

## MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF CABINET

Any matters within the minutes of the Cabinet's meetings, and not otherwise brought to the Council's attention in the Cabinet's report, may be the subject of questions and statements by Members upon notice being given to the Democratic Services Lead Manager by 12 noon on Monday 13 June 2011.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON TUESDAY 24 MAY 2011 AT 2.00PM  
AT COUNTY HALL**

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Cabinet at its next meeting.

Members:

*Dr Andrew Povey (Chairman)	*Mr Tim Hall
*Mr David Hodge	*Mrs Kay Hammond
Mrs Mary Angell	*Mr Ian Lake
*Mr Michael Gosling	*Mr Peter Martin
Dr Lynne Hack	*Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos

\* = Present

[Prior to the start of the meeting, the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games announced that Guildford would be one of the 70 towns in the country to host the Olympic Torch Relay.]

**PART ONE  
IN PUBLIC**

**73/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)**

Apologies were received from Mary Angell and Lynne Hack.

**74/11 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 26 April 2011 (Item 2)**

The minutes of the meetings held on 26 April 2011 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**75/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**

There were none.

**76/11 PROCEDURAL MATTERS (Item 4)**

**(a) Petitions**

**(i) (a) A petition objecting to on street parking charges in Banstead Village, with 4000 signatures, was presented by Roger Collins.**

The key points from his presentation were:

- On-street parking charges would seriously damage the local economy.
- Banstead Village residents had conducted their own 'churn' survey, which indicated no more than 5-15% of shoppers exceeding a 1 hour parking period.
- Parking meters would spoil the street scene.
- Most residents were against the proposals and businesses were unanimously against them.
- The business case for the introduction of charges was not proven.
- Surrounding residential roads would suffer.

The Cabinet Member for Transport tabled a response to the petition.

**RESOLVED:**

That the response set out in Appendix 1 be agreed.

**(b) A petition objecting to on street parking charges in Reigate and Banstead with 6183 signatures was presented by Christopher Whinney.**

The key points from his presentation were:

- As a member of Reigate Business Guild, he had visited 120 local traders and businesses in Reigate and most were against the proposals.
- The proposals were shortsighted and would lead to the demise of Reigate High Street
- The proposals would entail a 10year payback period.
- Inconsistency in the proposals.
- Concern that the views of residents and businesses had been ignored.
- the Cabinet should reconsider the proposals

The Cabinet Member for Transport tabled a response to the petition.

**RESOLVED:**

That the response set out in Appendix 2 be agreed.

**(ii) A petition from residents and customers in Claygate requesting that the County Council remove Claygate from the pay and display charging proposals because this will directly affect the character and viability of the village, with more than 3000 signatures, was presented by Richard Catling.**

The key points from his presentation were:

- Claygate was a proactive community which had suffered in the recession.
- The introduction of pay and display charging proposals would result in lost trade as shoppers migrate to local supermarkets with free parking.
- The charges applied to Monday-Friday only and excluded Saturday, the busiest day. Therefore, the cost benefits would be marginal
- The petition had been supported by all political parties and included the support of the local MP.
- Acknowledgement that the proposals had changed but requested further consultation.
- That the Cabinet should exclude Claygate from the proposals for Elmbridge.

Mr Mike Bennison, local Member for Hinchley Wood, Claygate and

Oxshott was invited to speak and made the following points:

- The current arrangements worked well and the new proposals would not generate much income.
- Concern that traders would go out of business and the fragile local economy would be destroyed.
- The average time for shoppers was 15-20 minutes.
- Reference to Thames Ditton being removed from the proposals and citing the similarity between the 2 villages and therefore requested the removal of Claygate from the proposals for Elmbridge.
- Acknowledgement of the changes made to date, which now included a free 30 minute period.

The Cabinet Member for Transport tabled a response to the petition.

**RESOLVED:**

That the response set out in Appendix 3 be agreed

**(iii) A e-petition relating to the cessation of transport to Denominational Schools, with 3646 signatures, was presented by Ciran Stapleton from Salesian School.**

The key points from his presentation were:

- He was mindful of the cuts and difficult decisions that were being made by the Local Authority but considered that phasing out the withdrawal of denominational transport would affect the vital link between schools, parents and communities.
- Concern that some families would be isolated.
- Reference to the Home to School Travel and Transport Guidance, local agreements and historical reasons for its provision.
- The County Council had a statutory responsibility to have regard to the guidance.
- The impact that its withdrawal would have on families and parental choice.
- Alternative schools may not be able to accommodate additional pupils.
- Efficient and safe Home to School Transport at affordable rates was essential.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning referred to his tabled response to the petition and said it would be discussed fully under item 9. However, he acknowledged the strong views on this topic. He also said that the Local Authority was not bound by legislation to provide travel to faith schools other than for those reasons stated in his response.

**RESOLVED:**

That the response set out in Appendix 4 be agreed

**77/11 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND ANY OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL (Item 5)**

[Note: Due to a large amount of public interest (b) was taken before (a)]

**(b) ON STREET PARKING TASK GROUP**

**Report of the Environment and Transport Select Committee**

A revised cover report, which included amendments made at the Environment and Transport Select Committee's meeting on 18 May, was tabled at the meeting. (Appendix 5)

Mr Nick Skellett, local Member for Oxted, was invited to speak. He made the following points;

- The key problem in Tandridge was commuter parking.
- Parking for shoppers was not an issue in Tandridge because the District Council provided free parking for them.
- Caterham was an area which required re-generation and on-street parking charges would not help.
- He referred to Annex 9 and also the revised cover sheet to the task group report, which stated that the case for on-street parking charges in Oxted was finely balanced. However, he agreed that it could be reviewed at a later date if the District Council changed its parking strategy.

The Cabinet Member for Transport referred to his tabled response to the report from the Environment and Transport Select Committee's task group and said that some of the issues raised by the petitioners concerning displacement had been addressed in his response.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety drew attention to the timetable for the remaining Boroughs and Districts not being discussed today, which was set out at the end of the Cabinet Member for Transport's response.

**RESOLVED:**

That the response from the Cabinet Member for Transport, set out in Appendix 6, be agreed.

The Deputy Leader made a speech in which he stated that the Cabinet had recognised in 2010 that the on-street parking enforcement process was in need of a number of improvements, which were:

- To increase efficiency, effectiveness and reduce management overheads
- To improve enforcement in key areas
- To ensure financial stability and accountability
- That any surplus would be invested back into highways or transport improvements in the local area.

He said that he believed that on-street parking charges should only be installed if the case was financially proven and that there, as there seemed to be no case for introducing on-street parking charges in Tandridge, he supported a public consultation on commuter parking throughout that district.

