# Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee

Item No.

| Report title:              | 2016-17 Forward Programme & Budget Report                               |
|----------------------------|---|
| Date of meeting:           | 18 February 2016  |
| Responsible Chief Officer: | Tom McCabe (Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services) |

# Strategic impact

The financial sustainability of Civil Parking Enforcement in Norfolk (outside of Norwich City) is dependent on the additional revenues associated with planned new on-street charges, or alternative sources of new revenue income. Without these revenues the scheme fails to cover costs and puts at risk the County Council's ability to manage the road network in accordance with Traffic Management Act duties. Partners are also seeking arrangements which avoid the perceived unfairness of large transfers of revenue raised from some districts to offset the costs of enforcement in other parts of the County.

# **Executive summary**

The CPE Task and Finish Working Group was convened following a report the Joint Committee in October 2015 detailing the review of the financial business model for CPE in Norfolk. The Working Group has now concluded its review of the options available to the Norfolk Parking Partnership to ensure a sustainable financial model can be achieved.

#### **Recommendations:**

- 1) That the NPP approves the changes to the Agreement set out in Appendix A, subject to ratification by each District Council.
- 2) That the NPP endorses the forward programme allocations and Business Plan projections for 2015-16 to 2019-20 as set out in Appendix B, and requests that the Officer Working Group acts on the basis of these.
- 3) That the NPP endorses the 2016-17 CPE Budget as set out in Appendix C and recommends that officers submit this to the Chair of the EDT Committee for approval as the basis for performance and financial controls.
- 4) That the NPP endorses the Forward Programme schemes listed in Appendix D and recommends that Orders are prepared and submitted to the Chair of the EDT Committee for approval to advertise at the appropriate time.

# 1. Proposal

- 1.1. The recommendations of CPE Task and Finish Working Group are that the following changes to the arrangements for CPE should be endorsed by the Norfolk Parking Partnership as the basis for developing a Forward Programme and setting a budget for 2016-17.
  - i) In accordance with clause 17.1 of the Agreement, the Joint Committee resolves to admit North Norfolk, Broadland and Breckland District Councils to the Joint Committee, subject to the agreements set out in 17.2.
  - ii) The Agreement be amended under Schedule 1, clause 1.4, to increase the quorum from two to <u>four</u> executive members.
  - iii) The Agreement be amended to include updated Business Case projections under Schedule 2, as set out in this report.

- iv) The Agreement be amended under Schedule 3 to include for a minimum of 50% of any surplus arising from CPE to be allocated for schemes within the District areas which contribute to that surplus.
- 1.2. The changes to the constitution of the Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee are intended to strengthen the role of the Committee and the Officer Working Group in managing both the financial performance of the CPE operations and, importantly, the fairness of the distribution of revenues and costs associated with parking management and enforcement.
- 1.3. Details of the proposed changes to the Agreement are set out in Appendix A, and the requirements for new on-street parking provision which underpin the updated Business Case are shown in Appendix B.
- 1.4. These changes are intended to ensure that the County Council is able to set a budget in 2016-17 which will allow for the financial sustainability of CPE operations in Norfolk, based on extending full voting rights to all the District Council partners. A proposed budget for the NPP for 2016-17 is shown in Appendix C.
- 1.5. In order that the financial basis of the proposed budget can be delivered, the Working Group has recommended that the required Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) be submitted for authorisation for advertisement alongside the proposed budget for 2016-17. The draft schedules for these Orders are shown in Appendix D.

#### 2. Evidence

- 2.1. The CPE Task and Finish Working Group has met three times since the Joint Committee considered the current financial position in October 2015, with the aim of reviewing the current arrangements for CPE in Norfolk. Two key concerns have been at the centre of these considerations:
  - i) Implications of a review of the financial business model reported at the October meeting of the Joint Committee.
  - ii) Concern that the financial sustainability of the CPE operations rests heavily on the revenues raised within some districts, whilst other are forecast to generate on-going large deficits within the overall financial model.
- 2.2. Officers have provided additional financial and other supporting information to allow consideration of options for funding a CPE service in Norfolk, Terms of Reference and minutes of the Task and Finish Working Group meetings are attached as Appendix E.
- 2.3. The Working Group has recommended that changes be made to the Agreement and the constitution of the Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee (as set out in Appendix A), which will broaden the participation to include executive members of all Districts covered by the Norfolk CPE scheme.
- 2.4. This has resulted in a recommendation that the Norfolk Parking Partnership sets a budget for 2016-17 based on a projection for additional revenue to be raised by extending on-street parking charges in Hunstanton, Cromer and Sheringham, as set out in Appendix B and Appendix C.
- 2.5. The proposed Forward Programme and Budget are considered sufficient to ensure that the scheme will achieve financial sustainability without the need for partners to make any additional contributions. There remains a strong concern that the Business Model places depends unfairly on residents of some

