Square area had requested resident parking areas as they struggled to park outside their properties.
- Some of the residents in the area of Glebe Avenue, York Avenue and Victoria Avenue had historically requested resident parking permits.
- The Joint Borough and County Officer Working Group that had undertaken the review had also looked to review existing parking restrictions within the town to see if they were still fit for purpose. I.e. the time allowed in limited waiting bays in the High Street.
- The town attracted high visitor numbers throughout the summer but in times of high demand the off street car parks were not at capacity due to the availability of free on street parking. The town was relatively compact meaning most residential areas were within walking distance from the high street and promenade, which could encourage on street parking.
- The responses from the public to the review had come from a wider area than that covered by the proposals. People from outside of Hunstanton had responded to say that if CPE was introduced then they would no longer park to shop in the town. Comments such as this, and the objections that had been received from a number of local pressure groups, had appeared in the press before all local residents had been consulted, and the results of the review had been fully evaluated.
- Nevertheless, overall one-third of those who had responded were in favour of a CPE scheme for Hunstanton.
- A number of lessons on how to sell the benefits of CPE schemes to local residents had been learned from the work that had gone into the proposals for Hunstanton. The lessons included the importance of explaining local survey results to the public in a range of different ways, undertaking a press release for the initial survey, undertaking a separate resident only survey and having wider stakeholder engagement.
- Members were of the view that a Working Group of Members and Officers was needed to examine the ground rules for consulting with residents as part of a CPE review.

Resolved

(a) To note that there could be some merit in going forward with a limited new on-street parking scheme for Hunstanton town centre, but that this would not be financially viable as part of a CPE scheme.

(b) To set up a Member/Officer Working Group to provide a steer to the Joint Committee on how to assess the merits of forthcoming proposals for CPE, and for the Working Group to include the following Members:

Mr Castle

Mr Hannah

Mrs Nockolds

and officers who attend meetings of the Joint Committee.

7. Norfolk Parking Partnership Financial Performance

The Joint Committee received a report that highlighted the financial performance of the Norfolk Parking Partnership for the year ending 31st March 2013.

Resolved

To accept the figures set out in the report as a true and accurate record of performance for the period 1st April 2012 – 31st March 2013.

The meeting concluded at 11:00am.

CHAIRMAN



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Tim Shaw on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

Annual Report 2013/14

Report by the Interim Director of Environment, Transport and
Development

Summary

The County Council introduced Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) in Norfolk (outside Norwich) with effect from November 2011. It has helped the Council control on-street parking to provide a consistent, efficient and effective regime of on-street parking enforcement across the county, thereby assisting the County Council as traffic authority in discharging its network management duty in such a way as to focus on key issues such as highway safety, accessibility and local environment. CPE is operated based on the premise that any on-street income generated through penalty charge notices (PCNs), pay and display or permit charge is retained and offset against the cost of the scheme and its ongoing enforcement.

This report provides the Annual Report for the second full financial year of operation of CPE in Norfolk and members of the Joint Committee are asked to approve the financial and statistical returns required by Government.

During the period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014 37,663 penalty charge notices were issued across the county (excluding Norwich). CPE operations resulted in a deficit of £185,035. This is an improvement on the business model, but work is required to further develop the management of on-street parking in Norfolk to ensure its long term financial sustainability in support the Council's responsibilities to manage traffic on its network. An overall financial surplus occurred in 2013/14 taking into account on-street pay and display receipts.

The capital funding previously approved by the Council to develop CPE together with the surplus that occurred in 2013/14 is proposed to be used to deliver a Forward Work Programme to improve the long term financial sustainability of the scheme and help the Council meet its responsibilities to manage traffic on its local road network.

Action Required

Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee is asked:-

- (i) To agree the financial and statistical returns for the operation of CPE in Norfolk (excluding Norwich City) for 2013/14, as set out in paragraph 2.2 below and in Appendix 1 for submission to Government.
- (ii) For its views on the scope and nature of the Forward Work Programme, including the transfer of the operational financial surplus from on-street parking in 2013/14 to deliver the Forward Work Programme to improve the long term financial sustainability of the CPE in Norfolk.

