

**Minutes of the meeting of Surrey County Council's
Local Committee in Elmbridge held at
4.00pm on Monday 28 February 2011 at
Elmbridge Civic Centre, Esher, KT10 9SD**

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
- * Cllr Glen Dearlove
- ** Cllr Barry Fairbank
- ** Cllr Jan Fuller Substituted for by Cllr John Sheldon
- * Cllr Tim Grey
- ** Cllr Alan Hopkins Substituted for by Cllr Elizabeth Cooper
- ** Cllr John O'Reilly
- * Cllr Karen Randolph

PART ONE

IN PUBLIC

01/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Cllr Jan Fuller and Cllr Alan Hopkins gave their apologies for this meeting, Cllr John Sheldon and Cllr Elizabeth Cooper substituted for them respectively.

02/11 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The Minutes of the meeting held on 6 December 2010 were confirmed.

03/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Mr John Butcher declared a prejudicial interest in item 8, in relation to a property that he owned.

Cllr John Sheldon declared a personal interest in item 15 as he was a Chairman of the Hershams Youth Club.

04/11 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

It is my pleasure to announce that in 515 days time, Elmbridge Borough Council will be hosting an Olympic event.

On 10th February 2011, it was announced by the London Organising Committee that the Olympic Road Cycling Race would be coming to Elmbridge. This will be a free event for all our residents to enjoy and to cheer the world's best cyclists as they battle for Olympic glory on the streets of Molesey, Walton-on-Thames, Weybridge, Oxshott, Esher and Thames Ditton.

Every Olympic event must be tested, and the test event for the Road Cycling event will be run on a single day, and last Thursday the date for this was confirmed for Sunday 14th August 2011.

To help our businesses benefit in a similar way from this remarkable opportunity, we are hosting a business information event on Tuesday 8th March at Sandown Park. I would encourage all local businesses to attend. As more detailed plans are drawn up, information will be provided to residents and business in a range of ways, including through newsletters, websites, the press and public meetings. I look forward to making regular announcements as we receive more detail on issues such as the best places to view the race, where park and rides will be located, and the timings and locations of road closures.

05/11 PETITIONS & LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION [Item 5]

One petition and one letter of representation were submitted as follows:

The Crossroads: The Woodlands, Woodend, Grove Way, Esher – Petition

Mr Mark Cockburn spoke at the Committee on behalf of the residents of The Woodlands, Woodend and Grove Way, Esher. There had been several accidents at this junction recently and recently one individual had not been prosecuted for dangerous driving due to condition of the road signage and markings. He requested that the Council implement relatively low cost solutions of remarking the road and improving the signage.

Resolved: To receive a response to the letter of representation at the 20 June 2011 Committee meeting.

The Parade, Claygate – Pay and Display - Letter of Representation

Mr Richard Catling spoke at the Committee on behalf of the traders of The Parade. New parking restrictions had recently been implemented along The Parade and these were working well. He requested that the Council did not implement the proposed on-street charges proposed along The Parade.

Resolved: To receive a response to the letter of representation at the 20 June 2011 Committee meeting.

06/11 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]

There was one public question received as set out in Annex A with the answers. **A supplementary question was asked and answered on this question.**

07/11 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 7]

There were two Member questions received as set out in Annex B with the answer. **A supplementary statement was asked.**

08/11 APPLICATION FOR A MAP MODIFICATION ORDER TO ADD A FOOTPATH TO THE DEFINITIVE MAP AND STATEMENT FOR SURREY ALONG LEIGH PLACE FROM STOKE ROAD (A245) TO TILT COMMON, COBHAM [Item 8]

The Committee was asked to consider an application to add a footpath to a definitive map and statement for Surrey over the road known as Leigh Place, Cobham.

As declared in item 4, Mr John Butcher declared a prejudicial interest in item 8, in relation to a property that he owned and left the room during the discussion and voting of this item.

