



Norfolk County Council

Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee

Date: **Thursday, 14 February 2019**

Time: **14:00**

Venue: **Edwards Room, County Hall,
Martineau Lane, Norwich, Norfolk, NR1 2DH**

Persons attending the meeting are requested to turn off mobile phones.

Membership

County Councillors

Mr B Spratt (Chairman) *Substitute: Mrs C Walker*

District Councillors

Mrs L Neal	<i>Substitute: Ms K Mason Billig</i>	South Norfolk District Council
Mrs K Mellish	<i>Substitute: Mrs J Westrop</i>	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk
Mr G Plant		Great Yarmouth Borough Council

Non-Voting District Councillors

Mr P Claussen		Breckland District Council
Mrs S Bütikofer	<i>Substitute: Mr E Seward</i>	North Norfolk District Council
Mr M Stonard		Norwich City Council
Awaiting Appointment		Broadland Council

**For further details and general enquiries about this Agenda
please contact the Committee Officer:**

Hollie Adams on 01603 223029
or email committees@norfolk.gov.uk

Under the Council's protocol on the use of media equipment at meetings held in public, this meeting may be filmed, recorded or photographed. Anyone who wishes to do so must inform the Chairman and ensure that it is done in a manner clearly visible to anyone present. The wishes of any individual not to be recorded or filmed must be appropriately respected.

Agenda

1. To receive apologies and details of any substitute members attending

2. Minutes

4

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 4 October 2018

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, to a greater extent than others in your division

- Your wellbeing or financial position, or
- that of your family or close friends
- Any body -
 - Exercising functions of a public nature.
 - Directed to charitable purposes; or
 - One of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union);

Of which you are in a position of general control or management.
If that is the case then you must declare such an interest but can speak and vote on the matter.

4. Any items of business the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency

5. Performance Monitoring Update

Page 11

A report by the Assistant Director, Highways and Waste

6. Expanded Eligibility for Blue Badge Holders – Impact on Service

Page 18

A report by the Assistant Director, Highways and Waste

A report by the Assistant Director, Highways and Waste

Chris Walton
Head of Democratic Services
County Hall
Martineau Lane
Norwich
NR1 2DH

Date Agenda Published: 06 February 2019



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020, or Text Relay on 18001 0344 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.



Norfolk County Council

Norfolk County Council & District Councils Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee

Minutes of the Meeting Held on Thursday, 04 October 2018
at 3pm in the Edwards Room, County Hall

Present:

Cllr B Spratt (Chairman)	Norfolk County Council
Cllr G Plant (Vice-Chairman)	Great Yarmouth Borough Council
Cllr K Mellish	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk
Cllr L Neal	South Norfolk District Council

Non-Voting Members Present:

Cllr R Price	North Norfolk District Council
--------------	--------------------------------

Officers Present:

Martin Chisholm	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk
Jo Day	Norwich City Council
Lorraine Houghton	Great Yarmouth Borough Council
Miranda Lee	Great Yarmouth Borough Council
Dave Stephens	The Team Manager for Network Safety & Sustainability, Norfolk County Council
Tim Young	The Project Engineer (Network Policy & Performance), Norfolk County Council

Also Present:

Cllr Mick Castle	Local member for Yarmouth North and Central
------------------	---

1. Chairman's Announcements

- 1.1 The Chairman spoke about the sad loss of former Councillor Adrian Gunson, who had worked tirelessly and been an ambassador for Norfolk County Council, served for many years on the Council and worked with the Highways department; the Joint Committee stood for a minute in silent remembrance of Cllr Gunson.

2. Apologies for absence

- 2.1 Apologies were received from Michele Earp, Rob Young. Jo day and Cllr Mellish had given apologies that they would arrive late. Also absent were,

3. Election of Vice-Chairman

- 3.1 The Chairman nominated Cllr Plant, seconded by Cllr Mellish. Cllr Plant was duly elected Vice-Chairman for the ensuing Council year.

4. Minutes

- 4.1.1 The minutes of the of the meeting held on 23 October 2017 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

4.2.1 Matters arising from minutes:

- The Chairman asked for an update on CCTV at Yarmouth
- The Team Manager for Network Safety & Sustainability reported that there been discussion about whether the Partnership's finances could fund ongoing support for CCTV in Great Yarmouth and Gorleston
- It was decided not to go ahead with this funding in 2017, but an additional year's support had since been secured for CCTV in Great Yarmouth through pre-CPE (Civil Parking Enforcement) balances and a commitment made to support Gorleston until the end of 2018
- Further allocated funds which were not drawn down may be able to be used to allocate funding to Gorleston's CCTV; this would need to be agreed by the District Council or Cabinet
- The Vice Chairman updated the Joint Committee that CCTV use in Yarmouth and Gorleston was being reviewed to see if 24/7 coverage was still required.

5. Declarations of Interests

5.1 No interests were declared.

6. Items of Urgent Business

6.1 No urgent business was discussed

7. Norfolk Parking Partnership Annual Report 2017/18

7.1.1 The Joint Committee considered the Annual Report for 2017-18, providing a draft statistical return, required by the DfT (Department for Transport), summary of financial accounts for 2017-18 and an update on areas of work for the Norfolk Parking Partnership since the last Annual Report, presented to the Committee in October 2017.

7.1.2 The Chairman circulated a list of acronyms and their definitions, attached at appendix A.

7.1.3 The Team Manager for Network Safety & Sustainability referenced the supplementary report which contained final statistics to be forwarded to the DfT and showed a downward trend of PCNs (Penalty Charge Notice) issued in the County's Parking Partnership area. This trend had been built into the revised business plan used to plan the 4-year budget.

7.1.4 Improved outturn in 2016-17 gave a positive balance in the CPE Reserve; but this had reduced to £11,135 in 2017-18 due to reduced performance. This was mainly because of the savings from efficiencies accruing much later than originally expected and meant the projected contribution of £59,000 to the Capital Replacement Fund had been withdrawn for 2017-18. Officers were looking at how to manage the risks of losing income caused by not implementing all the planned replacements of Pay & Display machines in Yarmouth.

7.1.5 Following combination of back offices, Officers were in a good position to move forward, and recommended that business plan objectives were adopted with some small changes.

7.1.6 It had been decided not to go ahead with the proposed changes to seafront charging at Great Yarmouth and a small amount of savings had been accrued elsewhere.

7.1.7 The Vice-Chairman was pleased that seafront parking changes were not going ahead as this would support local businesses and people.

7.2.1 The Team Manager for Network Safety & Sustainability reported that in 2017-18, the first full year of blue badge operations, there were 103 investigations. There had been positive feedback about the work from representatives and people in receipt of blue

badges.

- 7.2.2 The Chairman queried blue badge legislation changes. The Team Manager for Network Safety & Sustainability clarified that the Government were extending criteria of blue badge eligibility to encompass some non-physical disabilities which could have implications for management of on-street parking, noting that under current legislation there was an increase of approximately 1000 blue badges per year across the County.
- 7.2.3 The need for consideration of distance from vehicle to destination in the case of people with severe anxiety and a suggestion that different sized spaces could be needed for people with different disabilities was raised. The Vice-Chairman added that there was a requirement for disabled spaces to be at the closest place to the destination, and for spaces behind to be at a set distance to allow access;
- 7.2.4 Concerns were raised about some people with blue badges parking on double yellow lines or in other places such as in limited wait bays or the beach ramp at Sea Palling, causing difficulty for businesses, emergency vehicles or other drivers. It was noted that people with a blue badge could legally park in a limited waiting bay all day and an increase in the number of people issued with a blue badge would impact on the number of limited waiting bays as no restriction could be placed on them parking here.
- 7.2.5 The Team Manager for Network Safety & Sustainability added that the review of blue badge criteria came under the Government's inclusive transport strategy, placing the onus on transport operators, District Councils and others to work better together, drawing on local knowledge to come up with agreed approaches alongside the drive towards improving congestion; the discussed parking issues would need to be fed into this.
- 7.3.1 Cllr M Castle spoke as a Local Member for Yarmouth North and Central about the decision not to go ahead with changes to Yarmouth Central seafront parking charges. He noted that the County Council charged for parking between Sandown Road and Kings Road and Great Yarmouth Borough Council charged for parking in their 5 carparks here; the proposed changes would have built on existing arrangements in the area and sustained 52 week-a-year parking wardens. Cllr Castle felt it was important for the County Council and Borough Council to charge in comparable ways and areas.
- 7.3.2 In reference to the report, Cllr Castle was concerned that Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) was not sustainable; he noted that since the Police transferred responsibility of parking enforcement to Councils, some districts in Norfolk had not contributed substantially to enforcement costs across the County. He felt that a sustainable Parking Partnership should be developed through resident parking, on-street parking and fines, noting that there were areas which could benefit from resident permits and on-street parking charges.
- 7.3.3 Great Yarmouth Borough Council had introduced a sustained year-round enforcement team rather than a seasonally adjusted one which had made retention and training of staff problematic and may have previously contributed to PCN issuance numbers.
- 7.4.1 The Vice-Chairman felt that CPE costs could be reduced through better use of assets and was concerned that Kings Lynn and Great Yarmouth were the only District Councils paying for enforcement out of the 6 in the Partnership. He suggested that the other 4 District Councils contributed to CPE and that a discussion was held to facilitate all districts working together effectively and implementation of a viable CPE across Norfolk.
- 7.4.2 The Team Manager for Network Safety & Sustainability reported that discussions had moved forward between Leaders and Chief Executives; there was movement towards a consensus between Districts and Council to form a working group to deliver an approach to address balances in the financial arrangements and deliver aspirations for the public to see better on-street parking management.