- communities to help fund the enforcement actions across Norfolk, and specific commitments to re-balance this are required.
- 2.6. It is proposed to address this by including a specific aim for the Officer Working Group to share the financial information from the CPE Operations in ways that will support more equitable outcomes at the District level. This would include:
  - Consideration of the allocation of spend across the range of County Council services to take into account the financial reporting of CPE activities. For example, allocations of spend under the County's Highways Parish Partnerships scheme could take into account the way that CPE revenues and costs are distributed.
  - Consideration by District partners as to whether revenue contributions to the CPE budget are appropriate taking account of the range of parking services and policies to be supported at the local level.
- 2.7. Such considerations are supported by the Task and Finish Working Group as sitting well with the emerging scenarios for locality working which are under discussion between the councils as part of the County Council's Re-imagining Norfolk process.

# 3. Financial Implications

3.1. The review of the Business Plan carried out this year has shown that the current CPE arrangements are not sustainable and would lead to large and increasing deficit for which the County Council would be liable under the Delegated Function Agreement. The proposed option is to roll out further schemes across the County to ensure the operation remains sustainable. The recommended 2016/17 budget is shown in Appendix C.

# 4. Issues, risks and innovation

4.1. The concerns about the fairness of the CPE arrangements are at the centre of the proposals to re-constitute the membership of the Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee. Whilst it is not possible for Officers to recommend that these concerns are reflected in changes to the Agreement, it is intended that the changes to the Committee participation will allow the matters of fairness to be addressed alongside the management of the CPE operations, through the work of the Officer Working Group.

# 5. Background

- 5.1. A report to the Joint Committee on 1 October 2015 has recommended that a Working Group be formed to consider options for managing the projected deficits from CPE operations in Norfolk. A copy of the report, which is titled 'Review of the CPE Business Model' can be viewed <a href="here">here</a>.
- 5.2. The current business model for CPE in Norfolk uses the surpluses from on-street parking charges to offset the net costs of enforcement across the County. Any remaining surpluses have been used to fund a forward programme of schemes with the aim of securing long-term sustainability of the service and, potentially, other transport improvements, as prescribed in Section 55 of the Road Traffic Act 1984.
- 5.3. In the light of the review of the Business Case, actions are now required to ensure the longer term financial sustainability of CPE in Norfolk.

# **Officer Contact**

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

Officer name: Dave Stephens Tel No.: 01603 222311

Email address: Dave.stephens@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.

#### Amendments to the Agreement of the Norfolk Parking Partnership

- In accordance with Clause 17.1, the Joint Committee to resolve to admit North Norfolk District Council, Broadland District Council and Breckland District Council as New Participants, once the agreements in writing have been submitted to the Joint Committee in accordance with Clause 17.2.
- 2) In accordance with Schedule 1 each New Participant Council to appoint an executive member and a named substitute member.
- 3) Schedule 1, Clause 1.4 to be amended to require <u>four</u> executive members as a quorum.
- 4) Schedule 2 to be amended to reflect the revised information prepared by the chief finance officer and summarised in Appendix B of this report.
- 5) Schedule 3 to be amended as follows: 2.6 After an annual reconciliation by the County Council, should an overall surplus be identified in any Financial Year, it will be split in the following manner: after any deficits brought forward from prior years have been settled the total income for each district council area shall have deducted from it the reasonable Costs relating to on street civil parking enforcement in that area, to produce a net income figure. For those district council areas where there is a positive net income 50% of the surplus will be shared in a proportionate manner, taking account of surpluses contributed over the full period of operation of the Agreement. For the avoidance of doubt these funds shall be spent by the County Council on transport related expenditure only, and in accordance with Section 55 of the road Traffic Act 1984 (as amended). The remaining 50% of the surplus will be retained for the delivery by the County Council of the Forward Programme, or if not required for this purpose, to be added to the surplus for distribution as above.
- 6) Schedule 4 to be amended to allow cross-border working between Districts as endorsed by the CPE Delivery Group.
- 7) Addition to section 3.3 of the delegated authority to include removal of obstructions from the highway.
- 8) Addition of enforcement of School Keep Clear markings to section 3.3 referencing camera enforcement in 2015 amendments regulations.
- 9) Addition of Norfolk County Council off-street parking places (Cromer Bus Station, Thetford Bus Station, Norwich Bus Station and all Park & Ride Sites).
- 10) Amend 3.3a) to include reference to the 2005 bus lane contravention act and the 2015 parking contraventions amendment regulations.
- 11)Amend clause 10.5 of the Original Agreement to insert the words "For the avoidance of doubt this means considering in good faith all options to make the Functions commercially viable, including the possibility of their making a financial contribution towards the running costs within their own administrative areas" at the end of it.

