

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Reigate AND BANSTEAD LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 2.00 pm on 7 March 2016
at Reigate Town Hall, Castlefield Road, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0SH.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin (Chairman)
- * Ms Barbara Thomson (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mrs Natalie Bramhall
- * Mr Jonathan Essex
- * Mr Bob Gardner
- * Mr Michael Gosling
- * Dr Zully Grant-Duff
- Mr Ken Gulati
- Mrs Kay Hammond
- * Mr Nick Harrison

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Michael Blacker
- * Cllr Dr Lynne Hack
- Cllr Norman Harris
- Cllr David Jackson
- * Cllr Frank Kelly
- * Cllr Roger Newstead
- * Cllr Jamie Paul
- * Cllr Tony Schofield
- Cllr Bryn Truscott
- * Cllr Mrs Rachel Turner

* In attendance

56/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Kay Hammond, Mr Ken Gulati, and Councillors Truscott, Harris and Jackson.

57/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 2]

The minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting held on 14 December 2015.

58/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 3]

None received.

59/16 PETITIONS (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 4]

60/16 CHANGE THE ZEBRA CROSSING IN CROYDON ROAD, REIGATE TO A PELICAN CROSSING [Item 4a]

A petition (with 214 signatures as at 22 February 2016) to 'change the zebra crossing in Croydon Road, Reigate to a pelican crossing', was received from Mr Coppen. The Chairman welcomed Mr Coppen and thanked him for agreeing that the petitions be heard in reverse order (i.e. the petition concerning the A217 be heard first). Mr Coppen said the zebra crossing is used by school and college students and located near a railway bridge. Visibility is poor due to distractions including the bridge, shops and crossroads. He reported that there had been a number of near misses on the crossing and several people had been knocked over. One of his neighbours had broken her leg and his children had almost been knocked over. Mr Coppen requested that the council consider replacing the zebra crossing with a pelican crossing but if that was not feasible, they improve the lighting and add/or install advance warning signs.

A number of Members supported the petition and it was generally agreed that visibility was an issue. The possibility of improving signing and lighting (including 'halo' lights at approximately £4,000), from the 'minor safety scheme' was discussed but it was noted that funding for any improvement would be subject to competing priorities within the borough.

61/16 SAFE CROSSING OVER THE A217 NEAR THE TOP OF BURGH WOOD [Item 4b]

A petition (containing 1019 signatures as at 22 February 2016) was received from Mrs Eva Hellings to request a safe crossing on the A217 near Burgh Wood. Mrs Hellings stated that many people cross at this point every day, including children on their way to and from school. She said that children were being encouraged to walk and/or ride bicycles to school. Mrs Hellings said that parking near the schools was not an option and a crossing at this point was also necessary to connect the two parts of the community. Mrs Hellings said that the situation had been worsening for many years and recent housing developments in the area and the increase in the volume of traffic had exasperated the situation. The Committee watched a short video showing pedestrians including children, crossing the road.

It was suggested that a bridge might be a safer option. It was noted however that this option had already been considered and rejected as it was substantially more expensive than a crossing and would need long access ramps and there was insufficient land available to accommodate the ramps. The bridge would also be very high to provide clearance for tall vehicles which some user might find intimidating.

Whilst several Members expressed their support for the petition and the Local Committee was sympathetic to the needs of the community, particularly those with mobility difficulties, it was noted that the installation of a crossing was subject to funding being available. Although officers were currently looking into the issue of crossing the A217 and including it in the Epsom – Banstead Sustainable Transport Package LEP bid, there was no guarantee that it would form part of the bid.

The Chairman thanked Mrs Hellings for presenting the petition.

62/16 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 5]

None received.

63/16 FORMAL MEMBER QUESTIONS (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 6]

None received.

64/16 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 7]

The Decision Tracker was noted.