Finally, he stressed the need to embrace the principles of Localism and proposed the following recommendations, which were agreed.

Therefore, it was:

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the principles of localism and therefore the importance of on-street parking charges in improving enforcement and traffic management, and supporting local businesses by creating 'churn' in car parking spaces, be supported.
- (2) That the intent to maximise the involvement of Local Committees (which include representation from Borough and District Councils) in decision-making for their areas be endorsed.
- (3) That the considerable differences between various areas of the county be recognised, and that different solutions may therefore apply.

**(a) ELECTED HOME EDUCATION TASK GROUP**

**Report of the Education, Learning and Development Select Committee**

Ruth O'Hare, a Home Educating Parent, was invited to address the meeting. She expressed disappointment that the Cabinet response had stated that the service did not have the capacity to undertake some of the Task Group's recommendations at this stage and said that the report had looked at ways of doing things differently, which may be cost effective in the long term.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning referred to his response and said that the service would continue to work together to ensure positive benefits for the Home Education Service.

The Leader thanked the Task Group for their thorough report and said that he would be taking up the issue of funding for this service with the Government.

**RESOLVED:**

That the response from the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning, included with the agenda papers, be agreed.

**78/11 REVIEW OF CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO ON STREET PARKING CHARGES IN ELMBRIDGE (Item 6)**

Amendments and further information concerning the review of the consultation response to on-street parking charges in Elmbridge were tabled at the meeting. (Appendix 7)

Mr John Butcher, local Member for Cobham, was invited to speak. He made the following points:

- A decision concerning the introduction of on-street parking charges should be deferred until all consultation had taken place.
- Cobham had been treated less favourably than Weybridge (although

the tabled paper had addressed this).

- The significant number of supermarkets, with free parking, in Cobham.
- The proposals for displacement parking were inadequate
- More detailed information was needed on the estimated income.
- Details about an appeal process should be provided.

There was discussion concerning the estimated income and occupancy rates. The Cabinet Member for Transport confirmed that the next stage was the issue of amendment notices, which would be subject to a six week consultation process.

**RESOLVED (as amended):**

**In East Molesey**

- (1) That the proposed medium tariff be retained, but the maximum time limit for pay and display be extended to four hours, with no return within one hour, Monday to Friday between 8am and 6pm.

**In Thames Ditton**

- (2) That parking charges not be introduced in Thames Ditton at the present time. This, to be reviewed at a later date.

**In Esher**

- (3) That the proposed medium tariff without a free period for pay and display be retained, that the no return period be amended to 1 hour, and that CPZ/resident permits valid between 9am and 5pm together with other options for residents of the High Street be investigated.

**In Claygate**

- (4) That a free 30 minute period be introduced for all on-street parking spaces that are part of the current proposals in Claygate, but that the tariff is raised to the medium level, £1 per hour (50p for 30 minutes) with an amended two hour time limit, and no return within one hour, Monday to Friday between 8am and 6pm.

**In Cobham**

- (5) That all roads proposed for on-street parking charges, except those mentioned in recommendation 7 should have a free 30 minute period, followed by the medium tariff.
- (6) That the maximum time limit be increased to two hours (from one hour) on these roads.
- (7) That on street charges not be introduced in Cedar Road / Spencer Road. The proposed area of limited waiting in Cedar Road be implemented but without a charge.

**In Hersham**

- (8) That a free 30 minute period be introduced on Molesey Road and at Burwood Road / Pleasant Place, the existing time limit be amended to

two hours, and the no return proposals, as at present, be retained.

### **In Weybridge**

- (9) That all the proposed on street parking regulations be changed, to allow a free 30 minute period followed by the medium tariff, with a two hour maximum time limit and no return within two hours.

### **In Walton-on-Thames**

- (10) That the proposals on Hersham Road, Rydens Road and Station Avenue / Halfway Green be changed, to provide a free 30 minute period here followed by the medium tariff, with a two hour maximum time limit and no return within one hour on Hersham Road and Rydens Road, and a two hour maximum time limit with no return within two hours at Station Avenue / Halfway Green.
- (11) That the proposals at Ashley Road, New Zealand Avenue and in the High Street be left unchanged, whilst Bridge Street and Thames Street increase their maximum time limit to two hours from one hour.
- (12) That on Ashley Park Road and Mayfield Road, the proposed low tariff be removed and replaced with a £5 charge for four hours parking. This will cater for station users.

### **In General**

- (13) That any objections to the subsequent amendment notice be reviewed by the Cabinet Member for Transport prior to any order to introduce charges being made.
- (14) That the on street charging infrastructure and machines be ordered for Elmbridge Borough through the approved supplier as described in the report.

### **Reasons for decisions:**

Charging for parking helps the County Council effectively and efficiently manage on-street parking in Surrey and has the following benefits:

- 'Pay and display' makes short term parking easier to enforce and improves turnover of the available parking space making retail areas more accessible and helping local businesses.
- Free on street and 'pay and display' off street parking encourages drivers to look for on street parking and increases congestion and CO<sup>2</sup> emissions in town centres.
- A policy of setting higher charges for on street 'premium' spaces also encourages drivers to go straight to a car park, reducing congestion.
- Blue badge holders would be exempt from the charges.

The recommendations in this report have been developed following a widespread consultation and debate about on street parking charges in Elmbridge.



## **79/11 REVIEW OF CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO ON STREET PARKING CHARGES IN REIGATE AND BANSTEAD (Item 7)**

Amendments and further information concerning the review of the consultation response to on-street parking charges in Reigate and Banstead were tabled at the meeting. (Appendix 7)

Mrs Fraser, local Member for Banstead East was invited to speak. She:

- Stated that Reigate and Banstead had been short-changed because other Boroughs / Districts' consultation would have Local Committee input.
- Acknowledged that the report today had taken on board some comments and referred to the proposals for Banstead.
- Referred to the petitions and drew attention to the strength of feeling from residents and businesses.
- Welcomed the free 30 minute parking in Banstead.
- Expressed concern about displacement parking and requested a review of white / yellow lines in the southern part of the village, agreed in June 2010.

The Leader reiterated that the County Council had listened to representations during the consultation period. As a result, the proposals had been amended.

The Cabinet Member for Transport appreciated the concern from residents and businesses in Reigate & Banstead and Elmbridge but said that on street parking charges were already in place in Guildford and Woking. He acknowledged difficult decisions were being made.

He considered that the recommendations before the Cabinet reflected many of the task group's recommendations. Finally, he said that there would be ample opportunity for both Boroughs to comment through the formal consultation period after the issue of the amendment notices.