- 7.4.3 An additional recommendation was **PROPOSED** by the Vice-Chairman; *the Committee asks the Chairman and Officers to liaise with the District Councils of Broadland, North Norfolk, Breckland and South Norfolk to participate in discussions around financing of the current CPE arrangements in their areas to support the sustainability of CPE in Norfolk.*
- 7.4.4 Cllr Neal updated the Joint Committee that South Norfolk District Council were starting to invest in CPE schemes; they had been looking into introducing parking schemes in areas such as Trowse and Cringleford; the District Council would pay half the funding and the Parish Councils would contribute the remainder.
- 7.4.5 The Team Manager for Network Safety & Sustainability sought to clarify, in relation to the Vice-Chairman's proposal, what the suggestion was for the financial contribution of District Councils to CPE, for the purpose of ongoing discussions; the Joint Committee agreed that 50% would be appropriate, which would be approximately £10,000 for Breckland and North Norfolk and £15,000 for Broadland.
- 7.4.6 Cllr Price confirmed that the Leader of North Norfolk District Council did not want to progress with on-street parking arrangements in the District, however was happy to contribute to the CPE arrangements.
- 7.4.8 The Team Manager for Network Safety & Sustainability clarified that the formula at A13 was used to guide the Partnership if a surplus was returned, to formulate how to distribute it. The £500,000 saving did not sit within the existing budget for the Partnership; the Parking Partnership department budget paid for the Norfolk County Council portion of the budget covering, for example, NCC officers and related work such as blue badge investigations. Cllr Castle noted that it was outside of the remit of the Joint Committee to make recommendations of the County Council's Budget.
- 7.5 Cllr Neal seconded Cllr Plants proposal, shown at paragraph 7.4.3, above. The proposal was duly **agreed**.
- 7.6 The Joint Committee:
1. **ACCEPTED** the draft statistical return in Table 1 of the report and **AUTHORISED** the final statistical return to be sent on 4 October.
 2. **NOTED** the financial position of the NPP as at 31st March 2018
 3. **NOTED** progress with efficiency savings and **AGREED** that a report on the outcomes is brought to the next meeting in February 2019.
 4. **APPROVED** the budget for the NPP for 2018-19 as set out in Appendix C of the report
 5. **NOTED** the performance of the Blue Badge Investigations scheme and the positive feedback on the role of the Blue Badge Investigator
 6. **ACCEPTED** the report as the financial position of the CPE Reserves as at 31st March 2018
 7. **ASKED** the Chairman and Officers to liaise with the District Councils of Broadland, North Norfolk, Breckland and South Norfolk to participate in discussions around financing of CPE in their areas to support the sustainability of CPE in Norfolk.
8. **Norfolk County Council Enforcement Policy (Blue Badge Protocol) and Enforcement Guidance Manual Update**
- 8.1 The Committee received the report giving an update on review of the Enforcement Policy to reflect changes in legislation & guidance and development of a new Blue Badge Protocol.
- 8.2.1 A Discussion was held about "keep clear lines" outside schools and issues related to parking on double yellow lines on roads near schools:
- The Project Engineer (Network Policy & Performance) updated the Joint Committee

that new legislation allowed for “sign and lines” to be enforced without a TRO (Traffic Regulation Order); to do this, zig zags must be compliant with regulations

- Examples were given of creative ways that schools had developed for parents to drop off and pick up their children without using double yellow lines or parking enforcement
- It was noted that parking issues outside schools were for a short time each day
- It was recognised that these issues would be difficult to solve as parents needed to drop off and pick up their children
- It was noted that enforcing parking on roads surrounding schools was more difficult than enforcing parking on zig zag lines
- It was noted that there was not enough resource to have enforcement officers at each school each day to enforce parking on yellow or zig zag lines
- It was felt that writing to schools about the situation or trying to enforce it further would not be helpful as it could create a demand the CPE service could not meet
- The Joint Committee noted that there should be a level of tolerance from residents, knowing that they lived near a school, and a level of consideration from parents

8.2.2 The Team Manager for Network Safety & Sustainability concluded that better management of problems was more effective than enforcement; it was useful to learn from experiences where good management had been seen, when planning new schools for example.

8.3 The Joint Committee:

1. **ENDORSED** the Blue Badge investigation protocol as set out in Appendix A of the report
2. **NOTED** the changes to the operational guidance document especially in relation to enforcement of school keep clear markings (A full version of the document is attached as appendix B of the report)
3. **AGREED** to a further separate report on enforcement of school keep clear markings to fully explore the issue at the next committee meeting

9. Review of Parking Management

9.1.1 The Joint Committee considered the report providing an update on the County Council’s plan to develop existing CPE (Civil Parking Enforcement) arrangements in Norfolk to ensure traffic management met the expectations of business, residents and visitors.

9.1.2 The report discussed that issues would be brought to the Joint Committee to feed comments into the review; there was therefore a recommendation for the Joint Committee to meet more regularly. Officers would also feed these comments into meetings of the Leaders and Chief Executives. The Better Parking Strategy Manager was due to be in post in November 2018

9.2.1 The Vice-Chairman and Joint Committee were concerned that the Joint Committee was not involved in the Better Parking Project; the Team Manager for Network Safety & Sustainability reported that the Project was a review of County parking arrangements through Norfolk Parking Partnership and the Norwich City area with a view to improve the public offer by harnessing new technology, providing a higher quality service, extending coverage of on-street parking services and providing a wider range of parking schemes and improvements through a more financially sustainable arrangement of on-street parking.

9.2.2 The Vice-Chairman was concerned about plans being created about parking across the County without involvement of all Districts.

9.3 The Vice-Chairman, seconded by Cllr Mellish, **PROPOSED** to amend recommendation 8

as follows:

- The Joint Committee **AGREED** *that* the Better Parking Strategy Manager ~~to~~ *will* attend future meetings to ~~update work with~~ the Joint Committee on progressing the Better Parking project

- 9.4.1 The Team Manager for Network Safety & Sustainability confirmed it could be possible for the Joint Committee to be the body overseeing the project but noted that leaders asked for the body to have equal voting rights among participants and the Joint Committee was not set up in this way.
- 9.4.2 Concerns were raised about 50% of the CPE surplus being returned to the NCC budget.
- 9.4.3 Cllr Castle noted that under current arrangements, if District Councils were unwilling to accept the policies within the parking principles they could not come on board as equal voting representatives on the Joint Committee. The Vice-Chairman referred to the review of the parking principles mentioned on p87 and, after discussion, it was **suggested** that the principle asking Districts to agree to introducing on-street and permit parking could be changed to include the wording “or other revenue opportunities”.
- 9.4.4 The Team Manager for Network Safety & Sustainability noted that year-round on-street parking in Great Yarmouth was still reported in the proposals to the forward plan; this would be amended now that this was not going ahead, as discussed under item 7.
- 9.5 The Joint Committee:
- 1) **NOTED** and **COMMENTED** on the County Council’s review of the current arrangements for CPE in Norfolk and the appointment of a new post to support implementation of changes to current arrangements
 - 2) **NOTED** the on-going discussions of Norfolk’s Leaders and Chief Executives
 - 3) **AGREED** to take any items which the Leaders and Chief Executives pass to the NPP for action or consideration
 - 4) **AGREED** to meet quarterly in order to receive updates on the progress of the review work and take decisions when required to meet programme timescales, until the review is completed
 - 5) **NOTED** and **COMMENTED** on the potential schemes in Appendix B of the report
 - 6) **ASKED** officers to continue to develop proposals and bring a Forward Programme for approval as part of the Partnerships budget-setting process
 - 7) **NOTED** this report and the need to develop links between parking management, congestion and the roles that key players and technology can have
 - 8) **AGREED** that the Better Parking Strategy Manager will attend future meetings to work with the committee on progressing the Better Parking project

The meeting ended at 16.38

Mr B Spratt, Chairman



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language, please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020, or Text Relay on 18001 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

8. Abbreviations

CEA	Civil Enforcement Area
CEO	Civil Enforcement Officer
CPE	Civil Parking Enforcement
CPZ	Controlled Parking Zone
CV	Commercial Vehicle
DfT	Department for Transport
DPE	Decriminalised Parking Enforcement
DVLA	Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency
DYL	Double Yellow Lines
ECN	Excess Charge Notice
FCO	Foreign and Commonwealth Office
FPN	Fixed Penalty Notice
HA	Highways Agency
HHC	Hand Held Computer
HMSO	Her Majesty's Stationary Office
IHT	Institute of Highways and Transportation
LTP	Local Transport Plan
NPP	Norfolk Parking Partnership
NoR	Notice of Rejection
NtO	Notice to Owner
NVQ	National Vocational Qualification
NWAAT	No Waiting At Any Time
P&D	Pay & Display
PCN	Penalty Charge Notice
PCSO	Police Community Support Officer
PMC	Private Motor Car
PNR	Private Non-Residential
PPA	Permitted Parking Area
PSV	Public Service Vehicle
RNLI	Royal National Lifeboat Institute
RPS	Residents' Parking Scheme
RTA 1991	Road Traffic Act 1991
RTRA 1984	Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984
SEA	Special Enforcement Area
SLA	Service Level Agreement
SPA	Special Parking Area
SYL	Single Yellow Line
TEC	Traffic Enforcement Centre (Northampton County Court)
TMA 2004	Traffic Management Act 2004
TPT	Traffic Penalty Tribunal
TRO	Traffic Regulation Order
VED	Vehicle Excise Duty

Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee

Report title:	Performance Update 2018-19
Date of meeting:	14 February 2019
Responsible Officer:	Nick Tupper – Assistant Director, Highways and Waste
Strategic impact Responsibility for the performance of the Civil Parking Enforcement service sits with the Officer Working Group (OWG), and, following a review of best practice, the Joint Committee agreed the new Terms of Reference for the Group in February 2016. Effective performance management within the Partnership is essential to delivering value for money and achieving the efficiencies which are being sought.	

