

# **Essex Parking Partnerships**

## **Best Practice Review**

### **January 2015**

**Author: Liz Burr, Head of Network and Safety, Essex  
Highways**

## Contents

Review Objectives .....	3
Review Approach .....	3
Background to the Parking Partnerships .....	4
Governance Arrangements .....	4
Operational Model.....	5
Back Office and Staffing Structure .....	6
Differences in Approaches – TROs.....	6
Rural and Urban Characteristics .....	6
Comparing the North and South Partnerships .....	7
Comparisons with two-tier authorities.....	8
An Award Winning Approach.....	8
Key Findings .....	9
1. How effective/efficient has the partnership been in enabling car parking decisions to be made at a more local level and supporting the localism? .....	9
2. Has good practice been developed by both partnerships? .....	11
Good Practice – Essex North Parking Partnership .....	11
Good Practice – South Car Parking Partnership.....	12
3. Explore the opportunity to share Best Practice across the partnerships. To ensure that through this sharing of good practice, further opportunities for efficiencies are being explored ..	14
North and South Collaboration – Good Practice .....	14
4. Explore the opportunity to change operating models of the Partnerships and Local Highways Panels (LHPs) and their respective roles and responsibilities.....	17
LHPs.....	17
Parking Partnerships .....	17
Conclusion:.....	19
Recommendations and Next Steps:.....	20
Background Documents:.....	21

## Review Objectives

- To establish if the objectives of localism/ improving local ownership/delivery have been met
- To establish what good practice has been developed by both partnerships and to ensure that this is shared across both
- To ensure that through this sharing of good practice, further opportunities for efficiencies are being explored
- To examine the relationship/communications between NEPP/SEPP and the Local Highways Panels and to highlight any areas where this could be improved

This report represents the first review into the effectiveness of the two Essex Parking Partnerships.

## Review Approach

This section of the review began on 18th November 2014, and concluded on the 15th December. A separate financial review has also been undertaken by ECC to assess whether the original financial objective of establishing the partnerships has been met.

The approach of the review was based on:

Gathering key insights from key stakeholders

- Identifying and evidencing respective and joint Parking Partnership best practice
- Evaluating the effectiveness of the current partnership model and lessons learned
- Looking at NEPP and SEPP relationships with the Local Highways Panels (LHPs)
- Making recommendations for any change and improvement, as required

The methodology employed for the review combined quantitative and qualitative research to capture key success points, and provide an evidence base for the sustainability of the two model arrangement. This included desk top research, documentary review, and one- to-one interviews with key stakeholders and feedback from partner representatives from the meetings of the North and South Joint Committees held on the 11th December.

A list of members and officers interviewed as part of this review is listed below:

- Liz Burr, Head of Network and Safety/Traffic Manager | Essex Highways
- David Claydon, ISDP Programme Manager
- Nick Binder, South Essex Parking Partnership Manager
- Cllr Pratt, Chair of South Essex Park Partnership
- Richard Walker, North Essex Parking Partnership Group Manager
- Cllr Mitchell, Chair of North Essex Car Parking Partnership
- Cllr Johnson, Essex County Council, Cabinet Member for Highway Maintenance and Small Scheme Delivery

- Cllr Bobbin, Chair Basildon Local Highways Panel
- Cllr Walters, Chair Uttleford Local Highways Panel

## **Background to the Parking Partnerships**

In April 2011, following a review and options appraisal by Essex County Council (ECC), two Parking Partnerships - representing North and South Essex - were established through a formal Joint Committee agreement for a period of 7 years.

The two Parking Partnerships brought together all parking matters into a single point of contact for six districts in each partnership area of North and South Essex. The service is council-run and is a partnership between Essex County Council and two lead councils for the two areas. The North Partnership is led by Colchester Borough Council and the South Partnership by Chelmsford City Council. Their over-arching vision is to run on-street parking enforcement to a fair and consistent standard in order to provide the same level of service but in a more efficient way. The aim of the Joint Committee is to provide an on-street parking service which results in a merging of services to provide a single, flexible enterprise providing full parking services for a large group of Partner Authorities.

