



# North Essex Parking Partnership

## Joint Committee On-Street Parking

Grand Jury Room,  
Colchester Town Hall, High Street  
Colchester CO1 1PJ

23 June 2022 at 1.00pm

The vision and aim of the Joint Committee are to provide a merged parking service that provides a single, flexible enterprise of full parking services for the Partner Authorities.

## **Information for Members of the Public**

### **Access to information and meetings**

- You have the right to observe meetings of the Joint Committee, including those which may be conducted online such as by live audio or video broadcast / webcast. You also have the right to see the agenda (the list of items to be discussed at a meeting), which is usually published five working days before the meeting, and minutes once they are published. Dates of the Joint Committee's future meetings are available here:  
<http://www1.parkingpartnership.org/north/committee>.
- Occasionally certain issues, for instance commercially sensitive information or details concerning an individual, must be considered in private. When this is the case an announcement will be made, the live broadcast will end, and the meeting will be moved to consider the matter in private.

### **Have Your Say!**

- The Joint Committee welcomes contributions from members of the public at most public meetings. For online meetings of the Joint Committee, a written contribution to each meeting of no longer than 500 words may be made by each person which should be submitted via the form accessed by this link, before noon on the working day before the meeting date:  
[North Essex Parking Partnership Have Your Say!](#)
- Members of the public may also address the Joint Committee directly, for up to three minutes, if they so wish. If you would like to know more about the Have Your Say! arrangements for the Parking Partnership's Joint Committee, or request to speak, please email:  
[democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk)

If you wish to address the Joint Committee directly, or submit a statement to be read out on your behalf, the deadline for requesting this is noon on the working day before the meeting date.

## North Essex Parking Partnership

### Terms of Reference of the Joint Committee

The role of the Joint Committee is to ensure the effective delivery of Parking Services for Colchester Borough Council, Braintree, Epping Forest, Harlow, Tendring and Uttlesford District Councils, in accordance with the Agreement signed by the authorities in April 2011.

Members are reminded to abide by the terms of the legal agreement: "The North Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee Agreement 2011 'A combined parking service for North Essex' " and in particular paragraphs 32-33.

Sub committees may be established. A sub-committee will operate under the same terms of reference.

The Joint Committee **will be responsible for** all the functions entailed in providing a joint parking service including those for:

- Back-Office Operations
- Parking Enforcement
- Strategy and Policy Development
- Signage and Lines, Traffic Regulation Orders (function to be transferred, over time, as agreed with Essex County Council)
- On-street charging policy insofar as this falls within the remit of local authorities (excepting those certain fees and charges being set out in Regulations)
- Considering objections made in response to advertised Traffic Regulation Orders (as part of a sub-committee of participating councils)
- Car-Park Management (as part of a sub-committee of participating councils)

The following are **excluded** from the Joint Service (these functions will be retained by the individual Partner Authorities):

- Disposal/transfer of items on car-park sites
- Decisions to levy fees and charges at off-street parking sites
- Changes to opening times of off-street parking buildings
- Ownership and stewardship of car-park assets
- Responding to customers who contact the authorities directly

The Joint Committee has the following specific responsibilities:

- the responsibility for on street civil parking enforcement and charging, relevant signs and lines maintenance and the power to make relevant traffic regulation orders in accordance with the provisions contained within the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984

### Strategic Planning

- Agreeing a Business Plan and a medium-term Work (or Development) Plan, to form the framework for delivery and development of the service.
- Reviewing proposals and options for strategic issues such as levels of service provision, parking restrictions and general operational policy.

### Committee Operating Arrangements

- Operating and engaging in a manner, style and accordance with the Constitution of the Committee, as laid out in the Agreement, in relation to Membership, Committee Support, Meetings, Decision-Making, Monitoring & Assessment, Scrutiny, Conduct & Expenses, Risk and Liability.

### Service Delivery

- Debating and deciding
- Providing guidance and support to Officers as required to facilitate effective service delivery.

### Monitoring

- Reviewing regular reports on performance, as measured by a range of agreed indicators, and progress in fulfilling the approved plans.
- Publishing an Annual Report of the Service

### Decision-making

- Carrying out the specific responsibilities listed in the Agreement, for:
  - Managing the provision of Baseline Services
  - Agreeing Business Plans
  - Agreeing new or revised strategies and processes
  - Agreeing levels of service provision
  - Recommending levels of fees and charges
  - Recommending budget proposals
  - Deciding on the use of end-year surpluses or deficits
  - Determining membership of the British Parking Association or other bodies
  - Approving the Annual Report
  - Fulfilling obligations under the Traffic Management Act and other legislation
  - Delegating functions.

*(Note: the Committee will not have responsibility for purely operational decisions such as Staffing.)*

### Accountability & Governance

- Reporting to the Partner Authorities, by each Committee Member, according to their respective authorities' separate arrangements.
- Complying with the arrangements for Scrutiny of decisions, as laid out in the Agreement
- Responding to the outcome of internal and external Audits

**North Essex Parking Partnership  
Joint Committee Meeting – On-Street**  
Thursday 23 June 2022. Meeting held in the Grand Jury  
Room, Town Hall, High Street, Colchester CO1 1PJ

**Agenda**

**Attendees**

**Executive Members:-**

Cllr Richard van Dulken (Braintree)  
Cllr Richard Freeman (Uttlesford)  
Cllr Martin Goss (Colchester)  
Cllr Alistair Gunn (Harlow)  
Cllr Sam Kane (Epping Forest)  
Cllr Dan Land (Essex County)  
Cllr Alex Porter (Tendring)

**Officers:-**

Lou Belgrove (Parking Partnership)  
Liz Burr (Essex County Council)  
Jason Butcher (Parking Partnership)  
Scott Collins (Parking Partnership)  
Rory Doyle (Colchester)  
Jake England (Parking Partnership)  
Amelia Hoke (Epping Forest)  
Owen Howell (Colchester)  
Linda Howells (Uttlesford)  
Mike Kelly (Harlow)  
Hayley McGrath (Colchester)  
Danielle Northcott (Parking Partnership)  
Samir Pandya (Braintree)  
Ian Taylor (Tendring)  
Alexandra Tuthill (Colchester)  
Richard Walker (Parking Partnership)

**Introduced by      Page**

**1. Appointment of Chairman**

**2. Appointment of Deputy Chairman**

**3. Welcome & Introductions**

**4. Apologies and Substitutions**

**5. Declarations of Interest**

The Chairman to invite Councillors to declare individually any interests they may have in the items on the agenda.

**6. Have Your Say**

The Chairman to invite members of the public or attending councillors if they wish to speak either on an item on the agenda or a general matter.

**7. Minutes**

To approve as a correct record the draft minutes of the Joint Committee meeting held on 17 March 2022.

**7-18**

*Continues overleaf*

## North Essex Parking Partnership

<b>8. NEPP Annual Governance Review and Internal Audit Report '21-22</b>	<b>Hayley McGrath</b>	<b>19-22</b>
The report considers the Governance Review and Internal Audit of the North Essex Parking Partnership for the year 2021/22.		
<b>9. Annual Review of Risk Management</b>	<b>Hayley McGrath</b>	<b>23-38</b>
This report concerns the 2022/23 Risk Management Strategy and current strategic risk register for the partnership		
<b>10. Financial Update</b>	<b>Richard Walker</b>	<b>39-42</b>
This report presents the financial position of the Partnership.		
<b>11. Traders' Permit pricing review</b>	<b>Lou Belgrove</b>	<b>43-46</b>
The report sets out recommendations for changes to Trader Permit prices.		
<b>12. Obstructive Parking</b>	<b>Richard Walker</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Verbal update on the situation regarding potential future changes relating to obstructive/pavement parking.		
<b>13. Forward Plan 2022-23</b>	<b>Owen Howell</b>	<b>47-50</b>
To note the North Essex Parking Partnership Forward Plan for 2022-23.		

# **NORTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP JOINT COMMITTEE FOR ON-STREET PARKING**

**17 March 2022 at 1.00pm**

**Held in Clacton Town Hall, Station Road, Clacton CO15 1SE.**

## **Members Present:**

Councillor Simon Crow (Colchester Borough Council)  
Councillor Richard van Dulken (Braintree District Council)  
Councillor Richard Freeman (Uttlesford District Council)  
Councillor Alastair Gunn (Harlow District Council)  
Councillor Sam Kane (Epping Forest District Council)  
Councillor Sue Lissimore (Essex County Council)      Chairman  
Councillor Alex Porter (Tendring District Council)

## **Substitutions:**

None.

## **Apologies:**

None.

## **Also Present:**

Richard Walker (Parking Partnership)  
Jason Butcher (Parking Partnership)  
Liz Burr (Essex County Council)  
Rory Doyle (Colchester Borough Council)  
Jake England (Parking Partnership)  
Amelia Hoke (Epping Forest District Council)  
Owen Howell (Colchester Borough Council)  
Linda Howells (Uttlesford District Council)  
Michael Kelly (Harlow District Council)  
Andrew Nepean (Tendring District Council)  
Samir Pandya (Braintree District Council)  
Miroslav Sihelsky (Harlow District Council)  
Ian Taylor (Tendring District Council)

## **112. Minutes**

*RESOLVED* that the minutes of the meetings held on 28 October 2021 be approved as an accurate record.

## **113. Finance Report – to end of Period 10 (January)**

Richard Walker, Group Manager, presented the report and explained the need to set the 2022-23 budget for the expected new parking partnership which was expected to succeed the current North Essex Parking Partnership [NEPP], once a new Partnership Agreement was approved by the partner local authorities.

