

## **Norfolk County Council & District Councils Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee**

Date: **Tuesday 19 March 2013**

Time: **2.00pm**

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

### **Membership**

#### **County Councillors**

Mr G Plant (Chairman)

#### **District Councillors**

Mr K Kiddie	South Norfolk District Council
Mrs E Nockolds	Kings Lynn & West Norfolk District Council
Mr M Castle	Great Yarmouth Borough Council

#### **Substitute**

Mr B Long	Kings Lynn & West Norfolk District Council
Mr B Spratt (Vice Chairman)	Norfolk County Council

#### **Non-Voting District Council Representatives**

Mr B Bremner	Norwich City Council
Mr M Kiddle-Morris	Breckland District Council
Mr R Oliver	North Norfolk District Council

**For further details and general enquiries about this Agenda  
please contact the Committee Officer on:  
01603 223053 or email [committees@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:committees@norfolk.gov.uk)**

## A G E N D A

**1. Apologies for Absence**

**2. Minutes**

**(Page 5)**

To receive the minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2012.

**3. 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.

**4. Items of Urgent Business**

**5. Progress Report**

**(Page 9)**

Report by the Director of Environment Transport and Development

**6. Norfolk Parking Partnership Financial Performance**

**(Page 20)**

Report by the Head of Finance

**7. Date of the next meeting**

To agree that the next meeting be held at **10am on Friday 20 September 2013 in County Hall, Norwich.**

Agenda published: 11 March 2013

**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 Kristen Jones 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 Thursday 20 September 2012**

**Present:**

Mr G Plant (Chairman)	Norfolk County Council
Mr K Kiddie	South Norfolk District Council
Mrs E Nockolds	Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk
Mr M Castle	Great Yarmouth Borough Council

**Officers Present:**

Mr D Collinson	Norfolk County Council
Mr M Chisholm	Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk
Mr T Durrell	South Norfolk District Council
Mrs K Jones	Committee Officer, Norfolk County Council
Mr C Kutesko	Norfolk County Council
Mr P Warner	Great Yarmouth Borough Council

**1. Apologies and substitutions**

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Mr B Bremner and Mr M Kiddle-Morris.

**2. Minutes**

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 23 March 2012 were agreed by the Joint Committee and signed by the Chairman as an accurate record of the meeting.

**3. Declarations of Interests**

- 3.1 Mr G Plant declared a personal interest as he was also a Member of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.

**4. Progress Report**

- 4.1 The Committee received a report by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development. The report provided information on the development of the Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) project since the last Joint Committee meeting on 23 March 2012. The report also included, as an Appendix, a Parking Management Schemes Development Guidelines document, which had been previously circulated for comment. These Guidelines complemented the Parking Principles which were submitted to this Joint Committee in March 2012.
- 4.2 Members discussed the ongoing problem across Norfolk of inconsiderate drivers parking in pedestrianised zones and on walkways and pavements which often prevented pushchairs and disabled residents from being able to get around safely. The

following points were raised during the discussion of this issue:

- It was noted that this was a mainly a problem in town centres, around seafront areas, and at local hospitals, and that this issues had been widely reported in the press. It was noted that with the majority of cases the main enforcement powers which could be used was under highway obstruction. Mr Chisholm said that there was strong public feeling about this issue and there was consensus that civil enforcement officers should be given powers to enforce.
- The Chairman stated that there was the option of establishing a Local Traffic Order which required a red line around a specific area but for this to come about a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was required.
- Mr Collinson stated that the initial legal advice obtained provided for two options. The first option was via a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) which would take up to 18 months and required signage. The second option was a blanket approach, (such as in London). This solution would require a robust enforcement policy to be developed to ensure any intervention was proportionate to the issue. He suggested that the Joint Committee agree that officers would consider the best approach and would balance the two options.
- It was noted that any proposed solution would cover Norfolk as a whole and there would not be different solutions for each district partner. It was noted that a street-by-street approach would not be as effective as a Norfolk-wide approach.
- Members agreed the parking guidelines that had been circulated and consulted on and requested that when a possible solution was put forward that officers consider the demographics of the areas the solution would cover. In particular, in Great Yarmouth, while the level of car ownership was lower per capita than other parts of the county, there were still significant parking issues due to visitors to the area and to residents who lived in the town. The guidelines were flexible to take such issues into account.
- The costs of officer time and capital costs needed to be considered as well, whether the scheme would need signage and or significant time to appropriately enforce.
- The Chairman said that any solution would need to have a legal right to be enforced and sanction offenders.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- 4.3 That Officers would come up with a proposal regarding the issue of parking in pedestrianised zones across Norfolk after considering the comments made by the Joint Committee so that a decision could be made at the next meeting.
- 4.4 To agree the Parking Management Scheme document and that this document could now be finalised and formally issued.