1. **Background**

- 1.1. Norfolk County Council (NCC) as local traffic authority has a network management duty under Part 2 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA) to secure the expeditious movement of traffic on its road network and to make arrangements as it considers appropriate for carrying out the action to be taken in performing that duty.
- 1.2. Parking control is one element of assisting with these responsibilities. The County Council introduced Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) in Norfolk (outside Norwich) from November 2011. Within Norfolk (outside Norwich), CPE is being operated by the delegation of functions jointly and severally to the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk (BCKLWN), Great Yarmouth Borough Council (GYBC) and South Norfolk District Council (SNDC).
- 1.3. The boroughs and districts employ Civil Enforcement Officers who may issue Penalty Charge Notices for parking contraventions. One of the benefits of CPE is to permit the introduction of a common enforcement service for both on-street and off-street parking by Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs). This allows the service (including the resulting administration, processing and queries through the Central Processing Units) to be more uniform and efficient for all users, for example by issuing common Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs).
- 1.4. This is the second Annual Report of the Norfolk Parking Partnership (NPP), covering the year from April 2013 to March 2014. It covers a period when NCC Highways has revised the way it investigates parking issues in line with concerns raised at the Joint Committee in September 2013. The national government also carried out a consultation about on-street parking during winter 2013/14 and will be introducing some changes in the future to how we operate.
- 1.5. A main benefit of CPE is that the local control of on-street parking can enable consistent, efficient and effective enforcement provision across the county, thereby assisting the traffic authority to use its network management duty in such a way as to focus on key issues such as highway safety, accessibility and local environment. Consequently, CPE can be used to benefit both business and the community, to introduce/enforce Traffic Orders and to set up new measures as may be identified in the Parking Principles and the Traffic Management Programme. More fundamentally, it ensures at least an essential level of enforcement.
- 1.6. The CPE business case is based on the premise that any on-street income generated from CPE either through PCNs, pay and display or permit charging is retained and offset against the cost of the scheme and its ongoing enforcement. In addition, where there is an operational surplus, this can be used to support parking operation and the Council's responsibility as local Highway Authority under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) which may include transport initiatives supporting parking operations in accordance with Section 55 of the RTRA. This does not affect the revenue generated through off-street car parks, which are owned by district councils who continue to exercise their own controls.
- 1.7. The Council made its first a performance and financial return to Government for the period 2012/13. No response was received. A summary of this report, if agreed by Members, will be sent to the Department for Transport this year.

2. Performance

2.1 Use of 2012-2013 CPE Surplus

- 2.1.1 The performance during 2012-13 led to a surplus of £214,382. Last year's annual report set out how this surplus was to be used 2013-14. £50,000 was added to the budget for maintenance of parking and waiting restriction signs and markings, raising investment to £100,000. In addition, £100,000 was put towards specific transport and town realm schemes in Great Yarmouth.
- 2.1.2 Development of CPE elsewhere in the county was funded from a revenue fund allocated by the County Council's Cabinet agreed in January 2012 to seek to increase on street revenues from sources other than PCNs and locations other than Great Yarmouth. This stood at £155,000 at 1 April 2013.

2.2 Operational Position (1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014)

- 2.2.1 37,663 penalty charge notices were issued. Full parking statistics, collated from the borough and districts councils undertaking enforcement across Norfolk (excluding Norwich City) are shown in Appendix 1.
- 2.2.2 The total income received across the partnership was £1,081,009. Total expenditure was £1,004,203 and £43,337 was placed into a fund to cover future capital equipment replacement costs.
- 2.2.3 £644,039 of the income was generated from Penalty Charge Notices, and £350,730 from On Street Parking Pay & Display fees in Great Yarmouth.
- 2.2.4 Total surplus in respect of CPE (including Great Yarmouth On Street Parking) was £33,469.
- 2.2.5 **What the surplus will be spent on in 2014-15.**

An allocation of £160,000 from the surplus of 2012-13 and 2013-14 will be used to continue developing CPE schemes throughout the county outside of Norwich, as agreed by the Joint Committee in September 2013.

