

**Minutes of the meeting of Surrey County Council's
Local Committee in Elmbridge held at
4.00pm on Monday 21st June 2010 at
Walton Youth Centre, 1a Elm Grove, Walton upon Thames**

Surrey County Council Members

- ** Mr Michael Bennison
- ** Mr Nigel Cooper
- ** Mrs Margaret Hicks (Chairman)
- ** Mr Ernest Mallett
- ** Mr Anthony Samuels
- ** Mr John Butcher
- ** Mr Peter Hickman
- * Mr Ian Lake
- ** Mr Thomas Phelps-Penry

Elmbridge Borough Council Members

- ** Cllr David Archer
- ** Cllr John Bartlett
- A Cllr Glen Dearlove
- ** Cllr Barry Fairbank
- ** Cllr Jan Fuller
- A Cllr Tim Grey
- ** Cllr Alan Hopkins
- * Cllr John O'Reilly
- ** Cllr Karen Randolph

- ** Cllr John Sheldon
(substitute for Mr Tim Grey)

PART ONE

IN PUBLIC

18/10 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN [Item 1]

The Committee noted the appointment by Council of Margaret Hicks, Michael Bennison and John O'Reilly as Chairman and Vice Chairmen respectively for this municipal year.

18/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 2]

There were two apologies for absence from Cllr Glen Dearlove and Cllr Tim Grey. Cllr John Sheldon substituted for Cllr Tim Grey.

19/10 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 3]

The Minutes of the meeting held on 1st March 2010 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

20/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were no declarations of interest made.

21/10 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 5]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

1. She congratulated Mr Ernest Mallett on receiving an MBE for services to local government in the latest Queen's Honours List.
2. She congratulated Cllr John Sheldon on becoming Deputy Mayor for Elmbridge Borough Council
3. She welcomed Mr Tony Samuels to the Elmbridge Local Committee, following his election to Surrey County Council in May 2010.

22/10 APPOINTMENTS OF ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL CO-OPTED MEMBERS [Item 6]

The Committee noted that Elmbridge Borough Councillors Archer, Bartlett, Dearlove, Fairbank, Fuller, Grey, Hopkins, O'Reilly, Randolph had been appointed as members and Councillors Cooper, Lyon, Macleod, Sadler, Sheldon and White had been appointed as Substitute members of the Local Committee.

22/10 PETITIONS & LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION [Item 7]

Two letters of representation were submitted as follows:

French Gardens, Cobham – On Street Parking 23 signatures

Mr Percy Leary spoke at the Committee on behalf of the residents of French Gardens, Cobham.

Resolved: To receive a response to the letter of representation at the September Committee meeting.

Wolesey Road, Esher – Condition and usage of road – 22 signatures

Resolved: That the letter of representation be noted

There was one petition submitted as follows:

Objections to unsegregated shared use of residential pavement and pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles between nos 51 -81 Hampton Court Way

“We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to remove the shared use status of the residential pavement outside 51 – 81 Hampton Court Way”

There were 395 signatories on the petition. The lead representative Mr Nick Handel spoke to the petition for three minutes.

Resolved: To remove the cycle track outside Houses 51 – 58 Hampton Court Way as requested within the Letter of Representation

23/10 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 8]

There were six public questions received as set out in Annex A with the answers. Supplementary questions were asked and answered on questions 2 – 6.

24/10 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 9]

There were no Member questions submitted.

25/10 LOCAL COMMITTEE PROTOCOL [Item 10]

The Area Director for North West Surrey introduced the item stating that local committees were bound by the Standing Orders as set out within the Council’s Constitution except where a local protocol was drawn up to allow for minor variations to the Standing Orders relating to public engagement (Standing Order 41.1).

The Committee considered revisions to sections 2, 6 and 7 of the Elmbridge Local Committee Protocol.

Members were in favour of these proposals. However clarification was requested and given on the timings of registering to speak at the Committee on Public Rights of Way.

Resolved:

That the Local Protocol set out in Annex A of the agenda report was approved

26/10 REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES [Item 11]

The Committee considered the Member appointments (to represent Surrey County Council) to outside bodies for the 2010/11 municipal year.