#### **5. Norfolk Parking Partnership Financial Performance**

- 5.1 The Committee received a report by the Head of Finance. The purpose of this report was to highlight the financial performance of the Norfolk Parking Partnership from the beginning of operations on 7 November 2011 to 31 March 2012.

**RESOLVED:**

To note the performance of the Partnership.

**6. Norfolk Audit Services: Appointment of Internal Auditor, Internal Audit Terms of Reference, Code of Ethics and Strategy**

- 6.1 The Committee received a report by the Head of Finance. The purpose of this report was to explain the appointment of the Joint Committee's Internal Auditor, review the Internal Audit Terms of Reference, the Code of Ethics and Strategy in accordance with the CIPFA Code of Practice for Internal Audit in Local Government in the United Kingdom 2006.

- 6.2 In response to a Member question, rather than being audited twice at both a County level and District level, it was suggested that the District level audit would be a "light touch" audit and the primary audit would take place at the County level.

**RESOLVED:**

- 6.3 To approve the appointment of Norfolk Audit Services as the Committee's Internal Auditor, Terms of Reference as set out in Appendix A and the Code of Ethics as set out in Appendix B and the Strategy at Appendix C of the report.

**7. Meeting dates for 2013**

- 7.1 Members were asked to agree two meeting dates for March and September 2013.

**RESOLVED:**

- 7.2 That a selection of dates be circulated to Members and the two meeting dates for 2013 (one in March and another in September) would be confirmed by email after Members had been consulted.

The meeting concluded at 2:45pm.

**CHAIRMAN**



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





## **Progress Report**

Report by the Director of Environment Transport and Development

### **Summary**

This report provides information on the development of the Civil Parking Enforcement project since the last Joint Committee meeting on 20 September 2012. The report also includes, as Appendices, outline proposals to restrict parking in town centre pedestrianised areas and details of the Hunstanton parking review proposals, including the Stakeholder Identification and Involvement document.

The Joint Committee is asked for its views on taking forward both these sets of proposals.

### **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. This network duty cannot be delegated to District Councils.
- 1.2 In order to assist in meeting its TMA responsibilities, the County Council introduced Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) in the whole of Norfolk (extended from just Norwich) with effect from 07 November 2011. Under CPE, the enforcement of on-street parking restrictions has ceased to be the responsibility of the Police (and their Traffic Wardens) and has passed to the local traffic authority. The Police remain responsible for endorsable traffic offences.
- 1.3 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 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 in accordance with the Parking Principles, the Parking Management schemes Development Guidelines and the Traffic Management Programme. More fundamentally, it ensures at least an essential level of enforcement across the county.
- 1.5 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 other transport initiatives. This does not affect the revenue generated through off-street car parks, which are owned by the district councils who will continue to exercise their own controls.

- 1.6 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).

## **2. Current situation**

### **2.1 Operational Position**

- 2.1.1 Approximately 15500 penalty charge notices were issued from 01 April to 31 December 2012. This is only 75% of the business case predictions but reflects that the number of operational staff employed which was also below business case predictions, largely due to difficulties in engaging suitable seasonal staff. This issue is being re-addressed by the Borough councils for the 2013 summer season. Details of the financial results from April to September 2012 are included in the Financial Performance report (Item 5).
- 2.1.2 The Department for Transport (DfT) requires a performance and financial monitoring report to be submitted annually, within about 6 months of the end of each financial year. It requested however that we should not submit a report for the period November 2011 to March 2012 but rather that the first report should cover 2012/13. The draft report will therefore be brought to this Joint Committee in September 2013 prior to submission to DfT.