### **RESOLVED (as amended):**

#### **In Banstead**

- (1) That a free 30 minute period on all on-street parking spaces that are part of the current proposals in Banstead be adopted, with a revised two hour time limit and no return within one hour.
- (2) That on street spaces in The Horseshoe have a longer term daily rate of £4.50. However, a free 30 minute period is also provided.
- (3) That the single yellow line on the southern side of Greenhayes Gardens be extended to prevent obstructive parking (0830-1830 Mon Sat).
- (4) Agreed not to proceed with charges in Avenue Rd and change these to a 4 hour limit.

#### **In Reigate**

- (5) That the proposed medium tariff (£1 per hour) with a free 30 minute period in Church Street and the High Street be agreed, with a

maximum time limit of 2 hours in both roads.

- (6) That the no return period for Upper West Street be changed to one hour, to reflect the proposals in Church Street and the High Street.
- (7) That a free 30 minutes followed by the medium tariff in Bell Street, with a time limit of two hours and no return within one hour, be changed.
- (8) That the tariff be changed from medium to low (60p per hour) in Castlefield Road.
- (9) That the operational hours of restrictions in Rushworth Road be reduced to 10am to 4pm Monday to Friday and have a long stay charge of £4.50.
- (10) That the charges be reviewed, in following implementation to maintain a differential over off street spaces.

#### **In Redhill**

- (11) That the proposed tariff in Brighton Road be changed from 60p per hour to a free 30 minutes followed by the medium tariff (£1 per hour), with a revised time limit of two hours and no return within one hour.
- (12) That the tariff in Chapel Road be changed from low to medium (£1 per hour), and change the no return period to one hour, to reflect other similar locations in Reigate and Banstead.
- (13) That a longer term tariff of £5.50 over 5 hours be provided in London Road as well as the medium tariff (£1 per hour).
- (14) That the on street tariff as part of the review process to maintain a differential over off street parking charges (which are subject to reasonably regular tariff changes) be reviewed.

#### **In Merstham**

- (15) That the current proposals be retained. That the tariff and effects of displaced parking on roads such as Rockshaw Road, Ashcombe Road and Church Hill after implementation be reviewed. That the Banstead and Southern Villages parking review be implemented at the same time.
- (16) That the on street tariff as part of the review process to maintain a differential over off street parking charges be reviewed.

#### **In Horley**

- (17) That the medium tariff on the High Street and Victoria Road be changed to provide a free 30 minute period followed by the medium tariff, and the time period to two hours instead of one hour be revised.
- (18) That the provision of a long stay tariff (over 5 hours) of £5.00 in Station Approach be agreed. There is no two hour limit.
- (19) Russell Crescent be recommended to be free for up to five hours, with

a long stay tariff (over 5 hours) of £5.00.

(20) Agreed not to proceed with proposals for charges in Station Road.

### **In General**

(21) That any objections to the subsequent amendment notice be reviewed by the Cabinet Member for Transport prior to any orders to introduce parking charges being made.

(22) That the on street charging infrastructure and machines be procured for Reigate and Banstead Borough through the approved supplier.

### **Reasons for decisions:**

Charging for parking helps the County Council effectively and efficiently manage on-street parking in Surrey and has the following benefits:

- 'Pay and display' makes short term parking easier to enforce and improves turnover of the available parking space making retail areas more accessible and helping local businesses.
- Free on street and 'pay and display' off street parking encourages drivers to look for on street parking and increases congestion and CO<sup>2</sup> emissions in town centres.
- A policy of setting higher charges for on street 'premium' spaces also encourages drivers to go straight to a car park, reducing congestion.
- Blue badge holders would be exempt from the charges.

The recommendations in this report have been developed following a widespread consultation and debate about on street parking charges in Reigate and Banstead.

[Note: Due to public interest in item 9, it was taken before item 8]

## **80/11 HOME TO SCHOOL / COLLEGE TRANSPORT POLICIES INCLUDING THE PROVISION OF TRANSPORT TO DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS (Item 9)**

This report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning. He informed Cabinet that the report covered three items:

- Provision of free denominational transport
- Concessionary seats for mainstream pupils
- Post 16 Transport Entitlement

He said that Surrey County Council was not alone in seeking to make changes to denominational transport provision, as detailed in paragraph 2.40 of the report. He also drew Cabinet's attention to the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) (Annex 6), page 3 and said that withdrawal of this benefit would remove the inequality for families who are not eligible, or choose not to send their child to a faith school.

He confirmed that the Local Authority was not bound by law to provide transport to faith schools other than that provided for under statutory provision for children attending secondary school whose families are on a low income. However, he made reference to the strong feelings of those most affected and to the petition presented earlier in the meeting.

He also referred to the legal implications / legislative requirements (section 10) and considered that phased withdrawal from September 2012 would enable adequate notice of the change to be communicated to parents.

Finally, he referred to comments that he had received from the Environment and Transport Select Committee concerning climate change / carbon emissions implications, which he said would be difficult to evaluate at this stage.

Comments from the Education Select Committee concerning this item were tabled at the meeting. The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning confirmed that, as requested by this select committee, equalities implications had been fully considered and that any possible impact that this decision would have on school admission patterns would be closely monitored.

Referring to recommendations 2,3,4, he said that these related to increasing the fare for a concessionary seat, removal of the discount for siblings and changing the policy so that seats were sold on a half-termly basis.

Finally, he said that recommendation 5 referred to the eligibility criteria for post 16 Transport following the withdrawal of the EMA scheme.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety said that she had carefully considered the EIA and was satisfied with the decisions being proposed.

The Deputy Leader congratulated officers for a fair and balanced report.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the withdrawal of free home to school denominational transport for new pupils from September 2012 be approved but that schools which wish to introduce their own arrangements at full cost recovery be supported.
- (2) That an increase in the fare for a concessionary seat to £2.10 in 2011/12 and £2.50 in 2012/13 be approved and thereafter to increase in line with inflation (the lower of CPI and RPI).
- (3) That the discounts for siblings and younger children in the concessionary fare scheme be removed.
- (4) That a change in policy be approved so that concessionary seats are sold on a half-termly basis.
- (5) That the changes to the eligibility criteria for Post 16 School/College travel, as set out in Annex 5 to the submitted report, be approved.