The Group Manager informed the Joint Committee that the NEPP had received the last tranche of Government support funding. The Group Manager explained that funding levels had been calculated to cover the expected income loss, from sources such as selling parking permits, Parking Charge Notices [PCNs] and season tickets.

The NEPP had not yet returned to pre-pandemic levels of income, but income was increasing. A small outturn deficit was expected, which left the NEPP in good shape, with around £1m remaining in its reserves. It had been planned to use £18k of reserves to fund work on Traffic Regulation Orders, however this work had only cost £11k.

*RESOLVED* that the Joint Committee: -

- a) Noted the NEPP's financial position as at the end of Period 10 (January) 2022
- b) Agreed (in principle) the Base Budget for the 2022-2023 Financial Year

## **114. Permit and Pay to Park Prices to end of 2021/22 and proposed strategy for 2022/23**

Richard Walker, Group Manager, introduced the item and explained that the proposed changes to permit prices mainly applied to second and third permits for households. Costs of administering and enforcing the system for parking permits continued to rise, especially those relating to fuel and energy. These increases were mitigated somewhat by the NEPP moving to use electric vehicles [EVs]. Prices therefore needed to be adjusted in order to cover increased costs. Costs would be kept under review and, if mitigations could be found to reduce costs, pricing could be revisited and permit prices potentially reduced.

The Group Manager explained that the NEPP aimed to use pricing controls to influence and exert control over the number of applications for second and third permits for households, especially in areas where parking space was limited. The



NEPP was also working to influence a shift to the use of electronic permits, as paper permits were far more costly to issue and administer.

The Group Manager explained that the proposed strategy aimed to better-maintain the parity of 'pay to park' prices with the prices charged for off-street parking.

The Joint Committee discussed the situation regarding residents' parking permits, with views being given that the issuing of second and third permits to households often caused issues, especially where space was limited. One member argued that this could knock confidence in democratic processes where residents' parking zones existed where some households had multiple permits and others could not obtain any. It was further posited by that member that it was difficult to defend to electorates the widespread issuing of multiple parking permits and that it was reasonable to charge more for second permits, and more again for third permits. The Group Manager explained that the NEPP followed Traffic Regulation Orders [TROs] and examples were given, such as the restriction put in place by Colchester Borough Council to limit the issuing of parking permits to a maximum of two per household. It was hard to remove rights once these had been put in place, but the Group Manager noted that it might be possible to move to a system whereby the possibility of residents obtaining second and third permits be decided at local discretion on a council-by-council basis, after considering local situations and conditions. The Group Manager offered to discuss this in greater depth informally with Joint Committee members.

Concern was raised by a member of the Joint Committee that the Committee and partner authorities had not yet been shown a copy of the draft proposed new NEPP Agreement, and the Group Manager was asked where this draft was and how the Joint Committee could approve a pricing strategy for 2022-23 before it had seen the proposed new Agreement. The Group Manager explained that the draft Agreement was currently being worked on by the Legal Department of Essex County Council [ECC] and was closely based on the current NEPP Agreement. Liz Burr, Head of Network and Safety/Traffic Manager at Essex Highways, informed the Joint Committee that the County Council would send a letter of intent to the partner local authorities, if the draft new agreement was not ready by 31 March, proposing an extension of the current NEPP Agreement until the drafting and approval process for the new Agreement was completed. It had been hoped that the draft Agreement would already have been available for the partner authorities to consider, however this had not been possible.

Councillor Alex Porter [Tendring District Council] enquired as to whether the South Essex Parking Partnership [SEPP] had approved permit price changes. Liz Burr confirmed that SEPP had not considered any changes to its permit pricing at its meeting held in the previous week. The Group Manager explained that this item had been due for consideration at the NEPP meeting which had been scheduled for 9 December 2021 but which had been cancelled.

The Joint Committee discussed whether it might be appropriate to defer the two requested decisions under this item until such time as the draft new NEPP Agreement had been circulated to member authorities. Councillor Porter explained that he would not vote to approve any recommendation until he had seen the draft new NEPP Agreement. To answer questions regarding the potential effect of deferring the decisions on this item, the Group Manager explained that, in his view, there would be a new Parking Partnership, based on the views given by ECC, Braintree District Council, Colchester Borough Council and Uttlesford District Council and their agreement to participate in a new Partnership. The Group Manager explained that decision would need to be taken, regarding pricing, at some point, but that this was up to the Joint Committee, exercising powers delegated to it by ECC.

The Joint Committee discussed whether it would be possible to alter the wording of recommendation 1.2 to reflect the fact that the draft new Agreement had not yet been seen by the partner authorities and that the decision was being taken in principle, and subject to the new Agreement being ratified. Councillor Porter suggested that no decision should be made on permit prices for 2022-23 until the new NEPP agreement had been considered and ratified. The Group Manager explained that the policy and strategy framework of the current NEPP was to be taken forward and put in place for the proposed new NEPP, should it be formed, and would include the pricing framework in place as at the ending of the current NEPP, whether that be the current pricing framework, or the updated pricing as proposed in the report being considered at this meeting.

In answer to questions regarding the timing and effect of the proposed changes to pricing, the Group Manager clarified that what was proposed was to set the prices for the remainder of 2020-21 now, alongside setting the prices for the 2022-23 financial year so these could be set and advertised as quickly as possible to let residents know as soon as possible. It was expected that the 2022-23 pricing would be brought into operation in April/May 2022.

The Joint Committee discussed the efforts to move residents from paper permits to electronic permits. Committee members stressed the importance of considering those residents who relied upon the use of paper permits and cautioned any moves towards axing them. The Group Manager agreed that this was important and stressed that there were alternative ways to apply and arrange for permits, such as online, via the mobile app, or by calling the NEPP so that an officer can set up a digital permit, if the resident does not have internet access. The Group Manager stressed that a move to all digital permits would greatly increase the efficiency of patrolling and enforcement.

The Joint Committee discussed the approach taken to annual Traders' Permits, including the lowering of price by £20 in 2020-21 and the planned £10 reductions for both 2022 and 2023. The Group Manager was asked whether the initial lowering of the price had had an effect and why the two £10 reductions for 2022 and 2023 respectively weren't being implemented as a single £20 reduction in one go. The

Group Manager informed the Joint Committee that the Partnership did not receive many applications for Traders' Permits and explained that it was necessary for the Permits to apply across all partner authorities, and for the charges levied to be set so as to cover the Partnership's costs in issuing and administering them. The NEPP was still seeking the most appropriate level for the pricing of such permits and the proposed price could be changed if deemed appropriate. One Joint Committee member expressed the view that the lowering of the price for these permits had not worked and suggested that a future Joint Committee meeting could discuss the setting of Traders' Permit prices in greater detail.

A member cautioned that the needs of construction and maintenance professionals who required repeated or prolonged access to properties in residential parking permit areas should be considered when setting the details of dispensation permits.

Another member noted that residential permit pricing had been discussed previously and that this report proposed only rises or maintenance of current prices, and further to this queried why conversations regarding harmonisation of prices across the NEPP local authority areas continued when the proposed pricing for the different areas would not bring this about. The Group Manager stressed that it was important that prices charged covered the cost of patrolling and enforcement. The NEPP factored in local socio-economic factors when it considered pricing levels. Where the report mentioned price harmonisation [section 2.1], this was included as an 'aide-mémoire' to show the background to permit pricing.

The Group Manager was asked if it would be possible for the Joint Committee to be given a breakdown of the number of second and third permits issued to residential properties, split by local authority areas. The Group Manager highlighted that the new NEPP website could act as a portal for Joint Committee members and that he could ensure that this information was uploaded so that members could peruse the data.

The Joint Committee discussed the aim and purpose of the pricing strategy and the Group Manager agreed that the questions regarding this issue were wider than what was covered by this specific report. The policy regarding permit pricing was set under the overarching policy relating to harmonisation between the partner authorities' areas. Another policy which was set under that overarching policy was the Electric Vehicle Charging Policy. It was proposed to the Joint Committee that this issue be brought back to a meeting early in the life of the Joint Committee for the future NEPP (subject to a new NEPP being formed) for a more in-depth discussion on harmonisation.

Officers were asked what the legal process was for extending the current NEPP Agreement, in the eventuality that the new Agreement had not been circulated and agreed to by all partner authorities by 31 March 2022. Liz Burr, Head of Network and Safety/Traffic Manager [Essex Highways], explained that this had been raised with ECC's Legal Team who had been asked for assurance that a letter of intent could

cover this, from ECC to the Joint Committee. It was confirmed that all partner authorities would need to ratify the draft new NEPP Agreement, which was unlikely to be achievable by 31 March 2022. A further question would be put to ECC's Legal Team to confirm whether this would require a Joint Committee meeting to approve the accepting of that letter, or if the letter can be circulated and approval given by each partner. The Chairman indicated that she would be content if the advice from ECC Legal was to be that the letter of intent could be sent to all partner authorities and their approval sought online.

A Joint Committee member raised concern that the Joint Committee was being asked to approve a pricing structure for 2022-23 before the draft new NEPP Agreement had been circulated for consideration and had not been ratified by the partner authorities. The member suggested that recommended decision 1.2, which was to approve the proposed pricing for 2022-23, be removed. The Chairman asked advice as to whether 1.2 could be dropped and recommended decisions 1.1 and 1.3 taken without it. The Group Manager posited that in his view all three decisions would either have to be approved or rejected, noting that charging for permits would need to continue into 2022-23 whatever happened with regard to approval or rejection of the draft new NEPP Agreement when that was circulated to the partner authorities.

