

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00am on Wednesday 18th May 2011 at County Hall, Kingston-upon-Thames.

The Select Committee will confirm these Minutes at its next meeting on 30th June 2011.

**Members:**

- \* Mr. Steve Renshaw (Chairman)
- \* Mr. Mark Brett-Warburton (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mr. Mike Bennison
- \* Mr. Stephen Cooksey
- \* Mr. Will Forster
- x Mrs. Pat Frost
- \* Mr. Chris Frost
- \* Mr. John Furey
- \* Mr. Simon Gimson
- \* Mr. David Goodwin
- Mrs. Frances King
- \* Mr. Geoff Marlow
- \* Mr. Chris Norman
- \* Mr. Tom Phelps-Penry
- \* Mr. Michael Sydney

**Ex officio Members:**

- Mrs. Lavinia Sealy (Chairman of the Council)
- Mr. David Munro (Vice-Chairman of the Council)

**Cabinet Member for Transport:**

- x Mr. Ian Lake

**Other Members Present:**

- \* = Present
- x = Present for part of the meeting

**PART 1**

**IN PUBLIC**

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

Apologies were received from Francis King. Mel Few substituted.

02/11 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS: 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2011 and 9<sup>th</sup> March 2011 [Item 2]**

It was agreed that the following addition be made to point (i) of minute 17/11 of the Environment and Economy minutes of 9<sup>th</sup> March 2011:

“It was *claimed* that Cycle Woking had far exceeded targets”.

The Minutes of the meeting were otherwise agreed as an accurate reflection of the meeting.

03/11 **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of personal interests.

04/11 **QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]**

Two public questions were received. The first was from Mr. Bland on the subject of Community Recycling Centre Policy. The second was from Mr. Palmer on the subject of on-street parking charges. Both questions and their responses are contained in **Annexe 1**.

Mr. Bland asked the following supplementary question:

“Will the Chairman agree that the policy to charge for mixed construction waste from vans should not apply to residents depositing municipal waste?”

**Response:** The Chairman stated he would give Mr. Bland a response outside of the meeting.

Mr. Palmer asked the following supplementary question:

“Given that the Committee were unhappy with the original business case, are they happy with the assumptions now being made?”

**Response:** The original business case was based on the use of a low tariff with no free period. However, it is now based on the use of a medium tariff with a 30-minute free period and this makes the business case more viable.

05/11 **RESPONSE BY THE EXECUTIVE TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]**

There were no responses.

06/11 **FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME AND RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING [Item 6]**

- It was suggested that the White Lining and Road Markings item scheduled for November be brought forward.
- The Chairman stated he would speak with the Deputy Leader in order to clarify the status of the energy task group.
- The Chairman agreed to check progress with regards to EU funding for the Basingstoke Canal.

07/11 **MEMBER MOTION [Item 7]**

- Stephen Cooksey [Dorking and the Holmwoods] presented a motion to the Committee on the subject of on-street parking charges (see **Annexe 2**). Issues contained within the motion included the negative impact charges may have upon local retailers and the parking congestion that may be caused in residential areas.
- Eber Kington [Epsom and Ewell North] originally tabled a motion, but agreed to withdraw it and was given permission to speak to the Committee as part of Stephen Cooksey's motion.
- The Vice-Chairman of the Committee suggested that the motion was out of date and proposed that Members vote against it and deal with the issues raised under item 9.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

None.

**Resolved:**

The Committee voted against the motion (5 votes FOR to 10 AGAINST). It was agreed that any further issues be raised under item 9.

**Select Committee next steps:**

None.

08/11 **REPORT ON HOME TO SCHOOL/COLLEGE TRANSPORT POLICIES INCLUDING THE PROVISION OF TRANSPORT TO DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS [Item 8]**

**Witnesses:**

Paul Millin, Travel and Transport Group Manager.  
Claire Potier, Principal Manager for Admissions & Transport.

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

- Members were generally supportive of the proposals, though concern was raised as to the effect they would have upon siblings who may receive different levels of service as a result of free denominational transport being withdrawn for all new pupils from September 2012.
- Some Members believed that withdrawal of free denominational transport was discriminatory against an individual wishing to attend a faith school. Equally, other Members believed that the provision of free denominational transport was discriminatory towards those at non-faith schools who were not entitled to free transport.
- Officers were asked whether they felt the consultation was wide enough given the fact that 660 responses had been received from 1700 users. They replied that notice had been placed in local newspapers, and all affected schools had been notified. Also stated that the level of response was consistent with other consultations on similar subjects.
- The Chairman expressed concern over the potential for profiteering from petrol mileage claims, as people may claim an allowance and then form a

car club whereby one vehicle takes all students to school/college. Officers acknowledged that this could be a potential problem, though is not of great concern as very few people claim petrol allowance at present.

- It was proposed that Cabinet should consider withdrawing free transport to denominational schools for new households as opposed to pupils, as this would avoid any potential disparity in free transport provision between members of the same family.
- The Chairman stated that he believed there was an inconsistency between the criteria for denominational transport provision and that for school appeals, as eligibility for the former is calculated on walking distance while the latter is 'as the crow flies'.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

- PM undertook to inform the Chairman of the average subsidy per seat based on new charging figures.