#### **Reasons for decisions:**

- To ensure that all children are treated equally under the Home to School transport policy, regardless of their religion or belief and to realise savings in an area of discretionary expenditure
- This brings the fare in line with that charged on other bus provision and

ensures consistent charging policies across provision

- Ensures equity for parents so that some are not being charged more than others for the same route
- Whilst still not reflecting the true cost of the seat, the increased fare will generate increased income to help offset the true cost.
- This brings the fare in line with that charged on other bus provision and ensures consistent charging policies across provision
- Ensures equity for parents so that some are not being charged more than others for the same route
- Whilst still not reflecting the true cost of the seat, the increased fare will generate increased income to help offset the true cost.
- This ensures concessionary seats can be planned for and income from sales can be forecast more accurately.
- This encourages parents to ensure their child utilises a spare seat rather than allowing coaches to run with empty seats.
- An amendment is needed following the withdrawal of the EMA scheme.
- It ensures support is targeted to those on the lowest income.
- It ensures that travel costs are not a barrier to staying on at school or college post 16 for those who are on a low income and most in need.

#### **81/11 FINANCIAL OUTTURN 2010/11 (Item 8)**

A revised report including Annex A and supporting Appendices was tabled at the meeting. The Deputy Leader introduced the report and started by thanking the Acting Assistant Director for Finance and Strategic Assets and her staff for the report and compilation of Annex A earlier than in previous years.

He was pleased to report that the year end revenue budget outturn was a net underspending of £4.5m. He also drew attention to Annex A, Appendix 3 which illustrated the efficiency savings for 2011/12.

He also highlighted the carry forward request from the Children, School and Families Directorate of £4.0m to cover a series of risks that the service face due to legislative changes, a sinking fund of £3.0m to plan for the development of the Eco Park and the creation of a reserve for Severe Weather and Civil Emergencies.

On Capital, he said that much of the variance was due to slippages and delays in projects. He hoped that this would improve in future years as more accurate forecasting was applied.

On Debt, he was pleased to report that the level of bad debt provision had fallen over the last year.

Looking to the future, he said that savings of £59.3m would be required in 2011/12 and this achievement would be a challenge for the Members, the

Chief Executive, Strategic Directors and officers.

Cabinet Members commented on their individual portfolios and thanked Services for the efficiencies made to date.

**RESOLVED:**

**Revenue**

1. That the additional carry forward requests of £11.7m set out in Appendix 2 to the submitted report be approved.
2. That £4.0m of the request (paragraph 73, annex A) from Children's Schools and Families be approved and added to the Risk Contingency budget in 2011/12.
3. That the creation of a sinking fund to plan for the development of the proposed Eco Park (paragraph 74, annex A) to ensure budget implications are smoothed over its life be approved.
4. That the creation of the Severe Weather and Civil Emergency Reserve (paragraph 75, annex A) in 2010/11 be approved.
5. That the transfer of the £22m carry forwards, agreed by the Cabinet in 26 April, to the Budget Equalisation Reserve, as detailed in paragraph 76, annex A, be approved.
6. That the plan agreed by the Adult Social Care Directorate with Health for use of the £10.6m of whole systems funding for social care, as detailed in paragraph 18, annex A, be noted.
7. That the payment of £2.1m to Surrey and Borders Partnership, as detailed in paragraph 20, be approved.

**Capital**

8. That the additional carry forward requests of £10.0m as set out in appendix 5 to the submitted report be approved.

**Debts**

9. That the write off of £1.6m of care related debts, as detailed in paragraph 109, annex A, be noted.
10. That the write off of £0.4m of non-care related debt, as detailed in paragraph 109, annex A, be noted.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The recommendations assure adherence to the authority's financial governance requirements. The County Council's financial regulation require the aggregate outturn for the County Council's services to be reported to Cabinet, with proposals made for the carry forwards of service underspending and overspendings.

**82/11 DRIVER AND ESCORT SAFEGUARDING POLICY (AUTHORISED IDENTIFICATION BADGE SCHEME) (Item 10)**

The Cabinet Member for Transport said that the approval of this policy would ensure the appropriate safeguarding assessment for all taxi transport and escort arrangements secured through the Transport Co-ordination Centre for vulnerable adults and children was applied.

**RESOLVED:**

That the proposed policy, as set out in Annex 1 of the submitted report, be formally adopted.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To ensure that applicants for Authorised Identification Badges clearly understand the process the TCC will use to assess their suitability, and the appeals process which is open to them if such an application is refused or an existing Badge suspended or withdrawn.

**83/11 SUPERFAST BROADBAND PROJECT (Item 11)**

The Deputy Leader requested that Cabinet endorsed the recommendation to meet the upfront revenue costs of the project from the New Homes Bonus Grant subject to possible capitalisation at a later date of the superfast broadband infrastructure. This would ensure that Surrey Businesses, particularly those in a rural area, could be globally competitive.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the revenue cost of the project be funded from the New Homes Bonus Scheme Grant subject to possible capitalisation at a later date on delivery of the superfast broadband infrastructure.
- (2) That officers commence the process for notification to the EC of the grounds for intervention under the State aid guidelines and at the same time undertake a tender process for the infrastructure capability to be constructed to allow access to superfast broadband in those areas of Surrey not due to be provisioned by the market in the foreseeable future.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To ensure Surrey's economy remains globally competitive, public services are delivered in the most inclusive and cost-effective way and to mitigate climate change and improve resilience.

**84/11 LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 12)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the following decisions taken by Cabinet Members since the last meeting of the Cabinet be noted.

**(1) SCHOOLS CAPITAL 2010 - 2014: DEMOUNTABLES PROGRAMME**

That officers be authorised to seek competitive tenders and place an order with the successful contractor for the provision of demountable classrooms.

That the business case be approved for the release of capital funding and the letting of the contract, subject to costs being contained within the budget of £5.193m.

**Reasons for decision**

The proposal delivers value for money and supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places to meet the needs of the population in their area.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 20 April 2011)

**[The meeting closed at 4.00pm]**

---

**Chairman**



**ITEM 4 - PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**Petitions:**

**RESPONSE TO PETITION OBJECTING TO ON-STREET PARKING CHARGES IN BANSTEAD VILLAGE**

**The Petition**

'Surrey County Council plan to introduce charging for on-street parking in Banstead from July this year. This will apply to all the areas along the High Street and at the top of adjacent roads, where parking is currently free for a period up to 1 hour. Charges will start at 50p per half-hour. We believe that residents will find this unacceptable and shopkeepers in Banstead may be concerned that this will have a damaging effect on their business.

We wish to object to the introduction of charges for on-street parking in Banstead'.

**The Response**

The County Council has listened to Surrey residents and businesses across the County and understands the concerns about proposed on street parking charges. As a consequence we have revised our proposals for on street parking charges in many locations, including Banstead where a free 1/2 hour is planned. A free 30 minutes in Banstead will help increase turnover of the parking spaces and make sure visitors and residents are not deterred from visiting the local shops. The introduction of pay and display parking charges will enable the council to work more efficiently and provide a better service for residents. The detailed consultation response and modified proposals for Banstead are shown in a later item for this meeting. The Cabinet will take this petition into consideration as well as the other responses to the consultation, including the petition received from Eber Kington, which states 'Say No to Pay and Display – A240 Kingston Road, Stoneleigh Park Road and Ruxley Lane', when making decisions on the recommendations for this item.