### **2.2 Current Development Issues**

- 2.2.1 The issue of vehicles being observed to be parked in pedestrianised areas where the Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) which introduced the pedestrianised area by restricting the entry of motor vehicles did not generally include a similar restriction on parking within the area was discussed at the last meeting of the Joint Committee.
- 2.2.2 This did not appear to create a particular concern when both moving traffic offences such as entering a restricted zone and parking contraventions were enforced by the Police and Traffic Wardens. The split of responsibilities has however led to the situation where the Police are not willing to enforce against vehicles parked in pedestrianised areas unless they have also been observed to have driven into the area in contravention of entry restrictions. Civil Enforcement Officers meanwhile are unable to issue penalty charge notices because there aren't any waiting restrictions in force.
- 2.2.3 In order to resolve this issue and to avoid compromising the public's perception of CPE, Members requested that remedial proposals should be drawn up for each area. Outline proposals are being prepared and it is intended that implementation will be underway in Q1 2013/14. In general, the proposed measures 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.

## **3 Future Developments**

- 3.1 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.
- 3.2 The current business case 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 unsustainable 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.

- 3.3 NCC Cabinet has therefore agreed that we should seek to increase on street revenues from sources other than PCNs and in locations other than Great Yarmouth in order that we may move forward to a sustainable longer term solution. Such measures will need to include detailed consideration of introducing additional on-street charging with an aim to achieve financial break even within each District Council area. County and District Councils are currently working together to identify locations where potential parking management schemes could be brought forward.
- 3.4 A light touch set of Parking Principles, intended to be used to provide a steer on how to address parking across the county in conjunction with the different local circumstances that exist in particular places, together with a Parking Management Schemes Development Guidelines document which sets out the process for taking forward changes to parking provision, have therefore been adopted by the County Council. These documents will provide a framework for the development of future parking management schemes, including where appropriate, on street pay and display and/or residents' parking schemes.
- 3.5 We have consulted with the District Councils on locations where they considered it would be possible to develop parking schemes in accordance with the Parking Principles and the Development Guidelines. Following these consultations, Hunstanton has been selected for a comprehensive review of on-street parking because of seasonal parking problems and the opportunity to support the economic vitality of the town and complement the regeneration proposals, as set out in the Hunstanton Southern Seafront and Town Centre Masterplan.
- 3.6 It is intended that the review should seek the active involvement of a wide range of stakeholders in order to identify issues and opportunities and build support and ownership for the proposals within Hunstanton. This should help to reduce the risk of serious opposition at later stages, and should improve the chances of successful delivery of a parking management scheme that supports the local community and the economic vitality of the town. The Hunstanton Stakeholder Identification and Involvement document is included as Appendix 1.

## **4 Resource Implications**

### **4.1 Finance:**

- 4.1.1 There are financial implications resulting from the implementation of CPE, including legal and contractual procedures to be undertaken, equipment and software to be procured. NCC has currently both revenue and capital budget allocations to cover the costs of CPE implementation only. There are no further budget allocations after March 2013 but the residue of the 2012/13 revenue budget has been rolled forward to 2013/14.
- 4.1.2 The capital costs of implementing CPE are £250,000 for equipment, including hand held computers and vehicles and software upgrades. Future equipment renewals and upgrades etc will be charged to the CPE on-street operating account.
- 4.1.3 A further capital bid of £250,000 for the provision on-street pay and display equipment where suitable new locations are agreed for the introduction of on-street charging was approved by Cabinet in January 2012. The introduction of additional on-street charging should however increase parking revenue receipts.
- 4.1.4 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.

- 4.2 **Staff:** Staffing is a key issue for the implementation of CPE. The District Councils employ back office and/or enforcement staff (CEOs), including those transferred from the Traffic Warden service in accordance with the Transfer of Undertaking (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE). Staff have been trained to undertake CPE duties, including on-street enforcement and there will be a need to roll out common procedures as new and replacement staff are taken on. The County Council has taken on the parking manager function to monitor the delegation and ensure our statutory duties are discharged.
- 4.3 **Property:** No requirements other than those associated with the staff to be engaged on CPE duties.
- 4.4 **IT:**
- 4.4.1 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.
- 4.4.2 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.
- 4.4.3 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.

## 5 Other Implications

### 5.1 Legal Implications:

- 5.1.1 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.
- 5.1.2 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.
- 5.1.3 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.
- 5.1.4 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.