65/16 EPSOM - BANSTEAD SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT PACKAGE (FOR DECISION) [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Neil McClure, Transport Policy Project Manager, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

The Chairman welcomed Neil McClure who presented the report. Neil said officers were continuing to develop the scheme and the deadline had been extended to the end May 2016. He said that due to the tight timescale a six week consultation period had been tentatively arranged for May/June 2016. The results of the consultation would be presented to the Local Committee at their meeting on 12 September 2016. Works would commence during the autumn of 2016.

It was noted that an exhibition would be held in the project area (paragraph 4.4 of the report). Members requested that an exhibition be held in the Banstead area, and the Horseshoe was suggested as a possible venue.

Members commented that the bid criteria encouraged the public to use bicycles to get to work and asked officers to consider the 'sit up and beg' type bicycle (with a carriage on the back), as the model.

It was noted that Kingswood doesn't have a pavement in the village, many lanes in the project area were narrow and often cars parked on both sides of the road restricting access. Members commented on the safety of cycling with small children and it was noted that some areas do not have buses, in particular between Banstead and Epsom. Members requested that more emphasis was placed on improving the bus services.

It was also noted that funding for the project comes from a separate board and Members requested that the local contribution funding to the Package from the Preston Regeneration Scheme is subject to agreement by the Preston Regeneration Implementation Board be recorded on the Decision Sheet.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) AGREED to:

- (i) note the project progress to date
- (ii) approve the project to be the subject of a public consultation exercise during May/June 2016
- (iii) delegate authority to the Area Highways Manager in consultation with the Epsom - Banstead STP Member Task Group to agree the project consultation material
- (iv) note that the local contribution funding to the Package from the Preston Regeneration Scheme is subject to agreement by the Preston Regeneration Implementation Board.**

66/16 HIGHWAY SCHEMES 2015/16 - END OF YEAR UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR INFORMATION) [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Anita Guy, Highways SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussions – key points

The Chairman welcomed Zena Curry who presented the report. ITS improvement schemes progressed in 2015/16 include:

- Zebra crossings installed in Pendleton Road, Redhill and Merland Rise, Epsom Downs;
- Pedestrian refuges in Carlton Road, Reigate at the junction with Gatton Park Road and in Lee Street, Horley near Whitmore Way;
- Safety improvements at Sandcross Lane by Sandcross Primary School and Merrymeet by Woodmansterne Primary School; and
- Design of schemes for implementation in 2016/17.

See Annex 1 of the report for further detail.

It was noted that potholes fall under the category called 'safety defects' and were now being reported online which had resulted in an increase in the number reported.

Members mentioned that some lines on the roads needed refreshing. Zena said that whilst lines on the highway were refreshed on a cyclical basis, particular locations can be raised with officers for assessment and may be refreshed on an ad-hoc basis.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead):

- (i) noted the contents of the report.

67/16 REVISED HIGHWAYS FORWARD PROGRAMME (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Anita Guy, Highways SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussions – key points

The Area Highways Manager stated that as a result of the updating of the formula based on population and road length, Reigate and Banstead had been allocated a small increase in both the revenue budget and the capital funding for improvement schemes as set out in paragraph 2 of the report.

It was agreed that the additional £1,128 be allocated to Small Safety Schemes and the LSR allocation be increased by an equivalent amount (to be divided equitably between divisional Members for works in their area).

It was also agreed that the additional £598 in the revenue budget be allocated to drainage/ditching works.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) AGREED:

- (i) to note the contents of the report;
- (ii) that the Capital Integrated Transport Schemes and Local Structural Repair budgets be revised, as set out in Annex 1 and paragraph 2.1 of the report; and
- (iii) that the revenue maintenance budget be revised, as set out in Annex 2 of the report.