Members noted that the Elmbridge Community Partnership was currently looking at its thematic groups, which could impact on memberships of one or more of these outside bodies, but the result of the considerations were not known at this time.

It was agreed that the membership of the outside bodies remain the same as for the 2009/10 year, with the exception of the Elmbridge Environmental Forum where Mr Tony Samuels would be the representative for Surrey County Council.

Resolved:

- (i) Mrs Margaret Hicks be appointed to the Elmbridge Community Partnership
- (ii) Mr Peter Hickman be appointed to the Elmbridge Health and Social Care Partnership
- (iii) Mr Ernest Mallett be appointed to the Elmbridge Business Network
- (iv) Mr Tony Samuels be appointed to Elmbridge Environmental Forum
- (v) Mr Nigel Cooper be appointed to the One Elmbridge Partnership
- (vi) Mrs Margaret Hicks be appointed as lead County Councillor for the Fire and Rescue Service and Mr Bennison be appointed as substitute
- (vii) Mrs Margaret Hicks be appointed as lead County Councillor for community safety.

27/10 ELMBRIDGE PARKING TASK GROUP [Item 12]

The Committee considered the terms of reference for the Elmbridge Parking Task Group.

It was agreed that the membership of the Group should be amended to include both of the Local Committee Vice-Chairmen. This would mean that the membership would be: the Chairman and both Vice-Chairmen of the Local Committee and the Borough Council Portfolio Holder for Highways.

The Committee discussed the reasons why this was not a meeting in public and therefore the reasons why the notes of the meeting were not a public document.

Members of the Committee were concerned that divisional members were not always involved in discussions relating to their local area. The Committee agreed that the terms of reference should be amended to state that the Task Group would consult with the relevant Divisional Members on items discussed.

Resolved:

- (i) The terms of reference for the Elmbridge Parking Task Group be approved as set out in Annex A
- (ii) The Chairman, both Local Committee Vice Chairmen and the Borough Portfolio Holder for Highways be appointed to the Elmbridge Parking Task Group in 2010/11.
- (iii) The Task Group would consult with the relevant Divisional Member on items discussed.

28/10 DRIVE SMART PRESENTATION [Item 13]

The Chairman welcomed Chief Inspector Clive Davies who gave a presentation update on Drive Smart.

CI Davies informed the Committee that there had been approximately 40 interventions since the start of Drive Smart and the key indicator on serious road issues had reduced from 403 in 2007/8 to 312 in 2009/10.

He advised that Drive Smart was a scheme that was funded by Surrey County Council but that involved partners across the county. The scheme had funded vehicles, vehicle activated signs, lasers, community speed watch kits and signs, communications and education.

With regards to education, he described the 'Theatre in Education' Forums taking place with Year 7 and Year 12 classes. He reported that they worked with Year 7 classes, as they were reportedly the most prone to risk taking, and with Year 12 classes as the Safe Drive Stay Alive evaluation had identified this age group as requiring intervention.

In addition, the School Speed Watch had been particularly effective. There were now 27 new schemes, which had resulted in 2358 interventions. Members commended the use of the School Speed Watch.

Resolved: The presentation be noted.

29/10 ELMBRIDGE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP UPDATE [Item 14]

The Chairman welcomed Peter Kipps (Elmbridge Community Safety Partnership Manager) who gave a presentation update on the activities

of the Community Safety Partnership (previously the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership).

Members were informed that the Partnership now had a duty to be more accountable to members of the public through the Councillor Call For Action.