- 2.2.6 The aim is to have used all the surplus by the 31 March 2015. Any remaining surplus will be rolled forward into 2015-16.

Issues during 2013/14

2.3 Lessons learnt from Hunstanton Whole Settlement Parking Study

- 2.3.1 Proposals for introducing further parking controls to roads in Hunstanton were discussed at the Joint Committee in September 2013.
- 2.3.2 The Council had carried out consultations in two parts. First, the public were asked what parking problems they thought there were and did they want proposals developed to ease the problems. The response showed that the majority wanted

something done.

- 2.3.3 When proposals were developed they were sent to addresses in the whole town in September 2013, not just the roads concerned. Comments against the scheme from people from outside of Hunstanton and a number of local pressure groups appeared in the press before all local residents had been consulted. Overall one-third of those who had responded were in favour of a CPE scheme for Hunstanton, but as the majority of respondents were not in favour it was decided not to take the scheme forward at that time.
- 2.3.4 This committee asked for a working group of Members and officers to consider the ground rules for consulting with residents as part of a CPE review. The meeting took place on 15 January 2014, with Brian Hannah (Sheringham and then chairman of this committee), Michael Castle (Yarmouth North and Central), Elizabeth Nockhold (South Wootton) and Richard Bird (North Coast, which includes Hunstanton).
- 2.3.5 The working group felt that the proposal could have been developed further before being presented to the public and that each road could have been looked at individually. The pay and display element and the residents parking should have been considered separately. The group recognized the benefits to local businesses of introducing parking controls, as experienced in Great Yarmouth.
- 2.3.6 It was agreed that the schemes should be tailored to the local conditions, eg seasonal charges, allowing 30 minutes free parking before charging, different types of restricted zones. This pattern has been followed so far in the studies being carried out in King's Lynn. It has allowed officers to focus more on the needs of individual areas while still considering the context for the whole town.

2.4 **School parking**

- 2.4.1 Parking remains an issue which affects roads around many schools throughout the county, despite a requirement for each school to have a travel plan. Some drivers stop on School Keep Clear markings to drop off or pick up children. Some park adjacent to the markings for extended periods before the end of the school day to be as close to the school entrance as possible. In many cases they park in a way which disrupts life for local residents.
- 2.4.2 At some school sites where the free movement of traffic is impeded waiting restrictions have been introduced in addition to the Keep Clear markings. Enforcement has to be prioritized with other requests across the enforcement area and civil enforcement officers (CEOs) cannot attend every day. Like enforcement generally, visits are made with the aim of encouraging offenders to think they will be caught and deciding not to re-offend.
- 2.4.3 Various campaigns have been staged to remind parents that they should not stop on the Keep Clear zig-zag markings. These markings are generally only advisory. In some cases it may be worth creating a traffic regulation order to allow CEOs to give a penalty charge notice to vehicles where there is a persistent problem. However, even with such an order the CEO would be expected to advise a driver not to stop

there rather than give out a PCN.

2.4.4 In investigating the clearway order we would have to consider the knock-on effects of the proposal. For example, it could lead to more use of the residential roads by parents. Parking restrictions in Norfolk are introduced in consultation with the local community and would need general acceptance to be implemented. Therefore it would not be a foregone conclusion that the clearway restrictions would be strengthened.

2.4.5 The draft version of the Traffic Signs Regulations and Directions 2015 was issued for consultation by the DfT in May 2014. One of the items considered was the introduction of enforceable school clearway markings without the need for a traffic regulation order. Should the final regulations confirm this change, there would still be a need to check clearway markings are correct before they can be enforced and consider the impact on surrounding area.