*RESOLVED* that the Joint Parking Committee: -

- a) Approves the changes to some permit prices [as shown in the report] to the end of 2021/2022 and the current NEPP Agreement
- b) Approves changes to some permit prices for the financial year 2022/23 under the new NEPP Agreement, in principle, and subject to the new Agreement being confirmed
- c) Notes that changes to 'pay to park' prices across NEPP Districts to the end of 2021/22 and beyond following the previous delegation of powers to officers to vary the on-street prices in pay to park areas at any other time in order to maintain at least parity with off-street areas.

It was noted that these resolutions were not carried nem. con. by the Joint Committee.

### **115. NEPP Surplus Fund – Project Progress and Fund Reallocation**

Richard Walker, NEPP Group Manager, presented the background to this item, which related to the decisions to spend part of the NEPP's reserve fund on project work for each partner authority, in line with section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. NEPP officers had also proposed project work, primarily involving innovation and better usage of data. This report noted changes made to some of the projects involved, including those affected or caused by the pandemic.

Jason Butcher, Parking Projects Manager [Parking Partnership], explained that the aim was to note the progress of current project work and the withdrawal of the listed projects for Epping Forest District Council and for the reallocation of the funds allocated to those cancelled projects to be used to improve the NEPP's vehicle fleet, including new electric vehicles [EVs] and the charging infrastructure which they would require. The report outlined the issues and implications involved and it was noted that existing NEPP vehicles were soon due to be replaced in any case.

A Joint Committee member argued that, with the increase in use of EVs, Government would be likely to look to recoup lost revenue, such as from reduced income from fuel duty, by levying charges on the charging of EVs or by raising road tax on EVs. Officers were asked for this to be considered and noted in the wording of the NEPP's plans and project work on this. The Parking Projects Manager explained that it was difficult to make predictions, but that the plans had made a conservative estimate as to fuel costs and it was expected that differences in cost between running petrol/diesel vehicles and EVs would be reduced over the coming eight years.

The Parking Projects Manager was queried about the use of Park Safe cars with regard to Red Routes, double yellow lines (where it was stated by a Committee member that vehicle-mounted camera options could not assist enforcement, and roadways adjacent to schools, and whether there would be a greater use of Red Routes as being enforceable through use of vehicle-mounted camera systems. The Parking Project Manager confirmed that the Park Safe cars could be used to support enforcement of yellow zig-zags placed outside schools, as well as at bus stops.

The Joint Committee was reminded that the NEPP was working on wider plans to improve enforcement outside schools, to make better use of vehicle-mounted and fixed camera technology. Limits on the number of Civil Enforcement Officers [CEOs] had meant that enforcement outside schools, and influencing long-term compliance was difficult, as motorists tended to comply whilst NEPP personnel were in attendance, but this compliance often did not carry over into times when officers were not on scene. Sites where cameras had been installed had seen improved rates of compliance overall. Jake England, Parking Manager – Data-led Services, confirmed that Park Safe cars were only able to be used to assist in enforcing certain types of restrictions. Wider use of the cars was being explored, whereby potential contraventions could be flagged up to an operator or system, with CEOs notified to enable them to attend and inspect potential situations where enforcement action might be necessary.

A Committee member asked whether the battery life of the EVs would last for the full eight years proposed in the report. The Parking Project Manger agreed that battery degradation over time needed to be considered, and that it was considered that battery failures over that timespan would be highly unlikely. The NEPP were looking at vehicles which were of a higher standard than the minimum that was thought necessary and it was explained that, in general, EV maintenance costs were much

lower than the costs incurred by alternatives. No major concerns had been identified regarding battery life.

Officers were asked whether there were any other new projects which had been inserted to the programme, above those detailed in the report. The Parking Project Manager confirmed that there had been a number of changes to the projects within the programme, with details brought to the Joint Committee's meetings where these take place. A summary of the changes, removals and additions to the projects in the programme of parking projects was offered for circulation after the meeting to those who wished to see the full list of changes.

The Joint Committee asked for more information regarding the noting, at 5.2, that funds may be needed to support EV charging infrastructure at operational bases, and the scale of these additional costs in the different local authority areas. The Parking Project Manager agreed that this was a challenge, and explained that conversations had already been held with colleagues in one local authority and as an outcome the opinions given were that it would not be appropriate for the NEPP to have its own dedicated charging infrastructure in that area. In Colchester Borough, charging resources were already available and NEPP had worked with the Borough Council to secure use of these for NEPP vehicles. Alternative charging locations were sought in other local authority areas. Assurance was given that the EVs to be used by the NEPP would have sufficient battery power to allow them to be charged in the Eastern local authorities, such as Colchester, and have sufficient range to travel to those partner authorities in the West where charging infrastructure was yet to be sourced for their use. Support from the partner authorities in the West of the NEPP area would be welcomed to help locate and obtain the ability to use charging infrastructure in their areas.

The Group Manager noted that there were growing numbers of private charging points, in addition to those provide by public authorities. An example of this was the charging infrastructure operated by Gridserve in Braintree District. Improvements had been made to the speed of charging, which would allow for EVs to quickly 'top up', especially when being operated in Harlow District, which was furthest from the vehicles' current base. The EVs identified for use by the NEPP had battery capacity for over a day of operating which meant that charging could occur in relays, with one charge point being able to accommodate three or four vehicles. The NEPP was exploring ways to change deployment patterns, and the Group Manager posited that it would be of assistance were NEPP vehicles to be able to use charging facilities in Uttlesford District, as identified by Linda Howells, Economic Development Officer [Uttlesford District Council].

*RESOLVED* that the Joint Committee: -

- a) Notes the programmed and unprogrammed project summary tables in Appendix A

- b) Notes the withdrawal of all Epping Forest District Council (EFDC) projects, following discussions with local Officers
- c) Approves the proposed use of the EFDC project funds for NEPP fleet transition to electric vehicles (EVs), necessary infrastructure or to support the delivery of existing projects.

## **116. Park Safe Car Update**

Richard Walker, Group Manager, explained that the use of electric vehicles [EVs] would bring additional efficiencies to the NEPP's operations. The NEPP continued to look to implement transformative changes to its operations. The use of Park Safe cars, which had access to a full parking database (including permit holders), brought greater efficiency in flagging up vehicles for officers to attend and investigate for potential contravention of parking restrictions. The NEPP had been a lead innovator in parking technology and aimed to continue this work, working with partners to use technology to increase efficiency and the use of officer time. The measures proposed had the potential to reduce the cost of enforcement services.

Jake England, Parking Manager – Data-led Services, confirmed that the NEPP would operate three Park Safe cars once two new vehicles are delivered, and explained how these cars would be used to identify parked vehicles for investigation by targeted foot patrols. This would allow the cars to be used to monitor all restrictions for officers to then investigate where possible contraventions are identified. Park Safe cars were currently able to operate in each local authority area, excluding Tendring District Council, and the recommended decisions included the extension of Park Safe car usage to include operation in Tendring District.

Councillor Alex Porter [Tendring District Council] argued that the recommended decision relating to noting the addition of two more Park Safe cars related to their expected delivery in April, thus going beyond the current NEPP Agreement in operation. Further to this, Councillor Porter requested that the recommendation for Park Safe cars across all six partner Districts/Boroughs be amended to exclude Tendring District, due to the stated intention of Tendring District Council's Cabinet not to accept the use of Park Safe cars in its area and to oppose any such use.

The Group Manager explained that the NEPP Joint Committee was the extant body currently tasked with decision making regarding parking, including decisions on the future of parking enforcement. The Joint Committee's powers would then transfer to whatever body succeeded it, which could reverse or amend any decisions made, but this did not prevent the Joint Committee from exercising its powers whilst the current NEPP Agreement was in operation.

Regarding the recommended decision to authorise use of the Park Safe car/s in all six Districts/Boroughs, the Group Manager underlined that the Joint Committee made decisions like this, as a body, under delegated powers from Essex County Council

and for the County Council, rather than for the individual district and borough local authorities separately. The Group Manager explained that the Joint Committee was able to make these decisions, or make decisions which diverged from the recommended decisions if it so wished.

Councillor Porter queried how the Joint Committee could make decisions for a future time after the ending of the current NEPP Agreement and before the partner authorities had been given the opportunity to examine the draft new NEPP Agreement. Councillor Porter argued that the Joint Committee had the power to make decisions which tailored enforcement provisions to each district and borough, to suit each area's own individual differences and needs, and signalled his intention to move an amendment to recommended decision 1.2, so that it stated that Park Safe cars would be deployed in five of the six North Essex districts, but not in Tendring District.

Joint Committee members requested more details from Councillor Porter as to the reasons for the opposition to the use of Park Safe cars in Tendring. Councillor Porter stated that he had the full support of his Cabinet colleagues in this opposition. The Chairman suggested that the Joint Committee could make the decision as to making possible the use of Park Safe cars in all six local authority areas, on the understanding that each individual borough and district leadership could then liaise with the NEPP as to whether they wished the Park Safe cars to operate in their area or not. This would allow for future changes in views, regarding camera vehicles, in each local authority to be reflected in whether these vehicles be used in their areas.

Councillor Porter argued that the Joint Committee should not vote on whether to approve unamended decision 1.2, as Tendring District Council disagreed with this recommended decision. Concern was raised by a member of the Joint Committee that one member of the Committee should not be able to exercise a veto power over decision making of the Committee. The Joint Committee discussed the potential implications of a partner authority opting out of using the Park Safe cars. The Group Manager confirmed that there were time and efficiency savings to be made from using vehicles to speed up the patrol rounds of officers, rather than relying on slow foot patrols which were more costly.