He went through the finances relating to the Community Safety Partnership and outlined the main successes of the Partnership over the last year as:

- A significant reduction in the amount of graffiti around the borough
- An increase in the number of Neighbourhood Watch Schemes in the borough
- Positive take up of the Youth Development Scheme
- 3 new cold-caller zones (in Claygate, Cobham and Hersham) established
- New terms of agreement for the Domestic Abuse Outreach programme

He explained that the Elmbridge Community Safety Partnership had set three priorities for the 2010/11 year as set out below, and invited the Committee's comments on the priorities

1. To reduce crime and increase public confidence
2. To reduce violent crime (including domestic abuse) and the harm caused by drugs and alcohol
3. To reduce anti social behaviour, including the anti social use of vehicles and support positive youth diversion

The Committee discussed the importance of CCTV cameras and their use in resolving or detecting crimes. The Elmbridge Community Safety Partnership Manager advised that officers did not have the resources to watch all the CCTV footage but were being smart about which pieces of footage were scrutinised. He also advised the committee that Partnership had looked into using a volunteer group to watch the CCTV footage.

Members commended the Youth Development Scheme with the Surrey Fire and Rescue teams. The Committee suggested that figures of reported crime did not always reflect the level of crime correctly as often organisations did not report crimes that had taken place, such as the borough and district councils.

Resolved:

- (i) That the community safety funding (£2500) delegated to the Local Committee be transferred to the Elmbridge Community Safety Partnership
- (ii) The Area Director should manage and authorise expenditure from the budget delegated to the Local Committee in accordance with the Local Committee's decision.

- (iii) To note the funding of £12,000 to Elmbridge Community Safety Partnership for the provision of Domestic Abuse outreach in Elmbridge
- (iv) To receive the end of year report on activities for 2009/10.
- (v) To receive details of the Partnership Plan for 2010 – 11 and the actions to support that Plan.

30/10 A318 BARNES WALLIS DRIVE/OYSTER LANE – PROPOSED CYCLE ROUTE [Item 15]

The Committee considered a report seeking approval for regulatory signs to be agreed along Barnes Wallis Drive in relation to a shared footway/cycle route along Barnes Wallis/Oyster Lane.

The Local Highways Manager introduced the item stating that Section 106 monies from a planning permission granted in 2005 were funding this scheme. Therefore the scheme needed to be implemented by February 2011.

Resolved:

That the erection and use of regulatory signs to diagram numbers 955, 956 and 957 in accordance with the Traffic Signs and General Directions 2002 be approved.

31/10 FORMER GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS SITE A309 KINGSTON BY PASS, HICHLEY WOOD – PROPOSED TOUCAN CROSSING [Item16]

The Committee considered a report seeking approval for regulatory signs to be agreed along Barnes Wallis Drive in relation to a proposed toucan crossing along the Kingston By-pass (A309).

The Local Highways Manager introduced the item stating Elmbridge Borough Council had granted planning permission for this development in 2006, the committee was solely being asked to approve the regulatory signs.

Members did not agree with the principle that the footbridge should be removed, nor that a toucan crossing should be introduced in its place. There was concern that this would not be the best solution for the residents of the area, and the local Member stated that he had not been consulted on the proposal before or after the planning permission had been given.

The Committee was also concerned about whether the proposed toucan crossing should have been brought to the Local Committee for decision rather than a decision being made at the planning application stage. The Local Highways Manager advised that as it was a Transport

Development Control proposal it had been considered at the planning application stage. Members agreed that they wanted more information on the process before making a decision on this report.

Resolved:

To defer consideration of this item until the next meeting so that more information on the decisions relating to the scheme could be provided.

32/10 MEMBERS' ALLOCATIONS – ANNUAL REPORT [Item 17]

The Committee considered a report on how Members Allocations were spent in 2009/10.

Members were supportive of receiving this information in this format, but requested that totals were given to each of the columns. The Committee discussed how to assess the benefit of the projects.

Resolved:

That the content of the report be noted.

33/10 PROPOSED UPDATE SPEED LIMIT POLICY FOR CONSULTATION WITH LOCAL COMMITTEES [Item 19]

The Committee considered a report on the proposed updated Speed Limit Policy as part of the internal consultation.

The Road Safety Partnership Project Manager introduced the item highlighting the benefits of the revisions to local residents and explaining how the changes would impact on the work of the Local Committee.

Members were in support of the Policy to allow Local Committees to make decisions on speed restrictions. They recognised the benefits of introducing 20 mph restrictions in relation to safety on the roads but acknowledged that if there were insufficient resources to enforce these restrictions, they would not be beneficial. However, they strongly suggested that the Policy should take into account the vehicle density of roads rather than just the length of the road when looking at speed restrictions.