# **APPENDIX B1**

# Norfolk Parking Partnership – CPE Forward Work Programme 2016 to 2017

# Coastal towns On-street pay and display

| King's Lynn<br>Highgate area                            | Introduction of charging using pay and display (with 45 minutes free parking) | Scheme under construction  |
|---|---|--|
| King's Lynn –<br>South Quay                             | Introduction of charging using pay and display (with 45 minutes free parking) | Scheme under construction  |
| King's Lynn –<br>Springwood                             | Introduction of charging using pay and display (with 45 minutes free parking) | Scheme under construction  |
| Sheringham:<br>Town Centre,<br>Front and<br>approaches. | Introduction of charging using pay and display (with 45 minutes free parking) | Required TROs to be approved by delegated authority to Chair of EDT Committee. |
| Cromer: Town<br>Centre and<br>Front                     | Introduction of charging using pay and display (with 45 minutes free parking) | Required TROs to be approved by delegated authority to Chair of EDT Committee. |
| Hunstanton:<br>Town Centre<br>and cliff top<br>area.    | Introduction of charging using pay and display (with 45 minutes free parking) | Required TROs to be approved by delegated authority to Chair of EDT Committee. |

# **APPENDIX B2**

| Norfolk Parking Partnership - Effect of Addition | al On-Street Pa | y & Display Scher | <u>nes</u> |         |         |          |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|------------|---------|---------|----------|
|  | 2015/16         | 2016/17           | 2017/18    | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | Total    |
| 2015/16 Outturn Forecast for Partnership         | -92,373         |                   |            |         |         | -92,373  |
| King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council       |                 | -26,910           | 107,567    | 194,291 | 186,041 | 460,989  |
| North Norfolk District Council                   |                 | -188,306          | 110,272    | 106,564 | 102,875 | 131,405  |
| Breckland District Council                       |                 | -27,664           | -34,185    | -40,745 | -47,345 | -149,939 |
| Broadland District Council                       |                 | -36,249           | -37,647    | -39,063 | -40,495 | -153,454 |
| Great Yarmouth Borough Council                   |                 | 25,698            | 44,545     | 28,243  | 11,887  | 110,373  |
| South Norfolk District Council                   |                 | -31,063           | -32,809    | -34,569 | -36,348 | -134,789 |
| <b>Total for Norfolk Parking Partnership</b>     | -92,373         | -284,494          | 157,743    | 214,721 | 176,615 | 172,212  |
| Balance in Partnership Fund Brought Forward      | 148,106         |                   |            |         |         |          |
| CPE Reserve                                      | 55,733          |                   |            | 143,703 | 320,318 |          |
| Capital Replacement Reserve                      | 173,348         | 3,587             | 220,330    | 350,348 | 409,348 |          |
| Net Funds  | 229,081         | 3,587             | 220,330    | 494,051 | 729,666 |          |

Note: In 2018/19 and 2019/20 there will be a need to allocate further contributions to the Capital Replacement Fund following the creation of new capital assets under the \forward Programme schemes.

