



**LOCAL COMMITTEE
(REIGATE AND BANSTEAD)**

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

28 FEBRUARY 2011

Three public questions have been received in relation to Agenda Item 12 – Highways Update

1. A question from Ms Julie Rogers, a resident of Chipstead:

“The experimental scheme in Chipstead High Road was approved by this Committee on 20 September 2010 on the basis that it was funded by external sources, with a potential ‘£1,300 shortfall although expenditure to date indicates that any shortfall could be less than this amount.’ Please can the Local Committee advise how much has been/is anticipated to be spent by Surrey County Council in the current financial year on this scheme?

The report to this Committee of 20 September at paragraph 5.3 stated: ‘No County budget has been allocated at this time to cover these costs, but officers would approach the Residents’ Association and the local County Member to seek the necessary funding.’

Could the Committee explain why scarce budget is now being allocated to this externally funded scheme at the expense of other highways schemes across the borough and contrary to the contents of the report which approved the installation?”

The Chairman responds on behalf of the Committee:

“Surrey County Council is not anticipating allocating any funding to the experimental kerb build-out in High Road, Chipstead this financial year.

The forward programme approved in principle by the Local Committee in July 2009 allocated £20,000 for Chipstead Speed Management. Due to cutbacks in funding, at the time of the report to Local Committee in September 2010 there was no funding available that could be allocated to the scheme, and so to date the scheme has been wholly funded by the Chipstead Residents’ Association. The Leader of Surrey County Council has announced that funding of £2m for Local Committees to invest in local safety schemes is being made available for 2011/12. Of this, the Local

Committee (Reigate and Banstead) has been allocated £223,050. In the report to Local Committee (Item 12 on this agenda), officers have suggested that a contribution of £5,000 be made towards the High Road, Chipstead scheme to ensure that there is funding available to either remove the scheme or make it permanent subject to a decision to be made at a future meeting of the Local Committee.”

2. A question from Mr David Marshall, a resident of Chipstead:

“On Section 106 (s106) deposits Surrey County Council agreed that only £5,000 was required from Croudace for the development on Outwood Lane as a s106 contribution for highways infrastructure because of a planned speed reduction/traffic calming scheme on Waterhouse Lane/Outwood Lane. The Surrey County Council Engineer confirmed on 22 October 2010 that:

‘In July 2009, the Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) agreed in principle a five year forward programme of schemes, based on priorities and potential funding levels. The schemes on the programme were assessed and prioritised against set criteria in accordance with the County’s Local Transport Plan (Congestion, Accessibility, Safety, Environment and Maintenance). Potential traffic calming measures in Outwood Lane between the Ramblers’ Rest and Hazelwood Lane was included on the programme for 2013/14. With reduced or zero levels of funding anticipated in future years, it is unlikely that it will be possible to progress the schemes on the programme in the foreseeable future.’

My question is, therefore, what will this £5,000 contribution now be used for, and will the full contribution now be sought from Croudace?”

The Chairman responds on behalf of the Committee:

“The Planning Infrastructure Contribution (PIC) for the housing development on Outwood Lane towards highway works of £5,600 was calculated by applying a formula which takes into account the total travel generated by the development. The level of contribution is not determined by the existence of existing proposals in an area although the contribution can be used towards any such scheme. In this particular instance, two transportation improvement schemes within close proximity to the site were identified towards which the contribution could be used (Waterhouse Lane/Outwood Lane traffic management measures and cycle storage facilities at Chipstead Station). The developer would not be expected to pay the full amount of the cost of either of these schemes as this would not be justified by the size of the development.”

3. A question from Mrs Angela Marshall, a resident of Chipstead:

“We are advised by Surrey County Council that the Chipstead Residents’ Association has provided funds for an experimental traffic calming scheme in the High Road, Chipstead, and that this is an externally/privately funded scheme. However, we have been advised by Surrey County Council that the costs of maintenance and liability insurance for this scheme will be met from council funding.

Can the Committee please explain why the costs of maintenance and liability insurance for this externally funded scheme are to be met by Surrey County

Council monies and not by the private funder whose scheme it is, as per Surrey County Council good practice guidance?”