There has now been more discussion and scrutiny of parking charges taking into account local views. This has meant changes to the original proposals and in some cases additional areas have been suggested.

**Ian Lake**  
**Cabinet Member for Transport**  
**24 May 2011**

**RESPONSE TO PETITION CALLING UPON SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL TO WITHDRAW ITS PROPOSALS TO INTRODUCE ON-STREET PARKING CHARGES IN THE BOROUGH OF REIGATE AND BANSTEAD**

**The Petition**

'Say No to On-Street Parking Charges - 'Surrey County Council plans to introduce parking charges across the county, with Reigate and Banstead proposed to be the first of the 11 districts to be affected. In total 587 bays which currently offer free parking are set to be replaced by Pay and Display areas. This is a short-sighted policy, which will raise funds in the short-term, at the expense of our local traders, ultimately possibly threatening the survival of these very High Street shops, and other businesses, and in turn eliminating the source of that revenue, as well as the associated revenue in business rates currently generated.

We, the undersigned, call on Surrey County Council to withdraw its proposals to introduce on-street parking charges in the Borough of Reigate and Banstead."

**The Response**

The County Council has listened to Surrey residents and businesses across the County and understands the concerns about proposed on street parking charges. As a consequence we have revised our proposals for on street parking charges in Reigate and Banstead and other parts of Surrey. A free 1/2 hour is now planned in several locations including Horley, Banstead and parts of Reigate and Redhill. A free 30 minutes in smaller and peripheral shopping centres will help increase turnover of the parking spaces and make sure visitors and residents are not deterred from visiting the local shops. The introduction of pay and display parking charges will enable the council to work more efficiently and provide a better service for residents. The detailed consultation response and modified proposals for the Borough and County are shown in later items for this meeting. The Cabinet will take petitions and other responses into consideration , including the petition received from Eber Kington, which states 'Say No to Pay and Display – A240 Kingston Road, Stoneleigh Park Road and Ruxley Lane', when making decisions on the recommendations for these items.

**Ian Lake**  
**Cabinet Member for Transport**  
**24 May 2011**

**RESPONSE TO PETITION TO REMOVE CLAYGATE FROM THE PAY AND DISPLAY CHARGING PROPOSALS IN ELMBRIDGE**

**The Petition**

‘Residents and customers in Claygate petition Surrey County Council to remove Claygate for the pay and display charging proposal as this will directly affect the character and viability of the village.’

**The Response**

The County Council has listened to Surrey residents and businesses across the County and understands the concerns about proposed on street parking charges. As a consequence we have revised our proposals for on street parking charges in many locations, including Claygate where a free 1/2 hour is proposed. A free 30 minutes will help increase turnover of the parking spaces and make sure visitors and residents are not deterred from visiting the local shops. The introduction of pay and display parking charges will enable the council to work more efficiently and provide a better service for residents. The detailed consultation response and modified proposals for Claygate are shown in a later item for this meeting. The Cabinet will take this petition into consideration as well as the other responses to the consultation, including the petition received from Eber Kington, which states ‘Say No to Pay and Display – A240 Kingston Road, Stoneleigh Park Road and Ruxley Lane’, when making decisions on the recommendations for this item.

**Ian Lake**  
**Cabinet Member for Transport**  
**24 May 2011**

## **RESPONSE TO PETITION CONCERNING THE CESSATION OF TRANSPORT TO DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS**

### **The Petition**

'We petition Surrey County Council to revoke the proposed cessation of transport to denominational schools.

We oppose on grounds that:

- (1) In the Home to School Travel and Transport Guidance. (pages 27 – 30) set out the provisions relating to "Religion or belief". Paragraph 119 refers to section 509AD of the Education Act 1996 which places a duty on local authorities in relation to the provision of travel to have regard to the wishes of a parent for their child to be provided with education or training at a particular school or institution on grounds of the parent's religion or belief.
- (2) Paragraph 131 states "...the Secretary of State hopes that local authorities will continue to think it right not to disturb well established arrangements, some of which have been associated with local agreements or understandings about the siting of such school." The Council has a statutory responsibility to have regard to this document.
- (3) This will impact and affect families on the margins of financial eligibility. Many children to our schools come from homes considerably further than the local community schools.'

### **The Response**

Thank you for submitting your petition to 'Revoke the Proposed cessation of transport to denominational schools'. I note that you stated three grounds for submitting the petition.

The first two grounds relate to the Home to School Travel and Transport Guidance, issued in 2007. This says that local authorities in fulfilling their duties and exercising their powers relating to travel, have a duty to have regard to 'amongst other things, any wish of a parent for their child to be provided with education or training at a particular school or institution on grounds of the parent's religion or belief'. In relation to transport to faith schools it also says that 'the Secretary of State hopes that local authorities will continue to think it right not to disturb well established arrangements'. However the local authority is not bound by legislation to provide travel support to faith schools other than that provided for under statutory provision for children attending secondary school whose families are on a low income. The Home to School Travel and Transport Guidance acknowledges this when in the same paragraph it says 'under the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), parents do not enjoy any right to have their children educated at a faith or a secular school, or to have transport arrangements made by their local authority to and from any such school'. The same section of the guidance also says that 'Local authorities must make decisions that balance the provision of education with reasonable public expenditure'.

The third reason cited for opposing the proposal are on the grounds that it will impact

families on the margins of financial eligibility as many children who travel to faith schools are from homes further away than those experienced by community schools. However, the proposal is to withdraw free transport to denominational schools from September 2012 for new applicants only. In this way, parents who are considering applying to a faith school that might be further away will be aware of the change of policy and will be able to take into account travel routes and costs when deciding on their preferences. Practicalities of getting children to school is something that many parents face and it is not an issue that is exclusive to faith schools. Whilst in the past children travelling to faith schools have received support, this proposal would ensure that all children would be treated equally and that children travelling to a faith school on faith grounds would not receive a benefit that was not available to other children.

Given that this level of support is not statutory, that other children do not benefit from this level of support and that the Council is having to identify savings it seems appropriate to propose that this level of support should cease for new students from September 2012. This phased approach seems the most reasonable as it allows those parents who have children already travelling on free transport to continue to receive it whilst allowing time for other families applying for September 2012 to consider the impact this might have on their preferences. However we are keen to support schools who would wish to introduce their own transport at full cost recovery, either through a subsidy or charging parents, so that they might minimise the impact on their admission intake.