**Budget for Norfolk Parking Partnership 2016-17** 

| Dauget for Norfolk Farking Farthership 2       | King's     | North     | Breckland | Broadland | Great      | South    | NPP Total   |
|--|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|-------------|
| Civil Darking Enforcement                      | Lynn       | Norfolk   |           |           | Yarmouth   | Norfolk  |             |
| Civil Parking Enforcement Costs                |            |           |           |           |            |          |             |
|  | (150 110)  | (64.792)  | (64.702)  | (22.202)  | (270 240)  | (24.760) | (722.202)   |
| Parking Enforcement – Annual Operating Costs   | (159,448)  | (64.783)  | (64.783)  | (32,392)  | (379,219)  | (31,768) | (732,393)   |
| Annual 'over-the-counter' PCN Charges          | 0 (00.047) | 0         | 0         | 0 (4.404) | 0 (40,400) | 0        | (0.4.000)   |
| Parking Dept (NCC) – Ann. Operating Costs      | (20,647)   | (8,389)   | (8,389)   | (4,194)   | (49,106)   | (4,114)  | (94,839)    |
| Central Processing Unit – Ann. Operating Costs | (52,698)   | (25,136)  | (24,986)  | (3,119)   | (75,389)   | (4,935)  | (186,263)   |
| Signs & Road Markings Maintenance              | (22,206)   | (9,022)   | (9,022)   | (4,511)   | (52,814)   | (4,424)  | (101,999)   |
| Capital Contribution                           | (12,845)   | (5,219)   | (5,219)   | (2,609)   | (30,549)   | (2,559)  | (59,000)    |
| Total Costs                                    | (267,844)  | (112,549) | (112,399) | (46,825)  | (587,077)  | (47,800) | (1,117,494) |
|  |            |           |           |           |            |          |             |
| Income   |            |           |           |           |            |          |             |
| On-street Parking Enforcement – PCN Income     | 178,712    | 85,243    | 84,735    | 10,576    | 255,665    | 16,737   | 631,668     |
| Total Income                                   | 178,712    | 85,243    | 84,735    | 10,576    | 255,665    | 16,737   | 631,668     |
| Surplus/(Deficit) from CPE                     | (89,132)   | (27,306)  | (27,664)  | (36,249)  | (331,412)  | (31,063) | (542,826)   |
|  |            |           |           |           |            |          |             |
| On-street Pay & Display                        |            |           |           |           |            |          |             |
| Costs  |            |           |           |           |            |          |             |
| Cash Collection and Maintenance <sup>2</sup>   | (2,805)    | 0         | 0         | 0         | (81,183)   | 0        | (83,988)    |
| Residents Permit Scheme Costs                  | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0         | (17,955)   | 0        | (17,955)    |
| Scheme Set Up Costs                            |            | (161,000) | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | (161,000)   |
| Total Costs                                    | (2,805)    | (161,000) | 0         | 0         | (99,138)   | 0        | (262,943)   |
|  |            |           |           |           |            |          |             |
| Income   |            |           |           |           |            |          |             |
| Residents Permit Scheme Income                 | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0         | 79,458     | 0        | 79,458      |
| On-street Pay & Display                        | 65,027     | 0         | 0         | 0         | 376,790    | 0        | 441,817     |
| Total Income                                   | 65,027     | 0         | 0         | 0         | 456,248    | 0        | 521,275     |
| Surplus from P&D and Residents' Schemes        | (32,778)   | (161,000) | 0         | 0         | 357,110    | 0        | 163,332     |
|  |            |           |           |           |            |          | •           |
| Overall NPP Surplus / (Deficit)                | (26,910)   | (188,306) | (27,664)  | (36,249)  | 25,698     | (31,063) | (284,494)   |

#### Notes:

- 1. Hunstanton On-Street Pay & Display scheme expected to go live in 2017/18
- 2. King's Lynn and North Norfolk cash collection costs are based on GYBC and will be confirmed
- 3. Summer charging is based on 50% occupancy and Winter on 5%
- 4. Contribution from King's Lynn residents parking permits expected to be negligible
- 5. On-Street Scheme set up costs for Hunstanton are expected to be incurred in 2016/17, and include design, equipment and implementation costs
- 6. North Norfolk Enforcement costs based on the number of CEOs (2)
- 7. Cromer and Sheringham On-Street Pay & Display schemes expected to go live in 2017/18
- 8. On-Street Scheme set up costs for Cromer and Sheringham are expected to be incurred in 2016/17, and include design, equipment and implementation costs
- 9. Breckland Enforcement costs based on the number of CEOs (2)
- 10. There are currently no plans for On-Street Pay & Display schemes to be implemented in Breckland
- 11. Broadland Enforcement costs based on the number of CEOs (1)
- 12. There are currently no plans for On-Street Pay & Display schemes to be implemented in Broadland
- 13. Great Yarmouth winter charging for On-Street Pay & Display scheme expected to go live in 2017/18
- 14. No changes are expected to be made to the Great Yarmouth residents parking permit zone
- 15. There are currently no plans for On-Street Pay & Display schemes to be implemented in South Norfolk

# 1) Draft Schedules for Traffic Regulation Orders to be made 2016-17

Pay & Display in the Town of Hunstanton.

Cliff Parade

Lincoln Square

**Boston Square** 

St Edmunds terrace

Le Strange Terrace

First 45 mins free then, £2.50 for 1-2 hrs, £3.0 for 2-3 hrs, £4 for 3-4hrs. Max stay 4 hrs, no return in 5 hrs.

High Street

First 45 mins free then, £2.0 for 1 ½ hrs. Max stay 1 ½ hrs, no return in 2 hrs.