The core activity of the Partnerships can be summarised as follows:

- Enforcement of parking restrictions
- Dealing with the notices issued under the Traffic Management Act 2004
- Investigating requests for new or amended on-street parking restrictions/schemes

## **Governance Arrangements**

Essex County Council has delegated the functions relating to the management and enforcement of on-street parking via a Joint Committee Agreement to the Joint Committee of each of the Partnerships, this formal agreement, signed by all parties outlines their aims and governance arrangements. The relationship is between the Client authorities and the Joint Committee, with services delivered by the Lead Authority.

The key Joint Committee functions include:

- Holding a Joint Committee meeting at least four times a year (in the North meetings are rotated across geographical areas, whilst in the South, meetings are held in the designated central point of Chelmsford).
- Each Joint Committee consists of a nominated Joint Committee Member from each of the partner areas and ECC (the Joint Committee member must be an Executive Member of the authority).

- Responsibility for approving Annual Business Plans, Policies and Procedures, Risk Management Action Plan, approving funding for signs and lines maintenance and new TROs and considering objections against a proposed Traffic Regulation Order.
- Managing the financial accounts in accordance with the Joint Committee Agreement, and making decisions on the best way to manage any surpluses generated.

Our attendance at the North Joint Committee meeting held in December, and feedback obtained from members, indicated cross-Party consensus that the Partnership enabled greater collaboration around parking matters, and that Councillors are better able to raise local decisions since the formation of the Partnership. These views were also echoed by the Chair and lead officer from the South Partnership during separate interviews.

## Operational Model

A founding aim of the Parking Partnerships was to reduce the amount of unsustainable deficit under previous agency agreements, and deliver a new service at zero cost to ECC, whilst retaining a high level of service provision. The Partnerships have reduced a previous operating deficit of £1.2M. Before they were formally established, each Partnership developed an outline business case. Currently, both Partnerships now operate in surplus, and re-invest this money to make further service improvements to the on-street car parking function in the County. Financial and performance achievements are reported in each Partnership’s Annual Report.

Significant financial savings were made by moving to two back office functions, and the new operating model introduced in 2011 has enabled more effective deployment of resources.



Figure 1: key benefits achieved through operating model

## **Back Office and Staffing Structure**

The structures of both Parking Partnerships are broadly similar. Each partnership has a Partnership Manager, with overall responsibility for performance and delivery. In the North 2 Districts/Boroughs are grouped together, with team leader/manager responsibility and in the South each district/borough is serviced separately. Civil Enforcement Officers are located in each local area.

A copy of the current 2014 organisational staffing arrangements for NEPP and SEPP are included in Appendix 1.

## **Differences in Approaches – TROs**

Overall, the two Partnerships offer a consistent approach and similar service in areas of operation. One notable area of difference is in the process for dealing with Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). Highway authorities can place temporary, experimental or permanent restrictions on traffic within their areas by way of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). Some of the most popular uses for TROs are restricting the movements of HGVs in residential areas, implementing parking restrictions on single streets.

In the South all requests are passed into ECC Customer Services in the first instance. Here they are reviewed against the county Council's criteria for it to fund a waiting restriction TRO (based around safety and congestion on key routes in the county). Requests that do not meet the ECC criteria are then passed direct to SEPP to be evaluated against their criteria. In the North all request are considered direct by NEPP who also undertake the review against ECC criteria. The NEPP has their own scoring matrix to assess each scheme's viability. It may be worth exploring, perhaps at future joint officer and/ or Chair meetings, the merits of each approach, with a view to looking into the viability of having one, consistent procedure.

Those interviewed from the North also expressed their feeling that their lack of provision of funding for taking on the TRO function, which they did from day one of the Partnership, had left them at a disadvantage, particularly in relation to their overall financial break even abilities and surplus generation. The South took on the TRO function in 2012/13 and received some start- up funding.

## **Rural and Urban Characteristics**

The geography of the two Partnership areas reflects the diversity of the County. Broadly, the North covers a more rural area. Interviewees from this area, and representatives attending the Joint Committee on the 11th December, were keen to highlight in the review that this difference does reduce their ability to generate the same level of income (eg from PCN's and parking charges) than the more urban South area, with has a higher footfall.