2.5 **Government Consultation On Parking Enforcement**

The Department for Transport launched a consultation on local government enforcement in December 2013. In summary, having asked if we thought we ran our parking services fairly and reasonably, it proposed the following

a) All CCTV enforcement should be abolished

NPP argued that, although we do not currently carry out CCTV enforcement, there were some cases such as School Keep Clear markings where it would aid safety. The Government has responded that in some such cases, bus clearways and lanes, and on red routes CCTV enforcement would be allowed, but all other forms would be outlawed.

b) Traffic adjudicators should be given wider powers to allow appeals and costs to be claimed

NPP considered that regular reviews of adjudicator powers was to be expected, although it was difficult to see how costs may be fairly set. The Government intends to widen the powers in particular circumstances and to revise guidance to explain what provision for allowing costs is available.

c) Allow a mechanism for local residents and businesses to require local authorities to review parking in their locality

NPP considered that the Parking Principles and the use of the DfT approved guidelines on civil parking enforcement meant that the Partnership was fair and reasonable in its approach. The Government, however, started a further consultation on 30 August 2014 into reviewing how a mechanism may be introduced.

d) To allow grace periods at paid for and free parking bays after the original time has ended, and possibly on yellow line waiting restrictions

NPP, whilst understanding the reason for allowing grace periods at some locations, considers good practises are more important. Grace periods should not be allowed at such as loading bays or on yellow lines as they would make these unenforceable. The Government has responded that it will seek to introduce a standard 10 minute grace period across the country. The NPP enforcement teams consider this could be accommodated in the NPP Parking Enforcement Guidance Manual without causing a reduction in performance..

2.6 Forward Work Programme

- 2.6.1 It is important to sustain the future viability of CPE and to ensure financial break even as a minimum in order to avoid long term dependency upon other funding streams.
- 2.6.2 The current business model relies on limited revenue opportunities generated from unpredictable levels of PCNs, together with some of the surplus produced by on-street charging in Great Yarmouth (previously ring-fenced for transport related expenditure in the Borough). Although the business case predicts that the use of this surplus should be sufficient to cover the operating deficit in the short-term (and this is the basis on which CPE has been supported by GYBC), it is not anticipated that this will be sustainable into the future as the income stream is too heavily reliant on PCN revenue. New revenues therefore need to be identified or costs will have to be reduced as ongoing subsidy is not a viable option.
- 2.6.3 A Forward Work Programme (FWP) has been developed to take forward the development of CPE, including considering the introduction of on-street parking charges and resident permit schemes that seek to manage the demand required for on-street parking in an individual locality. A copy of the items contained in programme for 2014/15 is set out in Appendix 2. The programme includes work underway to review parking in parts of Kings Lynn, including the introduction of charging to previously free parking bays. Studies of sea front and town centre parking in Cromer and Sheringham have started in accordance with the County Council's 'Parking Principles'. At the time of writing this report all of the capital funding agreed by Cabinet is allocated to delivering the FWP.

3. Resource Implications

- 3.1. **Finance** : There are financial implications resulting from the implementation of CPE, including legal and contractual procedures to be followed, equipment and software to be procured and maintained. The operation of CPE and the delivery of its Forward Work Programme is undertaken within existing resources.
- 3.2. The District Councils to whom the functions are delegated have accepted no financial liability arising out of or in relation to the on-street enforcement service. The Joint Committee will be aware of the financial risks that this poses to the County Council and will appreciate the need for partnership working to mitigate these risks as far as possible.