**Peter Martin**  
**Cabinet Member for Children and Learning**  
**24 May 2011**

**CABINET**

**DATE:** 24 MAY 2011

**REPORT OF:** ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT SELECT  
COMMITTEE

**ON-STREET PARKING TASK GROUP**

**LEAD MEMBER:** CLLR. STEVE RENSAW, CHAIRMAN OF ENVIRONMENT AND  
TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE

**SUBJECT:** REPORT OF THE ON-STREET PARKING TASK GROUP

**KEY ISSUE/DECISION:**

Cabinet is to consider whether to approve the recommendations of the On-Street Parking Task Group.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The report and recommendations of the On-Street Parking Task Group, Chaired by Mr Steve Renshaw is attached at Appendix A. The Environment & Transport Select Committee considered the report on 18 May and the following amendments were made at the meeting.

**Alternative recommendation (e):** In recognition that the arrangements for enforcement may well change in the future, a more simple recommendation to (e) is:

- That SCC agrees a cost for enforcement with whichever authority / authorities that will enforce on their behalf over a given area. 100% of any surplus, however generated is then returned to SCC, who will then put this entire sum at the discretion of the Local Committee from where that surplus arose, which may, or may not, be the same Local Committee as that of the enforcing authority.

The Committee accepted that the parking situation in Oxted is finely balanced due to the assumptions around occupancy rates. Therefore, it could not make a firm recommendation as to whether on-street parking charges should be implemented but felt that the business case would probably be non viable, due to the widespread availability of off street parking which was free of charge.

The Committee also accepted that the distribution of proposed charging areas across Surrey was not always even. In particular this applied to towns around Guildford (as opposed to Guildford itself). The Committee felt that Members should inform officers of any areas they believe should be included in the proposals that are currently omitted.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The reasons for the recommendations are:

- a. To ensure that the agreed policy to introduce on-street parking charges in Surrey is implemented in a manner that can take local circumstances into account and mitigate some of the concerns of local residents.
  - b. To ensure that there is clear agreement on how decisions will be made on how any surpluses arising from the policy will be spent.
- 

**Contact Officer:**

Nicola Morris, Democratic Services Officer on behalf of the On-Street Parking Task Group

**Consulted:**

Environment & Transport Select Committee  
Local Committee Chairmen excluding Elmbridge and Reigate & Banstead  
Parking team within Surrey County Council

**Sources/background papers:**

Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984

---

## REPORT OF THE ON-STREET PARKING TASK GROUP

### CABINET RESPONSE TO THE REPORT FROM ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE'S TASK GROUP

#### Background

1. On 18 May 2011 the Environment and Transport Select Committee considered a report from the Transport Select Committee Parking Task Group about on street parking charges and enforcement.
2. The report has been submitted to the Cabinet and recommends changes to the way on street parking charges and enforcement are developed in the future. The Cabinet would like to thank the task group for their excellent work on this subject as well as everyone that contributed.
3. The Cabinet Member's response to the recommendations is set out below:

#### Response to recommendations

The recommendations from the Environment and Transport Select Committee are individually detailed along with the Cabinet Member's response.

- (a) ***That where parking reviews are currently taking place, they should try to anticipate the displacement parking that may result from the introduction of on-street charging and that a further review should be scheduled 6 – 12 months after introduction, in order to ensure that any problems are appropriately addressed.***

#### Response

It is planned to arrange parking reviews for the proposed on street charging areas approximately 6 to 12 months after any charges are installed. A budget has been set for this work as part of the project cost. When new parking restrictions are introduced it is usual for parking behaviour to change(s) and it can take several months for this pattern to settle down.

- (b) ***That the enforcement authorities report to officers in the Parking Team on a quarterly basis regarding the results of the implementation in different locations.***

#### Response

The Surrey Parking Team will work closely with district and borough enforcement teams to monitor the effects of any on street charges including displacement, income, occupancy and other enforcement issues. The County Council will also be able to remotely monitor the operational status of pay and display machines through the software provided by the supplier.

- (c) ***That in any future agreement, SCC should contractually stipulate the performance criteria that it expects enforcement authorities to meet, where failure to do so attracts a penalty.***

#### Response



This is being considered as part of the arrangement for new on street enforcement agreements post April 2012.

**(d) That the recommendations of the Task Group incorporating some of the suggestions proposed by Local Committees, as set out in Annexes 3-11, be approved as the basis for the formal public consultation.**

Response

The recommendations of the Task Group set out in the plans of the Annexes will be incorporated into proposals for future statutory advertisement.

**(e) That any surplus arising from on-street parking charges and their enforcement covered by any new agreement from April 2012, should be viewed as over and above the forecast highways budget.**

**(i) That any surplus arising from on street parking charges, should be split 35:65 between the enforcement authority and the County.**

**(ii) That in all cases, the 65% of any surplus arising that is due to the County should be spent on appropriate local schemes that are in compliance with the guidelines, at the discretion of the Local Committee from where that surplus arose.**

**(iii) That in cases where the enforcement authority is the same District from where any surplus is generated, the 35% that is due to the District, should be spent on appropriate local schemes at the discretion of the Local Committee. (The result under these circumstances would be that 100% of any surplus is available to the Local Committee, where District and Borough Members will continue to have voting rights for highway functions, as has already been established.)**

**(iv) That in cases where it is proposed that one local authority enforces in a different authority, SCC should ensure that there is a clear agreement between the two authorities, detailing how the 35% surplus will be distributed between the two Local Committees. (It is recognised that where an enforcement authority enforces on behalf of SCC in a different District, only the respective portions of the 35% surplus which have been agreed between the enforcement authority and the enforced authority, are returned to each respective Local Committees. This means that under these circumstances, the Local Committee of the enforcing authority will receive an additional sum to the 100% of the surplus that may have arisen in its own District. Correspondingly, the District where that surplus arose will still receive the 65% from County, but only the portion of the 35% that has been agreed with the enforcing authority, which inevitably will result in less than 100% of any surplus that has been generated in its own District, being at the disposal of it's Local Committee.)**

An alternative wording for this recommendation was discussed and agreed at the meeting.

**"In recognition that the arrangements for enforcement may well change in the future, a more simple recommendation to (e) above, is that SCC agrees a cost for enforcement with whichever authority / authorities that will enforce on their behalf, over a given area. 100% of any surplus, however generated is then returned to SCC, who will then put this entire sum at the discretion of the**

**Local Committee from where that surplus arose, which may, or may not, be the same Local Committee as that of the enforcing authority."**

Response to all sections

There is a need to ensure we have proper and fair working relationships with our enforcement agents. The distribution of a "share" of surplus will be considered as part of any revised operating agreements.