## Comparing the North and South Partnerships

District Population (ONS data)	2011	2012	% Change
Colchester	173,614	176,008	1.40%
Tendring	138,062	138,285	0.20%
Braintree	147,514	148,384	0.60%
Uttlesford	80,032	81,250	1.50%
Harlow	82,177	82,676	0.60%
Epping Forest	124,880	126,080	1.00%
North total	746279	752683	0.90%

District Population (ONS data)	2011	2012	% Change
Brentwood	73,841	74,020	0.20%
Basildon	174,971	176,474	0.90%
Chelmsford	168,491	169,335	0.50%
Castle Point	87,964	88,218	0.30%
Maldon	61,720	61,918	0.30%
Rochford	83,333	83,869	0.60%
South total	650320	653834	0.50%

(ONS data)	Area	Population	Density (per sq m)
NEPP	885	752,683	851
SEPP	483	653,834	1,354
SEPP <i>as a proportion:</i>	55%	87%	159%

The two Partnership areas have their own particular features, although the NEPP area is significantly more rural with greater distances to travel.

SEPP is just over half the size of NEPP in area. NEPP is more populated, although the population spread is over one and a half times the area, leading to a much lower density. SEPP has a proportional population 160% the size for its area when compared to NEPP. Full detail of the volume of PCNs issued for each district within both partnerships can be found in their annual reports available on the Parking partnerships website.

## **Comparisons with two-tier authorities**

What Essex is doing is unique, and is working well. No stakeholders interviewed proposed changing the model or reverting to the previous way of doing things with ECC in full control.

We undertook some quick desk top research into the work of other two-tier authorities. Many two tier authorities had undergone some devolution of authorities, but we could find no evidence of local, decentralised decision making. For example, in Devon, and Lincolnshire, the County retains responsibility for on-street parking, and Traffic Regulation Orders. In Gloucestershire, the County is responsible for on- street parking but delegates off-street parking to the Districts. There is a similar arrangement in West Sussex. The responsibility for off-street parking has always been a second tier authority responsibility. ECC only has responsibility for on-street parking – this is what it has delegated to the borough/city/districts.

## **An Award Winning Approach**

In 2012, the collaborative and localised work of the Partnership approach in Essex was recognised by at the British Parking Awards. This is a national award, sponsored by Parking Review Magazine, which recognised good practice in parking management design. ECC and the two Partnerships were the overall winners in the Partnership Parking Award, in recognition of the innovation in setting up the partnership, localism. You can find out more about the award, and the runner up local authorities via [www.britishparkingawards.co.uk](http://www.britishparkingawards.co.uk)



## Key Findings

Below is a summary of the key findings of the review against the key lines areas of investigation:

### **1. How effective/efficient has the partnership been in enabling car parking decisions to be made at a more local level and supporting the localism?**

Interview feedback from both the North and South Chairs and lead officers indicates overwhelmingly support in favour of keeping the current two Partnership model, with views expressed that the Partnerships' had exceeded expectations in how they had enabled the Joint Committees to make evidence based, smarter decisions at local level.

Key benefits of the Partnership model were identified by stakeholders as supporting:  
Local control:

- Pricing, charging and permit policies determined by the Joint Committee
- Management and delivery of Enforcement activity
- Consistent approach to Traffic Management Act
- Public invited to attend and speak at meetings – 'public question time'

An improved service for residents:

- Increased efficiency of back-office functions
- Monthly area reporting – greater scrutiny and performance management
- Greater flexibility of CEO deployment and streamlined management
- Exploiting opportunities for economies of scale – joint policies, joint procurement, testing new ways of working 1 area eg MI Permit before wider roll out
- Surpluses re-deployed to further improve the service eg hand held Cameras in the South

Improved local enforcement

- Single methodology for the creation of Traffic Regulations Orders (Both North and South now carry out this function)
- Robust local scoring system enabling smarter, more informed local decisions (North)
- Improved processes and procedures for signs and lines installation and maintenance
- Increase in activity (and enforcement) due to local involvement of ward members, public and local consultations
- Emphasis on improving staff safety (eg lapel cameras in the South)
- Transparency and communication – residents and ward members