**Recommendations (to Cabinet):**

That Cabinet:

- (a) By 9 votes FOR to 3 votes AGAINST with 3 abstentions, withdraw free transport to denominational schools.
- (b) By 12 votes FOR to 0 votes AGAINST with 3 abstentions, increase the fare for a concessionary seat to £2.10 in 2011/12 and £2.50 in 2012/13 and thereafter to increase in line with inflation (the lower of CPI and RPI).
- (c) By 7 votes FOR to 0 votes AGAINST with 7 abstentions, remove the discounts for siblings and young children in the concessionary fare.
- (d) By 12 votes FOR to 0 votes AGAINST with 3 abstentions, change policy so that concessionary seats are sold on a half-termly basis.
- (e) By 10 votes FOR to 0 votes AGAINST with 5 abstentions, change the eligibility criteria for Post 16 School/College travel, as set out in Annexe 5 of the report.

**Select Committee next steps:**

The recommendations of the Select Committee will be considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2011.

09/11 **FINAL REPORT OF THE ON-STREET PARKING TASK GROUP [Item 9]**

**Witnesses:**

Richard Bolton, Local Delivery and Customer Service Group Manager.  
David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager.

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

- The Chairman reported that issues in relation to Elmbridge and Reigate and Banstead would not form part of the discussion, as they were not considered by the task group proposals. This was because the two areas were already subject to consultation, the results of which would be reported to Cabinet on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2011.
- Concerns were raised regarding the positioning of parking meters. In certain cases their placement appears to be inconsistent, with meters either being located too far apart, or too close together which would potentially have a negative impact on street scenes.
- Officers stated that the number of ticket machines would vary at different locations but must be in the line of sight of bays, and that they must be in positions whereby people are not forced to cross the street in order to use them.
- The Chairman stated a key proposal of the report is that Boroughs and Districts use a standardised spreadsheet in order to make it easier to monitor cost enforcement.
- Some Members of the Committee were supportive of the proposals, citing that the charges would make enforcement more efficient. It was also stated that a key benefit of the task group report was that proposals now reflected specific local circumstances, rather than applying a 'one size fits all' approach. Some Members raised concerns however, that the proposals were being introduced in order to make money rather than to improve enforcement and help local retailers.
- Issues raised by the Member motion [item 7] were discussed. Some Members of the Committee stated that the proposals would benefit local businesses because churn would improve. It was also argued that shop workers currently occupy a large number of parking spaces and charges would dissuade this practice from taking place in future, thus making shopping districts more economically viable. It was argued by some therefore that this alleviated the concerns raised in point 1 of the motion.
- It was stated that recommendation (i) of the task group report (re. the introduction of resident's parking schemes) should ease Member concerns relating to parking congestion. Although it was claimed however that the introduction of such schemes would take too long, some Members still believed that this would address the issues outlined in point 2 of the motion.
- Some Members agreed that a free 30-minute period would improve the economic viability of local shops by encouraging local people to carry out the activities outlined in point 3 of the motion.
- The Committee voted on the following points outlined in Stephen Cooksey's motion and all were rejected by a majority of the Committee:

That on-street parking charges would:

- 1. further disadvantage local retailers at a time of economic difficulty (REJECTED by 5 votes FOR to 9 votes AGAINST, with 1 abstention),
- 2. increase car parking congestion in residential roads close to town and village centres (REJECTED by 5 votes FOR to 9 votes AGAINST, with 1 abstention),
- 3. inconvenience local people seeking a brief parking period to visit a cashpoint, collect a parcel or a prescription or make a simple

purchase (REJECTED by 4 votes FOR to 10 votes AGAINST, with 1 abstention).

- The Mole Valley Local Committee Chairman agreed with the task group report in that a 'one size fits all' approach to the proposals would not work. However, the Chairman also informed the Committee that Mole Valley believed Ashstead and Bookham were being unfairly targeted by the charges as a result of their economic vibrancy and that there were similar sized shopping parades in other areas where there were no proposals to introduce charging, particularly in towns around Guildford. The Committee was also informed that Mole Valley Local Committee had passed a resolution requesting the withdrawal of on-street parking proposals.
- The Chairman asked Members wishing to suggest additional locations for inclusion in the proposals to forward them to the Parking Team for consideration. The Vice-Chairman suggested that Merrow Parade in Guildford be included in the proposals.
- A number of Members raised concerns relating to the report annexes for each Borough/District. Local Committees will have the opportunity to address these issues when the proposals go out to public consultation.
- 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.

**Actions/further to information to be provided:**

None.

**Recommendations (to Cabinet):**

That Cabinet consider the recommendations put forward in the report, along with the following alternative recommendation **(e)**:

“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”.

**Select Committee next steps:**

None.

10/11 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 10]**

- Thursday 30<sup>th</sup> June at 10.00am in Committee Room C.

[Meeting Ended: 1.05pm]

---

**Chairman**