#### Pay & Display in the Town of Sheringham

The Esplanade (including no overnight parking)

First 45 mins free then, £2.50 for 1-2 hrs, £3.0 for 2-3 hrs, £4 for 3-4hrs. Max stay 4 hrs, no return in 5 hrs.

High Street

Church Street

Station Road

First 45 mins free then, £2.0 for 1 ½ hrs. Max stay 1 ½ hrs, no return in 2 hrs.

#### Pay & Display in the town of Cromer

A149 Runton Road

First 45 mins free then, £2.50 for 1-2 hrs, £3.0 for 2-3 hrs, £4 for 3-4hrs. Max stay 4 hrs, no return in 5 hrs.

The Croft

Louden Road

**Mount Street** 

Bond Street

First 45 mins free then, £2.50 for 1-2 hrs No Return within 3 hrs.

Canada Road

Hamilton road

Garden Street

Church Street

**Tucker Street** 

First 45 mins free then, £2.0 for 1 ½ hrs. Max stay 1 ½ hrs, no return in 2 hrs.

#### 2) Forward Programme (NB not in priority order)

| King's Lynn:<br>residential<br>area south of<br>town centre | Investigation of resident parking issues in streets south of Town Centre | Investigation carried out and concluded traffic management issues more relevant than parking.  |
|---|--|--|
| Sheringham:<br>Town Centre,<br>Front and<br>approaches      | Investigation of rationalization of waiting and parking restrictions.    | Investigation and public consultation on hold.   |
| Sheringham:<br>central<br>Residential<br>Roads              | Investigation of resident parking issues.                                | There is only sporadic support for introducing resident only parking. Issues raised could be resolved with changes to waiting restrictions. On hold. |
| Cromer: Town  | Investigation of   | Further discussions with stakeholders  |

# Appendix D

| Centre and Front  | rationalization of waiting and parking restrictions.                                   | required. Scheme on hold.                                       |
|---|--|---|
| Cromer: Residential streets surrounding Town Centre and Front | Investigation of resident parking issues.  | Further discussions with stakeholders required. Scheme on hold. |
| Thetford town centre and Station area                         | Investigation of resident parking issues relating to local workers and rail commuters. | Not programmed.   |
| Hunstanton  | Parking issues would be considered further in 2015/2016                                | Not programmed.   |
| Trowse with<br>Newton   | Parking issues relating to local workers and commuters                                 | Not programmed.   |

# TERMS OF REFERENCE (Civil Parking Enforcement Task and Finish Working Group)

- To investigate and appraise the following options for Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) in Norfolk:
  - 1) Additional On-street Pay and Display Schemes are identified and implemented throughout Norfolk.
  - 2) The Partners contribute annually to cover the financial shortfall, the formula for which needs to be determined.
  - 3) Reviews are carried out on the Partner's operations to identify best practice and efficiencies that can be rolled out across the Partnership.
  - 4) Consider contracting the service out to a private enterprise.
  - 5) Consider the Parking Partnership becoming a not for profit enterprise.
  - 6) Dissolve the Partnership.

Option 2 above reflects that Partner Districts not wishing to have on-street pay & display and residents permit parking might be required to contribute financially.

- To produce a report on the options appraisal and make recommendations for implementing changes which will deliver the required objectives below:
  - 1) That no deficit arises from CPE activities in the current financial period, or if a deficit does arise that a formula is agreed to share the financial burden appropriately between the Partners.
  - 2) That the longer term financial sustainability of CPE in Norfolk is supported.
- To consider the existing Constitution of the Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee and make recommendations for changes which would further support the aims of CPE in Norfolk. Subject to attaining a sustainable business plan it is envisaged that all Partner Districts will be full voting members for the 2016-17 Municipal Year.

Minutes of Meeting 1 – 29 October 2015

| Present:             | Dept/Organisation              |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Cllr Mick Castle     | Norfolk County Council         |
| Dave Stephens (DS)   | Norfolk County Council         |
| Helen Martin (HM)    | Norfolk County Council         |
| David Cumming (DC)   | Norfolk County Council         |
| Robert Ginn (RG)     | Norfolk County Council         |
| Martin Chisholm (MC) | BC Kings Lynn and West Norfolk |
| Cllr David Pope      | BC Kings Lynn and West Norfolk |
| Cllr Trevor Carter   | Breckland District Council     |
| Dorian Avellino (DA) | Breckland District Council     |
| Dave Disney (DD)     | South Norfolk District Council |
| Cllr Lee Hornby      | South Norfolk District Council |
| Cllr Graham Plant    | Gt Yarmouth Borough Council    |
| Miranda Lee (ML)     | Gt Yarmouth Borough Council    |
| Karl Read (KR)       | North Norfolk District Council |
|                      |                                |

| Item | Minute | Action and |
|------|--------|------------|
|      |        | due date   |

#### 1.0 **Declarations of Interest**

Nothing to report.

