

**DRAFT MINUTES: of the meeting of the Surrey County Council Local Committee held at 2.30pm on Monday 18 June 2012 at the RBC Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Addlestone.**

**Surrey County Council Members**

Mr Mel Few  
Mr John Furey  
Miss Marisa Heath  
Mrs Yvonna Lay (Vice Chairman)  
Mr Chris Norman (Chairman)  
Mrs Mary Angell

**Runnymede Borough Council appointed members**

Councillor P. Roberts (apologies)  
Councillor A Alderson  
Councillor T. Dicks  
Councillor D. Cotty  
Councillor R. Edis  
Councillor P. Tuley  
Councillor G Woodger (substitute)

**PART ONE - IN PUBLIC**

[All references to Items refer to the Agenda for the meeting]

**14/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Patrick Roberts.

**15/12 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING HELD ON 20 FEBRUARY 2012 [Item 2]**

The minutes were approved and signed.

**16/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

None received.

**17/12 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4]**

None received.

**18/12 PETITIONS [Item 5]**

A petition from residents and businesses in Virginia Water (207 signatories) was presented by Mr Sonny Jafri, who advised the Committee that he had a further 37 signatories to add to those collected in advance of the deadline. He said that the petition opposed the introduction of parking meters outside the two parades of shops in Virginia Water, arguing that as a village there was limited passing trade and that what there was would be deterred as soon as people saw meters,

regardless of any free period. He suggested that the proposed "free waiting time" of thirty minutes was insufficient for visitors to wait for a prescription or go to the hairdressers, and asked the Committee to consider free parking for two hours instead if it was insistent on implementing meters. The chairman thanked Mr Jafri for his presentation.

## 19/12 **WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS** [Item 6]

Two written questions had been received:

### 1. Question from Mr Keith Day of Virginia Water

"If Surrey County Council has carried out a cost-benefit exercise for the meter parking proposals in Virginia Water, what will be the total cost initially, and on an ongoing basis, and what is the projected annual revenue?"

**The Chairman has given the following response with advice from the Parking team:**

I refer you to Annex 2 of the report at Item 9.

There are approximately 30 businesses in Station Parade and Station Approach. There are a mix of businesses, some such as dry cleaners and chemists that only require a short visit and others such as restaurants, hair dressers and estate agents that may require longer visits. There are 106 on street spaces available limited to 2 hours 0800-1800, Mon to Sat.

It is proposed to introduce a tariff to the on street spaces allowing a free initial 30 minutes with a maximum stay of 2 hours at a cost of £1 per hour.

In practice this means visitors would press button 1 on the pay and display machine for a free 30 minute ticket. If they wanted to stay for 1 or 2 hours then they would press button 2 and insert payment.

The estimated income is based on the following assumptions:

- The parking spaces will be used 6 days per week, 52 weeks per year.
- The parking spaces will only be occupied for 70% of the time between 0830 and 1730 (when most of the shops are open), based on observations of the occupancy levels.
- Of the vehicles that do park, only 20% stay for more than 30 minutes.(or 80% contribute no revenue)

The estimated income is therefore approximately £41,500.

It is considered that 5 pay and display machines would be needed to cover both shopping parades. A sum of £2500 has been allowed per pay and display machine to allow for the on going maintenance costs which include:

- Collecting cash - up to 3 times per week
- Repairs and maintenance
- Enforcement Officer time replacing ticket rolls etc.

The operational costs for running 5 pay and display machines are estimated at £12500 per year.

The initial capital set up costs will be in the region of £3000 per pay and display machine. There are also adjustments to signs and legal costs involved, making the estimated initial cost of installing pay and display charges in Virginia Water approximately £20,000.

## **2. Question from Mr Constantin Schwarz of Virginia Water**

[In reference to Item 9 on this agenda] Can you please clarify the number of pay and display machines which are actually supposed to be deployed?

**The chairman has given the following response with advice from the Parking team:**

The number of pay and display machines required in each location in Runnymede is as follows:

- Egham - 4 machines (10k maintenance cost)
- 
- Guildford St, Chertsey - 4 machines (10k maintenance cost)
- 
- Windsor Street, Chertsey - 8 machines (20k maintenance cost)
- 
- Addlestone - 6 machines (15k maintenance cost)
- 
- Virginia Water - 5 machines (12.5k maintenance cost)

A sum of £2500 per year has been allowed in the financial estimate to cover the cost of cash collections, repairs, servicing, CEO time and repayment of the initial capital costs.

The locations of the machines are subject to further consultation, particularly in conservation areas so they have not been shown on the plans. The Committee will be able to approve the locations at a later date if consultation is agreed.