Councillor Porter accused the Joint Committee of being pointless as, in his view, it was Essex County Council which made the decisions, rather than the Partnership, and asked what the point of the Joint Committee was, if other members of the Joint Committee opposed the views of Tendring District Council's Cabinet on this item.

The Chairman expressed disappointment that Tendring District Council had not raised their concerns on this item prior to the meeting, as this would have given an opportunity to address the issues raised and seek a solution. The Chairman summarised the cost implication of allowing an opt-out for local authorities regarding use of Park Safe cars, including increased cost-effectiveness of enforcement in five of the partner districts being contrasted by a less cost-effective enforcement regime



in a partner district where enforcement must be done on foot, thus causing a greater pull on resources.

Councillor Porter informed the Joint Committee that Tendring District Council would be happy to take over parking enforcement in the District and had offered to deploy its own staff to enforce parking regulations, at no cost to the County Council, stating that an agreement in principle had been drafted, but no further progress had been made on this. In light of this, it was the view of the Cabinet of Tendring District Council that the current arrangements regarding enforcement be kept, and Park Safe cars not deployed in Tendring.

The Joint Committee queried whether the decision being recommended could be deferred, potentially to be taken by a new NEPP, should an Agreement be ratified by the partner authorities for a new NEPP.

The Group Manager asked whether the opposition from Tendring District Council's Cabinet to the Park Safe cars stemmed from camera vehicles issuing PCNs [parking charge notices] themselves, and what the difference was between vehicle mounted cameras and the fixed cameras already mounted in places such as outside the school in Dovercourt. Councillor Porter reiterated Tendring District Council's offer to take on parking enforcement operations and argued that he did not need to justify what he was saying, as justification had not been given as to why this recommended decision was necessary. It was argued that the use of cameras was revenue raising, employing fewer staff, and collecting more money. Tendring District Council did not want this.

The Chairman proposed that recommended decision 1.2 be deferred in order to allow a full consideration to be made and an expanded report to be brought back for decision at a future meeting, in order to ensure that necessary parking enforcement operations could continue in Tendring District. The Parking Manager for Data-led Services suggested that the first recommended decision, to note the new Park Safe cars, could be taken at this meeting and that the second decision, regarding areas of operation for the cars, be deferred so that he and the NEPP could engage with the concerns of Tendring District Council in order to seek mitigations and solutions to alleviate any fears. The Group Manager concurred with this suggested approach.

**RESOLVED** that the Joint Committee: -

- a) Notes the addition of two new Park Safe cars (CCTV camera cars) and the imminent upgrades enabling patrols of permit parking areas, scheduled for delivery in April 2022, along with other upgrades in the forward plan
- b) Defers any decision regarding whether Park Safe cars should be deployed across all six North Essex Districts until a future meeting, potentially of a Joint Committee operated by a successor parking partnership under a new NEPP Agreement

## **117. Update on Obstructive Parking**

Richard Walker, Group Manager, explained that there had been no news or developments since the previous meeting, in October 2021, and provided the background to this matter and the consultation and potential Government action to decriminalise obstructive parking offences. The Department for Transport continued to consider the digital management of Traffic Regulation Orders which, it was noted, was something which was already done in Essex. The potential options for changes to enforcement were given, with the NEPP favouring the option to decriminalise obstructive parking and enable NEPP officers to carry out enforcement actions, alongside the Police, where this was felt to be appropriate. The NEPP did not favour a blanket ban on all pavement parking.

## **111. Forward Plan 2020-21**

Owen Howell, Clerk to the Joint Committee, explained that the proposed dates for meetings to be held in 2022-23 were dates proposed for the Joint Committee for the expected new North Essex Parking Partnership, which would succeed the current NEPP, should the new NEPP Agreement be ratified by the partner local authorities.

*RESOLVED* that the Joint Committee: -

- a) Notes and approves the North Essex Parking Partnership Forward Plan for 2021-22
- b) Notes and approves the scheduling of proposed dates for the North Essex Parking Partnership's successor Joint Committee (if such a joint committee is agreed and formed), as listed at 5.1 of the report



# North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 23 June 2022

Title: Annual Governance Review and Internal Audit

Author: Hayley McGrath, Corporate Governance Manager, Colchester BC

Presented by: Hayley McGrath

The report considers the Governance Review and Internal Audit of the North Essex Parking Partnership for the year 2021/22.

## **1. Recommended Decision(s)**

1.1. The Joint Committee is requested to:

- note the Annual Governance Review of the North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP), and;
- review and comment on the attached Internal Audit report for the North Essex Parking Partnership.

## **2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)**

2.1. The service is provided by the lead authority on behalf of the partners and it is therefore appropriate that the Joint Committee is provided with assurance that the service is being appropriately managed.

## **3. Background Information**

- 3.1. Previously the Accounts and Audit regulations required the Joint Committee to annually review the service's internal control arrangements and complete a governance statement and a small bodies return. The minimum turn-over limits have been raised and the service no longer has a duty to complete these items.
- 3.2. However, it is felt appropriate that the Joint Committee is still provided with assurances about the effectiveness of the internal control arrangements and the internal audit review forms a significant part of the review.
- 3.3. All audit reports are given one of four assurance ratings – no assurance, limited assurance, reasonable assurance or substantial assurance. This is based on the number and severity of the recommendations. A guide to assurance levels and recommendations is set out at Appendix 1.

#### **4. 2021/22 Governance Review**

- 4.1. The small bodies return required the Committee to confirm that the service had complied with several areas of governance. Therefore, the governance review has assessed the following areas:
- An adequate system of internal control was maintained, including measures designed to prevent and detect fraud and corruption.
  - Risks were appropriately assessed and controlled.
  - Accounting records and control systems were subject to an effective system of internal audit.
  - Appropriate action was taken in respect of any external and internal audit recommendations.
- 4.2. Many of the systems that the Partnership uses are managed by Colchester Borough Council and are subject to their internal control procedure and review processes. Colchester Borough Council has a duty to produce an Annual Governance Statement and this indicates that an effective system of control has been in operation during 2021/22.
- 4.3. The service continued to recover for the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic during the year, ensuring that all there were safe systems of working for all staff.
- 4.4. There were some changes to the members sitting on the joint committee during 21/22. This meant that there was a loss of experience and knowledge, which caused some initial issues at the start of the year in terms of designating the chairmanship and understanding of the committee's requirements, such as quorate numbers and ability of members to be able to make decisions. However, these issues were resolved and did not cause any governance breaches.
- 4.5. The joint agreement expired at the end of March 2022. The new agreement has yet to be finalised, however it will be backdated to 01 April 2022. This has not had an impact on the governance review for 21/22, but will be assessed as part of the review for 22/23.
- 4.6. The Parking Partnership has a risk management process, which is supported by a strategy and risk registers. The joint committee receive a separate assurance report on risk management.
- 4.7. Overall, there are adequate systems of control in place in the North Essex Parking Partnership.

#### **5. 2021/22 Audit Review**

- 5.1. The last annual partnership audit was carried out in January 2021 and the final report was issued in March 2021. The results of the audit were reported to the joint committee in June 21.
- 5.2. There were two level 2 recommendations, which resulted in a reasonable assurance rating, which was the same as the previous year. The recommendations related to:
- Re-tender of the contract for cash collection.
  - Reviews of policies and procedures.

- 5.3. Both recommendations were accepted and have been actioned. The policies will need to be reviewed in light of potential upcoming legislation changes.
- 5.4. The audit reviews of the partnership have consistently achieved a reasonable assurance rating for several years. The processes of the partnership have not changed, therefore rather than review the same areas again in 21/22, the transactions of the partnership were assessed as part of Colchester Borough Council's Key Financial Controls audit.
- 5.5. This assessed the systems and controls in place within the financial systems of the Council, including bank payments, reconciliations and payment authorisations, to confirm that these are operating adequately, effectively and efficiently. Parking partnership transactions were included in the audit sampling.
- 5.6. The Key Financial Controls audit did not identify any concerns relating to Parking Partnership transactions.
- 5.7. It is proposed that the full audit of the partnership is carried out every other year, with the accounting transactions assessed in between, as long as it continues to achieve a minimum of a reasonable assurance rating.

## **6. Conclusion and Recommendations**

- 6.1. There were no significant governance issues raised during the year and the audit process did not highlight any areas of concern that affect the overall control arrangements of the Partnership.
- 6.2. The review has demonstrated that the governance arrangements for the Partnership continue to be effective.
- 6.3. Members are asked to review and comment on the governance processes and internal audit reports.

## **7. Standard References**

- 7.1. Having considered consultation, equality, diversity and human rights, community safety, health and safety and risk management implications, there are none that are significant to the matters in this report.

## **8. Appendices**

- 8.1 Appendix 1: Key to Assurance Levels

## Key to Assurance Levels

### Assurance Gradings

Internal Audit classifies internal audit assurance over four categories, defined as follows:

Assurance Level	Evaluation and Testing Conclusion
Substantial	There is a robust system of internal controls operating effectively to ensure that risks are managed and process objectives achieved.
Reasonable	The system of internal controls is generally adequate and operating effectively but some improvements are required to ensure that risks are managed and process objectives achieved.
Limited	The system of internal controls is generally inadequate or not operating effectively and significant improvements are required to ensure that risks are managed and process objectives achieved.
No	There is a fundamental breakdown or absence of core internal controls requiring immediate action.

