

NORTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP JOINT SUB COMMITTEE TRAFFIC REGULATIONS

**8 MARCH 2012
AT COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL
10.30 AM**

Present: - Councillor Susan Barker (Uttlesford District Council)
Councillor Penny Channer (Essex County Council)
Councillor Martin Hunt (Colchester Borough Council)
Councillor Robert Mitchell (Braintree District Council)
Councillor Pam Sambridge (Tendring District Council)
Councillor Wendy Schmitt (Braintree District Council)
Councillor Penny Smith (Epping Forest District Council)

Apologies: - Councillor Tracey Chapman (Essex County Council)
Councillor Tony Hall (Harlow District Council)

Also Present: - Mr. Trevor Degville (Parking Partnership)
Mr. Qasim Durrani (Epping Forest District Council)
Mr. Robert Judd (Colchester Borough Council)
Mr. Joe McGill (Harlow District Council)
Mr. Paul Partridge (Braintree District Council)
Ms. Liz Saville (Essex County Council)
Mr. Andrew Taylor (Uttlesford District Council)
Mr. Ian Taylor (Tendring District Council)
Mr. Shane Taylor (Parking Partnership)
Mr. Richard Walker (Parking Partnership)
Mr. Matthew Young (Colchester Borough Council)

Apologies: - Ms. Lou Belgrove (Parking Partnership)
Mr. John Gilbert (Epping Forest District Council)
Mr. Michael Perry (Uttlesford District Council)

4. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Barker, in respect of being a Member of Essex County Council, declared a personal interest in the following items.

5. Public questions and Statements

Ms. Nicki Woolf attended the meeting to give her support to the opportunity to approve the Villa Road – Stanway, Colchester Scheme (reference 18). Ms. Woolf explained that the lack of parking restrictions in this area caused problems for pupils and parents crossing the road in the vicinity of Stanway Primary School, and there had been many incidents in this area over the

years with inconsiderate motorist's blocking views, mounting kerbs and generally causing problems to pedestrians.

Mr. Young (Colchester) confirmed that Colchester would be putting forward the aforementioned scheme for approval under item 9 of the agenda.

Ms. Woolf was told if the scheme is approved then the implementation can, according to the complexity of a scheme take from between 6 – 18 months to complete.

The Chairman confirmed to Ms. Woolf that once the decision to adopt the scheme was approved, officers would notify her on the progress of implementation.

6. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2011 was confirmed as a correct record.

7. Traffic Order making process – Department for Transport review

Mr. Richard Walker (Parking Partnership) introduced the report that provided members with details of the Traffic Order making process being reviewed by the Department of Transport, and that was subject to a consultation that closes on 23 April 2012. The Committee was asked to consider and determine how the Partnership should respond to the consultation.

The consultation was to determine a process that was more flexible in its approach to allowing traffic authorities to decide on the appropriate methods to use when publicising and consulting on Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs).

Councillor Barker said she would prefer a one-off advertisement, with a letter of notification to residents within 500 metres of the proposed scheme.

Councillor Schmitt was all in favour of web-based publishing on Council / Parish websites that had a far better chance of reaching local people. Councillor Sambridge agreed, saying the Tendring District Council website was a popular choice of communication. Mr. McGill (Harlow) confirmed that Harlow receive a far greater percentage of web-based responses.

Councillor Mitchell agreed with Councillor Barker and Schmitt, saying web-based advertising could be map-based, much clearer to the enquirer and also allowed the person to respond electronically. It was agreed newspaper advertisements is limiting and cannot provide the mapping information or the electronic response. Councillor Mitchell also felt a person responding electronically should receive an electronic reply, not a letter.

Councillor Hunt said whilst newspaper advertisements is limiting, it did provide information to those without on-line facilities, and it was important that advertising did reach all people. Mr. McGill (Harlow) said it was also important that whilst web-based advertisements is the way forward, provision should be made to provide the information to disability groups e.g. those unable to read from the web-site.

Mr. Walker (Parking Partnership) said he strongly expected the consultation to confirm the comments of members, that this review of process was long overdue. He suspected it would not be very long before the Department of Transport would indicate to traffic authorities the outcomes of the consultation.

Mr. Taylor (Uttlesford) said the Partnership's response should demonstrate that what it proposed would increase participation.

RESOLVED that the NEPP Joint Sub-Committee;

i) Noted the report on the Traffic Order making process, including the consultation document entitled: Traffic Orders: Simplifying the process.

ii) Agreed that the consultation response should confirm its acceptance for web-based advertising. It was also agreed that letters of notification should be sent to residents within 500 metres of the proposed scheme, and advertising should encompass equality and diversity needs.

8. Traffic Regulations Sub Committee – Decision Protocol

Mr. Walker (Parking Partnership) introduced the report that provided members with details of the protocol for decisions made by the Sub-Committee.