5.2 **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA):** A detailed assessment of the changes (if any) considered likely to result from the introduction of CPE has been carried out. A broad assessment is that a more focussed and visible enforcement service should be beneficial, particularly for pedestrians and disabled drivers.

5.3 **Communications:** A communications strategy and key stakeholder consultation have been implemented. A Norfolk Citizens' Panel survey in 2009 explored attitudes to parking enforcement. On-line consultation has been undertaken with businesses and local councils through the 'Norfolk Matters' and 'Business Matters' electronic

newsletters to help establish these key stakeholders' parking enforcement priorities. The wider public have been kept informed through council magazines, including updates in Your Norfolk. (where appropriate) A Stakeholder Communications Mapping exercise has recently been carried out and a Stakeholder Identification and Involvement document has been drafted for the Hunstanton parking review proposals.

- 5.4 **Health and Safety Implications:** The better enforcement of waiting restrictions should make a positive contribution to road safety.
- 5.5 **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.

## 6 **Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act**

- 6.1 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 and effectiveness has increased particularly where the same enforcement staff undertake both on and off street enforcement duties in an area.

## 7 **Action Required**

- 7.1 The Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee is asked for its views on the proposals for restricting waiting and allowing civil parking enforcement in the identified town centre pedestrianised areas.
- 7.2 The Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee is asked for its views on the proposals for reviewing the parking management arrangements in Hunstanton.
- 7.3 The Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee is asked whether any further areas have been identified for future parking management scheme reviews.

## **Background Papers**

The Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions Designation Order 2011 No. 2431

## **Officer Contact**

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

Chris Kutesko	01603 223457	Chris.kutesko@norfolk.gov.uk
David Collinson	01603 222253	David.collinson@norfolk.gov.uk



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

## Norfolk Parking Partnership

### Hunstanton parking review - Stakeholder identification and involvement

#### Background

Hunstanton has been selected for a comprehensive review of on-street parking because of seasonal parking problems and the opportunity to support the economic vitality of the town and complement the regeneration proposals, as set out in the Hunstanton Southern Seafront and Town Centre Masterplan.

#### Current situation

For longer stays, there are eight pay and display car parks operated by the Borough Council providing a total of 3205 spaces. Long stay (except overnight) on-street parking is available along Cliff Parade. On a number of streets, there are seasonal restrictions and in the town centre there is time-limited (45 minutes) on-street parking. There are currently no residents' parking schemes.

On-street parking is an issue regularly raised through the Chamber of Trade, and the length of stay on time limited spaces was raised during the Let's Talk Shop consultation meeting in March 2012.

Both on and off –street parking enforcement is carried out by the Borough Council through the Norfolk Parking Partnership.

#### Key issues for review

Amongst other things, a comprehensive review will need to consider:

- The introduction of on-street pay and display on Cliff Parade (as at Great Yarmouth). This would encourage the use of car parks, but is likely to put pressure on adjacent residential streets. Charging would provide an income stream to help cover the cost of enforcement;
- Residents' parking schemes on residential streets to complement the seafront pay and display charging and mitigate displacement;
- The length of stay on existing town centre on-street parking bays.
- Seasonal restriction periods of operation to ensure consistency across the town (Parking Principle 15)

#### **Stakeholder involvement - aims**

The aim of stakeholder involvement is to identify issues and opportunities and build support and ownership for the proposals within Hunstanton, reducing the risk of serious opposition at later stages, and improving the chances of successful delivery of a parking management scheme that supports the local community and the economic vitality of the town.

The main stakeholders are shown in the table below, with a separate list setting out the most critical key stakeholders with contact details.

## **Suggested approach**

### **First phase**

Initial discussion with the main stakeholders. This is to introduce the parking review, stimulate input and prepare stakeholders for further involvement.

In Hunstanton, the regeneration masterplanning by the Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk has led to the creation of the Hunstanton Regeneration Project Team and the advisory Hunstanton Town Team. (The Town Team was awarded £10,000 through the Mary Portas High Street Initiative.)

The Town Team comprises many of the key stakeholders, including:

- Borough ward members for Hunstanton.
- NCC Highways Area Manager
- Borough regeneration, conservation, planning and open spaces officers
- Town Centres Manager
- Hunstanton Chamber of Trade
- Hunstanton Town Council
- Hunstanton Civic Society.