68/16 THE ACRES, HORLEY (FOR DECISION) [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers Attending: David Taylor, Transport Development Planning Senior Project Manager, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussions – key points

The Chairman welcomed Dave Taylor who presented the report. Dave said that following complaints about traffic speeds and the public using the estate roads in The Acres, Horley, Surrey County Council and the developer had worked together on a scheme to introduce a speed limit of 20 mph throughout the estate. The developer had agreed to fund and carry out the works.

Members requested that the 20mph zone be extended in Langshott to Keepers Cottage (the matter is in hand) and discussed the enforceability of a 20mph zone. The need to signpost the zone adequately was noted. Dave stated that the police supported the 20mph zone and there would be markings on the carriageway as well as signs along the route. There would also be speed controls at every junction.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) AGREED:

- (i) that the Speed Limit Order is advertised and subject to the satisfactory resolution of any objections or other representations, that the Speed Limit Order creating the 20 mph zone is made and brought into force.

69/16 ON STREET PARKING ENFORCEMENT UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR INFORMATION) [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager, SCC and Gavin Handford, Corporate Policy and Governance Manager, RBBC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussions – key points

Members raised a number of questions on the report concerning PCNs, property costs, equipment and stationery, temporary staff, and requested answers to these questions in writing.

It was suggested that it would be useful to have a comparison between the different boroughs in Surrey.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) AGREED to:

- (i) note the contents of the report **subject to the receipt of satisfactory written answers to the questions raised at the Local Committee held on 7 March 2016.**

Meeting ended at: 3.38 pm

Chairman

Annex 1

On-street parking enforcement (Reigate & Banstead)

Further information in response to questions at the Local Committee meeting held on 7 March 2016

1. The figures reported suggest that Reigate & Banstead is issuing less PCNs per hour, which in turn suggest that the on-street enforcement activities are becoming less efficient. Please explain.

In accordance with the Traffic Management Act 2004 and its Operational Guidance, parking enforcement is carried out consistently and fairly to achieve compliance with waiting and parking restrictions implemented to reduce congestion, keep traffic flowing improve safety. . It is not ethical to set targets for the performance of parking enforcement based on the amount of PCN issued. The TMA clearly states that authorities must not have targets, this is to avoid allegations of Councils using parking as a 'cash cow' the ability to enforce is based on enforceable lines and signs and driver non compliance. If compliance improves, PCN levels will drop.

In 2014/15 staffing levels were impacted by vacancies (hence the lower salary expenditure), sickness and other leave. As staff were recruited, they will also have required training and support before being fully operational. This impacted on the level of PCNs issued during the year.

We increased enforcement around schools, which was identified as a local priority, but often does not result in PCNs being issued.

The above will all have impacted on the PCNs per hour indicator.

We will continue to prioritise enforcement according to local intelligence and seek opportunities for the service to operate more efficiently.

2. Please explain the increase in property costs and how many square feet are occupied by the Parking Team.

As stated at the Local Committee meeting, the increase in property costs compared with 2012/13 was the result of changes to the Council's accounting requirements. The costs reported in 2013/14 and 2014/15 are accurate, whereas the costs were under reported in 2012/13.

Reigate & Banstead does not allocate property costs according to the square footage of a site or the space occupied by the service. The allocation of property cost is apportioned according to the number of staff within the service, as a proportion of the whole Council.

In response to the specific question on office space: parking services currently occupy lower floor 140sq meters and upper floor 154 sq. meters.

As previously reported, a property review within Earlswood depot has been commissioned and is underway. The first phase has been agreed in principal with works to commence in summer 2016.

3. Please give more detail concerning the increase in cost shown for CEO equipment and stationery (pg. 77).

The increase in costs related to CEO equipment and software improvements to improve the process for issuing and managing Penalty Charge Notices. The costs were a one off charge in 2014/15.

The stationery costs increased due to some additional design and print costs related to improvements to resident parking permits.

These costs will reduce again in 2015/16.