In terms of the current situation and the procedure flowchart shown in the agenda papers, Mr. Walker said the Parking Partnership is now at point B, seeking a formal decision.

Responding to a question over the scope of regulations which the Committee could decide, Mr. Walker (Parking Partnership) confirmed that the Committee may decide in regard to parking permissions and waiting restrictions on any highway or road to which the public have access, land maintained at public expense but not including other traffic regulations such as those for moving vehicles, those on bridleways and byways or public footpaths.

Ms. Saville (Essex County Council) explained that in regards to the work of the Parking Partnerships and the Local Highway Panels, there was no overlapping of their responsibilities. Essex County Council is working to develop the Terms of Reference of the Highway Panels, and there is a clear separation of duties for Parking Partnerships and Highway Panels (or their equivalent). Essex County Council will continue to reserve the right to agree Traffic Regulation Orders under Highway Safety grounds or major developments funded by 106 agreements. The schemes approved by Essex County Council would nevertheless be processed by the Parking Partnerships on Essex County Council's behalf. Ms. Saville and Councillor Channer (Essex County) said the new reporting and decision making process is being developed to run efficiently and would provide a separation of duties for the Parking Partnerships and Highway Panels.

Mr. Young (Colchester) confirmed that Colchester used the Local Highway Panel to present for consideration the list of schemes to be presented to the Parking Partnership for adoption. This was only a temporary arrangement, to provide transparency and accountability to the process, but in the future it is envisaged that a sub-committee of the current Finance and Audit Scrutiny Panel will be introduced to deal with this work. Mr. Young also confirmed that it was agreed locally not to present to the Parking Partnership any schemes for adoption that scored below 20 points. Mr. Walker said this path of action was used to bring Colchester list down to a manageable level, for local consideration before presenting to the Parking Partnership. Mr. Taylor (Tendring) felt this extra level of local reporting further complicated what was already a complex process. Councillor Barker said it would be for districts to process this work in accordance with their own local arrangements, as would be the case for Uttlesford, a point agreed by Councillor Smith (Epping) and Councillor Schmitt (Braintree).

Councillor Barker requested officers to provide an overview of parking and how the scheme works to the next meeting on 22 March 2012. Mr. Walker (Parking Partnership) confirmed that he has slides available for districts to provide their own presentations at a local level.

RESOLVED that the Sub Committee agreed to approve and adopt the protocol with regard to making decisions on Traffic Regulation Orders for North Essex.

9. Traffic Regulation Orders - amendments made under urgent powers

RESOLVED that the Traffic Regulation Orders Sub-Committee noted the following decision 'The Essex County Council (Audley End Road)(Temporary Clearway) Order 2012', taken under delegated powers.

10. Parking Traffic Regulation Orders for Adoption

Councillor Barker thanked Mr. Taylor (Parking Partnership) for completing the schedule of work within the agreed timeframe and presented to this meeting for decision.

Mr. Walker (Parking Partnership) introduced the schedule of Parking Traffic Regulation Orders, reference 2011/JPC/N – T/02/04. The schedule (see below) of new parking regulation schemes was presented to the Parking Partnership Committee's Sub Committee for consideration and adoption, in accordance with its approved protocol.

Councillor Barker explained that the overall schedule currently had 53 schemes listed for adoption though at present the average cost to implement a scheme could only be estimated. In order that the Parking Partnership could retain an exact control on expenditure that would also provide a contingency for exceptional unforeseen circumstances, Councillor Barker suggested that the first tranche of schemes to be adopted should include four schemes put forward by each district, plus those agreed by the Sub-Committee where the scheme's implementation would be externally funded. This will provide an agreement to go forward with approximately half of the schemes in the schedule, would provide officers time to get a more accurate assessment of the costs to implement individual schemes, and would provide the opportunity for a second tranche of schemes to be presented for adoption at the start of 2012/13.

Following discussions on 'externally funded schemes', members appreciated the concerns expressed by Mr. Taylor (Tendring) that greater clarification was needed to understand what self funded schemes would be included and the criteria for inclusion, understanding that self-funded or not, there was still a resource needed within the Partnership to complete the work.

Mr. McGill (Harlow) was surprised that having got to such an advanced stage, that the Sub-Committee was now putting a limit on the number of schemes each district could put forward for adoption, believing to delay the work was foolhardy. Mr. McGill said Councillor Hall, who was unable to attend the meeting, was in the knowledge that all the schemes listed in the schedule would go forward for approval.

Mr. Walker (Parking Partnership) confirmed to Mr. Durrani (Epping Forest) that whilst only four of 15 schemes that Epping Forest had ranked is listed on the schedule the remaining 11 schemes will be added to the schedule and will go forward for decision at the next Sub-Committee meeting when the second tranche of schemes are considered for adoption.