Executive summary

In March 2016 the Joint Committee approved changes to the Terms of Reference of the Officer Working Group which included some new Key Performance Indicators (KPI) and a stronger focus on performance management.

Recommendations:

- 1. Officers should review the currently defined Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), as shown in Appendix A and, if appropriate, any proposed changes to the KPIs or other benchmarking tools should be brought back to the Joint Committee later in the year.**
- 2. Going forward, the OWG should consider the need for wider sharing of information under revisions to the Delegated Functions Agreement, which may be required to extend the participation of District Councils in the Joint Committee.**

1. Proposal

- 1.1. Following the implementation of a combined back office for the Partnerships operations, the Officer Working Group should continue to review performance of the services to ensure value for money and maximise the resources available for enforcing parking orders.
- 1.2. No changes are currently required to the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the OWG, however officers should review the currently defined Key Performance Indicators (KPI), as shown in Appendix A. If appropriate, any proposed changes to the KPIs or other benchmarking tools should be brought back to the Joint Committee later in the year, once any changes have been trialled and found to be workable. As far as possible the approach should be to measure and quantify the operational and financial activities and present the information so that all partners can be appraised of the way the functions are being delivered, and the Joint Committee can exercise its remit to govern the action carried out in a transparent manner.
- 1.3. All partners should work to ensure that the information required to support effective performance monitoring is available in a timely manner and is shared

with others in accordance with the Terms of Reference.

- 1.4. Going forward, the OWG should consider the need for wider sharing of information under revisions to the Delegated Functions Agreement, which may be required to extend the participation of District Councils in the Joint Committee.

2. Progress update

- 2.1. Progress has been made in delivering improved efficiency of operations, as follows:
- 2.2. Enforceable restrictions – collaborative working to resolve defects Work is on-going to ensure that all defects reported are clearly highlighted as ‘CPE’ within the County Councils contacts management system, enabling us to target and prioritise accordingly. The Mayrise system should then be able to provide data on the performance in relation to resolving defects.
- 2.3. Targeting hotspots (for offending and for traffic management reasons). Targeting is carried out by the district council partners, with oversight provided by the OWG. Information on Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) issuance is now available via the back-office system operated by King’s Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council, although further information on the coverage of deployments would add to the picture of where effective enforcement is being carried out.
- 2.4. Implementing remote monitoring of Pay and Display machines, to free up Civil Enforcement Officer (CEO) time and efficiencies within the cash collection process. This has now been implemented across the areas managed by West Norfolk and will be included in the re-procurement of Pay and Display machines in Great Yarmouth this year.
- 2.5. Facilitating cross border working (i.e. CEOs from South Norfolk or Great Yarmouth or West Norfolk working in other areas if they are nearby). This was successfully implemented in 2016 and has improved the effectiveness of enforcements, particularly in South Norfolk where staff were not previously employed to carry out weekend and evening deployments.
- 2.6. Upgrading existing hand-held devices. This is now completed. 23 devices have been procured, all linked to the single back office system.
- 2.7. Progress has been made in improving consistency as follows:
- 2.8. Reducing any variation in approach between CEOs. This is overseen by the Officer Working Group and is supported by the operational liaison work. The creation of a single back office has improved the process of ‘dip-testing’ by which the performance of CEOs can be readily compared, and any inconsistencies identified. Due to the focus on implementation of the combined back office, this has not been a strong focus until recently.
- 2.9. Re-evaluating any variation in approach from area to area.
- 2.10. Employing full-time staff instead of seasonal staff. This has been completed, notably in the GY area. The flat profile staffing strategy is more efficient in terms of recruitment and training and staffing levels have been stabilised at 7 full time with additional resource to cover summer peak.
- 2.11. Whilst the focus has been on the efficiency and consistency of operations, other areas of improvement will require further attention, as follows:
 - Maintaining an up to date business plan.
 - Introducing KPIs
 - Timely provision and review of monitoring

- Provision of operational guidance for more delegated functions

These areas have been less well-developed since the 2016 report, and this is mainly due to the extended timescale for delivering a combined back office, and the need to divert officer time into other areas of operational management.

- 2.12. Maintaining an up to date business plan. The intention has been to maintain an updated rolling 4-year business plan for the Partnership. Until recently information on outturn costs and incomes, and the status of assets, has not been available to the County Council in accordance with the timescales set out in the Agreements, and this has hampered review of the business plan. Going forward, arrangements are now in place to ensure that information can be provided in a timely manner, and this will allow the business plan and the associated budget-setting to be more effective, as required under the Delegated Functions Agreement.
- 2.13. Introducing Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Reviews of performance based on the KPIs agreed by the Joint Committee has not been successful, due to issues with compilation of the indicators and the timely provision of data. It is therefore recommended that the Officer Working Group be asked to review the KPIs and consider how more effective measures of performance can be put in place which meet the requirements of the Agreement and satisfy the needs of audit. Based on successful flows of information, the OWG should trial any new measures to ensure they are workable, and bring a report back to the Joint Committee later in the year.
- 2.14. Timely provision and review of monitoring. As with financial information, arrangements are now in place to ensure that timely provision of monitoring data will be in place to support the work of the Officer Working Group.
- 2.15. Provision of operational guidance for more delegated functions. Review of the operational guidance has been on-going, led by the Project Engineer (Policy and Performance), with input and oversight from the OWG. This has included changes to the civil enforcements and also the policy on enforcements of criminal cases relating to Blue Badge misuse and fraud.

3. Financial Implications

- 3.1. Improved financial tracking throughout the year will enable prudent forward planning and budget setting assisting in putting the Norfolk Parking Partnership.

4. Issues, risks and innovation

- 4.1. Developing geographic tools to assist with performance monitoring, operational management and public enquiries.

5. Background

- 5.1. In March 2016 the Joint Committee approved changes to the Officer Working Group Terms of Reference, which were aimed at bringing a closer focus on to performance management of the Civil Parking Enforcement services, including monitoring of Key Performance Indicators and the delivery of improvements to efficiency, consistency and accountability. The report is available [here](#).

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.

Terms of Reference for the CPE Officer Working Group as of 18 February 2016

1. Purpose

- 1.1 To provide a forum for the sharing of financial and other information related to the functions of Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) so that transparency about the arrangements and trends for parking management can be achieved.
- 1.2 To agreed annual targets and monitor the performance of the Norfolk Parking Partnership (NPP) against the Key Performance Indicators agreed by the Joint Committee on 18 February 2016.
- 1.3 To deliver the following improvements, which will increase the efficiency of the partnership and support the long term sustainability of the partnership:

Improving Efficiency

- i. Enforceable restrictions – working together to resolve defects
- ii. Provision of metered parking - this is quicker to enforce than limited waiting freeing up Civil Enforcement Officer (CEO) time to monitor other areas
- iii. Targeting hotspots (for offending and for traffic management reasons)
- iv. Implementing remote monitoring of Pay & Display machines and providing a maintenance contract to free up CEO time
- v. Facilitating cross border working (i.e. CEOs from South Norfolk or Great Yarmouth or West Norfolk working in other areas if they are nearby)
- vi. Upgrading existing hand-held devices

Improving Consistency

- vii. Reducing any variation in approach between CEOs
- viii. Re-evaluating any variation in approach from area to area.
- ix. Employing full time staff instead of seasonal staff.

Improving Accountability

- x. Maintaining an up to date business plan
- xi. Agreeing targets and monitoring KPIs
- xii. Timely provision and review of monitoring information
- xiii. Provision of operational guidance for more of the delegated functions

- 1.4 To consider operational issues arising from the operational liaison group and to respond to changes in legislation/best practice

1. Membership

- 2.1 A named officer(s) from each of the NPP partners will attend the officer working group.
- 2.2 A representative from the Police will also be invited to attend
- 2.3 Representatives from finance/legal services will attend as required
- 2.4 Membership ends if a partner leaves the NPP or the NPP is dissolved
- 3. Accountability
 - 3.1 Norfolk County Council (NCC) will chair the officer working group
 - 3.2 The chair will report on progress with the improvements and on monitoring to the Joint Committee in the form of an annual report to the September JC meeting.
 - 3.3 Officer representatives will feedback to their respective organisations.
- 4. Decisions
 - 4.1 Decisions are made within the scope of responsibility delegated by the NPP Joint Committee and when a decision falls outside this delegation the item must be referred back to the Joint Committee for decision.
 - 4.2 Some decisions will also need approval from the relevant partner organisations.
- 5. Review
 - 5.1 These Terms of Reference will be reviewed annually to ensure that the membership and focus remains relevant to the effective delivery of CPE in Norfolk.
- 6. Meetings
 - 6.1 The officer working group will meet quarterly from 16 March 2016
 - ...
 - 6.2 Minutes will be prepared by NCC and circulated after each meeting
 - 6.3 An agenda will be circulated before each meeting with partners encouraged to add items to the agenda for discussion. This will enable NCC to invite other officers as required to ensure that a full discussion can ensue.