- 3.3. **Staff** : Staffing is a key issue for the implementation of CPE. The District Councils employ back office and/or enforcement staff (CEOs). Recruitment remains an important function for the Districts to keep their resources at the appropriate levels.
- 3.4. Staff are trained to undertake CPE duties, including on-street enforcement in accordance with common procedures. The County Council has taken on the parking manager function to monitor the delegation and ensure our statutory duties are discharged. This function was absorbed within the Highways service (now Highways and Transport) from 1 April 2013.
- 3.5. **Property** : None.
- 3.6. **IT** : To function efficiently and economically a CPE scheme must base its administration and ticketing facilities on established hardware and software systems which, where appropriate, are compatible with other highways and traffic regulation management systems. For such systems to function at the peak efficiencies good telecommunication links are also necessary.
- 3.7. The CPE back office function is being undertaken by both BCKLWN and GYBC. The County Council has been responsible for the costs of converting the existing software to operate CPE and funding the hand held terminals for operation by on-street enforcement staff.
- 3.8. The benefits to the CPE operation in having an ICT solution for the management of Traffic Regulation Orders has been investigated in detail and a process is currently nearing completion. The benefits of such a process expand beyond the CPE requirements.
4. **Other Implications**
- 4.1. **Legal Implications** : The Delegated Function arrangements as implemented are subject to an understanding that ultimate responsibility for proper conduct and management will continue to lie with the County Council.
- 4.2. As an executive function, the legal basis for the delegation is under section 19 of the Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Authorities (Arrangements for the Discharge of Functions) (England) Regulations 2000 which leaves the executives of the District Councils to assume responsibility for it.
- 4.3. A formal agreement between all four parties has been signed which sets out the basis of the arrangements, financial matters and the appropriate management structure for the delegation of functions. For information, the agreement is subject to the statutory rights and duties of the County Council.
- 4.4. Implementation of CPE has required a Designation Order to be prepared by the DfT and for a Statutory Instrument to be signed by the Minister and laid before Parliament.
- 4.5. **Human Rights** : None.
- 4.6. **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)** : A detailed assessment of the introduction of CPE was carried out. A broad assessment is that a more focussed and visible enforcement service should be beneficial, particularly for pedestrians and disabled drivers. Nothing in this report requires more detailed examination.
- 4.7. **Communications** : Individual items in the Forward Work Programme, for instance the current reviews of parts of Kings Lynn, Cromer and Sheringham, include their

own bespoke communications and stakeholder consultations. Any changes to existing or the introduction of new Traffic Regulation Orders involves formal statutory consultations.

- 4.8. **Health and Safety Implications** : Better enforcement of waiting restrictions should make a positive contribution to road safety, particularly where the incidence of footway parking can be reduced.
- 4.9. **Environmental Implications** : Better enforcement of waiting restrictions should make a positive contribution to the 'amenity' or general 'well being' of Norfolk's local communities protecting both the physical and natural assets of the county. Helping to ease traffic flow, through the prevention of inappropriate parking restricting the flow of traffic (including pedestrians and cyclists) helps to minimise fuel use and traffic emissions.
- 4.10. **Any other implications** : Officers have considered all the implications which members should be aware of. Apart from those listed in the report (above), there are no other implications to take into account.
- 5. **Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act**
- 5.1. It is considered that the presence of identifiable uniformed personnel patrolling the streets during daytime, and in some locations up to the early hours of the morning, can arguably do much to increase the public's perception of safety and lead to a reduction in anti-social behaviour and opportunist crime. Whilst the overall level of on-street parking enforcement resource has not changed significantly from that previously provided by the traffic wardens, its visibility has increased particularly where the same enforcement staff undertake both on and off street enforcement duties in an area.

Action Required

Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee is asked:-

- (i) To agree the financial and statistical returns for the operation of CPE in Norfolk (excluding Norwich City) for 2013/14, as set out in paragraphs 2.2 above and in Appendix 1 for submission to Government.
- (ii) For its views on the scope and nature of the Forward Work Programme, including the transfer of the operational financial surplus from on-street parking in 2014/15 to deliver the Forward Work Programme to improve the long term financial sustainability of the CPE in Norfolk.

Background Papers

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Name	Telephone Number	Email address
Rob Mills	01603 223930	rob.mills@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 and ask for Tim Edmunds or textphone 0344 800 8011 and we will do our best to help.