The plan for Virginia Water does show 4 machines, however following a more recent review of this location it is considered 5 machines would be required and this figure has been used for cost estimation purposes in the report.

### **Mr Schwarz asked a supplementary question:**

if as the report states, the annual income projected from Virginia Water is £41,000 this implies that 200,000 cars would visit the shops, is this realistic?

### **Mr David Curl (Parking Team Manager)**

answered that he agreed with this calculation which worked out as 500 car movements per day from Monday to Saturday through the year, and said that he did think it was reasonable to expect that the parking spaces would turn over at least five times per day, even given a two hour maximum stay.

### **3. Question from Mr Raj Shourie of Coopers Hill Lane, Englefield Green**

(In reference to Item 8 of this agenda) If my adjoining neighbours and I have responsibilities to maintain the lane as "street managers", why is it not within our legitimate remit also to maintain any street furniture such as the gate?

#### **The chairman has given the following response with advice from Surrey Highways Information team:**

"The proposed location of the gate is on the publicly maintainable section of Coopers Hill Lane for which the County Council are street managers. However, being the street manager of a highway does not provide the power to erect a gate across it. The County Council is the highway authority for the whole of Coopers Hill Lane, including the section that is not maintainable at public expense. Only the highway authority has the power to erect a gate across a highway such as Coopers Hill Lane."

Mr Shourie's representative asked why the boundary for the Surrey County Council-maintained had just been clarified.

Mr Ian Taylor advised that the boundary was clearly marked at Annex 1 of Item 8 which was published a week before the meeting.

The chairman announced that he planned to take Item 9 before Items 7 and 8.

#### **20/12 PROPOSED ON STREET PARKING CHARGES [Item 9]**

Mr David Curl (Parking Team Manager) introduced the report, noting that on-street meters had the effect of improving compliance with parking times and increasing the turnover of spaces to allow more people to park and use town centres. He advised that the proposal was to offer a thirty minute free waiting period at all the locations in Runnymede, with a slightly longer maximum waiting period of two hours in Virginia Water, in line with its current maximum waiting period. Mr Curl noted that the parking and enforcement service had run at a county-wide deficit of £350,000 in 2011-12. He said that, if members agreed the recommendation, the proposed changes would be advertised on the county council website, in local newspapers and libraries, and on lampposts at the proposed locations as part of a statutory consultation over the summer, with responses reported to members of the Committee in the autumn.

It was noted that the borough council had voted to oppose the introduction of meters at this time, at the Corporate Management committee on 30 May, due to the fragility of trading conditions, the business case presented, and the expected redevelopment of two RBC-owned car parks which would reduce capacity in the medium term.

Members also noted that Surrey County Council had agreed that this was a matter for local determination rather than county-wide policy, so that the decision rested with the Local Committee. The local member for Virginia Water noted that the village had the smallest population of the four proposed locations, but was expected to generate 58% of the income raised from charges, and added that the petition

presented to the Committee, together with nearly 300 letters of representation received, indicated the strength of opposition in his division. Other members spoke in support of removing Egham as well as Virginia Water from the proposed locations. The chairman noted that a straw poll of businesses in Chertsey had indicated that 60% were supportive or agnostic about the introduction of meters with only 40% actively opposing the proposal. The local member for Addlestone said that a move to reject meters would mean that Runnymede residents would have to fund the annual £40,000 gap in funding for parking enforcement in future.

Mr Few asked for a recorded vote, the results of which were:

To reject recommendation a) **For:** Mrs Angell, Miss Heath, Mrs Lay, Mr Few, Cllr Woodger, Cllr Alderson, Cllr Cotty, Cllr Tuley, Cllr Dicks, Cllr Edis.

**Against:** none

**Abstained:** Mr Norman, Mr Furey

To reject recommendation b) **For:** Mrs Angell, Miss Heath, Mrs Lay, Mr Few, Cllr Woodger, Cllr Alderson, Cllr Cotty, Cllr Tuley, Cllr Dicks, Cllr Edis.

**Against:** none

**Abstained:** Mr Norman, Mr Furey

To reject recommendation c) **For:** Mrs Angell, Miss Heath, Mrs Lay, Mr Few, Cllr Woodger, Cllr Alderson, Cllr Cotty, Cllr Tuley, Cllr Dicks, Cllr Edis.

**Against:** none

**Abstained:** Mr Norman, Mr Furey

To reject recommendation d) **For:** Mrs Angell, Miss Heath, Mrs Lay, Mr Few, Cllr Woodger, Cllr Alderson, Cllr Cotty, Cllr Tuley, Cllr Dicks, Cllr Edis.