The Town Team therefore provides a ready-made grouping of key stakeholders with the additional benefit that they have background knowledge of the town centre regeneration planning, including parking issues.

Initial discussion with this group is the logical first step in developing parking proposals that have wide stakeholder support. The group should be supplemented by the County Councillor for Hunstanton (currently vacant – Michael Chenery covering) .

Initial discussion with the Town Team should be quickly followed by direct contact with all the main stakeholders (notwithstanding their representation on the Town Team). The purpose of this communication would be to introduce the parking review and invite their views on issues and opportunities.

The wider community can be informed that the review is taking place by means of articles in partner publications (Borough and County) the local media and a letter drop.

### **Second phase: Development of proposals**

The key stakeholders in the development of feasible proposals are the Borough and County Councils and Hunstanton Town Council.

Emerging proposals can be commented upon and refined by other stakeholders during this process to produce draft proposals for wider consultation.

### **Third phase: Consultation on draft proposals**

Wider consultation involves stakeholders who are likely to be most affected by the proposals. This includes people who want or need to park, and those whose businesses and operations benefit from properly managed parking within Hunstanton.

As much feedback as possible should be via internet response forms or survey (eg Survey Monkey). To ensure accessibility, telephone responses would be possible via Norfolk County Council's Customer Service Centre, and written representations, while not encouraged, would be accepted.

Media for cost-effective promotion of the consultation include:

- Partner publications:
  - NCC – Your Norfolk, Norfolk Matters, Business Matters
  - BC KL&WN – Your Council (?)
  - Town Council – Hunstanton Town and Around magazine

Partner websites, including links to online response forms.

- Leaflets/posters in partner public reception areas, including libraries,
- Offices, public notice boards.
- Press releases/briefings to secure coverage in the local news media.

### **Implementation**

The Traffic Regulation Order legal procedures will include statutory consultation procedures. The stakeholder involvement outlined above should have exposed and, if possible, resolved issues. This should minimise objections at the statutory stage, although it is unlikely to have removed them all.



**Key messages:**

The parking review will complement the regeneration of Hunstanton town centre and southern seafront.

A comprehensive 'whole settlement' parking review will prevent problems associated with parking demand being displaced into other areas of the town.

Properly managed parking will benefit residents, businesses and the local economy.

Properly managed parking helps traffic flow freely, improving the attraction of the town, ease of deliveries and access for emergency vehicles.

On-street parking charges contribute to the cost of enforcement.

Enforcement is an essential part of a parking management regime designed to benefit the town, its businesses, residents and visitors.

## Hunstanton parking review – stakeholders

Low → Ability to influence the changes → High

<p>High ↑ Impact parking changes will have on them →</p>	<p>Parking users: Shoppers (residents/local) Tourists/visitors Business employees/staff Residents of directly affected streets</p>	<p><b>Hunstanton Town Team</b> <b>(Includes civic society, chamber of trade, borough, town council, seafront traders, NCC ETD)</b></p>
	<p>Taxi companies Bus/coach operators</p> <p>Businesses – town centre and seafront retail, catering, banking, etc.</p> <p>Businesses – town centre and seafront tourism, leisure, entertainment, accommodation. West Norfolk Tourism Forum</p> <p>Health clinics/surgeries</p> <p>Schools – Infant, Junior, High</p> <p>Local news media</p> <p>Hunstanton in Bloom</p>	<p><b>Hunstanton Regeneration Project Team</b></p> <p><b>BC KL&amp;WN – Regeneration</b> <b>BC KL&amp;WN – Local Members</b> <b>NCC – Local Member (vacant)</b> <b>NCC – ETD Highways</b></p> <p>Hunstanton Chamber of Trade</p> <p>Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee</p> <p>BC KL&amp;WN – CPE function</p> <p>Norfolk Constabulary</p> <p>Access/disability groups</p> <p>Emergency responders – Ambulance, Fire &amp; Rescue, Police, Coastguard, RNLi</p>
<p>Low ↑</p>	<p>Other Hunstanton residents</p> <p>Tourists/casual visitors</p> <p>Businesses – manufacturing, service industries</p> <p>HGV operators/logistics/delivery cos</p>	<p>Norfolk Casualty Reduction Partnership</p> <p>New Anglia LEP Norfolk Chamber of Commerce</p> <p>MPs</p>