Key Performance Indicators (KPI) for the Norfolk Parking Partnership

KPI1 % PCNs cancelled due to CEO error – ensures that the tickets issued are of high quality and reflect the high standards provided by CEOs

KPI2 variance between predicted deployed hours/or employed hours to actual deployed hours – value for money

KPI3 % customer contacts to parking teams resolved according to customer service timescales – measures standard of interface with customers, and includes NCC's response times to customer enquiries

KPI4 defect reports received as a result of not being able to issue a PCN - measures the frequency of defects and the impact that this is having on enforcement

KPI5 defects resolved within agreed timescales - measures the success of our agreed approach to defect resolution

KPI6 Performance against compliance/consistency assessment - this will benchmark compliance with restrictions and consistency in enforcement around the county. An agreed number of streets around the county will be visited quarterly by NCC officers. The numbers of non-compliant vehicles will be recorded. This can then identify countywide/area-specific trends

KPI7 Provision of monitoring data including financial returns - timely provision of information is essential to ensure regular monitoring. Of these KPIs

KPI8 Invoices issued on time (days late) - timely issuing of invoices is essential to monitor performance against the business model

KPI9 Invoices paid (days late) - monitors NCC processes in settling invoices

Norfolk Parking Partnership

Report title:	Expanded Eligibility for Blue Badge Holders – Impact on Service
Date of meeting:	14 February 2019
Responsible Officer:	Nick Tupper – Assistant Director, Highways and Waste

Strategic impact

Responsibility for investigation and prosecution of Blue Badge offences lies with Norfolk County Council as highway and enforcing authority. The Blue Badge Investigator is funded by the Norfolk Parking Partnership (NPP) until March 2019. In 2018 the Government consulted on an expansion of eligibility for the current Blue Badge scheme to those with hidden disabilities. This could impact on the current level of service provided by the Blue Badge Investigator and the level of demand for parking spaces.

Executive summary

The Blue Badge Investigation service has been in operation since 2016 and has made a positive impact on tackling both wrongful and fraudulent use of Blue Badges. The service is a valuable asset which is well received as wrongful use is an issue that impacts on all road users.

Reports of Blue Badge misuse and confiscations by Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO) have increased year on year. With the coming expansion (expected summer 2019) of the eligibility criteria for Blue Badges there is a potential for an increase of around 20% in the number of issued badges. This will in turn increase the risk of fraudulent and wrongful use.

This will also increase the level of demand for on-street Blue Badge parking in dedicated bays and double yellow lines, it will also increase the level of demand in off-street destinations.

Recommendations

That the Joint Committee:

- 1. Agrees to fund the Blue Badge Investigator post for a further period of 2 years.**
- 2. Notes the potential increase in Blue Badge use (as detailed below) and the impact it may have on the Blue Badge Investigation service area.**
- 3. Endorses close monitoring of the impact the expanded criteria has on the investigation element of the service**
- 4. Endorses a specific ‘toolbox’ talk for CEOs in relation to the widened eligibility criteria**
- 5. Agrees that relevant Officers within their Authorities highlight this with colleagues in their strategy and planning departments with a view to amending or updating policy as required.**

1. Proposal

- 1.1. The Blue Badge Investigator has been in post since 2016 with positive feedback from Blue Badge user organisations, such as Disabled Motoring UK, and the wider public. Abuse of the Blue Badge scheme is an issue that impacts throughout society from denying space to legitimate users to bringing the scheme into disrepute for non-users.
- 1.2. Reports of potential misuse come from members of the public, both online and through personal interaction with the Investigator and Civil Enforcement Officers while on patrol. As the service has become established and public awareness increased so has the level of reporting. In 2016/17 over a 6 month period 29 reports were received. In the 2017/18 financial year 103 reports were received and in the first 3 quarters of this (2018/19) financial year 86 reports have been received. This shows a steady increase in work load for the Blue Badge Investigator

- 1.3. Table showing disposals and level of reporting over the period of Blue Badge Investigation Service

Investigations of Blue Badge Infringements	2016-17 (since Nov 16)	2017-18	2018-19 (Apr-Jan)
Disposals:			
Formal prosecution (including caution)*	6	8	5
Advisory/warning letter or verbal advice from BBI	13	24	19
Details forwarded to parking team for CEO awareness	2	13	22
No action required (including insufficient or incorrect information to pursue further)	8	33	20
Investigation in progress/pending	0	0	3
Reporting:			
Reports from others (incl. public)	18	55	44
Identified by CEO	6	24	43
Identified by BBI	5	6	2

- 1.4. Due to the positive impact the Blue Badge Investigation service has both in terms of tackling misuse and positive public perception officers would like to see this service element continue.

Recommendation 1 – That the Joint Committee agrees to fund the Blue Badge Investigator post for a further period of 2 years

- 1.5. In January 2018 the Department for Transport (DfT) consulted on the expansion of the eligibility criteria for Blue Badges. The current rules embrace all conditions, physical or otherwise, but the regulations and guidance were not clearly understood and people with hidden disabilities find it difficult to access badges, even though their condition caused them very significant difficulties when undertaking a journey.

- 1.6. Norfolk County Council as a Blue badge issuing authority was one of 75 to respond to the consultation. The authority was in principle in favour of the amended criteria, which will give a great many more people access to this service but, as with other authorities expressed concerns over implementation and consequential impacts.
- 1.7. Broadly speaking for Norfolk County Council, as the Highway Authority, the impacts would be an increased demand for specific disabled spaces and use of the concession to park on double yellow lines for up to 3 hours.
- 1.8. The DfT published its consultation response at the end of the summer of 2018. It has decided to move forward with the expanded criteria of eligibility which will be implemented in the summer of 2019. They responded on the potential impacts of administration and parking provision.
- 1.9. The DfT calculated a very conservative estimate of a 6% increase in badge applications in England, resulting in 44,000 new badges being issued. Other Local Authorities believe the figure will actually be somewhere between 10% and 35%.
Norfolk has approximately 38,000 Blue Badge holders, a mean estimate of badge increases would be 22% which equates to 8,400 additional badges.
The National Fraud Office in 2012 estimated that 20% of Blue Badges in circulation were misused in some way, in Norfolk this could potentially equate to 1,600 of the newly issued badges.
We are currently receiving about 103 reports a year (2017/18 figures) with around 8% formal disposal. Almost every report requires some preliminary investigation even if no further action is pursued.
Therefore even a modest increase in the number of reports by 30% could have an impact on service delivery.

Recommendation 2 – The Joint Committee notes the potential increase in Blue Badge use and the impact it may have on the Blue Badge Investigation service area.

Recommendation 3 – The Joint Committee endorses close monitoring of the impact the expanded criteria has on the investigation element of the service.

2. Evidence

- 2.1. The Norfolk Parking Partnership, with Norfolk County Council as enforcing authority are 1 of only 52 Local Authorities, out of a possible 152, that undertake Blue Badge investigation and enforcement work. This was highlighted in December 2018 in a BBC report –
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-46715503>
This should be seen in positive light that we are exempla authorities that take this issue seriously due to its wide reaching societal impacts.

3. Financial Implications

- 3.1. The post of the Blue Badge Investigations Officer is wholly funded by the Norfolk Parking Partnership which is at present under financial strain.
- 3.2. The Blue Badge Investigator post is a 0.5Fte working a flexible week to suit the requirements of the investigations in progress.
The present level of reporting and work load can be adequately managed within this post and the budget set.

- 3.3. Should the level of reporting increase significantly above that experienced now then additional resource may need to be applied.
- 3.4. A case involving formal prosecution has a statutory time limit in which it has to be brought before Magistrates. Therefore investigations are time sensitive and additional numbers of reported offences could impact this.
- 3.5. At present Officers are developing a strategy to address the potential for an increase in reporting and case load. It may be possible to absorb some additional reporting by changing the way we work.
- 3.6. However, should the level of reporting increase significantly then the NPP may have to invest in further resource. At present this is envisioned to be of technical administrative support to assist in triaging the reports and setting up case files. This would free up the Investigators time to pursue the in-depth areas of each case.
- 3.7. The recent invitation to other non-voting members of the Norfolk Parking Partnership to become full members and to assist with financial contributions to offset the current deficit is a positive opportunity to ensure all members of the NPP help to fund Blue Badge Investigation service area.
- 3.8. A further paper specifically on budget implications will be brought to the NPP Joint Committee in the Autumn alongside the Annual Review following the implementation of the expanded Blue Badge Criteria when a more accurate picture of its impacts is known. This will allow prudent adjustments to the forward budget to be made.

4. Issues, risks and innovation

- 4.1. Not extending and funding the Blue Badge Investigators post will result in the loss of this service area which has very positive public perception.
- 4.2. The expanded criteria for Blue Badges will result in more being issued increasing the likelihood of fraud and wrongful use. Which in turn increases demand on the service.
- 4.3. With the Blue Badge criteria being extended to those with what are known as hidden disabilities there could be an increase in public reporting as new badge holders do not fit the traditional profile.
- 4.4. Civil Enforcement Officers as part of their role/powers have a duty to inspect Blue Badges where they suspect misuse. They already receive training on how to engage sensitively with the public in what are often stressful situations It would be beneficial for them to receive refresher toolbox type training with some specifics on the new types of health issues that may be involved.

Recommendation 4 – That the Joint Committee endorses a specific ‘toolbox’ talk for CEOs in relation to the widened eligibility criteria

- 4.5. Beyond the enforcement scope of this topic is the impact that expanded eligibility will have on the demand for Blue Badge parking. An increase in the numbers of badges issued will result more competition for on-street space and a demand for more off-street spaces. This is a wider issue that will impact strategically on current policy at both County, Borough and District level in terms of development planning.

Recommendation 5 – The Joint Committee agrees that relevant Officers within their Authorities highlight this with colleagues in their strategy and planning departments with a view to amending or updating policy as required.