Norfolk Parking Partnership – Annual Report 2013/14

Statistical Return*

	South Norfolk	Great Yarmouth	Breckland	Broadland	North Norfolk	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	County Total (excluding Norwich City)
Number of higher level PCNs served	243	5068	1462	275	1712	5661	14421
Number of lower level PCNs served	256	1580	1968	104	1810	1996	7714
Number of PCNs paid	428	5017	2855	321	2984	6238	17843
Number of PCNs paid at discount rate	370	4144	2474	290	2564	5223	15065
Number of PCNs against which an informal or formal representation was made	72	1415	580	83	721	1449	4320
Number of PCNs cancelled as a result of an informal or formal representation	21	487	303	41	361	576	1789
Number of PCNs written off for other reasons (e.g. CEO error or driver untraceable)	12	349	118	6	52	234	771
Number of vehicles immobilised	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of vehicles removed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* Set out in the format required by Government

Norfolk Parking Partnership – CPE Forward Work Programme 2014/15

(not in priority order)

Settlement Reviews

Parking management reviews conducted in accordance with the principles set out in the County Council's 'Parking Principles'. The reviews take into account and can assist and integrate proposed development, regeneration and public realm improvements. Reviews are currently underway in:-

King's Lynn: Town Centre South Quay	Investigation of rationalization of waiting and parking restrictions. Introduction of charging using pay and display	Layout designed and informally consulted on in summer 2014. Traffic orders have been drafted and advertised. Implementation if formal consultation is successful. December / January 2014/15.
King's Lynn: Springwood (near QEII hospital)	Investigation of options to help residents with overspill parking from the hospital.	Scheme agreed with local residents including residents parking provision in roads edging hospital boundary, minor junction waiting restrictions elsewhere. Traffic orders have been drafted for advertisement in October/ November
King's Lynn: Town Centre CPZ	Investigation of rationalization of waiting and parking restrictions. Introduction of charging using pay and display	Layout designed and informally consulted on in summer 2014. Traffic orders have been drafted to be advertised. Implementation if formal consultation is successful Jan/ Feb 2015
King's Lynn: residential areas surrounding Town Centre	Rationalizing of waiting and parking restrictions in Highgate area around college. Investigation of resident parking issues in North End area. Investigation of resident parking issues in streets south of Town Centre	Residents informal consultation complete and scheme to be agreed with stakeholders prior to formal advertisement December 2014
Sheringham: Town Centre, Front and approaches	Investigation of rationalization of waiting and parking restrictions. Introduction of charging using pay and display	Stakeholder consultations started. Design and consultation to be carried winter 2014/15. Any implementation spring/summer 2015.
Sheringham: central Residential Roads	Investigation of resident parking issues.	Stakeholder consultations started. Design and consultation to be carried winter 2014/15 and spring 2015. Any implementation autumn 2015.
Cromer: Town Centre and Front	Investigation of rationalization of waiting and parking restrictions. Introduction of charging using pay and display	Stakeholder consultations started. Design and consultation to be carried winter 2014/15. Possible implementation summer 2015

Cromer: Residential streets surrounding Town Centre and Front	Investigation of resident parking issues.	Stakeholder consultations started. Design and consultation to be carried winter 2014/15 and spring 2015. Possible implementation summer 2015
Great Yarmouth: Area C	Investigation of resident parking issues adjacent to existing zone.	Start study late autumn 2014.

Hunstanton parking issues would be considered further in 2015/2016

Enhancement of the Traffic Regulation Orders supporting pedestrianised areas

Fakenham and Great Yarmouth are the only outstanding market places to be completed. In order to resolve this issue and to avoid compromising the public's perception of CPE, the existing TROs for pedestrianised areas have been examined and a remedial programme has been drawn up for each area. This will comprise consultations and advertisement of proposals, the introduction of new TROs and appropriate signing and lining so that parking enforcement can be carried out. Work is programmed in terms of the Market Place in Great Yarmouth.

Review of School Keep Clear Orders

There is a concern about the safety of children outside of schools at the beginning and the end of the day. School keep clear markings are often abused as easy dropping-off and picking-up points.

It is considered enforcement of clearway markings could potentially improve the situation. It is currently not possible to enforce the clearways with civil parking enforcement officers as most do not have a traffic regulation order to back them.

A priority list has been developed for investigation during 2014/2015. Criteria would include the ease of providing effective enforcement at any particular site and an assessment of the impacts on the surrounding community..