The Chairman responds on behalf of the Committee:

“It was agreed at the formal meeting of the Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) in September 2010 that the temporary traffic calming scheme would have a shortfall of approximately £1,300 and that no County budget had been allocated at that time to cover these costs, but officers would approach the Residents’ Association and the local County Member to seek the necessary funding.

The Local Government and Rating Act 1997 allows Town and Parish Councils to fund/part fund some limited traffic management measures. Funding might also be offered by the local elected Member, the District or Borough Council or from funds raised locally.

Should the traffic calming need to be removed, the Local Area Manager will seek the additional funding from the Residents’ Association and the Divisional Member. If the need should arise, these funds are likely to be far reduced for the removal than those for the total implementation.”

4. A question from Mr Roger Collins, a resident of Banstead:

“In regard to Surrey County Council’s proposals to introduce on-street parking charges in Banstead High Street with effect from July/September this year (subject to the Council’s final decision on this matter), could you please explain how Surrey County Council can justify both subjecting residents to increased parking in roads near the High Street and jeopardising the currently fragile economy of Banstead Village by thus reducing the footfall of customers in Banstead when local shops and residents are already under major cost pressures from other factors?”

The Chairman responds on behalf of the Committee:

“Surrey Highways are currently consulting about on-street parking charges in many town and shopping areas around Surrey, including Banstead. Although there is concern amongst local residents and businesses, there are a number of sound reasons for introducing “pay and display” parking charges in many of the shopping centres around the County:

- On-street parking areas outside shops are currently very difficult to enforce effectively as number plates have to be recorded and checked at repeated intervals. This is very cumbersome and not efficient, meaning Civil Enforcement Officers are not able to enforce these areas effectively. The more time they spend checking parking bays, the less time is available to patrol areas with yellow lines where illegal parking could pose a safety or obstruction hazard.
- The difficulty of enforcing on-street parking bays (some towns, like Banstead, have over 100 spaces) means compliance with parking time limits is poor and many cars remain parked for longer than they should in short-term parking areas.
- A “pay and display” system makes enforcement much easier as parking attendants can see instantly if a car is parked legally. Compliance improves as enforcement becomes more effective.
- The real benefit of this is that parking spaces near shops are turned over more quickly which can help local businesses by making them more

www.surreycc.gov.uk/reigateandbanstead

accessible. Customers will be more likely to find a space due to the increased turnover which is particularly important on routes with passing traffic (or trade).

The key factor is getting the tariff levels right, as most people would not consider it fair to pay the same to park in Banstead as they would in Guildford or Sutton. The consultation proposals consequently have varying charges in different areas. The consultation process is picking up a lot of suggestions, particularly the idea of having a 15 or 30 minute period in some locations and this will be investigated further.

It is not straightforward, however, as the Council is trying to move away from a position where parking enforcement in Surrey is subsidised by approximately £500,000 a year from the highways budget. A free parking period could make the proposals financially untenable in some locations because it could mean the income from parking tickets would not cover the cost of maintaining the machines and enforcement.

We are, however, looking at all the options and seeking ways of making this initiative work for local communities, as there are real benefits for local business.”

5. A question from Mr J Fleming, a resident of Redhill:

“When will the waiting restrictions relevant to Raven’s Close, Redhill, be fully implemented? The waiting restrictions were granted Committee approval on 25 January 2010 and the Orders made on 27 October 2010 but the weekday daytime parking restriction on the western boundary of the close has not yet been provided.”

The Chairman responds on behalf of the Committee:

"The lining crew has been to Ravens Close on several occasions in the last few months but has been unable to put down the yellow line owing to the large number of parked cars. Within the next two weeks they will make two more visits. On the first visit they will erect signs warning motorists that lining works will be taking place on a certain date and that they should not park there. On the stated date, they will make the second visit to install the line."

NOTES:

- (i) Surrey County Council’s constitution, (Standing Order 66) requires that public questions be sent in writing to the Local Committee and Partnership Officer at least 7 days before the meeting.
- (ii) At the discretion of the Chairman, a member of the public who has given notice of a question may ask one supplementary question relevant to the subject of the original.