Mr Dolman, speaking against the officer recommendation made the following points:

- Following a burglary in 2007 the owners of properties along Leigh Place were advised by Surrey Police to put in the gates to bar the entrance to the road.
- At that time, Surrey County Council informed the owners that there was no public right of way recorded on the definitive map and statement for Surrey along Leigh Place.
- They then proceeded to put in the code on the gate, which was the trigger for the objection from those using Leigh Place as a right of way. However the owners had provided the individuals who had objected with the gate code and the matter had been resolved.
- Human Rights Act, as specified within the report, needed to be taken into consideration including respect for individual's private life

and peaceful enjoyment of their possessions.

- There were rights of way on each side of Leigh Place so this path was not required to be a right of way.
- There have been “Access to Residents Only” signs on the gates since 1999.
- He questioned the statement in the report that those using the road as a right of way had not been challenged stating that there could be over 100 people using the road and it would not be possible to check each individual without a security guard.
- He requested that the Committee refuse the officer recommendation on the grounds of safety for the residents of Leigh Place.

Mr Eyles and Mr Bartley, the applicants, made the following points in response to Mr Dolman:

- They understood the desire of the residents to secure their road on the grounds of safety and privacy.
- They understood that Surrey Police had advised to gate the road but that they hadn’t known that this was not a right of way.
- They agreed with Mr Dolman that they had reached an agreed position but that they had misgivings about this as it would only be able to be used by those “in the know” so they weren’t unhappy that the application could not be withdrawn.
- There were footpaths each side of Leigh Place but these led in different directions, they were poorly maintained and were dangerous.
- The Council needed to stop the gradual erosion of rights over land to the public.
- There was sufficient user evidence to suggest that this route had been used since 1980.
- In reference to the officer report, they noted that the objector to the recommendation had stated that there had been a placard on the gate of Leigh Place informing members of the public of the private road status but they had not seen this.

Mr Austin, speaking for the officer recommendation made the following points:

- He had lived in the area since 1960 and had used Leigh Place as a pathway between 1960 to 2008. He had also used it for vehicular access up to the 1970s when it was closed to traffic.
- There had originally been a hotel at the location and there had been through access prior to this. He would still use the road for vehicular access if he could.
- He used Leigh Place on foot daily. He had not been challenged, and hadn’t needed to ask for permission.
- Gates had been erected about 10 years ago, but they had only been erected at the Leigh Hill end recently.

- He had not known it wasn't a right of way until a couple of years ago when he was locked out when it snowed.
- Most private roads allow pedestrian access to members of the public.

Mrs Briant, the Countryside Access Officer, introduced the report by responding to the points raised by Mr Dolman. She stated that when the council had advised him that Leigh Place was not recorded on the definitive map and statement as a public right of way, that was the position at that particular point in time but it did not necessarily mean that the public had not acquired rights over the route.

With regards to the comments on the Human Rights Act, if the Committee were minded to agree with the officer recommendation, they would be formalising rights that already exist and, in the circumstances, the recommendation was not considered to engage Article 8 and Article 1 of Protocol 1. The fact that there were alternative public footpaths in the vicinity was not a factor that could be taken into account when considering the evidence.

She stated that the County Council had a duty under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to maintain a definitive map and statement of public rights of way within Surrey. It also had a duty to modify the definitive map and statement if it discovers evidence which, on balance, supports a modification, and where there arises under section 31(1) and (2) of the Highways Act 1980, an unrebutted presumption of dedication of a way as a public footpath as a result of 20 years public use of a way as of right and without interruption, the 20 years ending with the date when the right of the public to use it was brought into question. Although the applicant had requested that their application be withdrawn, once evidence has been submitted the council did not have power to allow the applicants to withdraw. The council were required to investigate the matter and to bring it to a conclusion. The Committee were therefore requested to consider the application.

A background to the application was given to the Committee, with an explanation that the evidence was not considered to be sufficient to support vehicular access. However, there was sufficient evidence to suggest that members of the public had used the route on foot for 49 years despite the gates being introduced along Leigh Place.

She explained the difference between the statutory test and common law test, and that issues of desirability, security, safety and privacy could not be taken into consideration when determining the application.