- Public Information is clearer and more transparent policies have been published for all services, which are more consistent across the Partnership area and a single public website
- Savings have been achieved by combining management, accounts, legal and HR departments and closing offices – allowing for local re-investment of surpluses

In summary, each Chair and lead officer from the Partnerships felt that, whilst it might be feasible to make further changes (and potential savings) to the current arrangement, e.g. by moving to a one partnership model, this was not desirable. In summary, their views expressed were:

- Why fix something that isn't broken?
- The new model had only been in operation for 3 years, and was demonstrating that it had the potential to make further performance improvements
- There is potential to keep improving the service and generating income, allowing for local political decision making in how best to re-invest the surplus
- Districts and Boroughs value their ability to make decisions locally
- Local residents value local consultations and their ability to attend and input into Joint Committee meetings and local consultations

These views were also echoed by the representatives of NEPP and SEPP Joint Committees, who were asked for their input into the review at their respective meetings, held on the 11th December.

Essex's localism agenda, as expressed within its County and local strategies, is a significant policy development, placing community engagement, involvement and decision-making at its heart. This is best achieved through decisions being devolved and local, where possible, with resident input where applicable. The Essex Parking Partnerships' seems to embody all of these things, and represents a good approach to localism.

## **2. Has good practice been developed by both partnerships?**

There are several examples of good practice that each Parking Partnership has introduced. Most of the examples below illustrate how they have been able to respond to the development of new technology to instigate new initiatives, as well as devising innovative solutions to respond to the concerns of local residents.

It is difficult to know if some of these initiatives would have happened anyway, without the move to a two partnership model. However, the examples highlighted do demonstrate a level of local design and responsiveness, showing that local solutions to issues have been developed. Each Parking Partnership has come up with different solutions that are unique and bespoke to their area. Below is a sample of good practice from each area:

### **Good Practice – Essex North Parking Partnership**

#### ***Tackling Schools Enforcement – Park Safe Enforcement Car***

Parking congestion and parking violations outside schools can be very challenging. Resources do not enable the ability to provide for a daily enforcement presence outside all schools, and residents had been asking have for additional patrols that resources cannot be supply. In order to overcome some of these challenges, a Park Safe camera enforcement car is being deployed, to have an ad hoc presence in hot spot areas. This is supplemented by foot patrols. The Park Safe car is primarily used in the ‘KEEP CLEAR’ areas outside schools. The Park Safe car is also typically used elsewhere in areas where there are Loading Restrictions, Clearways and Bus Stops and has been a great asset to local communities.

There has been a lot of coverage in the local press about the car, especially during its launch. The real benefit of a vehicle is to increase the level of enforcement presence, whereby drivers consider it is not worth the chance of parking dangerously on the school Markings, for fear of being caught.

#### ***Online Permits – MiPermit***

The service has introduced an online permit system, which was first trialled in Colchester. MiPermit allows online and mobile administration of the service by residents. Residents without online access can still be assisted by phone. The benefits of MiPermit, which is also already used for cashless parking in car parks, are welcomed by the residents. Residents don’t need a paper permit, and visitors can be accommodated using the online system or via text - without the need for scratch-card vouchers.

As well as cutting stationary, admin and postage costs, it allows for better monitoring and audit of the issuing of permits. It is estimated that the cost of corresponding with residents about permits equates to approximately £21 - so making better use of technology has resulted in real cash savings.

### ***Better Use of Resources***

With 1 central back office function looking after 6 partnership areas, and the local deployment of enforcement staff, staff resources are able to be used more effectively and performance management has improved.

For instance, In 2013/14, 72,000 Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) were issued. This was approximately 12,500 more than in the comparable year before, mostly due to an increase in the number of Civil Enforcement Officers employed), and also better organisation and deployment arrangements during early summer. Both on- and off-street operations had more PCNs issued than the previous year. The off-street increased by a greater proportion, reflecting slightly more activity in car parks.