#### 2.0 Apologies for absence

Broadland District Council.

Cllr Castle advised that a response has been received from Broadland to the effect that they do not feel they need to be represented on the Working Group, but would expect that the Partnership would bring forward such proposals for on-street parking measures that are required under the duties of the TMA 2004.

#### 3.0 **Appointment of Chair**

This is covered under Item 4.

#### 4.0 Terms of Reference

- 4.1 DS introduced the draft TOR report, highlighting that the core focus of the Group is to manage projected deficits arising from CPE.
- 4.2 Cllr Plant raised that the TOR do not include for the Group to consider arrangements to allocate surpluses out of the CPE operations to spending on transport schemes in the areas where the surplus is generated.

Officers advised that should any surpluses arise, spending is permitted in accordance with Section55 of Road Traffic Act 1984 Financial Provisions relating to Delegation Orders. The Delegated Functions Agreement includes for the proportionate

distribution of spending, by the County Council, however it is not an intention of the Partnership to generate surpluses when setting budget. A copy of Appendix B to the report at Item 5 is included below:

# Appendix B

Section 55 of RTA 1984 Financial Provisions relating to delegation orders

# Key Points

- Norfolk County Council must keep a separate account and records of expenditure and income related to parking places
- 2. At the end of each financial year any deficit in the 'parking account' should be made good from the general fund.
- 3. Any surplus can either be
  - a. spent on a project (as defined below)
  - b. allocated to a project (as defined below) which will be carried out in a future financial year
  - c. carried forward in the parking account to the next financial year

#### Permitted areas of investment

- a) paying back the general fund for any deficit covered in the previous 4 financial years
- b) funding the provision or maintence of off street parking
- funding the provision or maintence of existing on street parking
- d) provision of, operation of or facilities for, public passenger transport services
- e) highway or road improvement projects (as defined by Highways Act 1980)
- f) environmental improvement projects including
  - a. the reduction of environmental pollution
  - improving or maintaining the appearance or amenity of a road; land in the vicinity of a road; open land or water that has general public access
  - c. the provision of outdoor recreation facilities available to the public without charge

NOTE: An authority must not manage CPE to deliberately make surpluses. The above informs us what can be done IF a surplus is made.

- 4.3 It was agreed to amend the note referring to Option 2 to remove the reference to residents permit parking as this should be managed to cover its costs through specific permit charges.
- 4.4 The composition and Terms of Reference, as amended, were accepted and the meeting progressed with Cllr Castle in the Chair.

#### 5.0 Review of Business Financial Model for CPE

- 5.1 DS introduced the report and highlighted the resultant projections for deficits form CPE operations in 2016-17 and beyond.
- Also, there is a projected current in-year risk of a shortfall which means that the Partnership would be unable to fund the Forward Programme and the work on this is now on hold.
- Whilst the County Council, under the Delegated Functions
  Agreement, carries the risk of any financial liabilities arising
  out of CPE operations, there are legal and financial
  imperatives which preclude NCC from progressing the
  scheme on the basis of any projected deficits.
- The requirement is therefore to put in place an agreed budget for 2016-17, based on revised projections underpinned by new agreements to meet the funding requirements of CPE.
- 5.5 MC raised that existing commitments of funding to support Partner functions should be reviewed against value for money and to ensure that no 'budget switching' is involved in the CPE activities.

# 6.0 Options to be developed

- Officers have been working up the Options set out in the Terms of Reference, and each option was discussed. The start date for any revised arrangements is April 2016 or soon after.
- 6.2 Option1
- 6.2.1 Key Points discussed:
  - Implementation Costs not taken into account in the revised projections shown.
  - No stream of funding in place to deliver the schemes now that reserves are likely to be used up by end of 2015-16.
  - Seasonal income/annual scheme/resource/differential