During the discussion the Committee made the following points:

- Providing a key to certain individuals using the right of way was not a permanent solution and could easily be changed by those living along Leigh Place
- Considering the evidence set out within the report and from those

speaking at the Committee, under the balance of probabilities there was sufficient evidence to suggest that there should be a public footpath along Leigh Place.

The Committee voted on the item and in a majority 16 voted for the officer recommendation, 1 person abstained.

Resolved: That:

- i) A Map Modification Order be made to add a public footpath from Stoke Road along Leigh Place to its junction with Tilt Common, Cobham to the definitive map and statement for Surrey. The route will be known as public footpath no.93 (Esher).
- ii) In the event that one or more objection is received and maintained, that the order and supporting documentation be forwarded to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to decide the matter.

**09/11 LETTER OF REPRESENTATION – COPSEM LANE, OXSHOTT
[Item 9]**

This was a response to a letter of representation that was submitted to the Committee on 6 December 2010. The report set out to update the Members on the investigations into the request for a possible speed limit change along Copsem Lane, Oxshott.

The Area Team Manager introduced the item stating that there was a good safety record along this section of road and that Surrey Police agreed with the current speed limit so it was difficult to pursue this scheme. He set out the different ways of regulating traffic set out within the petition and the reasons why this would be inappropriate at this time. It was reported that the Highways Team would monitor the collision history along this section of road as a matter of course and if collisions rose significantly this would be referred to the Casualty Reduction Working Group for action.

Mr Butcher asked whether the officers knew of whether section 106 money had been allocated towards traffic signs when the housing nearby had been constructed. Also he asked whether residents had been asked whether they would want to fund the traffic regulation methods. The Area Team Manager advised that he would look into whether there were section 106 monies available, but that he did not consider that it would be value for money for residents for them to fund the scheme.

Cllr Sheldon asked whether it would be possible to install a mirror on the junction. The Area Team Manager advised that it was difficult to judge the speed of vehicles through a mirror.

Resolved: That the contents of the report be noted as there was

insufficient justification for intervention at this location in terms of recorded collisions; therefore it was not considered value for money to progress a scheme at this time.

10/11 LETTER OF REPRESENTATION – QUEENS ROAD/SOUTH ROAD, WEYBRIDGE [Item 10]

This was a response to a letter of representation that was submitted to the Committee on 6 December 2010. The report set out to update the Members on the investigations relating to inconvenient parking along Queens Road and South Road, Weybridge.

The Area Team Manager introduced the item stating that he had conducted a site visit to the location and viewed the good safety record along this section of road. It was his advised that the problems caused along this stretch of road was due to motorists not adhering to the double yellow line parking enforcement. He stated that due to the lack of collisions along this road it would not be value for money to continue with this scheme at this time. The Highways Team would monitor the collision history along this section of road as a matter of course and if collisions rose significantly this would be referred to the Casualty Reduction Working Group for action.

Mr Lake questioned whether the Local Committee had previously given funding to restrict the hours of loading and unloading on this road. HE requested that this be looked into and reported back to the Committee.

Resolved: That the contents of the report be noted as there was insufficient justification for intervention at this location in terms of recorded collisions; therefore it was not considered value for money to progress a scheme at this time.

11/11 PETITIONS RESPONSE – ASHLEY ROAD, WEYBRIDGE [Item 11]

This was a response to two petitions that were submitted to the Committee on 6 December 2010. The report set out to update the Members on the investigations relating to road safety along Ashley Road, Weybridge.

The Interim Area Team Manager introduced the item stating that there had been no collisions along this road that involved members of the public, in the last speed survey it was ascertained that the average speed of motorists along this road was under 20mph, with the odd motorist travelling at speeds above 30mph. However it was noted that there had been issues with motorists along this road, and therefore it had been recommended that the proposals put forward within the petition be considered alongside the other proposals for inclusion within the 2011/12 Highways Schemes Programme.