5. Background

- 5.1. Below is a link to the relevant DfT consultation response published in summer 2018 –

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/blue-badge-disabled-parking-scheme-eligibility-consultation-summary-of-responses-and-outcome/blue-badge-consultation-summary-of-responses-and-government-response>

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 : Tim Young

Tel No. : 222412

Email address : Timothy.young@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 Joint Committee

Report title:	Norfolk County Council – Better Parking Strategy Project Update
Date of meeting:	14 February 2019
Responsible Officer:	Nick Tupper – Assistant Director, Highways and Waste

Strategic impact

At the 15 March 2018 Chief Executive's Meeting it was decided to undertake a review of the current principles of parking management in Norfolk, as current arrangements were not sustainable, coupled with forecast increases in traffic congestion and the need to support economic growth, new EV and parking technology and improve air quality and the overall 'parking experience'.

To assist this review, the post of Better Parking Strategy Manager was created and funded by Norfolk County Council (NCC), to manage a 'Better Parking Project', and this report summarises progress to date with the Project.

Executive summary

The NCC Better Parking Strategy Project is a 2-year project which commenced on 1 November 2018, aimed at improving the management of parking in Norfolk, including a review of the 'Parking Principles', the document which currently sets out the County Council's general parking strategy.

The Project will help shape the over-arching and future parking strategy for Norfolk, ensuring that the Norfolk Parking Partnership (NPP) and the County-wide Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) arrangements remain fit for purpose and financially sustainable. The project will also seek to provide local solutions whilst adopting a more consistent, county-wide approach to CPE and the management of both on and off-street parking and providing a more positive future parking 'experience', with improved information and data available to all relevant users and stakeholders.

The initial phase of the project has been to formulate a project plan, undertake a fact find and review of current NPP council member operations and benchmark these against other established and well-run UK parking partnerships, in order to benefit from their experience and industry best practice.

Recommendations:

That the Joint Committee:

- 1. Notes the progress of the Better Parking Strategy Project to date, given that this commenced on 1 November 2018 and is at a very early stage.**
- 2. Is given the opportunity to comment on the progress of the Better Parking Strategy Project to date and provide input for future consideration.**
- 3. Is invited to comment on suggested revisions to the current Parking Principles, in support of the Better Parking Strategy Project, and provide feedback and suggestions by the June Committee Meeting.**

1. Proposal

1.1. Project Delivery

1.1.1 The Better Parking Strategy Project has been designed to deliver outcomes over a 2-year period in accordance with a clear steer from Council Leaders, and provide updates and reports in a timely manner - to meet both project milestones and relevant committee deadlines.

1.1.2 The project has been sub-divided into 5 key phases to represent the main areas of work that need to be undertaken. Phase 1 involves researching and collating baseline information regarding current CPE operations and practices. To date, good cooperation has been received from NPP partner councils in Great Yarmouth and Kings Lynn, who have hosted visits to look at how their CPE and other parking operations are run and managed. To complete the exercise, similar operational visits are scheduled to be made to Norwich City and South Norfolk councils during February 2019.

1.1.3 The operational visits will allow working methods, costs, income, initiatives and use of new technology to be benchmarked internally and compared with similar parking partnerships nationally; ultimately, with the goal of sharing industry best practice and improving the efficiency of the NPP, its financial sustainability and the ability to create a consistent annual surplus to be reinvested in agreed forward projects.

1.2 Review of Parking Principles

1.2.1 The first formal review of the Parking Principles document is scheduled for February 2019 with a view to presenting a first draft of a revised document to the Joint Committee at its June 2019 meeting, and a final draft for the August 2019 Joint Committee meeting. The Officer Working Group is invited to help shape the content and structure of an updated version of the Parking Principles document, followed by the opportunity to comment by the Joint Committee. All input and comments will be considered as part of the overall review.

1.2.2 The Better Parking Strategy Manager will provide further updates on the review of the Parking Principles at each Joint Committee meeting, to both track progress and to ensure a good level of stakeholder engagement and input. For information and reference, a copy of the Parking Principles is shown attached as Appendix A.

1.3 Withdrawal of the Norfolk County Council Agency Agreement with Norwich City Council

1.3.1 At its meeting on 18 January 2019, the EDT Committee decided not to extend the current Agency Agreement with Norwich City Council, in favour of its withdrawal and cessation from 1 April 2020. Whilst the impact on the NPP working arrangements is currently being considered, the decision represents a unique opportunity for the Better Parking Strategy Project and the Joint Committee to explore increased cross-border working, operational and financial resilience, greater economies of scale and more consistent, efficient and effective parking-related working practices across Norfolk.

1.3.2 In the interim period, and as transitional arrangements are considered and agreed, these will be reported to the Joint Committee, together with any proposals arising from this and how this feeds into the Better Parking Strategy

Project.

1.4 DfT Bid – Funding for Innovation: Opening Local Authority Transport Data

- 1.4.1 One element of the Better Parking Strategy Project involves communications and data sharing, and, as part of a joint East Anglian bid for DfT funding to open up parking Data, the Better Parking Strategy Manager has provided input to the bid.
- 1.4.2 On behalf of the East Anglian Parking Forum, the bid is being led, drafted and submitted by its Chair, working to a very tight submission deadline of 8 February 2019.
- 1.4.3 If successful, the bid will secure £100k of DfT funding, supported by a further £5k from the North Essex Parking Partnership. The funding will be used to finance a public parking portal for East Anglia in order to join and open up a number of datasets that the authorities hold and encourage more close working together. The portal would provide a single and common point of access for motorists, the public and other stakeholders, to enquire about parking services and the location and availability of their destination parking. Ultimately it is hoped this will in turn help reduce congestion and air pollution through better route planning prior to setting out, based on real-time information about the route, destination and available (pre-bookable) parking.
- 1.4.4 No financial contribution from either NCC or the NPP is required in connection with this bid and the considerable benefits it could subsequently provide to the County and enabling a more consistent and positive cross-county parking experience for East Anglia.

2. Evidence

- 2.1.1 The Better Parking Strategy Project and the appointment of Better Parking Strategy Manager were approved by DMT as a direct result of a call to action by Norfolk Chief Executives; to review and improve the principles of parking management across Norfolk, support economic growth and vitality, reduce environmental impacts and traffic congestion and embrace the latest technology.
- 2.1.2 It was recognised that an additional full-time resource would be required to undertake such a large, stand-alone project, as this would not otherwise be deliverable given present staff numbers, available time and current workload. The appointment of Better Parking Strategy Manager was deemed to be the most efficient and cost-effective solution given the work and outcomes required over the forecast 2-year duration of the Project.

3. Financial Implications

- 3.1 In approving the review of the Parking Principles, the initiation of the Better Parking Strategy Project and appointment of the Better Parking Strategy Manager. Full Council approved a budget of £200k to cover the cost of these over the financial years 2018-19 and 2019-20.
- 3.1.1 There are no additional costs associated with the delivery of the above. Going forward, and as a result of the Better Parking Strategy Project, it is anticipated that the NPP will make further efficiencies to assist in generating an ongoing annual surplus, which can be reinvested into an agreed forward programme of works and initiatives to support the NPP and Joint Committee and a more positive parking experience for motorists.

4. Issues, risks and innovation

- 4.1. Whilst there are no issues or risks associated with reviewing the Parking Principles or delivery of the Better Parking Strategy Project, non-delivery of either presents a number of risks to the County Council and the NPP:
- Uncertain financial sustainability and future for the NPP;
 - Unsatisfactory support for positively assisting in addressing forecast increases in traffic congestion, supporting economic growth and vitality and reducing air pollution;
 - Unsatisfactory support for strategic transport and town and city infrastructure projects;
 - Unsatisfactory and tardy responses to areas in Norfolk seeking to tackle invasion and other parking issues and the roll out of further controlled parking and on-street pay and display zones;
 - Failure to maximise opportunities to foster and develop cross-border working and sharing operational best practice and the utilisation of new and smart parking technologies;
 - Potential reputational damage to NCC and the NPP resulting from either not addressing or responding positively to any of the above risks.

5. Background

- 5.1. Since November 2011 Norfolk County Council has been legally responsible for the delivery of Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) throughout Norfolk. Whilst the operational functions of this delivery were delegated to the District and Borough Councils in 2012, ultimate responsibility and overall management still rests with the County Council.
- 5.1.1 The Norfolk Parking Partnership and Joint Committee were formed in 2012 to provide a joined up operational delivery and management of the delegated CPE operational functions.
- 5.1.2 Both operational and financial performance of the NPP since 2011 has fluctuated and has been inconsistent. Whilst cross border working and efficiency has improved in some areas, as well as savings and efficiencies from the creation of a single back-office function at Kings Lynn, there still remains much work to do in improving the NPP's operational and financial performance, stability and providing a consistent and flexible approach to parking, that addresses both local and county-wide needs and meets future and emerging demands.
- 5.1.3 The Better Parking Strategy Project will assist in improving the operational and financial performance of the NPP as well as delivering the agreed Project outcomes and producing a revised set of Parking Principles which are fit for future purpose.

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: Ian Gregory

Tel No: 01603 223851

Email address: ian.gregory@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.

Parking Principles

Introduction

Car parking is a key determinant affecting a range of factors including the economic buoyancy of town centres and how people choose to travel. The availability and pricing of car parks, together with how long people are allowed to park for affects economic vitality, growth, traffic demand, sustainable transport, mode shift and air quality. It is widely recognised that the parking end of a private vehicle trip is one of the strongest factors affecting private vehicle trip decision making and usage. The parking principles recognise that in a largely rural area like Norfolk, account needs to be taken of the fact that, for many trips, travel by car will be the only realistic option.