### ***TRO Scoring Matrix and Flow Chart***

In the North Partnership, TRO requests are dealt with directly by the Partnership (and not via ECC as in the South).

In order to make decisions for the local panels smarter and more streamlined, the Partnership has a scoring matrix which it uses to assess the validity and viability of each claim. This makes local decision making easier and more evidence based. It allows for smarter decision making as no local schemes is introduced without local consultation and feedback from local ward councillors, who are able to see the rationale and scoring, and make better informed decisions.

### **Good Practice – South Car Parking Partnership**

#### ***Staff Safety - Body-worn CCTV for Parking Officers***

Body-worn CCTV cameras have been introduced to improve the safety of Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs). This was, in part, in response to an incident of violence from a member of the public to a CEO. The use of the cameras are aimed at ensuring that, wherever possible, video and audio evidence will be available to the Police and Courts in the event of any CEOs being subjected to incidents of physical or verbal abuse, threats or aggressive behavior. The cameras were also introduced to reduce the number of complaints being made against the officers whereby the allegations made are unfounded, to provide a simpler and more efficient source of evidence.

At the Joint Committee in December, approval will also be sought for funding for new hand-held Computer equipment and ticket printers for staff. A new operational handbook for staff has recently been issues, to further emphasise the importance the Partnership places on personal safety.

### ***Basildon CCTV Vehicle***

The Partnership is in possession of a CCTV vehicle, based within the Basildon District. It complements the Basildon operation, and is operated by the Basildon CEOs. It has proven to be an effective method of enforcement for contraventions, which do not require an observation. The vehicle has been particularly effective in 'no waiting' and loading areas, clearways, school 'keep clears' and bus stops, increasing safety and assisting with congestion.

This heightened activity has resulted in PCN's have increased by 8% in the last year. The total expenditure on the CCTV Vehicle in the last financial year was £50,111. PCN income was £100,436 making good use of this additional income received from the increased numbers of PCN's issued.

### ***Performance Management of CEO's***

Having a more streamlined management structure and back office function enables more effective monitoring of CEOs. Performance is monitored for best use of resource and patrol rota coverage. This is assessed against a set of transparent criteria which includes - time in each street, number of observations, PCNs issues (no set target), sickness. Scoring is based on 3 levels – expected, good and excellent.

The average performance of the CEOs is at the top end of good, and the process also takes account of demographic differences and PCN (income generation) opportunities.

### **3. Explore the opportunity to share Best Practice across the partnerships. To ensure that through this sharing of good practice, further opportunities for efficiencies are being explored**

There is strong evidence of high levels of collaboration and good practice sharing of information between the two Partnerships and ECC. The Parking Managers from each Partnership, as well as an officer from ECC, meet on a regular basis to review operations. These meetings are valued by participants, and appear to allow for the dissemination of good practice and the sharing of progress on new initiatives between North and South.

Both Partnerships are committed to improving the service and driving efficiencies through continuous innovation. There are good examples where new ways of working have been adopted across the two areas as a result of innovation pilots being conducted in one of two areas. Examples of this include MiPermit (an on-line permit registration process), which was first tried out in the North before wider roll out and also the mobile CCTV car, which was first trailed in the South. This approach allows for experimentation and the ironing out of any glitches, making sure a new innovation is efficient and cost effective.

A selection of other examples of collaboration and joint Partnership working are listed below:

#### **North and South Collaboration – Good Practice**

##### ***Procurement and commissioning***

The two Partnerships together have greater purchasing powers, and have a greater opportunity to procure contracts for goods and services on framework agreements that both Partnerships can benefit from. For example, they are the largest purchaser of services from Chip side, and believe that together they have ensured good quality service and demanded a cheaper price from the supplier.

##### ***New Technology***

Both NEPP and SEPP have made more effective use of new technology since 2011, and are aiming to provide a ‘virtual’ service for those residents who no longer wish to use a paper based system.

The NEPP have estimated that each letter sent out costs them approximately £21. Therefore, any move to on-line communication and registration will make savings. Changes introduced have included

- Automated phone payment systems
- Pay Point cash payment outlets across the Partner areas
- New on-line virtual permit system for the Resident Parking Schemes

- The Response Master System to improve the productivity of dealing with PCN challenges and providing consistency in the decision making process.
- The Chip side enforcement processing module.