## Stakeholder identification and management

<p>Stakeholders in this quarter need to buy in to changes.          Their views are important and should be actively canvassed where significant changes to parking are proposed.          Methods to consider include leaflet/letter drops providing opportunities to give views.          (Electronically if possible)</p> <p>Also, the use of publications/newsletters for local councils/ business (eg NCC's Norfolk Matters/Business Matters electronic newsletters)</p> <p>Feedback in response to views expressed is critical. This group must be shown that concerns they raise are properly addressed.</p> <p>All communications should signpost website information, which should be available as an up to date resource for all stakeholders.</p> <p>The group includes the local media, who can influence views through the stance taken on parking proposals.</p>	<p>This group is actively involved in decision-making, or can strongly influence decisions.</p> <p>They need to be actively engaged in the development of proposals before they are opened up to other stakeholders.</p> <p>All council members should be kept well informed through each authority's existing mechanisms.</p> <p>Individual members should be directly informed and involved in proposals for their specific areas.</p>
<p>This group should be kept informed. Council magazines and use of the local news media, with signposting to web information, will be sufficient.</p>	<p>This group has the potential to influence decisions.          If they are kept informed and buy in to the proposals, close involvement will not be necessary except where specific issues arise.          General information can be provided to MPs through NCC's Norfolk Bulletin (e-newsletter for MPs).          Briefing letters to the LEPs, CoC, and others where relevant.</p>

### Key messages:

The parking review will complement the regeneration of Hunstanton town centre and southern seafront.

## Norfolk Parking Partnership Financial Performance

Report by the Head of Finance

The purpose of this report is to highlight the financial performance of the Norfolk Parking Partnership from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2012.

The Joint Committee is asked to review and note the performance of the Partnership.

### 1. Background

1.1 The members of the Partnership are Norfolk County Council, Great Yarmouth Borough Council, King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council and South Norfolk District Council. King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council provide the service on behalf of North Norfolk District Council, Breckland District Council and Broadland District Council.

### 2. Financial Performance

- 2.1 In the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2012, there was a deficit from district council operations of £15,828. The Business Case gave a deficit of £43,503 for the period. The lower figure was due to the Partners operating with fewer staff than the Business Case was based on, which also reduced capacity to issue Penalty Notices.
- 2.2 Great Yarmouth Borough Council generated £95,325 from Penalty Notices (against £223,242 in the Business Case), and had costs of £131,675 (against £268,668 in the Business Case), giving a deficit of £36,350 (a deficit of £45,427 in the Business Case).
- 2.3 King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council generated £193,386 from Penalty Notices (against £264,612 in the Business Case), and had costs of £169,811 (against £260,579 in the Business Case) giving a surplus of £23,576 (a surplus of £4,033 in the Business Case).
- 2.4 South Norfolk District Council generated £12,335 from Penalty Notices (against £22,287 in the Business Case), and had costs of £15,388 (against £24,396 in the Business Case), giving a deficit of £3,053 (a deficit of £2,109 in the Business Case).
- 2.5 There was an overall capital allocation of £250,000 for the project. By 30<sup>th</sup> September 2012, Great Yarmouth Borough Council had spent £72,245, King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council had spent £124,607, and South Norfolk District Council had spent £3,707. This totals £200,559. The balance of £49,441 remains available for expenditure in 2012/13.
- 2.6 Great Yarmouth Borough Council have reported gross income of £340,975 from On Street Pay and Display Parking between 1<sup>st</sup> April and 31<sup>st</sup> October 2012.

### **3. Internal Audit**

- 3.1 The internal controls and procedures of the Parking Partnership were assessed by Norfolk Audit Services. From the sample they assessed, the systems in place were found these to be acceptable, although it was noted that there were delays in receiving information from the Partners.

### **4. Resource 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. Recommendation**

- 5.1 It is recommended that the Joint Committee accept these figures as a record of performance for the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2012.

### **Officer Contact**

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:  
Robert Ginn Tel No; 01603 223182      robert.ginn@norfolk.gov.uk



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