### Recommendation Levels

Internal Audit categories recommendations according to their level of priority as follows:

Priority Level	Staff Consulted
1.	<b>Urgent.</b> Fundamental control issue on which action should be taken immediately.
2.	<b>Important.</b> Control issue on which action should be taken at the earliest opportunity.
3.	<b>Routine.</b> Control issue on which action should be taken.
OEM	<b>Operational Effectiveness Matter.</b> Items that would be best practise / improvements but do not impact on the effectiveness of the controls.



# North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 23 June 2022

Title: Annual Review of Risk Management Report

Author: Hayley McGrath, Corporate Governance Manager, Colchester BC

Presented by: Hayley McGrath, Corporate Governance Manager, Colchester Borough Council

This report concerns the 2022/23 Risk Management Strategy and current strategic risk register for the partnership

## **1. Recommended Decision(s)**

1.1. The Joint Committee is requested to:

- endorse the Risk Management Strategy for 2022/23, and
- agree the Strategic Risk Register, subject to any requested amendments.

## **2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)**

- 2.1. Risk Management is the control of business risks in a manner consistent with the principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. It is an essential corporate governance process that ensures that both the long- and short-term objectives of the organisation are achieved and that opportunities are fully maximised.
- 2.2. It is essential that the service operates an effective risk management process which provides an assurance to all partners that it is being properly managed. As required by each partner's own code of corporate governance.

## **3. Supporting Information**

- 3.1. Risk Management is not about eliminating risk, as this would limit the ability of the service to develop and deliver its ambitions. Its purpose is to recognise the issues that could affect the achievement of objectives and develop actions to control or reduce those risks.
- 3.2. An effective risk management process is a continuous cycle of identification, controlling, monitoring and reviewing of potential risk issues.
- 3.3. For the NEPP this is governed by a strategy for managing risk that sets out the roles and responsibilities of the joint committee and officers. It also defines the types of risk, the processes to be followed and the review arrangements.
- 3.4. The main document is the risk register which captures details relating to both strategic and operational risks and the actions to be undertaken to control those risks. The strategic risks are reported to the joint committee and the operational risks are managed by the service.

#### **4. Review of the Risk Management Strategy**

- 4.1. The strategy should be reviewed annually to ensure that it is still relevant to the service and that it meets the governance objectives. Therefore, a review has been carried out and the draft strategy for 2022/23 has been attached at appendix 1 for approval.
- 4.2. It is felt that the strategy continues to meet the needs for the service therefore no changes have been made to the process.

#### **5. Review of the Risk Register**

- 5.1. The register is attached at appendix 2, this sets out the strategic risks, which are scored for impact and probability, enabling the risks to be ranked, so that resources can be directed to the key areas.
- 5.2. The register was last reported to this committee in June 2021. The register has since been reviewed with the Parking Services Manager and then by the partnership client officers to ensure that it continued to reflect the issues faced by the service.
- 5.3. Following the review by client officers the following changes are recommended for consideration by the committee (comments in red on the register):
- 5.4. Remove risks 1.2 and 1.9, and replace with a new combined risk around financial risk, especially the current cost of living crisis. This has been added as risk 1.23.
- 5.5. Remove risk 1.13 relating to Central Government changes. Whilst there is always the potential for changes to be made to parking legislation, there is no current indication that it would significantly impact the service.
- 5.6. Remove risk 1.20 relating to the Covid pandemic, the issues that were highlighted are now considered to be included in other risk areas as 'business as usual'.
- 5.7. Consider the wording of risk 1.22, are there any residual areas of the new agreement that are causing concern?
- 5.8. The operational risks are managed by the service and currently the highest operational risks relate to the possibility of an officer or member of the public incurring a serious injury and an interruption to the IT that is required to deliver the service.
- 5.9. It is requested that this committee reviews the remaining strategic risks to ensure that they still reflect the issues faced by the service and that they are appropriately scored.

#### **6. Standard References**

- 6.1. Having considered consultation, equality, diversity and human rights, community safety, health and safety and risk management implications, there are none that are significant to the matters in this report.

#### Appendices

Appendix 1 – North Essex Parking Partnership Risk Management Strategy 2022-23

Appendix 2 – North Essex Parking Partnership Strategic Risk Register June 2021-22



## **RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

*This document outlines the Partnership's commitment to managing risk in an effective and appropriate manner. It is intended to be used as the framework for delivery of the Risk Management function and provides guidance for officers to ensure that managing risk is embedded in all processes.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

The Service undertakes that this strategy will promote and ensure that:

1. The management of risk is linked to performance improvement and the achievement of the Partnership's strategic objectives.
2. Members of the committee and Senior Management of the Partnership own, lead and support on risk management.
3. Ownership and accountability are clearly assigned for the management of risks throughout the Partnership.
4. There is a commitment to embedding risk management into the Partnership's culture and organisational processes at all levels including strategic, project and operational
5. All members and officers acknowledge the importance of risk management as a process, by which key risks and opportunities are identified, evaluated, managed and contribute towards good corporate governance.
6. Effective monitoring and reporting mechanisms are in place to continuously review the Partnership's exposure to, and management of, risks and opportunities.
7. Best practice systems for managing risk are used throughout the Partnership, including mechanisms for monitoring and reviewing effectiveness against agreed standards and targets.
8. Accountability to stakeholders is fully demonstrated through periodic reviews of the Partnership's risks, which are reported to the committee.
9. The Risk Management Strategy is reviewed and updated annually in line with the Partnership's developing needs and requirements.

---

**Endorsement by Chairperson of the Committee**

*“The North Essex Parking Partnership is committed to ensuring that risks to the effective delivery of its services and achievement of its overall objectives are properly and adequately controlled. It is recognised that effective management of risk will enable the Service to maximise its opportunities and enhance the value of services it provides to the community. The North Essex Parking Partnership expects all officers and members to have due regard for risk when carrying out their duties.”*

***signature required***

**WHAT IS RISK MANAGEMENT**

Risk Management is the control of business risks in a manner consistent with the principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. It is an essential performance management process to ensure that both the long- and short-term objectives of the Service are achieved and that opportunities are fully maximised.

Risk Management is not about eliminating risk, as this would limit the ability of the service to develop and deliver its ambitions. Its purpose is to recognise the issues that could affect the achievement of the objectives and develop actions to control or reduce those risks. Acknowledgement of potential problems and preparing for them is an essential element to successfully delivering any service or project. Good management of risk will enable the Service to rapidly respond to change and develop innovative responses to challenges and opportunities.

‘The Good Governance Standard for Public Services’ issued by The Independent Commission on Good Governance in Public Services states that there are six core principles of good governance including ‘Taking informed, transparent decisions and managing risk’. The document goes on to state ‘Risk management is important to the successful delivery of public services. An effective risk management system identifies and assesses risks, decides on appropriate responses and then provides assurance that the chosen responses are effective’.

Appendix A outlines the risk management process.

## OWNERSHIP

The responsibility to manage risk rests with every member and officer of the partnership however it is essential that there is a clearly defined structure for the co-ordination and review of risk information and ownership of the process.

The following defines the responsibility for the risk management process within the joint parking service:

**Joint Committee** – Overall ownership of the risk management process and endorsement of the strategic direction of risk management. Responsible for periodically reviewing the effectiveness of the risk management process.

**Assistant Director Environment, Colchester Borough Council** – Advising the Joint Committee on strategic risks and ownership of the service's operational risks.

**North Essex Parking Partnership Manager** – Control and reporting of the service's operational risks. Embedding a risk management culture in the service.

**Assistant Director Corporate & Improvement Services, Colchester Borough Council** – Responsible for co-ordination of the risk management process, co-ordinating and preparing reports and providing advice and support.

**All Employees** – To understand and to take ownership of the need to identify, assess, and help manage risk in their individual areas of responsibility. Bringing to the management's attention at the earliest opportunity details of any emerging risks that may adversely impact on service delivery.

**Internal Audit, External Audit and other Review Bodies** – Annual review and report on the Service's arrangements for managing risk, having regard to statutory requirements and best practice. Assurance on the effectiveness of risk management and the controls environment.

---

## THE WAY FORWARD

### Aims & Objectives

**The aim** of the service is to adopt best practices in the identification, evaluation, cost-effective control and monitoring of risks across all processes to ensure that risks are properly considered and reduced as far as practicable.

**The risk management objectives** of the North Essex Parking Partnership are to:

- Integrate risk management into the culture of the service
- Ensure that there are strong and identifiable links between managing risk and all other management and performance processes.
- Manage risk in accordance with best practice
- Anticipate and respond to changing social, environmental and legislative requirements
- Prevent injury, damage and losses and reduce the cost of risk
- Raise awareness of the need for risk management by all those connected with the delivery of services.
- Ensure that opportunities are properly maximised through the control of risk.
- Reduce duplication between services in managing overlapping risks and promote 'best practise'.

### Strategic Risk Management

Strategic risks are essentially those that threaten the long-term goals of the partnership and therefore are mainly based around meeting the objectives of the Service Agreement. They may also represent developing issues that have the potential to fundamentally effect service provision, such as proposals to dramatically change County Council arrangements.

### Operational Risk Management

Operational risks are those that threaten the routine service delivery and those that are associated with providing the service. These could include damage to equipment and Health and Safety issues.