### ***Staff Training***

Both partnerships also have staff training needs which are identified and shared, such as City and Guilds training for CEO's in Parking Enforcement and TRO Traffic Regulation Order Marking.

### ***Bi-monthly Joint Meetings***

Held between the NEPP, SEPP and ECC parking managers to discuss new initiatives, share good practice, monitor trends and 'peer challenge' each other.

### ***Joint Policies***

Developed, were applicable, on a joint basis to maximise resource and quality. Policies range across areas such as enforcement, operational protocols, dispensations, enforcement discretion policy

### ***Shared website***

There is a jointly owned website, with 2 separate North/South portals, providing update information and displaying policies, procedures and joint committee decisions. There are also links to the individual travel management and parking arrangements for each of the twelve District and Boroughs in the County. The website provides good and transparent information for the public and can be found at [www.essexparkingpartnership.org](http://www.essexparkingpartnership.org)

This collaboration between the managers of the North and South Partnerships is clearly beneficial, enabling economies of scale as well as the ability to pilot new ways of working in one area, before wider roll out.

Councillor feedback received at the North Joint Committee meeting, highlighted the fact that the good work of the Partnership needs to be celebrated and showcased more widely – for the benefit of the Public, County elected members and LHP's. There is little information on good practice on the joint Partnership website, or in the respective Partnership's annual reports, and perhaps these could be used as a means of disseminating more widely the good work of both Partnerships.

The Chairs of the respective Partnerships have never had an arrangement whereby they meet with each other to also share good practice, identify trends and work out solutions to challenges etc. Whilst neither Partnership Chair, when interviewed, saw any merit in meeting their counterpart, we would suggest that a one-off meeting is held to look at joint

issues, and an evaluation of its effectiveness taken soon after to determine whether it should be repeated.



#### **4. Explore the opportunity to change operating models of the Partnerships and Local Highways Panels (LHPs) and their respective roles and responsibilities**

The LHPs and the North and South Parking Partnerships have two distinct areas of responsibility. Broadly speaking, the roles of the respective organisations can be summarised up as follows:

##### **LHPs**

LHPs are established in all 12 districts. These panels are responsible for making recommendations and setting priorities for Highways schemes in their areas. County and District/Borough Members meet on a quarterly basis to consider Highways expenditure within their local district or borough boundaries. The scope of works of the Local Highways Panels is broad and includes the following service areas:

- Traffic management improvements
- Tackling congestion
- Safer roads (including casualty reduction)
- Public Rights of Way improvements
- Cycling schemes
- Passenger transport improvements
- Minor improvement schemes
- Each area has a revenue budget of £130,00 for Highway Rangers to carry out small scale maintenance work

##### **Parking Partnerships**

- The Parking Partnerships bring together all street-based parking services in Essex.
- The aim is to administer the parking rules to a fair, proportionate and consistent standard in order to provide a service in a reasonable and responsible way.
- Each Partnership is responsible for its area's on-street Civil Enforcement Officers ("traffic wardens"); the and enforcement process together with challenges to, and payments of, parking penalties ("parking fines") plus administration of the parking restrictions ("yellow lines") and the management and maintenance of the scheme.

LHPs have no remit over local parking schemes, as this now lies with the respective Partnerships, although as previously mentioned, each one operates a different process. However, there are clearly overlaps in the work of the respective organisations. For example, the LHPs have responsibility for safety and congestion in its overall traffic management remit. They also approve new local developments, and has to take account of on-street and off-street parking needs. Therefore, there is an obvious need for each the

LHPs to be aware of the activity of the Partnerships (particularly relating to parking schemes), and vice versa.

There was a strongly expressed view amongst the ECC Cabinet Member interviewed and also the LHP Chairs that they wanted more information about the work of the two Partnerships, in order to be kept updated on new parking schemes in particular. We were, however, only able to speak to two LHP Chairs as part of our research due to time constraints, but they were of the view that communication between the two organisations is poor. As a consequence, this can result in lack of and/or misinformation. This often appears to make matters very difficult locally. An example of this was given as when formally or informally dealing with queries from residents or the police, which are sometimes mistakenly referred to the LHP members for resolution.