**Against:** none

**Abstained:** Mr Norman, Mr Furey

## **RESOLVED**

that the Committee did not approve the statutory advertisement of the parking charges and waiting restrictions proposed in Chertsey, Addlestone, Egham or Virginia Water, as shown on the drawings in the annexes to the report.

## **21/22 HIGHWAYS UPDATE REPORT [Item 7]**

Mr Jason Gosden introduced the update report, highlighting the significant increase in highways budgets for determination by the Committee, namely:

- \* £133,000 for integrated transport schemes (summarised in Table 1);
- \* £133, 000 for capital maintenance, a new fund for which priorities needed to be agreed prior to August;
- \* £210,000 for revenue maintenance, a budget which had doubled from 2011-12 and for which a provision split was outlined in the report;
- \* £30,000 of Community Pride (CP) funding which members may pool or split between their divisions, with a proposed deadline of 31/12/12.

Members were in favour of splitting the CP funds and bringing forward the deadline for proposals on how it should be spent to the end of October. It was noted that “wet spots” were an issue in the borough, and Mr Gosden advised that those designated as a major problem would be addressed by the Asset Planning team whilst more

minor drainage problems such as ditch clearing should be addressed through the local revenue maintenance budget. It was noted that the Committee was due to consider a report on Flood Risk Management at its September meeting (see Item 15) and that drainage concerns should be addressed then.

The request was made to provide a table in the next Highways Update report to indicate “proposed” and “committed” amounts for each heading, and the chairman undertook to raise this.

## **RESOLVED**

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes;
- (ii) **Split the Community Pride funding equally between County Councillors on the Committee, and agreed a deadline of 30/10/12 for Councillors to submit their projects for funding to the Local Maintenance Engineer.**
- (iii) Note that a further Highways update report is to be brought back to the next meeting of this Committee.
- (iv) Authorise the NW Area Team Manager, together with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of this Committee to agree and approve the capital maintenance schemes for Runnymede, following consultation with Committee Members **and to review at 17 September Committee.**
- (v) Approve the provisional split of 2012/13 Revenue funding shown in Table 2 and authorise the NW Area Team manager to adjust the split of this funding in response to operational need throughout the course of the financial year, subject to consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of this Committee.

## **22/12 APPLICATION TO INSTALL A GATE IN COOPERS HILL LANE, ENGLEFIELD GREEN [Item 8]**

Mr Ian Taylor (Highways Information Team leader) introduced the report, which he said had been initiated through a request from the owner of Grand View, Mr Shourie, to install a gate to be operated remotely as a deterrent to fly tipping in the Lane (although he noted that as stated in the report, the borough council did not consider that fly tipping was an issue at this location). Mr Taylor advised the Committee that a Traffic Regulation Order of 1955 already prohibited vehicular traffic except for access beyond the council car park, and highlighted the proposed location of the gate as shown on the map at Annex 1. He advised that the Committee had two options, recognising that any gate would be on the public highway and so must be installed and maintained to an appropriate highways standard:

- to refuse the request
- to agree the request to install a gate at the expense of the owner and subject to the provisos outlined.

The local member stated that she supported the application provided that the gate was operated by a keypad (and not remote control) and was reassured that there would be no cost to the taxpayer. Her proposal was seconded by Mr Few.

## **RESOLVED**

- i) to approve the installation of a highway gate that would remain in the control of

the County Council, subject to the full cost being met by the applicant, a commuted sum to cover the cost of future maintenance being paid to the County Council by the applicant, and the section of Coopers Hill Lane affected by the installation of a gas main being restored to a satisfactory condition.

- ii) If, at some time in the future, it becomes apparent that it would be in the best interests of the public for any gate that is installed to be removed, altered and/or relocated, this will be done and in the case of the gate being removed, any unused maintenance monies that have been paid to the County Council will be refunded to the owner of Grand View.

#### 23/12 **ANNUAL REVIEW OF ON-STREET PARKING IN RUNNYMEDE** [Item 10]

Mr Jack Roberts (Parking team) introduced the report, noting that this was the second review of Runnymede undertaken by the team in consultation with the joint member task group (Mrs Lay, Mr Norman, Cllr Cotty).

He said that a total of 120 requests for change had been considered prior to drafting the report, and that following the Local Committee's decision, the proposed changes would be advertised to the public and objections received would be summarised for members to review. There would be no provision for new proposals to be submitted until the next review.

Members asked officers to remove the proposed limited waiting bays and new disabled parking bay at the Broadway, New Haw (65), and suggested two additional locations for consideration at the next annual review.