### Links

It is essential that risk management does not operate in isolation to other management processes. To fully embed a risk management culture, it has to be demonstrated that risk is considered and influences all decisions that the service makes. It is essential that there is a defined link between the results of managing risk and the following:

- Service Delivery Plan
- Revenue and Capital Budgets
- Annual Internal Audit Plan

---

## Action Required

The following actions will be implemented to achieve the objectives set out above:

- Embedding a risk register that identifies the strategic and operational risks and outline the actions to be taken in respect of those risks.
- Considering risk management as part of the partnership's strategic planning and corporate governance arrangements
- Ensuring that the responsibility for risk management is clearly and appropriately allocated
- Maintaining documented procedures for managing risk
- Maintaining a corporate approach to identify and prioritise key services and key risks across the partnership and assess risks on key projects.
- Maintain a corporate mechanism to evaluate these key risks and determine if they are being adequately managed and financed.
- Establish a procedure for ensuring that there is a cohesive approach to linking the risks to other management processes
- Including risk management considerations in all committee reports
- Ensure appropriate risk management awareness training for both members and officers.
- Establishing a reporting system which will provide assurance on how well the service is managing its key risks and ensures that the appropriate Members and officers are fully briefed on risk issues.
- Preparing contingency plans in areas where there is a potential for an occurrence to have a significant effect on the partnership and its business capability.
- Regularly reviewing the risk process to ensure that it complies with current national Governance Standards and Best Practice.

## REPORTING & REVIEW

To ensure that the risk management process is effective it will need to be measured and reported to the Joint Committee at least annually, with a six-monthly interim review by the Parking Partnership Manager.

The results of the Joint Committee reviews should be fed into the risk reporting process for each partner to ensure that each Authority has the necessary evidence to provide assurance for their own governance requirements.

## Appendix A

### The Risk Management Process

Risk Management is a continual process of identifying risks, evaluating their potential consequences and determining the most effective methods of controlling them and / or responding to them. The risks faced by the Service are constantly changing and the continual process of monitoring risks should ensure that we can respond to the new challenges. This process is referred to as the risk management cycle.

#### **Stage 1 – Risk Identification**

Identifying and understanding the hazards and risks facing the service is crucial if informed decisions are to be made about policies or service delivery methods. There is detailed guidance available on how to identify risks which includes team sessions and individual knowledge. Once identified a risk should be reported to the Parking Partnership Manager who will consider its inclusion on the relevant risk register. If the risk is identified in between register reviews, then it is reported to the Risk & Resilience Manager for information and the Parking Partnership Manager is responsible for managing the risk.

#### **Stage 2 – Risk Analysis**

Once risks have been identified they need to be systematically and accurately assessed. If a risk is seen to be unacceptable, then steps need to be taken to control or respond to it.

#### **Stage 3 – Risk Control**

Risk control is the process of taking action to minimise the likelihood of the risk event occurring and / or reducing the severity of the consequences should it occur.

#### **Stage 4 – Risk Monitoring**

The risk management process does not finish with the risk control procedures in place. Their effectiveness in controlling risk must be monitored and reviewed. It is also important to assess whether the nature of the risk has changed over time.

**North Essex Parking Partnership Risk Register**  
**DRAFT for committee 25 June 22**

Version 13 – June 2022

**STRATEGIC RISKS**

RISK No.	RISK	CONSEQUENCE	CONTROLS	BY WHOM	REVIEW	SCORE	Workings		Previous Workings	
							P	I	P	I
1.2	A partner resets their strategic priorities to meet future funding challenges which impacts on the arrangements for the partnership. <i>Remove, along with 1.9 ,and replace with new combined risk relating to funding and costs.</i>	Decrease in service provision / failure of the partnership. Stranded costs to be covered by the remainder of the partners.	Ensure that member authority representatives fully understand the partnership agreement and are involved in the budget setting of each authority.	Chief Finance Officer		6	2	3		
1.3	There's a change in political will of a partner that leads to them resetting their strategic priorities, which impacts on the arrangements for the partnership.	Decrease in service provision.	Ensure that performance of the partnership is appropriately reported back to each authority and the effects of withdrawing are understood.	Parking Partnership Manager	January 2023	8	2	4		

**North Essex Parking Partnership Risk Register**  
**DRAFT for committee 25 June 22**

**Version 13 – June 2022**

RISK No.	RISK	CONSEQUENCE	CONTROLS	BY WHOM	REVIEW	SCORE	Workings		Previous Workings	
							P	I	P	I
1.9	Potential future financial challenges, of reduced income and increased costs, are greater than expected. <i>Remove, along with 1.2 ,and replace with new combined risk relating to funding and costs.</i>	Inability to invest in the future of the service. Missed opportunities. Failure of the service.	Financial performance is stringently monitored, and deviancies reported to the partnership for action.	Parking Partnership Manager		10	2	5		
1.10	The partnership is subject to a major legal challenge relating to policy decision.	High financial impact of defending action. Reputation loss Reduction or withdrawal of services	All policy decisions are made in line with legal powers.	Chair of the joint committee	January 2023	4	1	4		



**North Essex Parking Partnership Risk Register**  
**DRAFT for committee 25 June 22**

Version 13 – June 2022

RISK No.	RISK	CONSEQUENCE	CONTROLS	BY WHOM	REVIEW	SCORE	Workings		Previous Workings	
							P	I	P	I
1.13	Central Government changes, from minor operational adjustments through to fundamental policy decisions, affect the ability of the partnership to deliver programmed services and meet its published financial and operational targets. <i>Recommend removal - is this actually a strategic risk, or just something that might happen?</i>	Increased challenge from the public - whose expectations are raised, increased costs of additional working, reduction in performance whilst changes bed in. With impacts as highlighted in 1.10 above.	Ensure all consultation is considered and responded to, ensure policies and procedures are aligned with any changes and future direction  Note: The risk is not considered to have materialised as anticipated however there is still potential footway parking legislation.	Chair of the Joint Committee		4	2	2		
1.15	Investment in innovation does not provide a return that matches or exceeds the investment.	Loss of financial stability and partners lose confidence in the arrangements. The Service is not able to keep pace with competitors in off street parking and cannot meet customer expectations.	Ensure that there is a robust business case for all new investment, that considers all of the options and potential failures, with financial modelling of all scenarios. Development of formal monitoring processes for all investment - that identifies deviancies to the business plan at an early stage.	Chair of the Joint Committee	January 2023	6	2	3		

RW/HJM  
 TO BE AGREED BY COMMITTEE: 23/06/22  
 NEXT REVIEW: January 2023

**North Essex Parking Partnership Risk Register**  
**DRAFT for committee 25 June 22**

**Version 13 – June 2022**

RISK No.	RISK	CONSEQUENCE	CONTROLS	BY WHOM	REVIEW	SCORE	Workings		Previous Workings	
							P	I	P	I
1.20	The impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic will be far reaching on the partnership for a significant period of time. <i>Suggest removal, the impacts of Covid, such as financial issues, are picked up under the other risks now.</i>	Significantly reduced income from off street and pcn's. Fundamental changes to working practises leading to increased operating costs. A need for partners to reduce costs/cut services. Reduced ability of partners to invest in the service.	Implementation of a specific recovery programme for the service. This should detail all of the impacts of COVID-19 and the actions / resources required to enable the service to respond to them. This should be reported to the committee on a regular basis with interim reports between committee meetings.	Parking Partnership Manager		20	5	4		
1.21	Insufficient investment in embedding innovative technology in to the service, including developing the service to reflect the advances in sustainable travel.	Opportunities to deliver service efficiencies and improvements are missed.	New technology opportunities should be monitored and assessed on a cost/benefit basis.	Parking Partnership Manager	January 2023	4	2	2		

**North Essex Parking Partnership Risk Register**  
**DRAFT for committee 25 June 22**

**Version 13 – June 2022**

RISK No.	RISK	CONSEQUENCE	CONTROLS	BY WHOM	REVIEW	SCORE	Workings		Previous Workings	
							P	I	P	I
1.22	<p>The partnership agreement expires on 31 March 2022 and heads of terms of the new agreement have been drawn up. However, the specific impacts on the partnership, such as treatment of any surpluses, are still to be defined and could have a detrimental impact on the service</p> <p><i>Is this still a risk in terms of final agreement, does it need to be amended to reflect any current concerns.?</i></p>	<p>Delivery of future projects could be impacted if the terms of the agreement are not in line with those anticipated.</p> <p>A failure of a partner to agree the new arrangements in a timely manner could lead to the service not being able to operate.</p>	<p>Ensure that there is continued engagement with ECC and the interests of the NEPP are fully understood.</p> <p>Development of a high-level timeline to show the key dates for the processes needed for agreeing/approving the new NEPP Agreement, to be shared with all members and regularly monitored.</p>	Parking Partnership Manager	January 2023	8	2	4		

**North Essex Parking Partnership Risk Register**  
**DRAFT for committee 25 June 22**

**Version 13 – June 2022**

RISK No.	RISK	CONSEQUENCE	CONTROLS	BY WHOM	REVIEW	SCORE	Workings		Previous Workings	
							P	I	P	I
1.23	<i>New suggested risk: Council contributions are not rising sufficiently to meet current and future financial challenges, including inflation rates, continued increases in service delivery costs and potential reduced income as the public look to decrease the costs of living impacts.</i>	<i>Decrease in service provision / failure of the partnership. Stranded costs to be covered by the remainder of the partners.  Inability to invest in the future of the service. Missed opportunities.</i>	<i>Ensure that member authority representatives fully understand the partnership agreement and are involved in the budget setting of each authority.  Financial performance is stringently monitored, and deviancies reported to the partnership for action.</i>	Chair of the Joint Committee	January 2023	15	3	5		