The Parking Partnerships are governed by a Joint Committee, and that includes a member from each Borough and District, and there is also a member of the County represented here. These Joint Committee members are appointed by the partner authorities, and it is to be expected that these representatives will communicate within their own area on key parking matters. The role of the local member on the Joint Committee is not explicitly referenced in either Partnership's founding Joint Committee Agreement. It may be worth re-visiting the original JCA and adding clarity on the role of local representatives, through including Terms of Reference covering the role and remit of the local representative. This could include:

- Clarity around roles and expectations
- Information about the type and scope of local issues that can be raised
- Delegated responsibilities
- Local resident engagement
- Reporting mechanisms back to local areas
- Supporting and promoting locally the aims of the Partnership

There is a perceived disconnect between the Partnerships and the LHPs, so, it is important to look at fresh ways to improve communications and clarify roles and remits. Mistrust and lack of information sharing provides a real risk to local decision making and the operation of the split functions of the different organisations.

In September, The South Partnership introduced a new system, whereby they provide a monthly report to County members of the schemes that have been considered and/or agreed in the area. This arrangement or something similar could be rolled out in the North, to improve knowledge and information sharing between the Partnerships and LHPs.

It may also be useful to look at providing clarity to all elected members and relevant officers of Districts, Boroughs, ECC and the LHPs about the different roles and responsibilities of each organisation, and partner appointed representatives. This could be done via a briefing note and perhaps a presentation to all LHPs and Partnership members. Mistrust and lack of clarity about form and function, if left unchecked, will present a risk to the viability and sustainability of the Partnerships.

## Conclusion:

All of our interviews as part of this review indicate a commitment to maintaining the current arrangements. Partnership members felt decision making was much more effective, localised and less and controlled from ECC. Key operational benefits and efficiencies identified included:

- Joint Working Enforcement can be mobile across district boundaries
- Single Back Office function for each – efficiencies and savings
- Single database – single file server and improved mapping system
- Savings on £1.2 m deficit – and increased income (eg via PCN's) enabling local re-investment in improvements
- Off Street included – client authorities can elect to have their own off-street services delivered by the Partnership
- Local input and local decision-making through the Joint Committee – gives local district input where this was not recognised previously
- Cross boundary working – enforcement, technical and management; all delivered through a single lead authority.
- Single Back Office – efficiency in operation and critical mass to cover effectively or leave commitments.
- Partnership with suppliers – Chipside has developed a single-database hosted solution which integrates with Web Services payment, case challenge and information pages.
- TRO sign/line maintenance and mapping

Both partnerships display characteristics of good partnership working, and have maintained and improved local service delivery. Together, at officer level, the two partnerships work well together and have an open approach sharing information and piloting new initiatives.

## Recommendations and Next Steps:

1. Maintain the Current 3 way Partnership model
  - Undertake a review in 2015 (as defined by the joint committee agreement)
  - Collate feedback from any existing resident data to gain insights into how residents feel about the Parking Partnerships
2. TRO application
  - Review the differences in the two Partnership approaches to TRO's and the validity of keeping two different operating systems
3. Good Practice
  - Tell the Partnership story – highlight the achievements of the Partnership and new initiatives via the joint website and in Annual reports
  - Partnership Chairs to meet to discuss good practice and areas for further joint collaboration
4. Joint Committee Representatives
  - Develop Terms of Reference and clarity of their role in reporting back to local areas
5. Improve Communications between the Partnerships and Local Highways Panels
  - Re-issue information to all County, District and Borough Councillors about the roles and responsibilities of the Partnerships and LHPs, so that decision making and lines of accountability are set out clearly. Provide presentations to partner bodies, as requested.
  - Review the effectiveness of the NEPPs new commitment to information sharing with County members and develop similar arrangements across both Partnerships.

## Background Documents:



NEPP Annual  
Report 2013-14.pdf



SEPP Annual report  
2013-14.pdf



Parking Partnership  
development plan 2