Streamline Highway Fault Reporting

Changing the 'back office' parking ICT systems within the Borough and District Councils and the County Council's Highway Management System (HMS) to enable CEOs to report via their handheld CPE devices highway faults, such as missing or incorrect yellow road markings or signs, and for such reports to directly feed into HMS. Such arrangements would speed up reporting and potentially the remedy of faults and reduce duplicate handing and data entry across all the authorities involved.

Norfolk Parking Partnership Committee

Item No 8.

Report title:	Financial Performance 2013/14
Date of meeting:	25th September 2014
Responsible Chief Officer:	Tom McCabe
Strategic impact This report sets out the overall performance of the Norfolk Parking Partnership in 2013/14, and highlights details for each partner.	

Executive summary

Overall the partnership delivered a surplus of £33,469 for the period 1st April to 31st March. Once added to the available balance brought forward of £163,801 from previous years there is £197,270 available for 2014/15 and future years.

Recommendations: It is recommended that the Committee accepts this report as the position of the Partnership at 31st March 2014

1. Proposal (or options)

Overall the Partnership delivered a surplus of £33,469 in 2013/14, against a planned surplus of £86,501, an adverse variance of £53,033. The Partnership is hosted by Norfolk County Council, and enforcement delivered by Great Yarmouth Borough Council, King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council (who also provide the service on behalf of Breckland District Council, Broadland District Council and North Norfolk District Council), and South Norfolk District Council.

2. Evidence

Overall the Norfolk Parking Partnership generated a surplus from operations of £76,806 in 2013/14. It has been agreed that each year a contribution to the Capital Equipment Replacement Reserve (equal to 20% of the total capital spend to date) will be made to cover future costs. This is £43,337 in 2013/14. Once this is taken into account the surplus reduces to £33,469.

Overall the reduced costs compared to the Business Case were due to fewer staff being employed than planned. This clearly reduced capacity to issue Penalty Charge Notices and explains the lower than planned income figures. The original plan also included a county wide Parking Manager, but this post remains vacant, as previously agreed by the Committee.

The performance of each partner (and the effect of the Capital Equipment Replacement Reserve) is set out below:

Civil Parking Operations 2013/14	Plan £	Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
King's Lynn & West Norfolk CPE Costs	502,352	453,556	-48,796	(9.7)
King's Lynn & West Norfolk CPE Income	-446,875	-453,757	-6,882	1.5
King's Lynn & West Norfolk CPE Balance	55,477	-201	-55,678	100.4
South Norfolk CPE Costs	45,507	39,097	-6,410	(14.1)
South Norfolk CPE Income	-44,086	-34,459	9,627	(21.8)
South Norfolk CPE Balance	1,421	4,638	3,217	226.4
Great Yarmouth CPE Costs	491,333	431,757	-59,576	(12.1)
Great Yarmouth CPE Income	-353,825	-242,063	111,762	(31.5)
Great Yarmouth CPE Balance	137,508	189,694	52,186	38
Great Yarmouth On Street Pay & Display Costs	78,030	79,793	1,763	2.3
Great Yarmouth On Street Pay & Display Income	-358,938	-350,730	8,208	(2.3)
Great Yarmouth On Street Pay & Display Balance	-280,908	-270,937	9,971	(3.5)
Total from Operations	-86,502	-76,806	9,696	(11.2)
Capital Replacement Contribution		43,337	43,337	n/a
Overall Total	-86,502	-33,469	53,033	(61.3)

The following table shows the balance within the Partnership since the beginning of Civil Parking Enforcement on 7th November 2011:

Norfolk Parking Partnership Balance	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	2013/14 £
Opening Balance	0	46,419	263,801
In Year Surplus	46,419	214,382	33,469
In Year Contribution to Schemes	0	0	-100,000
Closing Balance	46,419	263,801	197,270

The lower contribution in 2013/14 reflected reduced income, plus a £100k in year contribution to cover replacement of signs and road markings. While this is included in

the Business Case, no contribution was made in 2011/12 and 2012/13. £100k was removed from the fund to cover the cost of schemes in Great Yarmouth. Plans to use the remaining surplus of £197,270 to support the Forward Work Programme are set out in the Annual Report and Forward Work Programme (Item 1 on the Agenda).