4. Please explain the increase in DVLA costs between the periods 2012-2015.

1. *The increase in cost from 2012 – 2015 is due to the increase in DVLA requests, and accounting for costs relating to requests generated within other systems. There is a legal requirement to obtain keeper details from drivers who have not paid within the 14 days discounted period. An automatic request is sent to DVLA to request data on all vehicles held on the system.*

5. Please explain the increase in cost concerning temporary staff, particularly when revenue has dropped.

The service includes management, back office and enforcement staff. In 2012-13 the section consisted of one agency staff member as we utilised staff across a larger shared back office team, reducing the requirement for temporary staff. In 2013-2014 the department had a review which highlighted the specialist knowledge required in parking due to the regulatory framework within which the service operates.

In order to ensure that parking standards were maintained, additional experienced staff were required and it was necessary to utilise temporary staff. We have now recruited permanent staff and the temporary costs have reduced considerably in 2015/16.

Revenue income can fluctuate for a number of reasons, including staffing levels and driver behaviour. Temporary staff are not employed to undertake on-street enforcement duties.

6. Is it significant that the cost of mobile phones has not increased in line with the increase in the cost of temporary staff?

The two costs are not related.

7. Why is the total charged to accommodation costs the same figure as the total charged against overheads in Reigate & Banstead when other Boroughs/Districts show a different figure for each category (pg79)?

As set out above, the property costs are a corporate recharge based on the Council's accountancy practices. This is the only recharge that Reigate & Banstead has applied, hence it is the same as the total overhead charges. The costs are allocated according to the size of the team. We cannot comment on the practices adopted by other areas.

8. Annex 2 - It would be useful to have a comparison between the different Boroughs/Districts in Surrey.

The reporting is intended to provide comparable data based on the standardised template provided by Surrey County Council. This will be reviewed by Surrey County Council during 2016/17.

9. Accommodation is shown as between 1 – 27% of overhead costs in other boroughs but as 100% in Reigate and Banstead. Please explain.

As set out above, the property costs are a corporate recharge based on the Council's accountancy practices. The costs are allocated according to the size of the team. We cannot comment on the practices adopted by other areas.

10. Please explain why more detail is not available for previous accounting years.

As set out above, the property costs are a corporate recharge based on the Council's accountancy practices. The costs are allocated according to the size of the team. The accounts have been closed and therefore it is not possible to report these in another format for previous years. This will be improved for the 2015/16 report.

11. Please could we have a standard county wide template for reporting costs.

There is a standard financial reporting template and this has been used in reporting the accounts. The template was developed by financial officers from the county and borough councils participating in civil parking enforcement, although each authority may have differing ways of calculating certain costs.

At the end of the 15/16 financial year there will be 3 years worth of comparable financial and KPI data from enforcement teams and this will be used to look at ways of improving the current arrangements. A review of the parking enforcement agency agreements will start in 2016.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (REIGATE & BANSTEAD)

DATE: 14 DECEMBER 2015



LEAD OFFICER: DAVID CURL, PARKING STRATEGY AND IMPLEMENTATION MANAGER

SUBJECT: FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

DIVISION: TADWORTH, WALTON AND KINGSWOOD

One formal public question has been received from Ms Gillian Hein:

The Council has recently proposed a number of parking changes in Tadworth but these are piecemeal and there have been strong objections from residents. Is it possible to have an overall plan for Tadworth which takes into account problems of through traffic using inappropriate residential streets, commuter parking pressures and congestion points? The current parking proposals to deter commuter parking will increase traffic speeds and push commuter parking further out onto streets currently unaffected.

David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager responds:

As part of the 2015/16 Reigate and Banstead Parking Review we included a number of proposals around Tadworth intended to help manage parking in the village. We have been reviewing the consultation responses and do not plan to go ahead with any where there are a significant number of objections. The feedback we have received from this consultation process will help us shape any further proposals and the council's parking team will work with the county councillor and residents' groups to achieve the best balance of restrictions in the village through our borough wide parking review process.

This page is intentionally left blank