Cllr Sadler stated that the survey had been taken several years previously and during a time when traffic would have naturally slowed down due to congestion on the roads. If 15% of the traffic travelling at above 30mph this would equate to 1,200 vehicles a day along a narrow stretch of road.

Several of the Members stated that they were in support of the petitioners and requested that this be added to the list to be considered as a matter of urgency.

Resolved: That the contents of the report be noted and agreed that the Committee would consider the suggestions made when determining the 2011/12 Programme.

12/11 PROPOSED ON-STREET 'PAY AND DISPLAY' PARKING CHARGES IN ELMBRIDGE – LOCAL COMMITTEE CONSULTATION [Item 12]

The Parking Projects Team Leader introduced the report stating that on the 12 January 2011 the Cabinet Member for Transport approved a consultation programme for the introduction of on street pay and display parking charges in Surrey.

The proposals would be publicised during the week and the details on the County Council website. This report had been brought to the Committee as part of the consultation, to allow the Committee to formally input into the process.

It was noted that this topic had been considered at the Elmbridge Borough Council meeting the previous week, and the resolution at this meeting was that there should be a starting 30 minute free period and that any displacement should be responded to rapidly. The majority of the Members agreed with this principle but stated that the Committee should only be advising the Cabinet on issues within Elmbridge not for the whole county.

Several Members stated that they didn't agree with the principle of introducing pay and display parking, and that the residents didn't agree with its implementation either.

With regards to the proposal put forward by Elmbridge Borough Council's Cabinet, Cllr O'Reilly stressed that this was a Parking Management Strategy issue. If the number of cars on the roads increased then there needed to be a sensible solution to allow residents to access local businesses, and that a 30 minute free waiting period was likely to increase the churn of vehicles in these bays.

Several Members questioned the statements within the report regarding the benefit this would provide for local businesses and stated that more evidence from other areas of the country that had implemented this type of scheme should have been included within the report.

It was noted that currently Surrey County Council subsidised the parking enforcement teams and this needed to be made into a cost neutral service to provide value for money to the residents of Surrey. The Parking Team Manager advised the Committee that funding had been set aside to tackle displacement issues arising from the implementation of this scheme, and that it would be possible to set up the machines to allow motorists to get the first 30 minutes free at any location.

The Committee considered and voted on a proposition to request that the Cabinet abandon the whole scheme as it was not in keeping within the nature of Surrey as a whole. This was defeated.

The Committee then considered, voted on and approved by majority the following recommendation:

Resolved: That the Elmbridge Local Committee, recognising its commitment to the community as a top priority, notes the proposal by the Cabinet to introduce Pay and Display on-street parking charges in this Borough and, in order to promote the economic vitality of local shops and small businesses and the wider interests of Elmbridge residents, calls upon the Cabinet to

- a) Provide a 30 minute period of free parking in each street or place where on-street Pay and Display charges are intended to be introduced in Elmbridge
- b) Respond rapidly to residents' requests to extend an area of no-parking restrictions where these roads are affected by displacement in Elmbridge

13/11 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES 2011/12 [Item 13]

The North East Area Team Manager introduced the report stating that the Council had allocated £2m across the county for Integrated Transport Strategy schemes. The revenue programme was based on similar allocations to 2010/11 and a capital programme of £202,084. This report was brought to the Committee to gain a steer for the directions of spend in Elmbridge.

He went through the recommendations setting out the reasoning behind each, and asking that each of the local members submit one or two of their priority highways schemes (revenue) for the coming year in the next week so that these could be fed into the discussion at the informal meeting on 21st March 2011.

The Members agreed that Option 2 of the report for capital works would allow for more of the Committee's priority highways schemes to be carried out in the coming year.

Cllr Butcher questioned where the reasoning behind the figures in both options and stated that the Committee should be looking at where the need for the works was rather than splitting the funding by division.

The Area Team Manager agreed that a list of all the schemes scheduled to be carried out by the Highways Service in the coming year would be circulated to borough members on the Committee.