During the budget setting process the county council needs to allocate resources to manage, maintain and improve the whole highway network. This recommendation from the task group will be given further consideration as part of future budget setting processes.

**(f) That a period of free parking of up to half an hour be permitted in commercially sensitive locations identified by Local Committees and agreed by the Task Group, as identified in the annexes to this report.**

Response

Please see earlier reply to recommendation d).

**(g) That to more effectively reflect local variances across the County, there should be wherever possible a link to off-street charging tariffs, by means of a premium on-street tariff, based on the cost of parking off-street, plus around 20%.**

Response

This can be considered as part of any future charging level reviews and is referenced in the reports of EBC and R&B.

**(h) That as a result of (f) and (g) the original proposal for a 'low' tariff be discontinued and that where reference is made to tariffs in general, the terminology is indicative rather than absolute, in that the cost of these tariffs will vary across the county.**

Response

This is accepted although there are some areas where a free parking period is not appropriate and a lower tariff than £1 per hour is needed to reflect local circumstances. In these cases there needs to be discretion to set the most appropriate tariff.

**(i) That consideration should be given to the simultaneous introduction of residents parking zones wherever possible, to better manage displacement parking and increase resident's acceptance of the proposals.**

Response

Residents Parking Schemes can be complex in terms of consultation and managing the varied parking needs of an area. Many schemes tend to be quite large, covering a number of roads to reduce the effect of displacement. Public engagement is crucial as there are often strongly held opposing views. There are potentially many towns that could be considered for residents parking schemes and to roll these out could take several years and / or significant resources. Wherever possible parking reviews with Local Committees will be coordinated to tackle displacement problems

as quickly as possible.

***(j) That where necessary, the number of machines per parking slot are kept to a minimum in order to minimise their impact on the street scene, particularly in less urban locations.***

Response

The number of pay and display machines will be kept to a minimum and balance the needs and convenience of visitors and shoppers with the visual impact on the street scene.

***(k) That wherever possible, road markings for the parking bays are kept to the legal minimum in order to minimise the impact on the street scene, particularly in less urban locations.***

Response

Road markings will need to comply with the appropriate legislation. However, they will be kept to a minimum wherever possible.

***(l) That the basic machine to be purchased should be able to record the registration numbers of vehicles, contain a modem to report faults and the operational status and accept payment by both coin and phone.***

Response

This is the typical configuration for a pay and display machine that have been specified through the procurement process.

***(m) That those machines in locations where payment by card could be appropriate in the future should be equipped with card technology at purchase, rather than being upgraded more expensively at a later stage.***

Response

Pay and display machines can be configured to accept payment in a number of ways. The procurement process and call off contract allows for them to be fitted with a credit or debit card reader if needed, however pay by phone is likely to be a more viable alternative in most situations. We will be aiming to introduce pay by phone as the main alternative to cash payment.

***(n) That the cost to those wishing to park on street should be the same, regardless of the method of payment and that tariffs should be set to reflect this. There should be no premium for paying by phone, or where applicable, card.***

Response

The procurement for 'pay by phone' will aim to get the best deal for the Council and residents/customers of this service. This recommendation is desirable and will be investigated through the tender process.

***(o) That SCC accepts the sum of £2,500 as the 'average' operational cost per machine, which cumulatively results in the SCC cost per District / Borough and then across the county itself.***

Response

This sum is the accepted cost which has been used in assessing various sites.

**(p) That SCC insists before any extension to any of the current enforcement contracts is considered, each authority completes a standardized spreadsheet, detailing the cost base for its enforcement measures, set against measurable performance criteria of officers employed and their frequency of patrol etc.**

Response

Standardised financial reporting is being developed. Finance teams in the district and borough councils have been working with Surrey Treasurers to develop and agree a joint format. Sound financial and performance reporting will be a key requirement of any future agency agreements.

**(q) That further to (o) and (p), where an enforcement authority enforces in a District / Borough other than its own, SCC ensures that the 'enforced' authority has had sight of the spreadsheet and agrees, both with the accuracy of the cost base and that there is a clear agreement as to how any surplus should be shared between the enforcing authority and the enforced.**

Response

This is subject to agreements about on street enforcement post April 2012. Further consideration of this issue is needed.

**(r) That the space on the reverse of tickets be sold for marketing purposes, which would contribute to any surplus for SCC.**

Response

Ticket advertising will be investigated as on street charges are introduced.

**(s) That on introduction, there should be split tickets to allow retailers to refund the cost of parking to customers should they wish.**

Response

The pay and display ticket machines will have the facility to issue split tickets. This facility will be reviewed/discussed with local businesses as areas of pay and display are introduced.

**(t) That while it is not possible to park in a given space, it should be possible to purchase an annual season ticket in order to park in a given area, or zone.**

Response

This will be considered further if and when pay and display charges are more widespread. There is also a need to consider the cost and availability of season tickets in local car parks.

**(u) That the viability of payment by smart cards, or similar technology, be investigated with a view to their subsequent introduction.**

Response

Smart cards or residents parking cards can be considered if or when parking charges become more widespread in Surrey. The pay and display machines can be fitted with card readers as required. At the moment the cost of setting up such a scheme is unknown and would overly complicate the current initiative.

**(v) That given the more widespread introduction of charging to park on the street, the fees for parking permits again be reviewed and set to be more realistic in reflecting the benefit gained, rather than the current token charge of £50 per annum.**

Response

The cost of residents parking permits was reviewed last year and set to £50 for the first and £75 for subsequent permits from April 2011. The cost of permits will be reviewed as part of the county council's annual review of fees and charges.

**(w) That consideration should also be given as to whether a permit for a second vehicle at the same address should be offered at a lower, or a higher sum, in order to discourage multi vehicle ownership at locations where there is no off street parking.**

Response

Please see earlier reply to recommendation v). Revised guidance on the number and cost of resident permits has been endorsed as part of the Surrey Transport Plan (approved by Council in March 2011). The cost will be reviewed as part of the county council's annual review of fees and charges.

**(x) That the number of permits to be allowed per residence again be reviewed in order not to exacerbate the problem of on street parking by encouraging multi car ownership**

Response

Please see earlier reply to recommendation v). Revised guidance on the number of resident permits has been endorsed as part of the Surrey Transport Plan (approved by Council in March 2011)

**(y) That residents who reside within parking zones be enabled to purchase a book of visitor permits at a cost of £2 per permit per day.**

Response

This new charge has been adopted and came into effect in April 2011. Revised guidance on number and cost of visitor permits has been endorsed as part of the Surrey Transport Plan (approved by Council in March 2011). The cost of these permits is £2 per day and will be reviewed as part of the county council's annual review of fees and charges.