It was agreed that subject to the Cabinet approving the revisions, the Local Committee should undertake an informal meeting with the Local Highways Manager and the Road Safety Partnership Project Manager to consider a live request for a speed limit change and the options open to the Committee.

Resolved:

To submit the following comments into the consultation on this Policy:

- (i) The Members were in support of the Policy to allow Local Committees to make decisions on speed restrictions
- (ii) They recognised the benefits of introducing 20 mph restrictions in relation to safety on the roads but acknowledged that if there were insufficient resources to enforce these restrictions, they would not be beneficial.
- (iii) The Policy should take into account the vehicle density of roads rather than just the length of the road when looking at speed restrictions

34/10 FINANCIAL ALLOCATIONS 2010/2011 FOR HIGHWAY WORKS [Item 20]

The Committee considered a report on the level of funding available for minor highway and cyclic maintenance works for the 2010/11 financial year and a proposal to use the £100,000 Local Revenue Budget to fund an additional Community Gang for 8 months to directly deal with local divisional Member concerns.

The Local Highways Manager advised that within the current budget as agreed by the Cabinet on 30 March 2010, the Local Committee had a local revenue budget of £100,000. The proposal was that the Committee fund a community gang to carry out works across the borough so that all areas of the borough would benefit from the funding.

However, he advised Members that the availability of this funding was subject to the conclusions of the Coalition Emergency Budget being considered on the 22 June 2010. Early assumptions were that the Highways Service budget would be cut by £3-9 million (which would include the local revenue budget).

Members discussed the options open to them to fund this community gang if this funding was removed. It was agreed that the Committee was in support of using the £100,000 to fund this work, but that it would not agree on other capital bids until the conclusions of the Coalition Emergency Budget had been published so that could reconsider how to use its capital allocations.

Resolved:

- (i) To note the funding for highway maintenance revenue works as set out in Annex A,
- (ii) To approve the use of the £100,000 Local Revenue allocation to fund an additional Community Gang for 8 months to directly deal with local divisional Member concerns.

35/10 MEMBERS' ALLOCATIONS REPORT [Item 18]

The Committee considered a report on the criteria and guidance relating to Members' Allocations, and funding proposals for approval.

The Chairman proposed that the Committee deferred consideration of the proposed capital allocations until the next meeting of the Committee, so that it could consider them in light of the information on whether the Committee would still have the £100,000 capital allocation.

The Area Director for North Surrey directed Members attention to paragraph 5 i of the guidance note on allocations, where it stated that Members' allocations should rarely be used to 'top up' the Highways budget agreed by the County Council, especially where the additional £100,000 capital allocation has been allocated by the Local Committee for Highways purposes. He advised that the legal criteria for the allocation of Members' Allocations were set out within the 'Criteria for Use of Funds' but that the Committee needed to take into consideration what was set out within the guidance note when making a decision on allocations.

The Committee acknowledged the statement within the guidance note, but also acknowledged that the legal criteria for Members' Allocations were set out within the 'Criteria for Use of Funds'. It was noted that this funding had not previously been used for highways work, but that the Committee needed to look at how the allocation could be used for the most value for money in the current financial arena.

It was agreed that no decisions would be made on capital allocations until the next meeting where the Committee would have more information on the impact the Coalition Emergency Budget would have on the Council's budgets.

Resolved:

- (i) To note the Criteria and Guidance Note for the use of Members' Allocations as set out in Annex A and B.
- (ii) To note the allocations approved under delegated authority by the Area Director in consultation with the Chairman (paragraphs 2.1 to 2.2).
- (iii) To note returned funding of £36 and £125 granted to Elmbridge Young Persons of Honour Award 2009/10 (approved at LC on 9 March 2009 and 27 July 2009) to Mr Cooper's revenue allocation.
- (iv) To note returned funding of £64 granted to Elmbridge Young Persons of Honour Award 2009/10 (approved at LC on 9 March 2009) to Mr Lake's revenue allocation.
- (v) To note returned funding of £125 granted to Elmbridge Young Persons of Honour Award 2010 (approved at LC on 27 July 2009) to Mr Mallett's revenue allocation.