Resolved: That

- (i) The proposed revenue allocations in Table 1 be agreed.
- (ii) The preferred capital programme scenario for 2011/12 is as set out below:

Option 2 Focus on carriageway maintenance

Work type	Proposed Allocation	Comment
Small carriageway patching schemes	100,000	Fund to target localised small-scale improvements to carriageway beyond pothole repair.
Road Safety	60,000	Fund to target road safety schemes based on prioritised need by Road Safety Team in addition to the Countywide Programme.
Local Access Improvements	37,000	Funds could be used for a range of improvements from footway slurry/reconstruction to minor changes to kerbing such as informal crossing points for disabled groups and pedestrian/cycle signage. Likely that splitting equally across the divisions could be too little to deliver meaningful schemes.
Forward design	5,084	Fund to design and cost schemes for future years/reserves schemes early, allowing the 2012/13 programme to be determined as early as possible and therefore start as early as possible.

- (iii) Authority be delegated to the North East Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairmen to confirm the 2011/12 programme following the submission of a key local highway issue to the Area Manager and discussion at the next Informal Briefing.
- (iv) A report for information confirming schemes will be presented at the next Formal Committee.
- (v) Authority be delegated to the North East Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairmen to amend budgets throughout the year in order to ensure the budget is

- managed in an efficient and timely manner.
- (vi) The commencement of the new highways contract on 28 April 2011 be noted

14/11 LIBRARIES PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW [Item 14]

The Head of Cultural Services introduced the report stating that the Council had started a process of assessing each of its services through public value reviews to ensure that they were fit for purpose and sustainable.

He reported that the libraries within Surrey were in the top 25% countrywide for service provision, but there were some drivers for change in order to ensure that the service would provide a benefit for all residents.

The first significant change proposed was that mobile libraries be closed, following a process by which a personalised plan for reaching library services had been drawn up for each current user.

The second significant change proposed was that the Council would consult about the co-design of a local library service at selected libraries through a community-partnered approach. The library that this would affect in Elmbridge would be Molesey Library.

Members discussed the fact that the Library PVR report had been called in by the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee and that the Cabinet was due to reconsider this report at its meeting on 1st March 2011. Therefore the Committee decided not to consider this report at this time.

Resolved: That the report be withdrawn.

15/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SERVICE LOCAL DELIVERY PLAN 2011/12 [Item 15]

The Service Manager Youth Development East introduced the report stating that the Local Committee had the responsibility of approving the Youth Development Service Local Delivery Plan for the coming year. It was reported that the budget for 2011/12 had remained at the same level from 2010/11.

He explained that the Development Plan had been based upon the evidence set out within the 1 in 10 document and consultation with the local committee, young individuals in the borough and the successful practice already carried out in Elmbridge. In quarter three of 2010/11 all the parameters assessed against within the development plan had improved from the same period in 2009/10.

Resolved: That the 2011/12 Youth Development Service Delivery Plan for Elmbridge as detailed in Appendix 1 to the Committee report be approved.

16/11 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY DRAFT PUBLIC SAFETY PLAN 2011/20 [Item 16]

The Deputy Assistant Chief Officer introduced the report stating that Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority was required by statute to produce an Integrated Risk Management Plan (known as the Public Safety Plan) following public consultation. The report had been brought to the Committee as part of the formal consultation.

He informed the Committee that the new Public Safety Plan had been designed around the current fire stations in the county, and on the basis that Surrey was an island with no outside resources to support it. The reason for this was to ensure that the new Plan set out the realistic scenario of timing responses for appliances the Service could control.

Surrey Fire and Rescue had been very successful in recent years in preventing deaths, both through core work and the preventative programmes undertaken by the officers, he wanted to build on this within the new Plan. As the work of the service was becoming more varied, firefighters needed to be trained on a greater variety of techniques which could only take place during the day so the shift patterns of the fire-fighters needed to be more flexible to allow for more training during the day.

He went through the changes that were proposed within Elmbridge and the proposed changes to the expected response times for the first and second appliances, which differed only by a couple of seconds.