DS

|       | <ul><li>charging - Cllr Pope proposed all year round charges be considered.</li><li>Framework of decision-making to be considered.</li></ul>   |        |
|-------|--|--------|
| 6.2.2 | Agreed to develop Option 1 further, alongside Option 2, with a view to a possible hybrid option which meets needs of all Partners.   | DS     |
| 6.3   | Option 2   |        |
| 6.3.1 | <ul> <li>Key Points discussed:</li> <li>Lack of detail - more work required to define Option 2</li> <li>Delegated Functions Agreement and NCC's Legal position.</li> <li>Allocating surplus/deficit proportions.</li> <li>Interpretation.</li> <li>Hierarchy decision making framework.</li> </ul> |        |
| 6.3.2 | Agreed to develop Option 2 further, alongside Option 2.  | DS     |
| 6.4   | Option 3   |        |
| 6.4.1 | <ul><li>Key Points discussed:</li><li>Sharing of information and costs.</li><li>Progress within Norfolk.</li></ul>   |        |
| 6.4.2 | Expand to include best practice (elements of Option 4).  | DS     |
| 6.5   | Option 4   |        |
| 6.5.1 | <ul> <li>Key Points discussed:</li> <li>Information based on published DfT accounts.</li> <li>Learning good practice from peers (Essex).</li> <li>Comparatives questioned due to area/population density.</li> <li>Appropriate resource to deliver service/effects of minimum wage.</li> </ul>     |        |
| 6.5.2 | Agreed to combine elements of Options 3 and 4 and Delivery Group to develop actions and report back to Joint Committee.  | CPE DG |
| 6.6   | Option 5   |        |
| 6.6.1 | <ul> <li>Keys points discussed:</li> <li>Tax Benefits (none).</li> <li>Short term financial gain.</li> <li>Regulations on income.</li> <li>Powers of enforcement/Council responsibility.</li> </ul>  |        |
| 6.6.2 | Agreed not to consider Option 5 further.   |        |

6.6.2

- 6.7 Option 6
- 6.7.1 Agreed no merit in dissolving Partnership.

# 7.0 Any Other Business

7.1 DD expressed concern on timescale for revision/actions. DS advised that pressure to manage financial position is dictating the timescale for new arrangements to be agreed.

# Date, time and venue of next meeting

Thursday 03 December 2015 - 10:00 am

# Minutes of Meeting 2 – 3 December 2015

| Present:                | Dept/Organisation              |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Cllr Mick Castle (MC)   | Norfolk County Council (Chair) |
| Dave Stephens (DS)      | Norfolk County Council         |
| Helen Martin (HM)       | Norfolk County Council         |
| Duncan Ellis (DE)       | North Norfolk District Council |
| Cllr John Rest (JR)     | North Norfolk District Council |
| Robert Ginn (RG)        | Norfolk County Council         |
| Martin Chisholm (MC)    | BC Kings Lynn and West Norfolk |
| Cllr Trevor Carter (TC) | Breckland District Council     |
| Dorian Avellino (DA)    | Breckland District Council     |
| David Disney (DD)       | South Norfolk District Council |
| Cllr Lee Hornby (LH)    | South Norfolk District Council |
| Cllr Graham Plant (GP)  | Gt Yarmouth Borough Council    |
| Stephen Cornell (SC)    | Gt Yarmouth Borough Council    |
| Sarah Gibb (SG)         | NP Law                         |

| Item | Minute  | Action and due date |
|------|---|---------------------|
| 1.0  | Declarations of Interest  |                     |
|      | Nothing to report.  |                     |
| 2.0  | Apologies for absence   |                     |
|      | David Cumming, Cllr David Pope, Miranda Lee, Karl Read, K<br>Hughes |                     |
| 3.0  | Minutes of Meeting 1 held on 29 October 2015 and Matters Arising    |                     |
|      | Acceptance of minutes of previous meeting                           |                     |
|      | Signed as a true record of the meeting                              |                     |

Cllr Mick Castle (Chair Person) 03 December 2015

#### **Matters Arising:**

GP sought clarification of 4.2 Permitted areas of investment

a) Paying back the general fund for any deficit covered in the previous 4 financial years

DS confirmed this was purely an extract from Section 55, as circulated at previous meeting.

CPE Delivery Group (Wednesday 18 November 2015) agreed to take Options 1 and 2 forward and report to Joint Committee.

# 4.0 **Options development**

4.1 RG circulated Civil Parking by District figures for Options 1 and 2.

Comparison of Options 1 & 2 was discussed with the following to be noted:

- Option 1 includes the implementation of additional Pay & Display schemes.
- 2. Option 2 shows the effect of continuing the current arrangement and the gap that would need to be funded.
- 3. 2015/16 is the forecast position and includes the costs of rolling out the Kings Lynn Pay and Display scheme.
- 4. Winter charging is included in Option 1.
- 5. Effects of Residents and Business permits for Kings Lynn pay and display still to be confirmed.