- (vi) To note returned funding of £2,500 (£500 each) granted to the Surrey County Council Locality Team towards a Motor Skills Course (LC 16 June 2008) to Mr Bennison's, Mr Samuels', Mr Hickman's, Mr Mallett's and Mr Phelp-Penry's allocations.
- (vii) To note returned funding of £3,350 for concrete post and galvanised railing for Station Road, Thames Ditton (approved at LC on 28 March 2006) to the Capital allocation.
- (viii) To consider an application for funding of £3,520 towards the replacement of chairs and provision and installation of a cooker at Lower Green Community Association to be funded from Mr Cooper's allocation.
- (ix) To consider an application for funding of £1,500 towards the CODS (Cobham, Oxshott, Downside and Stoke D'Abernon) Youth Action Group Costa Coffee Club to be funded from Mr Butcher's allocation.
- (x) To consider an application for funding of £300 towards the installation of a teak 10th anniversary memorial seat at Hurst Meadows by Probus Club of Molesey to be funded from Mr Mallett's allocation.
- (xi) To consider an application for funding of £2,600 from the Elmbridge Community Safety Partnership towards a new gate and fence either side of a tunnel under the road at Desborough Island in Weybridge to be funded from Mr Lake's allocation.
- (xii) To consider an application for funding of £1,930 from the Bishop Fox Resident's Group for estate maintenance of public leisure areas on Bishop Fox Estate to be funded from Mr Mallett's allocation.
- (xiii) To consider an application for funding of £1,000 from Claygate Recreation Ground Trust/Claygate Cricket Club towards a new Clubhouse at Claygate Recreation Ground to be funded from Mr Bennison's allocation.
- (xiv) To consider an application for funding of £1,200 from West End (Esher) Cricket Club towards new Colts equipment to be funded from Mr Cooper's allocation.
- (xv) To consider an application for funding of £3,000 from CHEER (Concerned & Help for East Elmbridge Retired) towards the expansion of the Befriending Scheme to be funded £2,000 from Mr Cooper's allocation and £1,000 from Mr Hickman's allocation.
- (xvi) To consider an application for funding of £1,500 from Esher Girl Guiding towards the Centenary Celebrations at Hampton Court Palace to be funded £750 from Mr Cooper's allocation and £750 from Mr Mallett's allocation.
- (xvii) To consider an application for funding of £2,140 towards new flooring at Downside & Hatchford Village Hall to be funded from Mr Butcher's allocation.
- (xviii) To defer consideration on applications for the following until the September 2010 Committee meeting:
 - £4,000 Capital funding from Claygate Recreation Ground Trust/Claygate Cricket Club towards a new Clubhouse at Claygate Recreation Ground sponsored by Mr Bennison, and

- £2,000 Capital funding for flooring at Downside & Hatchford Village Hall sponsored by Mr Butcher.

36/10 2010 PARKING REVIEW AND SCHEMES [Item 21]

The Committee considered the results of a stakeholder exercise in Cobham, Palace Road and Wolsey Road in East Moseley and East Molesey controlled parking zone (CPZ) and other proposed amendments to parking controls.

The Parking Projects Manager reminded the Committee that at its last meeting, the Members had requested that consultation was conducted with residents, businesses and other stakeholders on parking proposals within the areas set out above. He advised the Committee, that the proposals recommended were subject to funding being available.

Members were concerned that they were being asked to make a decision on pay and display parking across the borough, without a County Council policy setting out the Council's approach to this issue. Because of this, the Committee requested that Annex A and B of the agenda report be brought back to the Committee for consideration once the County Council has an agreed policy on pay and display parking.

The Committee supported the proposals around Annex C – Wolsey Road and Palace Road, East Molesey.