#### **RESOLVED**

- (i) That the proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Runnymede as described in this report and shown in detail on drawings presented at this committee meeting as annex A are agreed, **with the exception of drawing (65) The Broadway.**
- (ii) The Local Committee allocates funding as detailed in paragraph 6.1 of this report to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments.
- (iii) That the intention of the County Council to make an Order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on street parking restrictions in Runnymede as shown on the drawings in annex A be advertised and that if no objections be maintained, the Orders be made.

#### 24/12 **YOUTH: LOCAL PREVENTION FRAMEWORK** [Item 11]

Mr Leigh Middleton reminded the Committee that, in February 2012, it had decided not to allocate funding from the Local Prevention Framework budget of £101k to an external bidder and had delegated authority to the Assistant Director for Young People to resolve the matter in consultation with the chairman, and Youth Task Group chairman. Since then, he advised that a second tendering competition had been run by the Youth Commissioning team, for which one bid had been received. Following consultation with the Youth Task Group the Assistant Director's recommendation was to adopt an in-house solution provided by Surrey Outdoor

Learning (SOLD) and the Youth Support Service, commencing July and using 75% of the allocated funding. It was suggested that the remaining 25% of funding allocated to Runnymede would be used to pilot personalised budgets for existing NEET young people to help them to achieve their agreed outcomes to become "PEET" (participating in training, education or employment).

Mr Norman and Mr Few confirmed that they had met with the Assistant Director to discuss this and were content with this recommendation, and looked forward to receiving further written details.

## **RESOLVED**

for local prevention activity to be delivered in-house, rather than through a Framework provider.

### **25/12 YOUTH SMALL GRANTS AWARDS [Item 12]**

Mr Leigh Middleton presented this report and tabled a revised Annex B which included the criteria for award of small grants. He noted that the first round of youth small grants had been publicised through the council website and Youth Focus Magazine. He said that three bids had been submitted and details were appended in Annex A.

Members asked that officers check the annual turnover of Chertsey Hub, which had submitted a request for £2,500 for its CORE summer activities, and circulate further details about the Addlestone and Chertsey Youth Group, which had requested £3873.

They also suggested that the next round of bids could be publicised more widely to young peoples' groups, using social media such as Facebook or Twitter.

## **RESOLVED**

- i) the award of funding to projects a)-c) as listed in paragraph 2.2. of the report.
- ii) **to delegate powers for remaining resources to the Head of Commissioning to approve any bids submitted under £1,000 in consultation with the local divisional member and a young person between formal committee meetings.**

### **26/12 LOCAL COMMITTEE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PROTOCOL AND TASK GROUP REPRESENTATION [Item 13]**

## **RESOLVED**

- (i) To adopt the provisions of the Local Protocol on Public Engagement, set out in Annex 1;
- (ii) To agree the terms of reference for the Youth Task Group (set out in Annex 2) and for the CPE task group (set out in Annex 3);
- (iii) The membership for the Task Groups, as set out in paragraph 1.7;
- (iv) To appoint members of the Local Committee to the outside bodies as listed at paragraph 1.8 of the report.

27/12 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING** [Item 14]

Mrs Michelle Collins (Team Leader West, Community Partnerships Team) presented the report and highlighted the proposal to delegate community safety funding of £3,160 as at recommendation v).

The chairman suspended standing orders and invited Mr Malcolm Loveday of the Chertsey Society to speak. He expressed thanks to the Local Committee for its support of the flagpole appeal at St Peter's Church in Chertsey, which was in memory of a former member of the Committee Mr Ray Lowther.

**RESOLVED**

- i) Noted the summary of the Local Committee's expenditure in 2011/12 detailed in paragraph 2.
- (ii) that each local member has an allocation of £12,615 revenue and £5,883 capital to fund projects within the local area in 2012/13.
- (iii) Agreed the items presented for funding from the Local Committee's 2012/13 revenue and capital funding as set out in paragraph 3 (3.2 to 3.15) of this report.
- (iv) Noted the expenditure approved since the last Committee by the Community Partnerships Manager and the Community Partnerships Team Leader under delegated powers, set out in paragraph 4.
- (v) that the community safety budget of £3,160 delegated to the Local Committee transferred to the Safer Runnymede community safety partnership, and that the Community Partnership Manager authorize its expenditure in accordance with Local Committee's decision, as detailed in paragraph 5.

28/12 **FORWARD PROGRAMME** [Item 15]

**RESOLVED**

to agree the Forward Plan contained in the report.

29/12 **LOCAL UPDATES FOR INFORMATION** [Item 16]

Noted.

[Meeting ended at 16:35]

Chairman's signature \_\_\_\_\_