Having determined the method by which schemes within the schedule would be included for approval, deferral or rejection, each district put forward their respective schemes for approval. The following schedule notes the decision taken on each individual scheme as follows, Approved (A), Deferred (D) or Rejected (R).

RESOLVED that the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Sub Committee;

- i) Considered Schedule 1, the list of individual Traffic Regulation Order Schemes presented for decision, in accordance with the approved protocol.
- ii) Decided the individual schemes to be 'approved'. An 'approved' scheme is noted as 'A' in the final column of the attached schedule.
- iii) Agreed to all those schemes being deferred or omitted from the current schedule, to go forward as part of the Future Work Programme to the next meeting of the TRO Sub-Committee.
- iv) Noted the 'Other Schemes' brought to the TRO Sub-Committee's attention in schedule 3 of the report.

11. Any other business

The Sub-Committee agreed to meet again in the first or second week of June 2012, date and venue to be agreed, to consider the second tranche of Traffic Regulation Orders schemes for adoption, to be followed by a meeting of the North Essex Parking Partnership in late June.

Mr. Walker (Parking Partnership) confirmed that officers from the Parking Partnership would be attending an award function in London on Friday 9 March. The Essex Parking Partnership had been shortlisted for the National Parking Award. Councillor Barker said it was to the Parking Partnership officers credit that their hard work had been recognised by their short listing and wished them good luck.

In response to Mr. Durrani (Epping Forest), Ms. Saville (Essex County) confirmed that the route of the Olympic Torch Procession would be a 'rolling road block' supervised by the Police, and that it would not be subject to a Traffic regulation Order.

Schemes presented for decision

Reference Number	District	Name of Scheme	Type of Restriction and brief summary	Funded	Priority for District	Score	Approved (A) / Deferred (D) / Rejected (R)?
1.	Uttlesford	Chelmsford Road, Hoblongs-Great Dunmow	Introduction of residents parking scheme to serve row of terraced properties with no current parking	N	1	38	A
2.	Uttlesford	Cambridge Road- Stansted	This scheme was originally with Essex County Council - Details of the scheme have been requested but not yet received but involve tweaks to the current scheme in place		2	51	A
3.	Uttlesford	Belmer Road-Stansted	Clearway - To prevent congestion by motorists parking to view the aeroplanes taking off from the nearby runway	Y	3	40	A
4.	Uttlesford	Common Hill-Saffron Walden	Creation of dual use bays in current limited waiting bays to create spaces for residential use. (Ashdon Road bay adjustments needed too)		4	20	A
5.	Braintree	Brise Close-Braintree	Waiting restriction to prevent commuter parking and no waiting junction protection		1	25	A
6.	Braintree	Church Street/Chalks Road-Witham	Removal of 6 metres of residents parking bay and upgrade 18 metres of single yellow line to no waiting at any time to allow buses and other large vehicle to exit corner unhindered by parked vehicles.		2	32	A
7.	Braintree	Walnut Drive/Homefield Way-Witham	Further monitoring required over a suggested 3 month period to ascertain if requested junction protection is warranted			-	D
8.	Braintree	Dudley Road-Earls Colne	Further monitoring required over a suggested 3/6 month period to ascertain if requested double yellow line restriction is warranted			-	D
9.	Harlow	Templebank	Extend the existing no waiting restriction throughout the full length of Temple Bank		1	-	A
10.	Harlow	Wych Elm	Install two dedicated parking bays immediately outside the local funeral director to allow bereaved families up to 2 hours parking	Y	2	-	A
11.	Harlow	Wych Elm	Transfer the limited waiting parking bays on the exit road of the one way system to the other side of the road as requested by local businesses	Y	3	-	A
12.	Harlow	Tripton Road/Westfield	Introduction of limited waiting on Tripton Road and West Field outside St Marks School		4	-	A
13.	Harlow	Park Lane	Introduce a resident permit zone		5	-	A
14.	Harlow	Moorfield/Parningdon Road	Introduce junction protection		6	-	A