In response to a question on false alarms made to the service, the Deputy Assistant Chief Officer advised the Committee that the majority of false alarms came from industry which the officers were challenging, but that it was difficult to do this when the false alarms came from residents.

Cllr Fairbank questioned whether the reduced number of appliances at Esher would mean that it would take longer to reach calls located between Kingston and Esher. The Area Manager (Policy and Performance) advised that the service would still be able to call on London fire appliances, but that the Plan did not incorporate this as the team could not guarantee those appliances.

The Committee commended the work of the service, stated that it was sad that more of the work of the service is road traffic related, but requested that the message be taken back to the fire-fighters that the service was well thought of and to keep up the good work.

Resolved: That the Committee had considered the Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority draft Public Safety Plan and had no comment to make as part of the consultation.

17/10 MEMBERS' ALLOCATIONS REPORT [Item 17]

The Committee considered a report on the criteria and guidance relating to Members' Allocations, and funding proposals for approval. Members discussed the types of projects to which funding should be provided.

The Chairman informed Mr Phelps-Penry that his application for the Fieldcommon Signs could not be taken forward at this time, as the necessary information on the permissions for the location of the signs had not been confirmed. He agreed that this should be delayed until this information had been received, and that this would come back to a future meeting.

Resolved to:

- (i) Note the Criteria and Guidance Note for the use of Members' Allocations as set out in Annex A and B.
- (ii) Note the allocations approved under delegated authority by the Area Director in consultation with the Chairman (paragraph 2.1–2.5).
- (iii) Note returned Capital funding from Highways of £4,835
- (iv) Approve an application for funding of £3,000 from Claygate Village Youth Club for refurbishment of the bar area and an extension to be funded from Mr Bennison's allocation.
- (v) Approve an application for funding of £1,653 from Heathside School, Weybridge towards new PE Mats to be funded from Mr Lake's application.
- (vi) Approve an application for funding of £300 from Claygate in Bloom towards the planting and initial watering of a screening hedge at Claygate Recreation Ground to be funded from Mr Bennison's allocation.
- (vii) Approve an application for funding of £2,364 from Oasis Childcare Centre towards a 2011 Summer Holiday Scheme to be funded from Mr Butcher's allocation. NB If this application is withdrawn or rejected to consider an application for funding of the £2,364 from Cobham in Bloom towards the planting of bedding plants from Mr Butcher's allocation.
- (viii) Approve an application for funding of £1,000 from Elmbridge Borough Council towards the Claygate Day Centre Stroke Support Group to be funded from Mr Bennison's allocation.
- (ix) Approve an application for funding of £1,000 from Hersham Youth Trust towards Disco Equipment and a purpose built

Storage Unit to be funded from Mrs Hicks' allocation.

- (x) Approve an application for funding of £1,500 from Hersham in Bloom towards the Hersham in Bloom 2011 Campaign for Planters, Water Connection and Information Boards to be funded from Mrs Hicks' allocation.
- (xi) Approve an application for funding of £1,400 from Elmbridge Mencap towards a new water heater in the kitchen to be funded from Mrs Hicks' allocation.
- (xii) Approve an application for funding of £2,775 from St Mary's Church PCC towards the provision of an outside play area to be funded from Mr Hickman's allocation.
- (xiii) Approve an application for funding of £1,386 towards the Elmbridge Taxi Voucher Scheme to be funded from Mrs Hicks' allocation.
- (xiv) Approve an application for funding of £8,500 towards the cleaning and re-engraving of some of the most weatherworn names on the Weybridge War Memorial, Temple Market to be funded from Mr Ian Lake's allocation.
- (xv) Approve the application to transfer the funding returned from the Highways Service of £4,835 to the Parking Projects Team to fund works agreed within the Elmbridge Parking Review in 2011.

The meeting closed at 8.15pm

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 28 February 2011**AGENDA ITEM 6****PUBLIC QUESTIONS****Question 1 : Cllr Simon Desborough – West Grove/Clarence Road**

Please could you confirm the date of the proposed road traffic survey for West Grove and junction of Clarence Road with West Grove and the expected date for the implementation of the outcome of the road traffic survey?