**North Essex Parking Partnership Risk Register**  
**DRAFT for committee 25 June 22**

**Version 13 – June 2022**

**IMPACT TABLE**

	Very Low	1	Low	2	Medium	3	High	4	Very High	5
Probability	<10%		10 – 25%		25 – 50%		50 – 75%		<75%	
Impact	Minimal - no interruption to service delivery < £10k		Minor - temporary disruption to service delivery £11k - £25k		Significant - interruption to part of the service £26k - £75k		Severe – full interruption to service delivery £76k - £100k		Catastrophic – complete service failure £100k<	

Minimum Score = 1 Maximum Score = 25

Low risk = 1 – 4 Medium Risk = 5 – 12 High Risk = 13 – 25

**Removed Items**

No	Risk	Date removed	Last score
1.1	A partner is not represented at a meeting or a suitable member from that authority has not attended, or the meeting is not quorate. (removed June 20)	June 20	2
1.4	Preferences of members dictates the direction of the meeting.	June 17	
1.5	Relationship between senior management and the committee deteriorates	June 17	
1.6	Lack of partnership support for shared targets.	June 19	
1.7	ECC review results in fundamental changes to the service	June 16	
1.8	Decisions are taken on a political basis as opposed to being considered on their own merits.		
1.11	Income decisions are based on outdated financial data		
1.12	Lack of agility responding to business need and demand, based on historical data in cttee reports. (removed June 20)	June 20	4

**North Essex Parking Partnership Risk Register**  
**DRAFT for committee 25 June 22**

**Version 13 – June 2022**

1.14	Selective media reporting of policy changes affects the ability of the partnership to deliver services. (removed June 20)	June 20	6
1.16	Introduction of new £1 coin	June 17	
1.17	Withdrawal of ECC funding (prior to review)	June 17	
1.18	The partner review of off-street parking arrangements could result in major changes to the arrangement	June 18	
1.19	The Senior Management review at Colchester Borough Council will result in a new lead officer (& client officer) for the service.	June 18	



# North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 23 June 2022

Title: Finance Report – End of Year and Reserves 2021/22

Authors: Richard Walker, Group Manager / Lou Belgrove, Business Manager

Presented by: Richard Walker / Lou Belgrove

The report sets out the End-of-Year financial position for NEPP from 2021/22 and the Reserve position as a result of operations during the year

## **1. Recommended Decisions Required**

- 1.1. Note the NEPP's financial position at the end the Financial Year 2021/22.
- 1.2. Note the current Parking Reserve position.

## **2. Reasons for Recommended Decisions**

- 2.1. For good governance, to ensure the future running of the service, and that NEPP on-street funds are allocated in line with its priorities and goals set out in the Development Plan.

## **3. Alternative Options**

- 3.1. Legislation dictates that on-street funds are ring-fenced in accordance with s.55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended).

## **4. Supporting Information**

- 4.1. Following the Covid-19 Pandemic and the National Government lockdowns, Service levels have now returned to pre-Pandemic levels and income is showing signs of recovery.
- 4.2. An unforeseen consequence of the temporary dip in PCN issuance has impacted on the Provision for Bad Debt; in the financial year 2020/21 the provision reduced and this was credited to the account; now levels have returned to pre-Pandemic levels this has meant a draw-down from the Reserve. This is a temporary impact, as no other PCN issuance change is predicted.
- 4.3. The usual £185k TRO (Traffic Regulation Order) costs, agreed project spend, and end of year deficit were all included and were also drawn from the Reserve.
- 4.4. At the end of the Financial Year 2021/22 an in-year deficit of £72k was recorded, due to recovering PCN levels, which has been drawn from the reserve to ensure a breakeven position at year end.
- 4.5. Details of the current NEPP financial position at the end of 2021/22 are set out in Appendix 1.

## 5. Financial Implications

- 5.1. With favourable operating conditions throughout the winter months, and with no further emergency measures imposed, the PCN income at year end has started to return to usual levels.
- 5.2. Income relating to “the debtor” (PCN income from Notices issued late this financial year but which will not be recovered until next financial year) has been included in the PCN income figure, along with the final £146k of the Income Support grant from Central Government (as an adjustment to the full year budget) – see Appendix 1.
- 5.3. Permit income continues to be monitored.
- 5.4. A wider return to the workplace has not happened post-Pandemic and levels of kerbside stays have not yet returned and has caused a shortfall in Parking Charges (kerbside) income but will be monitored for trends.
- 5.5. Despite the draw on the Reserve last financial year, little impact will be had on the planned project spend with many projects being initiated and delivered as expected.
- 5.6. Expenditure in areas for employees is currently under budget for the year due to transitional vacancies across the teams throughout the year. Recruitment has been successful and is ongoing.
- 5.7. The Supplies and Services costs are expected to come in under budget based on previous year spend and level of service provision remains unchanged.

## 6. Parking Reserve

- 6.1. The Parking Reserve is held separately and any surplus or deficit, after in-year operating costs and any provision for Bad Debt are deducted, is reflected in the table below.
- 6.2. An in-year deficit of £72k was recorded at the end of the Financial Year 2021/22 and was drawn from the Reserve to ensure a breakeven position at year end.
- 6.3. With c.£300k having been earmarked to be carried forward to support the start of any new Agreement with ECC commencing in 2022, the Reserve has effectively returned to zero, as our plans had projected in 2018.
- 6.4. The Cashflow amount remains at £100k as per paragraph 23.3 of the NEPP Joint Committee Agreement (JCA) and is part of the earmarked amount to be carried forward.
- 6.5. An illustration of the Parking Reserve at the end of 2021/22 is shown below:

### Decrim Reserve:

Cost Centre 0718:	B/F 01/04/21	In year Movements	C/F 31/03/22
DPE account (now part of Decrim Parking Reserve Balance)	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cashflow	(100,000.00)	0.00	(100,000.00)
Use of Reserves (TRO funding)		185,000.00	185,000.00
Use of Reserves (NEPP Projects)		128,013.04	128,013.04
Provision of Bad Debt - On-Street	(255,542.17)	206,600.00	(48,942.17)
Provision of Bad Debt - CCTV/Schools:		38,400.00	38,400.00
Transfer to Capital Expenditure Reserve		120,844.66	120,844.66
On-Street (surplus) / deficit	(732,101.71)	71,935.48	(660,166.23)
Balance off	(1,087,743.88)	750,793.18	(336,950.70)

## 7. Standard References

- 7.1. There are no particular publicity or consultation considerations; equality, diversity and human rights; community safety; health and safety or other risk management implications.



## Appendix 1 – On-Street Account - End of Financial Year 2021/22

2021/2022 - Year End Outturn	A	B	C	D	Notes
Provisional Outturn	2020/2021 Last Year	2021/2022 Current Year	2021/2022 Current Year	2021/2022 Current Year	
	Actual	Actual Outturn	FY Budget	Variance	
<b>On-street Account</b>					
<i>Direct costs</i>					
<b>Expenditure</b>					
Employee costs:					
Management	123	88	92	(4)	Parking Services Mgt Team staff costs and management a/c
CEOs & Supervision	1,399	1,325	1,435	(110)	CEOs & Supervisor staff & costs; small vacancy w/ spend
Back Office	425	421	446	(25)	Back Office staff costs
Data Led Services	0	226	210	15	
TRO's	134	164	138	26	TRO team staff costs
Premises / TRO Maintenance costs	329	313	228	85	R&M budget (seasonal; small expenditure anticipated)
Transport costs (running costs)	54	50	33	17	Fuel, public transport etc
Supplies & Services	437	737	896	(158)	General expenditure; includes ParkSafe car IT & TRO costs
Third Party Payments	13	19	57	(39)	Chipside and TEC bureau costs
	2,914	3,342	3,535	(193)	In Year Service expenditure total
<b>Income</b>					
Penalty Charges (PCNs)	(1,313)	(1,908)	(2,099)	190	PCNs - revised due to CEO deployment (£1,965 Last Yr) - weather
Fines (Blue Badge/Permits)	0	0	(38)	38	
Parking Permits/Season Tickets	(641)	(913)	(911)	(2)	Visitor Permits - includes new areas and fee increase last yr
Parking Charges (P&D etc)	(181)	(292)	(353)	61	Pay & Display - includes additional area and new fees
Other income	(18)	(27)	(30)	2	Misc - other works undertaken - billed at end of work
	(2,153)	(3,140)	(3,430)	289	In Year Service income total
Total Direct Costs	761	202	106	98	In Year Service net expenditure
Total Non-direct Costs	458	447	471	(24)	Corporate costs added (see table)
Sub total (in year operation)	1,219	649	577	72	Red is surplus = to be added to reserve
	(847)				
from Reserve	372				





# North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 23 June 2022  
Title: Traders Permit price review  
Author: Richard Walker, Group Manager / Lou Belgrove, Business Manager  
Presented by: Richard Walker / Lou Belgrove

The report sets out recommendations for changes to Trader Permit prices.

## **1. Recommended Decisions**

- 1.1. To approve proposed changes to the Trader Permit pricing structure to the end of 2022/23.

## **2. Reasons for Recommended Decisions**

- 2.1. NEPP set out at a previous Joint Committee a proposal to amend general permit prices across the Partnership as far as practicable to ensure income levels covered running costs with a commitment to review prices when required.
- 2.2. Following feedback from Members, it was agreed to review the Trader Permit pricing separately to that of the other permits and review the strategy and pricing structure applied to encourage uptake.
- 2.3. This report sets out a revised price for a Trader Permit for the purpose of ensuring good parking management and governance but to also assist local Traders to go about their business. This in turn will help to maintain a balanced budget to ensure the future running of the service and at the same time covers the base cost of providing permit area patrols.

## **3. Alternative Options**

- 3.1. There is an option of 'do nothing' which runs the risk of Traders continuing to opt to not buy an appropriate permit, based on current uptake, and may give the impression that NEPP does not recognise the needs of the businesses involved.