With regards to Annex D of the report, the Committee was in favour of the majority of the schemes with the exception of the proposal relating to Location 1 (Kenilworth Drive & Carrow Road, Walton on Thames) and Location 3 (4) and Location 3 (5). For location 1 the Parking Projects Manager informed the Committee that the consultation had been completed and that the responses indicated a clear majority of residents are opposed to becoming part of the Hersham CPZ and so no further action would be taken.

Resolved:

The Local Committee resolved to agree that:

- (i) The controlled parking zone account surplus in Elmbridge be used for implementation of the Walton controlled parking scheme and the 2010 parking review
- (ii) That the Local Committee give due consideration to allocating any additional funding required to complete the implementation of the parking amendments as part of the 2010 parking review
- (iii) Annexes A & B be brought back to the Committee for further consideration after a County Council Pay and Display Policy has been agreed

- (iv) In accordance with the recommendations in Annex C the necessary legal procedure be undertaken, to make new traffic regulation orders and/or amendments to existing traffic regulation orders as necessary in order to implement the recommended proposals, subject to funding being available
- (v) In accordance with the recommendations in relation to Annex D – Locations 2, 3 (1)(2)&(3), 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8 the necessary legal procedure be undertaken, to make new traffic regulation orders and/or amendments to existing traffic regulation orders as necessary in order to implement the recommended proposals, subject to funding being available
- (vi) Location 3 (4) and Location 3 (5) be deferred for consideration at the next Committee meeting so Members can view the relevant plans and details of these schemes.
- (vii) To revoke the voucher scheme in Hillcrest, Weybridge to bring the existing provisions in the controlled parking zone in line with the other controlled parking zones in the borough.

The meeting closed at 7.00pm

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 21st June 2010**AGENDA ITEM 8****PUBLIC QUESTIONS****Question 1: Mr David Cox – Sandy Way Residents Association**

Note: Members of the S.W.R.A. Committee attended a Local Action Clinic with the Local Councillors at Walton Library on Saturday the 5th June 2010 where apparently contradictory information was given regarding the introduction of the proposed No Parking Arrangements for New Zealand Avenue and Sandy Way in Walton-on-Thames.

The S.W.R.A. Committee would therefore request that the SCC Parking Group present to the meeting a clear and unequivocal statement regarding the current No Parking Arrangements to be introduced in New Zealand Avenue and what manner of controls, if any, are envisaged for Sandy Way to protect the residents from the predicted parking onslaught that will inevitably result.

Mr Rikki Hill will give the following response:

Both aspects of the question are answered in reports being presented to the committee today and are that, subject to funding being approved, the new parking restrictions in New Zealand Avenue will be introduced as soon as the works can be arranged; and there is a proposal for committee to consider to introduce a restriction on waiting at any time (double yellow lines) around the whole of the inside of Sandy Way.

Question 2 - Mr Tony Palmer – Weybridge Parking Proposals

Twenty three parking proposals affecting Weybridge were presented to the March 2010 Local Committee. The proposals were distributed only 2 days before the meeting, not allowing review, and all these proposals were approved without any debate or scrutiny by local representatives.

We have since reviewed the proposals and support nineteen in principle (including all fifteen 'safety' proposals and four of the 'amenity' or non-safety schemes that increase parking and have no apparent adverse impact).

HOWEVER, we have substantial concerns about for of the 'amenity' proposals that:

- Effectively make some roads residents only parking with an adverse impact on nearby businesses, other residents, visitors and workers' amenity.
- or
- Would worsen 'commuter' parking and road safety by revoking parking restrictions near a school (contrary to the recent CPZ consultants proposal). These proposals are inconsistent with an acceptable proposal in this package for a similar school location elsewhere in Weybridge.

As these proposals were presented to the Committee without any explanation, justification, impact assessment or adverse impact mitigation, we conclude that the Committee Members did not have the information to permit a balanced judgement on these proposals.

We ask that, regarding the parking proposals presented to the Local Committee in March 2010, will the committee agreed to (1) defer publication of four parking proposals* in Weybridge that address non-safety issues until further review and (2) require officers to bring the results of such reviews (in terms of justification, impact assessment and mitigation) back to the full committee before publication?