The Chairman will give the following response:

The site visits for the next parking review in Elmbridge are scheduled to take place during June and July this year, with a report on the outcome of the review being presented to this Local Committee at its meeting in December. If the Committee agrees to the introduction of new parking controls, *inter alia* in West Grove and/or at its junction with Clarence Road, and funding is available, we would advertise the proposals early in 2012 with a view to putting any new controls on the ground in the spring/early summer.

Question 2 : Ken Huddart – On street parking in Claygate

In proposing these Pay and Display machines, what analysis has Surrey C.C. done of the particular conditions in Claygate? In detail:

- What analysis has been done of the likely usage of and income from these machines.
- What account has been taken of the views of Claygate people, including the 2,000-signature petition in opposition to the proposals presented on 30 November 2010?
- What account has been taken of likely displacement of parking by the on-street charges onto traffic routes and residential roads?
- What account has been taken of displacement of parking to free parking facilities at supermarkets elsewhere, including Esher, Surbiton, Molesey and Cobham, and the resultant damage done to the viability of the Claygate shopping centre?
- What account has been taken of the likely adverse impact on Claygate's Village character?

The Chairman will give the following response:

In general on street charging is being introduced at locations where there are already limited waiting parking bays that are widely used and, in the long term, usage is expected to remain similar to current levels. The estimates for income for on street charging in Elmbridge as a whole are considered in Annex A to the "Proposed On-Street 'Pay And Display' Parking Charges In Elmbridge Local Committee Consultation" report.

All comments received in relation to the proposed introduction of charges have been recorded and will be reported to the Cabinet, in order to help them make their decision.

When looking at which locations might be suitable for the introduction of parking charges, consideration was given to the proximity or absence of other parking controls, in order to minimise any disruptive displacement. In addition the impact of charging will be monitored and reviewed at any locations where it may be introduced.

Introducing charging makes enforcement of the parking regulations much easier. Improved enforcement leads to greater compliance, which results in vehicles being less likely to overstay the maximum period allowed. This increases turnover of the available space, so making it more likely that customers can find a parking place, when they want one. The effect could therefore be to encourage local residents to use their local shops because it will be easier to park.

The only physical change that would occur if the proposals are introduced would be the installation of a small number of pay & display machines, which is not expected to unduly affect the character of Claygate.

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 28 February 2011**AGENDA ITEM 7****MEMBER QUESTIONS****Question 1: Cllr John Sheldon – Youth Development Plan**

Allocation of Youth Worker resource uniformly across all centers as proposed would halve the opening hours of the Hersham Centre, which provides the major share of the Elmbridge youth engagement. Will an exception be made to permit this outstanding performance to continue?

The Chairman will give the following response:

Our proposals are to offer the 32 youth centers which the County Council owns as 32 separate lots for third sector partners to bid to be the managing agents for the delivery of youth work. Each centre will have a standard resource package that will include one full time youth worker (on secondment) plus sufficient resource to deliver 15 hours per week of youth work programme for young people. There will also be some resource for management and administration. We envisage that the successful bidders will be able to lever in additional resources that will at least match the level of provision funded via the commission from Surrey County Council (SCC). SCC will also define the quality standards, outputs and outcomes that will apply across the 32 lots.

Beyond the 32 SCC owned youth centres are a small number of centres owned by voluntary sector organisations but where SCC is providing some professional youth work input. Hersham Youth Centre is an example of this arrangement. We propose that these centres will be funded at the 2010/11 baseline from within the commissioning budget allocated to local area committees under the local prevention framework. A service level agreement will be in place to ensure that the delivery of service is consistent with that required of all other commissioned youth centres in terms of quality and volume. Management of the youth workers would continue to be offered by the county council. For the year commencing 1st April 2013 Hersham Youth Centre will need to satisfy the local committee that the youth offer is aligned to local needs and priorities.