**(z) That SCC's Transportation Development Planning should continue to work closely with local planning authorities in determining how best to realistically address the acceptable provision of parking, both for new developments and particularly for conversions of larger properties into apartments, as necessary through a review of the current policy.**

Response

County Council Officers will continue to work with their colleagues within the Districts

and Boroughs.

### **Summary and proposed way forward**

The changes recommended by the Environment and Transport Committee will be incorporated where possible into the forward consultation programme for on street charging proposals.

The consultation programme will be modified to take account of this. It is therefore proposed to consult in the nine remaining districts and boroughs on the following timetable:

<b>Area</b>	<b>Consultation period</b>	<b>Cabinet review of consultation and decision date</b>
<b>Epsom and Ewell Surrey Heath Spelthorne Guildford</b>	<b>July 2011</b>	<b>27 September 2011</b>
<b>Woking Tandridge Mole Valley Waverley Runnymede</b>	<b>September 2011</b>	<b>29 November 2011</b>

**Ian Lake  
Cabinet Member for Transport  
24 May 2011**

**CABINET MEETING  
24 MAY 2011**

**Amendments and further information**

**Item 6 - Review of consultation response to on street parking charges in Elmbridge**

**1) Claygate.**

The proposals in the report recommend that parking charges in Claygate should only operate Monday to Friday. This is because the off street car park is also free on a Saturday.

Annexe 2 to the report incorrectly shows the operational time for Claygate to be Monday - Saturday. This should be Monday - Friday.

The estimated income for Claygate has been calculated assuming restrictions apply Monday -Saturday. Consequently if they were applied Monday - Friday then this would reduce the income by 1/6. This reduces income for Claygate to £12,000.

It has also been claimed (but not confirmed) that there will be one less space than shown on plans due to a new drop kerb access. This would further reduce income by 1/37 to £11,600. It should be noted that the income estimates for Claygate only assume 40% occupancy rates in the spaces available, although in practice it should be higher.

**2) Cobham**

Cobham High Street currently has unrestricted parking, meaning vehicles can park all day. The report proposes a 2 hour parking restriction in Cobham with no initial free period. The argument for a free 30 minutes for on street parking in the town is finely balanced, as there are two supermarkets nearby, however the majority of shops in the town have a different retail offer to the supermarkets. It could also be argued that the Waitrose in town brings customers in who also use other shopping facilities. The introduction of a free 30 minutes would mitigate concern that customers would be driven to use nearby supermarkets rather than shop in the town.

Should the Cabinet wish to consider a free 30 minutes in Cobham, the financial impact is estimated to reduce the income from £84,000 to £62,000. This, and the changes in Claygate are shown in the table below.

Location	Estimated cost of installing on street charging equipment	Possible income from on-street parking charges per year	Operating costs for pay and display machines per year
Claygate	£11,000	£11,600	£7,500
East Molesey	£22,000	£89,000	£15,000
Esher	£25,000	£61,000	£17,500
Walton-on-Thames	£60,000	£110,000	£45,000
Hersham	£8,000	£5,500	£5,000
Weybridge	£42,000	£48,000	£27,500
Cobham	£55,000	£62,000	£35,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£223,000</b>	<b>£387,100</b>	<b>£152,500</b>

**3) The following amendments are proposed to the report to clarify the powers under which the County Council is proposing these changes.**

Paragraph 126 should read “The County Council has the necessary legal powers to operate parking enforcement through the Traffic Management Act 2004 and introduce or amend orders to designate parking bays and introduce parking charges through the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984”.

In paragraph 127, the first sentence should read “The legal mechanism for introducing on street parking charges is through an order made under sections 45 and/or 46(1A) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended)”, and the last sentence should read “The introduction of such an order is subject to a statutory consultation and public notification process”.

Recommendation 13 should read “that any objections to the subsequent amendment notice are reviewed by the Cabinet Member for Transport prior to any order to introduce charging being made”.

**Item 7 - Review of consultation response to on street parking charges in Reigate and Banstead**

**4) Reigate**

Reigate has a 1 hour parking restriction in the High Street and a 2 hour restriction in Church Street. The case for a free 30 minutes in Reigate is not as strong as smaller shopping centres in Banstead or Horley, however there is considerable concern from the business community in the town that parking charges will harm trade. The Morrisons store in the town centre offers free parking for 2 hours and there is some feeling that without a free parking



period, customers will be attracted to use it rather than local shops. This is possible, however the supermarket also attracts visitors to the town who then also may go on to shop elsewhere. If introduced with parking charges, a free ½ hour would help reduce the concern from local businesses and should still cover the costs of operating the pay and display machines.

The table below has been updated to show the financial implications of a free ½ hour in Reigate (High Street, Church Street and Bell Street) to assist the Cabinet. If a free initial ½ hour is agreed then the maximum parking time allowed should be extended to 2 hours in the High Street and Church Street.

<b>Location</b>	<b>Estimated cost of installing on street charging</b>	<b>Possible income from on-street parking charges per year</b>	<b>Operating costs for pay and display machines per year</b>
Banstead	£52,000	£90,000	£35,000
Reigate	£40,000	£106,000	£27,500
Redhill	£22,000	£75,000	£17,500
Merstham	£25,000	£20,000	£5,000
Horley	£30,000	£50,000	£20,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£169,000</b>	<b>£341,000</b>	<b>£105,000</b>

**5) Banstead**

The attached Annexe 2 shows Banstead High Street to be Monday - Saturday, 0830-1830, 2 hours no return for 2 hours. This should be 'no return for 1 hour' and is correct in the report recommendations. This is to maintain consistency with other restrictions in Banstead.

**6) Horley**

The proposed tariff in Station Approach is Monday to Friday, 0800-1800, Medium tariff upto 5 hours (£1 per hour) or £5 for over 5 hours.

The proposed tariff in Russells Crescent is no charge for up to 5 hours or £5 for over 5 hours, 0830-18.30, Monday - Friday. There is no 2 hour time limit.

**7) The following amendments are proposed to the report to clarify the powers under which the County Council is proposing these changes.**

Paragraph 118 should read "The County Council has the necessary legal powers to operate parking enforcement through the Traffic Management Act 2004 and introduce or amend orders to designate parking bays and introduce parking charges through the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984".

In paragraph 119, the first sentence should read “The legal mechanism for introducing on street parking charges is through an order made under sections 45 and/or 46(1A) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended)”, and the last sentence should read “The introduction of such an order is subject to a statutory consultation and public notification process”.

Recommendation 21 should read “that any objections to the subsequent amendment notice are reviewed by the Cabinet Member for Transport prior to any order to introduce parking charges being made”.

**Ian Lake**  
**Cabinet Member for Transport**  
**24 May 2011**