This note sets out draft parking principles that can be used, together with consideration of the particular local circumstances that exist, as a guide to assist the county council in decision-making:

- How the county council plans, provides and controls provision of car parking (numbers of spaces, charging regimes, lengths of stay, etc...)
- About when, or if, changes will be made to parking restrictions, setting out that major parking management schemes would be undertaken only where they will be fully funded or are self-financing across the area (eg costs met from permit or other parking charges). Residents parking will only be introduced where it is fully funded or self-financing as a stand-alone scheme, ie it does not require ongoing financial support from the County Council. In both cases the funding includes the cost of design and implementation, and any ongoing revenue issues like upkeep of equipment.
- To put car parking provision in the context of facilitating effective delivery of other services and objectives (to ensure economic vitality, encourage people to travel sustainably, consistency of policy in relation to CPE operation).

The intention is to have a clear set of principles that can be applied consistently across the county with the aim of supporting the economic vitality of the county.

The principles do not provide a green light that parking will be amended in accordance with the guidance in the principles. Changes will only be made where there is a strong, well supported case for which funding can be found. This will mean that many proposals could only be taken forward if external funding is forthcoming (or the proposals are self-financing). This funding would need to take into account not only the design and implementation costs but also any ongoing revenue issues like upkeep of equipment.

Background to parking provision

Public parking facilities covered include parking on-street and in off-street car parks. On-street parking is not a right but is permitted (provided it is safe and doesn't cause an obstruction) unless there is a traffic regulation order specifying otherwise. A traffic regulation order may prohibit parking (shown by yellow lines), or restrict it (eg. applying a time restriction). The county council is responsible for managing on-street car parking, although in Norwich this is carried out by Norwich City Council on behalf of the county council.

Off-street public parking is generally provided in car parks, operated by district councils or private companies. Most car parks in Norfolk are operated by the district councils except in Norwich where a substantial amount of the off-street stock is run by private car park operators alongside some city council car parks. Regulations applying to off-street car parks are covered in off-street parking orders and set out for motorists through signing at the car park.

What the principles cover

These parking principles cover parking for which the county council is responsible: on-street provision and off-street Park and Ride facilities. They do not cover the numbers of spaces at new development. Norfolk County Council's Parking Standards and district councils' development management policies and car parking standards will be used for this purpose. Additionally,

they do not cover parking provided for individual premises like supermarket car parks or that which is publicly available (eg in a public car park).

The parking principles do not cover public transport facilities like bus stops, coach dropping-off facilities or taxi ranks. These facilities are important and are part of the general provision that local authorities make, usually on-street. Although they would have to be considered as part of general consideration of the different competing demands for kerb space, they are not considered as part of this guidance.

Contents

Core principles – amount and location of parking

- 1: Whole settlement parking management
- 2: Parking provision (amount and location)
 - 2.1 Parking provision in urban areas
 - 2.2 Parking provision in towns
 - 2.3 Parking provision in other areas
- 3: Parking provision (time periods and charges)
 - 3.1 Urban areas
 - 3.2 Towns
 - 3.3 Other areas
- 4: Alternative pricing structures
 - 4.1 Complementary infrastructure
 - 4.2 Differential control mechanisms

Provision for individual user-groups

- 5: Parking facilities for people with disabilities
- 6: Parking for people using public transport
 - 6.1 Rail stations in urban areas
 - 6.2 Rail stations in rural areas or in towns
 - 6.3 Bus stations in urban areas
 - 6.4 Bus interchanges in towns
- 7: Coach and bus parking
 - 7.1 Coach parking
 - 7.2 Coach dropping-off and picking-up facilities
- 8: Cycle parking
- 9: Facilities for Heavy Goods Vehicles
 - 9.1 HGV Layover / rest facilities
 - 9.2 HGV loading / unloading facilities in towns and urban areas
- 10: Motorbike parking

General Principles

- 11: Maintenance

12: Quality of parking provision

13: Information about and signing to facilities

Core principles – amount and location of parking

Whole settlement parking management

1 Parking management forms part of a wider set of complementary traffic management measures that affect places, including how they perform economically and how they feel to people who live there or visit. It is important that the context of the whole settlement is taken into account when thinking about parking, rather than simply considering what to do with parking at an individual location. This will allow consideration of factors including how parking (or the control of it) might affect the economic vitality of an area, and how changes in one location might have knock-on effects elsewhere in the settlement.

2 Whole settlement parking management plans should take into account, amongst other things, relevant Local Development Documents, *Connecting Norfolk* (the county's 3rd Local Transport Plan) and any detailed transport implementation plans that may have been produced. If restrictions are to be introduced, removed or changed, consideration will have to be given to how effective enforcement of any restrictions can be carried out and to how the changes might affect parking revenues (for example if charges are to be introduced or curtailed).

3 There will clearly be a cost to undertaking a parking study or plan, and this may be relatively large across towns or urban areas. Such studies should only be undertaken where external funding can be found, or the proposals across the area will be self-financing (eg from permit or other parking charges), including the cost of design and implementation, and any ongoing revenue issues like upkeep of equipment.

Parking Principle 1: Whole settlement parking management

Parking management will be considered across the whole settlement taking into account, amongst other things: economic vitality, parking demand and supply, displacement of parking demand, sustainable transport and highway

safety. Changes to restrictions should consider how effective enforcement of any restrictions can be carried out and to how the changes might affect parking revenues.

Whole settlement parking management plans will only be undertaken where funding can be identified or the proposals across the area will be self-financing including the cost of design and implementation, and any ongoing revenue issues like upkeep of equipment..

Amount and location of parking within settlements

Note: In the following principles:

Urban areas are defined as:

1. Norwich built-up area
2. King's Lynn town and the adjacent built up area
3. Great Yarmouth and Gorleston built-up area.

Towns are defined as:

Acle	Attleborough	Aylsham	Blofield
Bradwell	Brundall	Caister-on-Sea	Cromer
Diss	Dereham	Downham Market	Fakenham
Harleston	Hethersett	Hingham	Holt
Hoveton	Hunstanton	Loddon/ Chedgrave	Long Stratton
Poringland/ Framingham Earl	Reepham	Sheringham	Stalham
Thetford	North Walsham	Wells-next-the- Sea	Watton
Swaffham	Wroxham	Wymondham	

Time periods are defined as:

- Short Term: less than 2 hours
- Medium Term: 2- 5 hours
- Long Term: more than 5 hours.

Urban areas

4 Controlled provision and availability of car parking can play an important part in ensuring the economic buoyancy of areas by enabling people to gain access. It is also one part of a wider set of measures to manage urban traffic congestion and encourage people to use alternative forms of transport. Restricting the number of spaces or limiting the availability of long-stay car parking can have a significant effect on traffic volumes, providing that these measures are complemented by the provision of adequate alternative options, such as park and ride.

5 Given this, it might be considered that there is a 'right' amount of parking to serve the centre of urban areas. This amount of parking would need to take account of the nature of the individual settlement as it is now, and also consider the amount of growth planned in the area. It would be appropriate for consideration of all of these factors to lead to a guideline on the amount of parking that might be appropriate within each of the urban areas. Within Norwich, this is already established, with the guideline amount being expressed as a maximum number of spaces. Whilst a maximum might not be appropriate in the other urban areas, a steer on the overall quantum would be a helpful guide. For Great Yarmouth, the demands for the town centre and the seafront would need to be considered as two distinct, but overlapping, issues.

6 Park and ride can provide alternative long-stay parking provision for urban areas, reducing congestion and emissions from transport. Norwich is currently served by six Park and Ride sites. The Norwich Area Transportation Strategy Implementation Plan (NATSIP) identifies possible expansion of Postwick as park of Postwick hub. It also identifies in the longer term that a further possible site at Trowse could be provided if long term parking provision in the city centre is further reduced. The existing parking balance in Norwich is the controlling factor which dictates that park and ride is currently working as a subsidised service. Park and ride has also been suggested for King's Lynn and Great Yarmouth, amongst other places. However, in the short term at least, further expansion of existing park and ride systems, or new systems, will be not implemented unless the costs of provision and ongoing operation can be met, eg they operate on a purely commercial basis.

7 Parking for local residents / businesses, through a residents parking scheme may be appropriate in the urban areas, if supported by the local community and identified through the whole settlement parking work (Principle 1). In such cases, a residents parking scheme would be undertaken only where funding can be secured from outside sources or the scheme is self financing; ie it does not require ongoing financial support from the County Council. This funding requirement includes feasibility, design and

implementation, and ongoing revenue. Where such schemes are implemented, the provision of one disabled parking space (which couldn't however be assigned to an individual user or property) per street should be considered.

8 Within urban areas, it has become common practice to sell space in car parks for contract parking. This normally allows companies to buy space in car parks – at a discount – for commuter parking. In some cases this means that parts of urban centre car parks, which according to these principles should favour short-medium stay demand, are being used for long-stay commuter parking. It would be appropriate to limit or restrict this practice, although the limitations would need to be considered on a case-by-case basis, taking into account factors such as the ability of the firms who buy this space being able to attract employees and the overall demand for car park spaces in the urban centre.

Towns

9 The issues within the towns are similar to those described above for urban areas, except that park and ride would not be appropriate due to the size of the settlements and contract parking is not normally an issue. Exceptionally, residents parking might be appropriate only in the larger towns or honeypot/coastal towns as part of a settlement wide parking management scheme designed to deal with problems caused by a surplus of demand for car parking over its provision. Guidance on the overall quantum of parking in the settlement might be appropriate for the larger towns.