The following table shows the balance on the Capital Equipment Replacement Reserve (which was created in 2012/13):

Capital Equipment Replacement Reserve	2012/13 £	2013/14 £
Opening Balance	0	43,337
Contribution	43,337	43,337
Drawdown	0	0
Closing Balance	43,337	86,674

3. Financial Implications

Other than mentioned above, there are no further financial implications to this report.

4. Issues, risks and innovation

We have experienced delays in receiving information from the Partners. It is vital we receive up to date information on a quarterly basis to allow the programme to be managed. We intend to address this in the revised Business Case.

There are no other implications to this review other than financial as mentioned in section 3 above.

5. Background

This report links in to the Annual Report (Item 1) and supports the request to review the Business Case within Item 3.

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained or want to see copies of any assessments, eg equality impact assessment, please get in touch with:

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Officer Name:	Tel No:	Email address:
Robert Ginn	223182	robert.ginn@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

Norfolk Parking Partnership Committee

Item No 9.

Report title:	Revisions to CPE Business Plan
Date of meeting:	25th September 2014
Responsible Chief Officer:	Tom McCabe
Strategic impact The current Business Case for Civil Parking Enforcement was written for the launch of the scheme in November 2011. It needs to be updated to take into account recent performance and ensure it is still relevant, and the costs incurred through running the scheme are covered by the income generated.	

Executive summary

There is a need to review and if necessary revise the Business Case with the CPE partners to ensure that all assumptions about the operating environment and predicted performance are valid and achievable for the financial year beginning 1st April 2015, given that both income and costs have both been lower than the existing Business Case in reality.

Recommendations: Review the Business Plan with our partners and update where required.

1. Proposal (or options)

We propose to review the existing Business Case for relevance and ensure that the targets for the number of Penalty Charge Notices issued, the income generated from these, and the costs associated with managing this scheme is valid and robust for all members of the partnership. As set out below, performance and expenditure over the past two years has differed from the Business Case and this needs to be addressed.

The plan is to review the Business Case with all partners to ensure that each area is considered and a strong and robust Business Case is in place for the three years from 1st April 2015. This plan would then be reviewed on an annual rolling basis.

2. Evidence

The income generated by Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) has fallen short of that predicted within the Business Case since the scheme went live in November 2011. For example, in 2012/13 income was £289k less than the Business Case, and in 2013/14 it was £115k less.

Costs have also been lower than the Business Case, by £438k in 2012/13 and £115k in 2013/14. This is largely through fewer Enforcement Officers than planned being employed, and the County Parking Manager post being held as a vacancy.

There have also been delays in receiving the quarterly information from the Partners, and so this mechanism needs to be reviewed. We should also consider whether quarterly reporting gives the control necessary to manage the service and allow corrective action to be taken if performance is not matching up to the Business Case.

3. Financial Implications

The current Business Case is not up to date. It needs to be refreshed to take into account recent performance, the impact of enforcement on existing areas and the roll out to new areas. If this doesn't happen then there will be no relevant target for performance to be measured against and this increases the risk of incurring costs that will not be covered by the income generated, and will need to be covered by the Partnership.

4. Issues, risks and innovation

Other than the Financial Implications covered in section 3, we need to make sure that any expansion of the Business Case meets the legal requirements around Traffic Regulations and that managing and operating the scheme does not create additional burdens on the officers of Norfolk County Council and the CPE partners.

5. Background

There is great interest in both the local and national media at present about parking charges and penalties and so the revised Business Case must be clear on the benefits for Norfolk and how we would invest any future surpluses for the benefit of local areas that is consistent with objectives.

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained or want to see copies of any assessments, eg equality impact assessment, please get in touch with:

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Officer Name:	Tel No:	Email address:
Robert Ginn	223182	robert.ginn@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.