* Proposals of concern are: No 53 Holstein Avenue, No 54 Limes Road, No 58 Portmore Park Road and No 65 Melrose Road.

Mr Rikki Hill will give the following answer:

All the proposed changes to the parking controls and revocations that were presented to the committee in March had been assessed by officers taking into account a number of factors, including, but not limited to, road safety, accessibility, congestion and local support. The outcome of the assessments was considered by the Parking Task Group before being brought to the committee for consideration. Where the committee had concerns about particular proposals, they were deferred for decision at a later date, however as no such concerns were expressed about the four sites referred to in the question, they should proceed as agreed in March.

Question 3: Mr Rodger Bain – West Grove, Hersham

At the meeting of this Committee in July 2009, residents of West Grove, Walton on Thames made a request for the introduction of parking restrictions in order to reduce the congestion caused by commuter parking. Following a survey by council engineers during the winter it was decided that although West Grove does have a parking problem it was less pressing than other sites in the borough. Can we please have some indication of when West Grove will percolate to the top of the list for action and the introduction of restrictions?

Mr Rikki Hill will give the following answer:

All sites, such as West Grove, which are not being progressed as part of the current review will remain on the list for consideration, along with any new sites for which we receive requests, as part of the next review. As we cannot foresee what new locations may be put forward, it is not possible to put a time scale on when any particular location might be recommended for the introduction of restrictions.

Question 4: Ms Bridgette Tomlins/Ms Seema Kang – Cedar Road, Weybridge

Residents of Cedar Road, Weybridge are deeply concerned by seemingly unfair implications of the proposed new parking restrictions for Cedar Road and Holstein Avenue, which we understand will issue permits to other people to park in one part of Cedar Road, while apparently banning Cedar Road residents from parking there. The spaces in question are in the 11.80 metres at the end of Cedar Road which were compulsorily retained in council control when Cedar Road went private. Will the committee consider lifting the proposed ban on residents of Cedar Road from having permission to park in spaces on this length of their own road?

Mr Rikki Hill will give the following answer:

A short section at the Holstein Avenue end of Cedar Road is public highway. As parking is going to be controlled in the whole of Holstein Avenue it makes sense to introduce controls on this section rather than leave this small area of highway unrestricted. In the circumstances, the most appropriate controls to introduce are similar ones to those being introduced in Holstein Avenue.

Question 5: Mr Alistair Mann – Parking Consultation Report Cobham

The Cobham Consultation Officer's Report refers to a 'Broad Financial Analysis' underpinning the business case

What are the specifics of this, in terms of TOTAL initial investment (machines and labour); ongoing costs and projected revenue?

Mr Rikki Hill will give the following answer:

An outline of the financial analysis is included in the section 5 of the main report '2010 Parking review and schemes'. In Cobham we would be looking to install four pay and display machines at a cost of approximately £3,000 per machine (including installation), with annual running costs of £1,000. The projected revenue in Cobham, based on 40-50% occupancy is approximately £27,000 per annum.

**Question 6: Ms Cathy Cott
Elmbridge Parking Review and Schemes (Item 21)**

Conclusions from the recent Cobham parking consultation were that respondents wanted parking controls but said that pay and display would be wrong. The report of the consultation dismissed the latter conclusion and does not address the detriments of pay and display that concerned respondents. (It is the inconvenience of pay and display not necessarily the fees, that deters usage). The sense of the report is to advocate and clear the way for pay and display with the aim of revenue to finance parking schemes elsewhere. What are the priority reasons, and in what priority, for officers' recommendation of pay and display?

Mr Rikki Hill will give the following answer:

The primary reasons for introducing pay and display are:

- to provide turnover of the available parking space in the prime shopping locations in the High Street and Church Street
- to better control the short term parking at these locations - pay and display parking is generally better complied with than free limited stay parking, as well as being easier to enforce, so it is a more effective means of ensuring regular availability of space for users
- to better enable the county council to carry out its duty to run its on street operations efficiently, effectively and economically, as outlined in the government's statutory guidance issued under the Traffic Management Act 2004

There is no order of priority as all factors have to be taken in to consideration when introducing a scheme of this nature.