Out of town developments

10 The above principles generally relate to parking for the centre of towns and urban areas. However, there are some places on the edge of settlements that attract parking demand, such as out of town retail parks, supermarkets, leisure centres or business parks. Most will have their own off-street provision provided as part of the development. This will have been thought about as part of the planning process and is covered in other advice; principally District

Councils' *Development Management Policies* and the County Council's *Parking Standards*.

11 It might be appropriate to consider parking restrictions, including residents parking in the urban centres, to manage parking demand where there are evidenced problems relating to safety, maintaining or managing traffic flow, or amenity reasons.

Hotspots including coastal villages

12 At hotspots, where demand for parking could exceed available parking supply, restrictions on parking may be appropriate for the purposes of safety, maintaining or managing traffic flow, or amenity reasons.

Rural areas, including villages

13 The demand for car parking is generally lower once outside the urban areas, towns and hotspots like coastal villages. There is often no need for car parking provision over and above what is available on-street and off-street in facilities dedicated for use by visitors to an individual premises (eg offices or supermarkets). In most cases there will be no problem with parked vehicles – either the need for more parking, or from vehicles parking badly on the road. Furthermore, restrictions on parking in more remote areas will be difficult to enforce and is unlikely to be effective in controlling parking.

14 In these locations, the presumption will be that on-street parking restrictions would not be introduced unless there was an evidenced safety problem.

Parking Principle 2: Parking provision (amount and location)

2.1 Parking provision in urban areas

Guidance on the overall quantum of car parking provision for the centre of urban areas (and Great Yarmouth seafront) should be agreed. A guide to the amount of parking will be determined in the context of the whole settlement parking management, and in conjunction with district councils taking into account, amongst other things: the likely future demand for car parking given

planned levels of growth; availability of public transport services, walking and cycling; and the total quantum of parking available including such as provided by Park and Ride.

In the centre of urban areas on -street parking should favour short and medium stay demand. Long-stay provision should be provided at edge-of-centre locations or, in the case of Norwich, Park and Ride.

The preference for long-stay parking provision for Norwich city centre is Park and Ride. Further expansion will be considered only where its provision can be fully funded and where the ongoing running costs of operation can be fully met eg from passenger revenue.

For King's Lynn and Great Yarmouth Park and Ride will be supported in policy terms but promoters would need to show how its provision and ongoing costs would be met (both construction and operation in the long-term).

2.2 Parking provision in towns

Guidance on the overall quantum of car parking provision for the centre of towns may be appropriate for the larger towns.

In the centre of towns, on -street parking should favour short and medium-stay demand. Long-stay provision should be provided at edge-of-centre locations.

2.3 Parking provision in other areas

Public parking provision over and above what is available on-street would not generally be provided elsewhere (including locations in towns and urban areas away from the centre/edge of centre, in villages, and in rural areas). In such locations, parking should be limited to that associated with individual developments (eg at business parks) agreed through the development management and planning processes. However, additional parking provision may be appropriate at hotspots including coastal villages or where a town serves a large rural hinterland. In such cases demand for parking may regularly exceed available parking supply and provision may be appropriate. This could be charged.

On-street parking would normally be unrestricted away from areas where waiting and loading restrictions are required for highway safety reasons.

Parking Principle 3: Parking provision (time periods and charges)

3.1 Urban areas

The expectation would be that on-street car parking in the centre of urban areas (and Great Yarmouth seafront) is charged. This charge should be set at a premium to local scheduled bus services or park and ride services.

On-street parking should be restricted to shorter-stays than off-street and at a higher charge (where appropriate).

It may be appropriate to consider residents parking schemes in the urban areas where there is a proven need and local support. Residents parking schemes would be implemented only where funding for design, implementation and ongoing revenue costs is available. There would be an expectation that the funding comes external sources and / or the proposal will be self-financing.

3.2 Towns

On-street parking charges in, especially the larger, towns may be appropriate, particularly in the centre of towns where demand exceeds supply, and there are adequate alternatives (in the form of sustainable transport opportunities).

On-street parking should be restricted to shorter-stays than off-street and at a higher charge (where appropriate).

It may be appropriate to consider management of parking in residential areas adjacent to the town centres to avoid problems of overspill parking in these areas. In exceptional cases, residents parking schemes may be appropriate.

3.3 Other areas

Outside of the towns and urban areas on-street parking restrictions would not normally be introduced unless there was an evidenced safety problem.

At hotspots including coastal villages, where demand for parking regularly exceeds available parking supply and is causing a demonstrable problem, on-street parking restrictions may be appropriate for the purposes of maintaining or managing traffic flow, safety, or amenity reasons. This parking provision could attract a charge. The needs of people with disabilities will need to be considered (see Parking Principle 5).

Alternative pricing structures

15 The Local Transport Plan for the county, *Connecting Norfolk*, recognises that many trips in Norfolk will continue to be undertaken by car because of the lack of viability of other travel choices for many trips, or simply because people's lifestyles are built around car travel and these habits will be difficult to change. However, car travel can lead to problems including poor air quality and carbon emissions. These problems could be mitigated at least in part by encouraging a greener vehicle fleet, and this can be done through provision of appropriate infrastructure or other mechanisms such as differential charging mechanisms. Differential charging may be more appropriate in situations where people purchase parking over a long period of time; for example residents' parking permits, car park season tickets.

16 The county council is a partner in Evalu8, the east of England arm of government's Plugged in Places initiative, to roll-out charging points for electric vehicles. Charging points provided under this initiative benefit from a central administration function that includes, amongst other things, a user-booking system for the posts. Charging points installed for general public use should be incorporated into this network, branded as Source East.

Parking Principle 4: Alternative pricing structures

4.1 Complementary infrastructure

Complementary infrastructure like charging posts for electric vehicles is appropriate in locations where parking is permitted. Public electric vehicle charging facilities should be part of the Source East network.

4.2 Differential control mechanisms

Differential mechanisms are appropriate to encourage more efficient vehicles. These mechanisms could include differential charging regimes based on recognised categories of vehicle classification (eg CO2 emissions).

Provision for individual user-groups

Facilities for people with disabilities

17 Around one in five people have a disability. One in seven has an impairment that affects mobility. The National Travel Survey shows that access to a car is one of the most important factors in the amount of travelling people do, with many relying on cars to get about. Whether as a driver or passenger, the ease with which people can reach their destination is nearly always determined by where the car can be parked.

18 Government guidance suggests that parking for people with disabilities should not be no further from places like a bank, post office or large store than as little as 50 metres for people who use a stick.

19 However, although it is important to consider facilities for people with disabilities, there will be other competing demands for spaces, especially on-street, including loading and unloading, bus stops, etc... This will need to be

considered in the round. Where there is an absolute need to keep the road free from stopped vehicles, loading restrictions might be appropriate to prevent stopped / parked vehicles (including goods vehicles or blue badge holders' cars) disrupting traffic flow.

Parking Principle 5: Parking facilities for people with disabilities

Dedicated on-street parking for people with disabilities should be provided at locations close to services and facilities. The amount of parking will need to be considered on a case-by-case basis taking into account factors such as demand, other competing demands for kerb space, alternative off-street facilities and safety.

Consistent standards across the county should be aimed for.

Parking for people using public transport

20 Parking at bus and rail stations is useful, even in urban centres where sustainable transport might provide viable travel options, as it encourages people to use the bus or train for the lengthier part of their journey. The amount of parking will need to be assessed in the light of demand and other factors including land availability and other travel options. Such provision will usually be provided by the train operators. This section gives guidance about how the county council would work with providers in relation to parking at interchange facilities.

21 The expectation is that in the urban areas at least, parking for both bus and train interchanges (where provided) would be charged (ie people would have to pay for it). The assessment would need to consider how charges might affect people's choices including whether they would be discouraged from using public transport and whether charges were likely to result in displacement of vehicles to nearby streets.

22 Charges may be appropriate at interchanges in other locations, but would need to be considered in relation to the whole-settlement parking management in the area: for example whether charges or restrictions applied in other on and off-street provision. Whole-settlement parking management is covered in more detail in Principles 1, 2 and 3.

23 Parking for train services (and airports) normally attracts a charge, especially since much of this provision is provided by train/airport operators who customarily charge. Drivers are therefore likely to expect car parking charges and it would not be unreasonable that all such facilities are charged, where provided, although consideration will need to be given to whether this might displace parking onto nearby streets.

24 At bus interchanges, car parking will not normally be required since most people will be using public transport for the whole of their trip. However, there is experience that in some market towns, drivers are taking advantage of free public car parking facilities in order to leave their car at that town in order to catch the bus into (especially) Norwich. By doing this they can avoid having to drive into Norwich and find, and pay for, car parking during the day. In such cases, it may be appropriate to consider parking controls to avoid commuters to urban areas using the parking facilities that have been designed for visitors to the market towns. These controls need to be carefully thought through in order to avoid commuters choosing to drive the whole way into the urban area rather than using public transport for part of the trip. An alternative to parking control might be to provide dedicated parking facilities for bus users.

25 There is limited capacity for people to carry bikes on trains and so at rail stations secure cycle parking should be provided in order that people can cycle to and from the station. A separate county council document, *Design Spoke*, covers cycle parking in detail and should be referred to when looking at cycle parking provision.

Parking Principle 6: Parking for people using public transport

6.1 Rail stations in urban areas

Car parking at stations in urban areas may be appropriate. Provision will need to be assessed in the light of demand and other factors including land availability and other travel options. Picking up/dropping off facilities should be provided. There is an expectation that parking will be charged.