## **4. Supporting Information: Traders Permits**

- 4.1. Trader permits (or Waiver Certificates as they were originally named) were introduced to make it easier for businesses to make frequent short visits or to carry out works at properties within residential permit zones.
- 4.2. They were made available wherever a Visitor Permit would otherwise be used when providing services such as plumbing, building, electrical, gas or Estate Agents, allowing traders to make frequent stops to visit customers.
- 4.3. A Trader Permit allows traders with premises within the NEPP Partner districts, the authorised use of a permit parking place, permit parking area or limited waiting bay.

- 4.4. Traders are defined as any tradesperson or business engaged in an activity that requires a vehicle for the purpose of carrying of tools, goods or materials to a number of different locations within a Permit Parking Place/Area or Zone.
- 4.5. The permit may only be used to facilitate the traders' work duties and any other personal business is not permitted.

## **5. Proposals – Financial implications**

- 5.1. Originally the price of a Trader Permit was set at £300 per annum which was deemed a reasonable amount to allow a trader to park throughout the NEPP districts (avoiding the need for traders to end up paying twice if working near the border of two districts).
- 5.2. The Trader Permit price has always been included and reviewed as part of the more general permit price structure.
- 5.3. The previously agreed pricing plan was carried through to its conclusion and a review to set out prices for 2020 onwards was submitted, however, with the outbreak of Covid-19 permit prices were not reviewed and remained static at the 2020 prices.
- 5.4. Whilst the costs around providing the Service have increased, small increases to more called for permits have covered this and have brought the budget back on track to ensure this part of the Service operates on a cost neutral basis allowing reductions to be made elsewhere.
- 5.5. As part of the Permit Prices report, which was presented to the March 2022 Joint Committee, it was proposed that due to the current level of uptake, (see table in Appendix A) the price of a Trader Permit be gradually reduced to encourage more traders to purchase one.
- 5.6. Whilst members agreed with the reduction in price, it was felt that a larger reduction in the first instance may be of more benefit, with the prices being reviewed (if deemed necessary) in the future.
- 5.7. A new proposed Trader Permit pricing structure can be found in the table in Appendix B.
- 5.8. The prices proposed for the remainder of 2022/23 are based on an assumption that the permit will be used 2 times during a working week. This sets the daily price point at around £1.54p per day.
- 5.9. One point to consider is if the trader uses the permit more frequently than the assumed 2 days, the daily price point will drop significantly, which may result in the daily cost dropping to lower than that of a residential visitor permit (a 24 hour digital permit amounts to £1.25p per day)
- 5.10. Dispensations will also continue to be available as an alternative to the Traders Permit but at an inflated cost due to the nature of the yellow-line exemptions that they cover. (£24 for the initial day / £11 every day after that).
- 5.11. NEPP will also actively endeavour to promote the Traders permit when considering dispensation requests as it may be a more suitable alternative that the Trader is not aware of at the time of request.
- 5.12. The permit prices will be kept under review, especially in light of new technology. Prices may later be reviewed if new technology allows for efficiency savings to be made. This is particularly relevant where permits are converted to the virtual system and patrolling is made more efficient by using automatic number plate recognition.

## Appendix A:

### Number of Trader Permits issued per financial year:

2018/19	4
2019/20	8
2020/21	6
2021/22	3

## Appendix B:

### Previously proposed pricing structure – proposed March 2022

2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
£300.00	£250.00	£250.00	£220.00	<b>£210.00</b>

### Revised proposed pricing structure – proposed June 2022

2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
£300.00	£250.00	£250.00	£220.00	<b>£160.00</b>





# North Essex Parking Partnership

Meeting Date: 23 June 2022

Title: **Forward Plan 2022-2023**

Author: Owen Howell – Democratic Services, Colchester Borough Council

Presented by: Owen Howell – Democratic Services, Colchester Borough Council

This report concerns the 2022-23 Forward Plan of meetings for the North Essex Parking Partnership.

## **1. Recommended Decision(s)**

- 1.1 To note and approve the North Essex Parking Partnership Forward Plan for 2022-23.

## **2. Reasons for Recommended Decision(s)**

- 2.1 The forward plan for the North Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee is submitted to each Joint Committee meeting to provide its members with an update of the items scheduled to be on the agenda at each meeting.

## **3. Supporting Information**

- 3.1 The Forward Plan is reviewed regularly to provide an update on those items that need to be included on future agendas and incorporate requests from Joint Committee members on issues that they wish to be discussed.

## **4. Meeting venues for 2022-23**

- 4.1 The revolving hosting of Joint Committee meetings by the Partnership local authorities means that the next meeting is to be hosted by Harlow District Council on 27 October 2022. Hosting authorities will abide by any health and safety measures required by law at the time they are held.

## **5. Appendices**

- 6.1 Appendix A: NEPP Joint Parking Committee Forward Plan 2022-23.





**NORTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP (NEPP)**  
**FORWARD PLAN OF WORKING GROUP AND JOINT COMMITTEE MEETINGS 2021-22**

<b>COMMITTEE / WORKING GROUP</b>	<b>CLIENT OFFICER MEETING</b>	<b>JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING</b>	<b>MAIN AGENDA REPORTS</b>	<b>AUTHOR</b>
<b>Joint Committee for On Street Parking</b>	1 June 2022, (3pm) Microsoft Teams - online	23 June 2022 1.00pm,  Venue: Colchester Town Hall, High Street, Colchester	Annual Governance Review and Internal Audit  Annual Review of Risk Management  NEPP Financial Update  Traders' Permits  Forward Plan '22/23	Hayley McGrath (CBC)  Hayley McGrath (CBC)  Lou Belgrove (PP)  Richard Walker (PP)  Owen Howell (CBC)
<b>Joint Committee for On Street Parking</b>	6 October 2022,  Microsoft Teams - online.	27 October 2022 1.00pm,  Venue: Harlow District Council, The Water Gardens, College Square	Technical report and Traffic Order Scheme Prioritisation  Financial Report  Annual Report  Obstructive Parking Update  Forward Plan '22/23	Trevor Degville (PP)  Lou Belgrove (PP)  Richard Walker (PP)  Richard Walker (PP)  Owen Howell (CBC)
<b>Joint Committee for On Street Parking</b>	17 November 2022,  Microsoft Teams - online	8 December 2022 1.00pm,  Venue: Uttlesford District Council, London Road, Saffron Walden CB11 4ER	NEPP Financial Update  Use of Reserves  Obstructive Parking Update  Forward Plan '22/23 and' 23/24 Dates	Lou Belgrove (PP)  Richard Walker (PP)  Richard Walker (PP)  Owen Howell (CBC)

COMMITTEE / WORKING GROUP	CLIENT OFFICER MEETING	JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING	MAIN AGENDA REPORTS	AUTHOR
<b>Joint Committee for On Street Parking</b>	23 February 2023,	16 March 2023 1.00pm,	Finance Update and 2023/24 Budget	Richard Walker (PP)/ Lou Belgrove (PP)
	Microsoft Teams - online	Venue: Braintree District Council, Causeway House, Bocking End, Braintree CM7 9HB	Obstructive Parking Update	Richard Walker (PP)
			Forward Plan '22/23	Owen Howell (CBC)
<b>Joint Committee for On Street Parking</b>	1 June 2023,	22 June 2023 1.00pm,	Annual Governance Review and Internal Audit	Hayley McGrath (CBC)
	Microsoft Teams - online	Venue: Colchester Town Hall, High Street, Colchester	Annual Review of Risk Management	Hayley McGrath (CBC)
			NEPP Financial Update	Lou Belgrove (PP)
			Obstructive Parking Update	Richard Walker (PP)
			Forward Plan '23/24	Owen Howell (CBC)

\* These meeting venues are subject to change and may be replaced with online meetings, if required, in order to comply with social distancing measures and advice from central government.

#### **CBC / Parking Partnership Contacts**

Parking Partnership Group Manager, Richard Walker	<a href="mailto:richard.walker@colchester.gov.uk">richard.walker@colchester.gov.uk</a>	01206 282708
Parking Manager, Lou Belgrove	<a href="mailto:Christine.Belgrove@colchester.gov.uk">Christine.Belgrove@colchester.gov.uk</a>	01206 282627
Area Manager, Michael Adamson	<a href="mailto:michael.adamson@colchester.gov.uk">michael.adamson@colchester.gov.uk</a>	01206 507876
Area Manager, Lisa Hinman	<a href="mailto:lisa.hinman@colchester.gov.uk">lisa.hinman@colchester.gov.uk</a>	01376 328451
Parking Projects, Jason Butcher	<a href="mailto:Jason.butcher@colchester.gov.uk">Jason.butcher@colchester.gov.uk</a>	
Technical Services, Trevor Degville	<a href="mailto:trevor.degville@colchester.gov.uk">trevor.degville@colchester.gov.uk</a>	01206 507158
Technical / TROs, Shane Taylor	<a href="mailto:shane.taylor@colchester.gov.uk">shane.taylor@colchester.gov.uk</a>	01206 507860
Service Accountant, Louise Richards	<a href="mailto:louise.richards@colchester.gov.uk">louise.richards@colchester.gov.uk</a>	01206 282519
Governance, Owen Howell	<a href="mailto:owen.howell@colchester.gov.uk">owen.howell@colchester.gov.uk</a>	01206 282518
Media, Scott Collins	<a href="mailto:scott.collins@colchester.gov.uk">scott.collins@colchester.gov.uk</a>	01206 506167