Reference Number	District	Name of Scheme	Type of Restriction and brief summary	Funded	Priority for District	Score	Approved (A) / Deferred (D) / Rejected (R)?
15.	Colchester	Dedham High Street	Introduce no waiting restriction around the area near the War Memorial for both road safety and aesthetic reasons		2	38	A
16.	Colchester	Eudo Road	Introduce no waiting at any time and limited waiting bays	Y	3	37	A
17.	Colchester	Victoria Esplanade-West Mersea	Extension of current no waiting and no loading restrictions to prevent parking close to "blind" bend	Y	4	30	A
18.	Colchester	Villa Road -Stanway	Extension of current no stopping school keep clear restrictions to include north side of carriageway. Additionally a small amount of no waiting at any time is required to close gap a car length gap between current no waiting and school keep clear restrictions on south side of carriageway		5	29	A
19.	Colchester	Coventry Close/Exeter Drive/Riverside Estate	Increase of current no waiting restriction to prevent parking at weekends		6	26	A
20.	Colchester	Lion Walk Underground Area	Reinstatement of no waiting at any time restriction - Temporary TRO expired and restriction not made permanent by ECC	Y	7	25	A
21.	Colchester	Hakewill Way	No waiting restrictions along run up to traffic island/grass verge area in centre of road		8	22	D
22.	Colchester	Southfields and Forge Street Dedham	No waiting junction protection to be installed following recommendations from Parish Council		9	19	D
23.	Colchester	Wryneck/Hollymead/Fieldview Close-associated roads close to hospital	Investigation into appropriate scheme to prevent hospital staff/visitor parking in associated roads		1	47	A
24.	Tendring	Clarkes Road -Dovercourt	Waiting restriction and junction protection as parked vehicles causing line of site issues			-	D
25.	Tendring	Queensway -Holland on Sea	Extend junction protection to first driveway as vehicles parking and using shops are causing congestion		2	27	A
26.	Tendring	Milton Road- Lawford	Junction protection due to parked vehicles obstructing junction exit			25	D
27.	Tendring	Station Road- Lawford	Station Road Lawford from Riversiden Avenue West to Victoria Crescent (commuter parking)			28	D
28.	Tendring	Trinity Street- Mistley	Waiting Restriction-free flow of traffic and motorist site line			31	D
29.	Tendring	Cross Roads at the Wagon at Wix	Introduce waiting restrictions to stop dangerous parking by pub users at the crossroads in village		3	25	A
30.	Tendring	Fronks Road, First, Second, Third Avenue and Elmhurst Road	Junction protection needed at majority of roads present/mentioned			-	D

Reference Number	District	Name of Scheme	Type of Restriction and brief summary	Funded	Priority for District	Score	Approved (A) / Deferred (D) / Rejected (R)?
31.	Tendring	Quay Street- Manningtree	Change some bays to limited waiting for a trial period to encourage footfall to local businesses			36	D
32.	Tendring	Kings Quay Street- Harwich	Remove SYL Mon - Sat provide parking - limited waiting or unrestricted			-	D
33.	Tendring	Stephenson Road	Introduce DYL junction protection at entrance to Headinghams Bus Co.			22	D
34.	Tendring	Colchester Road- Elmstead Market	Introduce parking to wide pavement area -		4	NEPP	A
35.	Tendring	Promenade Way- Brightlingsea	Junction protection to car park entrances, seasonal SYL to create passing places			25	D
36.	Tendring	East Terrace- Walton	Clarify existing Order and / or replace with parking 24 hours no return in 1 hour - no HGV's, coaches, caravans, campervans			-	D
37.	Tendring	Cliff Parade- Walton	As above			-	D
38.	Tendring	Kingsway -Dovercourt	Extend 1hr ltd waiting to 2hrs			-	D
39.	Tendring	Station Road -Dovercourt	Extend 1 hour limited waiting to 2 hours			-	D
40.	Tendring	Frobisher School -Jaywick	Bus Stop Order and No Stopping Order		1	45	A
41.	Tendring	Cambridge Road -Clacton (Clacton Residents Parking)	Residents only parking-one off consultation			-	D
42.	Tendring	Waddeson Road- Dovercourt (Dovercourt Residents Parking)	Residents only parking-consultation required			-	D
43.	Tendring	New Pier Street- Walton (Walton Residents Parking-all roads below)	Residents only parking-consultation needed on all roads below as part of larger scheme			-	D
44.	Tendring	West Road- Walton	Residents only parking			-	D
45.	Tendring	Saville Street-Walton	Residents parking request due to limited spaces during seasonal restriction in place			-	D
46.	Tendring	Martello Road-Walton	Residents parking request			-	D
47.	Tendring	Church Road-Walton	Residents parking request due to limited spaces during seasonal restriction in place			-	D
48.	Tendring	Garden Road- Walton	Waiting Restriction			-	D
49.	Tendring	Portobelle Road -Walton	Dual use the taxi rank to allow Goods Vehicles (Tesco) vehicles to park without causing disruption			-	D

Reference Number	District	Name of Scheme	Type of Restriction and brief summary	Funded	Priority for District	Score	Approved (A) / Deferred (D) / Rejected (R)?
50.	Epping	Torrington Drive-Loughton	Introduction of junction protection at key points in road.		1	42	A
51.	Epping	Western Avenue-Epping	Introduction of commuter type restriction-consultation needed as road omitted from recent review due to residential objections		2	37	A
52.	Epping	Hastingwood layby	Opposite MacDonalds, issues around noise caused by lorries parked overnight		3	30	A
53.	Epping	Kendal Avenue/Ravensmere-Epping	junction protection		4	25	A

11 further schemes in Epping will remain on the list until the next meeting