Secure cycle parking should be provided to meet demand. A proportion of this should be in the form of bike lockers.

6.2 Rail stations in rural areas or in towns

Long-stay parking provision at stations may be appropriate, particularly in areas where public transport services are not so good. There should be provision of picking up/dropping off facilities. There is an expectation that parking will be charged, although an assessment would need to consider any knock-on effects such as displacement of all-day parking into other nearby areas.

Secure cycle parking should be provided to meet demand. A proportion of this should be in the form of bike lockers.

6.3 Bus stations in urban areas

Car parking at bus stations/interchanges in urban areas may be appropriate. Provision will need to be assessed in the light of demand and other factors including land availability and other travel options. Picking up / dropping off facilities should be provided. There is an expectation that parking will be charged.

Secure cycle parking should be provided to meet demand. A proportion of this should be in the form of bike lockers.

6.4 Bus interchanges in towns

In some towns where there is evidence that people use free parking facilities in the town in order to commute onwards by bus into the urban centres, there may be a need to consider the provision of car parking facilities for the bus interchange / services.

Secure cycle parking, with a proportion in the form of bike lockers, may be appropriate.

Coach and bus parking and facilities in major towns and at tourist hotspots

26 Many visitors arrive in the urban areas by coach. Coach parties may be visiting the town itself or visiting a particular attraction. Coaches will need access into the town with a dropping-off/pick-up point close to, or at, the attraction they are visiting. As well as needing dropping-off facilities close to these attractions, the coaches will need a place to park longer-stay before returning to pick up their passengers. parking areas will ideally include facilities such as restrooms. In the Norwich area longer-term coach parking at

a designated park and ride site is being progressed to overcome the lack of suitable long stay coach parking within Norwich city centre.

Parking Principle 7: Coach and bus parking

7.1 Coach parking

Parking for long-distance buses and coaches is appropriate for major centres or other areas attracting large numbers of coaches. Parking should be conveniently located to, but not necessarily at or adjacent to, dropping-off areas and include facilities such as restrooms.

Cycle parking

27 *Connecting Norfolk* aims to secure a modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport such as cycling. However, people are only likely to cycle if they are confident that there are adequate facilities to put their bikes at, or close to, their destinations. Hence it is important that cycle parking is available at places including transport interchanges, workplaces, shopping centres or visitor attractions. The standard and quality of provision at each of these will be dependent on a number of different factors including how long people will leave their bikes for.

28 A separate county council document, *Design Spoke*, covers cycle parking in detail and should be referred to when considering cycle provision. Parking at interchanges is covered in Parking Principle 6.

Parking Principle 8: Cycle parking

Sufficient bicycle parking, both covered and uncovered, should be provided to meet demand. A proportion of this should be secure cycle storage accessible to both casual and long term commuter users, and the remainder of the Sheffield stand type, meeting minimum spacing requirements.

Facilities for Heavy Goods Vehicles

29 Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) which operate from within the county have to operate from licensed premises; this is generally where HGVs are stored / parked overnight or when not out on business. The county council provides transport advice to the traffic commissioner on HGV operator

licensing proposals, which includes an assessment of the adequacy of the site for the number of HGVs (tractor and trailer units) proposed. These facilities are provided by the operator.

30 In addition to this, there may be some HGVs which, whilst on business in the county need to stop overnight. There is some limited evidence of vehicles using laybys. Generally this does not cause a problem, although it's unlikely there will be wash facilities or toilets for the drivers. However, in some cases, it might cause a worry to adjacent residents or a nuisance if the unit has a generator going overnight for refrigeration purposes. Some district councils have secured local bylaws which prevent overnight parking in some lay-bys. The county council would not usually introduce parking restrictions in such cases due to the practical enforcement issues this would create.

31 Although in principle, subject to consideration of the detail, dedicated overnight/rest facilities for HGV drivers are supported, there will be an issue about the cost of constructing and ongoing running of the facilities. Local authorities would not generally provide or run the facilities.

Parking Principle 9: Facilities for Heavy Goods Vehicles

9.1 HGV Layover/rest facilities

Facilities for HGVs would in principle be supported provided there is evidence of need and the costs of provision and ongoing running can be met. These will include appropriate facilities such as toilets and shower facilities.

9.2 HGV loading/unloading facilities in towns and urban areas

Adequate loading facilities either on or off-street within town and urban centres should generally be provided, although consideration will need to be given in each case to the competing demands for kerb space (or off-street facilities).

Motorbike parking

32 Although motorbikes (including mopeds) currently form a small proportion of the vehicles on the roads, they nevertheless provide a travel choice for people who don't want to use, or can't afford to run a car. This

might include young people who are able to run a moped before being able to drive a car.

Parking Principle 10: Motorbike parking

Facilities for motorbike parking are appropriate either on-street or of-street in the centres of market towns and urban areas. Provision will need to take account of factors such as demand and other competing demands for kerb space.

General Principles

Adequate maintenance of signs, lines and orders

33 It is important that it is clear to the public the restrictions that are in place. For this reason alone, the signs, lines and traffic regulation orders should be kept in good order and up to date. In addition, *Connecting Norfolk* identifies maintaining the existing asset as a priority whilst, as part of taking on powers for civil parking enforcement (CPE) a review of Traffic Regulation Orders and signing has been undertaken to ensure that they are all in order and that parking restrictions are able to be enforced. In the future the county council will be adopting map-based schedules for traffic regulation orders, which will be an important part of the effective ongoing management of traffic regulation orders.

Parking Principle 11: Maintenance

The county council will endeavour to ensure that signs and road markings for on-street waiting and loading restrictions are inspected in accordance with the Transport Asset Management Plan, and that Traffic Regulation Orders are maintained, accurate and up to date.

Quality of parking provision

34 Parking provision needs to be perceived as safe and secure in order that people feel confident using it, and customers will expect a certain quality of provision, particularly where they have to pay to use the facility. These principles do not set out quality standards as it's considered that this should be decided on a case-by-case basis. However, in the design of parking provision, consideration should be given to, amongst other things, lighting,

ease of use of pay machines, including for people using a wheelchair or with other disabilities, whether it's necessary to cover the facility with CCTV, whether the facility should be staffed, the quality of information including about charges or time restrictions, and condition of the car park surfacing.

Parking Principle 12: Quality of parking provision

All parking provision should be of an acceptable quality, easy for everyone to use and designed and maintained to give users the confidence that it is safe and secure.

Information about and signing to facilities

35 The amount of parking and the restrictions imposed can be an important factor in determining how people choose to travel and consequently the environment within the town or city centre. Drivers circulating around town centres trying to find parking, or trying to find free (no-cost) parking spaces, can cause congestion. This can be particularly aggravated where drivers queue on the road for car parking, blocking the free circulation of other traffic.

36 Providing drivers with information about car parking can be helpful to address the issues. This information can take many forms including: static direction signs to parking facilities; variable message signs indicating how many spaces are available at car parks, on a real-time basis; or web-based information. Signing is useful, particularly as part of a settlement-wide plan.

Parking Principle 13: Information about and signing to facilities

Adequate signing and information about car parking facilities should be considered where this will help motorists and traffic management within the settlement.

Parking for events and occasions

37 Special events like the Royal Norfolk Show, football matches, firework displays or even Christmas shopping can attract large numbers of motorists within a very short time period. It is very important that events like this are properly co-ordinated and managed to avoid road safety or congestion issues. In Norwich for example traffic marshals are employed at peak Christmas

shopping periods to manage car park queues and avoid queuing vehicles blocking the road network.

Parking Principle 14: Parking for events and occasions

Where events or occasions will attract large numbers of motorists within short periods of time, event management plans will need to be worked up and agreed to manage traffic flows and maintain safety.

Timing of restrictions – including seasonal restrictions

38 Many on-street restrictions apply only to busier periods when there is a need to manage the traffic. Typically, this will apply in towns and urban areas when restrictions have been implemented during daytime hours to keep them free of parked cars and hence keep traffic moving. During the quieter evening and night time periods parking may be acceptable to meet demand from, especially, residents. The periods of these restrictions will vary from place to place dependent on the local circumstances. (Typically, restrictions might apply from 8am to 6pm, or 7am to 7pm.) Although the time period might vary from town to town, care should be taken to ensure that restrictions apply consistently across the whole town (ie the time period is the same on different roads across the area). This will avoid motorists being confused about which time period applies to different streets and will make enforcement more practicable. However, it is accepted that different time restrictions may be necessary to cater for the different parking demand characteristics of a town centre compared to the seafront areas of coastal towns and villages.

39 Similarly, where seasonal waiting restrictions apply, the time period (eg 1 April – 30 September) should be consistent across a town or urban area to avoid confusion.

Parking Principle 15: Timing of restrictions – including seasonal restrictions

The time period of daytime only on-street waiting restrictions should be the same across the town or urban area (eg 8am-6pm). However, the times may be different for different towns, and time periods for seafront areas may be different from the town centre areas of a coastal town or village.

The time period of any seasonal waiting restrictions should also be consistent across a town or urban area (eg 1 April-30 September).

Parking around schools

40 Parking around schools is a particularly problematic issue. It may generally be appropriate to manage this parking through on-street waiting restrictions and school-keep-clear markings. However, the restrictions introduced will be dependent on the particular circumstances, to be decided in conjunction with the local community and the school.

Parking Principle 16: Parking around schools

On-street parking restrictions and school-keep-clear markings may be appropriate around schools. The measures will be dependent on the individual circumstances and decided in conjunction with the local community and the school.