#### Key points discussed:

- Contributions to capital replacement fund.
- Capital costs associated with implementation.
- Clear document wording as Authority must not manage CPE to deliberately make surpluses.
- 4.2 Presentation of Hunstanton, Sheringham and Cromer. HM presented slides to introduce the working principles for onstreet parking in these towns. Key points discussed:
  - First free period to be kept with an option to extend to 90 minutes.
  - Existing limited waiting bays converted to pay and display.
  - All day parking in off street car parks.
  - Blue Badge free on street car parking.
  - DCLG 10 minute grace period.
  - Parking Principles document.
  - DCLG right to challenge parking policies.
  - Policy for progressing local schemes, and lessons to be learnt from initial consultations. DE felt that the fact that 1

- hour free parking would remain was not made clear, and could support positive encouragement of visitors.
- South Quay operational 29 January 2016 could be used as example scheme of a non-detrimental regeneration project.
- Potential to extend bays to increase spaces (DD).
- No funding for review of schemes.
- Low income-generation for some areas (Market Towns in comparison to Coastal Towns).
- Current enforcement regime.
- CPE should not cover County Wide Schemes eg parking outside schools/zig zag line enforcement.
- Figures for next meeting should factor in new schemes -vdevelopment plan. Financial impact of pay and display machines. No of parking places.
- Surplus County wide policy or areas where generated.

# 4.3 Conclusions

Collective decision for CC as Highway Authority to progress Option 1, with on-going consideration of optional cash contributions.

All Districts to be party to Business Plan and become voting members on Joint Committee.

MC suggested time line for delivery of model.

07 January 2016 - review of final draft of report.

#### 5.0 **Any Other Business**

Nothing to report.

#### Date, time and venue of next meeting

Thursday 07 January 2016 - 10:00 am

Cranworth Room, County Hall

Minutes of Meeting 3-7 January 2016

DS

| Present:               | Dept/Organisation              |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Cllr Mick Castle (MC)  | Norfolk County Council (Chair) |
| Dave Stephens (DS)     | Norfolk County Council         |
| Helen Martin (HM)      | Norfolk County Council         |
| Duncan Ellis (DE)      | North Norfolk District Council |
| Cllr John Rest (JR)    | North Norfolk District Council |
| Robert Ginn (RG)       | Norfolk County Council         |
| Martin Chisholm (MC)   | BC Kings Lynn and West Norfolk |
| Michelle Earp (ME)     | South Norfolk District Council |
| Cllr Lee Hornby (LH)   | South Norfolk District Council |
| Cllr Graham Plant (GP) | Gt Yarmouth Borough Council    |
| Miranda Lee (ML)       | Gt Yarmouth Borough Council    |
| David Cumming (DC)     | Norfolk County Council         |

| Twiton County Counting |   |                     |
|------------------------|---|---------------------|
| Item                   | Minute  | Action and due date |
| 1.0                    | Declarations of Interest  |                     |
|                        | Nothing to report.  |                     |
| 2.0                    | Apologies for absence<br>Cllr D Pope, Cllr Trevor Carter, Dorian Avellino, Sarah Gibb,<br>Dave Disney, Karl Read and Stephen Cornell. |                     |
| 3.0                    | Minutes of Meeting 2 held on 03 December 2015 and Matters Arising 3.0 Matters Arising Amendment highlighted as follows:               |                     |

3.0 Matters Arising Amendment highlighted as follows: CPE Delivery Group (Wednesday 18 November 2015) agreed to take **Options 3 and 4** forward and report to Joint Committee.

Acceptance of minutes of previous meeting Signed as a true record of the meeting

Cllr Mick Castle (Chair Person) 08 January 2016

#### **Matters Arising:**

Nothing to report.

# 4.0 Report to NPP Joint Committee

# 2016-17 Forward Programme & Budget Report

Draft Report for 17 February Committee Meeting setting out details of agreement circulated. Recommendations and proposals to address constitution to determine Forward Programme discussed to include Appendixes. Voting rights for all Districts to be resolved.

#### Conclusion:

Form of wording to be inserted into main body of report (rather than Appendix A 5)) to clarify contribution expectation element of CPE. This wording to be agreed by all parties prior to Committee Meeting.

DS

# 2016-17 Efficiencies and Improvements/Terms of Reference

Draft Reports circulated. Comments/feedback welcomed and should be emailed directly to <a href="mailto:helen.martin@norfolk.gov.uk">helen.martin@norfolk.gov.uk</a> as per email dated 07 January.

- Suggested name change of Group highlighted.
- Forward Programme to encompass adhoc anomalies.

#### 5.0 **Any Other Business**

Nothing to report.

# Date, time and venue of next meeting

No further meetings to take place.