

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Elmbridge LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 4.00 pm on 23 February 2015
at Council Chamber, Elmbridge Civic Centre, High Street, Esher, KT10 9SD.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mrs Margaret Hicks (Chairman)
- * Mrs Mary Lewis (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Mike Bennison
- * Mr Peter Hickman
- * Rachael I. Lake
- Mr Christian Mahne
- * Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
- Mr Tony Samuels
- * Mr Stuart Selleck

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Steve Bax
- * Cllr Nigel Cooper
- * Cllr Andrew Davis
- * Cllr Jan Fuller
- * Cllr Peter Harman
- Cllr Stuart Hawkins
- * Cllr Neil J Luxton
- * Cllr Dorothy Mitchell
- * Cllr John O'Reilly

* In attendance

1/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Tony Samuels and Cllr Stuart Hawkins.

2/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record.

3/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were received.

4/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

The Chairman asked for the presentation showing some of the projects funded by Members' Allocations to be shown on the screen.

5/15 PETITIONS [Item 5]

Four petitions were received and the details are attached as Annex A.

1. A petition containing 91 signatures was received from Tony Nockles requesting: 'Surrey County Council to immediately commission a revised Road Safety Audit (Stage 1) using published drawings available in 2008 and in 2012'.

Tony Nockles spoke for 3 minutes in support of the petition. He showed a plan which identified the land owned by Surrey County Council explaining that it contained two public roads which are used as footpaths by pedestrians and cyclists. He added that 1000s of people cross these roads each year.

He explained the purpose of the petition was to ensure that the safety audit previously agreed by the Local Committee in February 2014 will address both present and future risks to pedestrians and cyclists crossing Hampton Court Station's forecourt, SCC owned frontage and Cigarette Island Lane. Tony Nockles said that after the February 2014 meeting the SCC officer agreed with the Councillor Stuart Selleck that a revised road safety report would be produced and the resulting Road Safety Comments were based on assumptions and focussed on the entrance to Cigarette Island Lane, ignoring the construction phase of the development, the bus stops and the station forecourt. He asked that SCC, as both the highways authority and the landowner, ensured that the revised safety audit was carried out without delay and that it should take into account the 2008 site drawing and the information in the 2012 Method of Construction Statement.

Stuart Selleck, the divisional Member, expressed his support for Tony Nockles. He added that Tony Nockles and some Councillors had met with South West Trains who had expressed concern for the safety of pedestrians on the forecourt of the station. In addition he knew that the one of the bus services of Transport for London (TfL) was no longer scheduled to stop at the station as they deemed the forecourt unsafe. He requested that SCC officers talk to the other agencies involved with the site and look at the safety audit. In support Cllr Steve Bax urged SCC to look into this issue.

3. A petition containing a total of 454 signatures was received from Sarah Spence requesting 'SCC to implement traffic calming measures on Ewell Rd.' Sarah spoke in support of the petition giving a number of examples of 'near misses', adding that 100s of other people had had similar experiences, explaining that this dangerous junction was the route used by many residents to access the local schools, nursery and recreation ground. She said that approximately 20% of the Long Ditton population had signed the petition and she had been overwhelmed by the response. She requested either a controlled crossing or speed restrictions as it is the most popular place to cross but on coming vehicles cannot be seen.

Peter Hickman, the divisional Member, said he had asked SCC officers to investigate as to whether the location could be included in the, already scheduled, Long Ditton schools safety measures work.

2. An e- petition containing 83 signatures was received from Sue Kittelsen stating 'travelling from Byfleet Road to the Painshill junction with the A3 and

the other way towards West Byfleet along Parvis Road has become a nightmare on a regular basis due to road works. We ask Surrey County Council to restrict all non emergency work to between 10 pm and 5 am on this very busy route'.

The response to the petition is attached as Annex B.
The officer Kevin Orledge summarised his response explaining that each application for roadworks is considered and a number of factors need to be taken into account.

4. A petition with 38 signatures was received from Mr Alfred Manly stating 'we the undersigned residents hereby request that all six trees that have been removed by Surrey County Council be replaced and replanted as soon as possible.'

Mr Manly spoke in support of the petition explaining that originally 10 trees were planted in 1980's, partly funded by the residents, and six have since been cut down by SCC without the residents receiving any consultation or notification. The residents do not agree that the trees were dead and think that they probably only needed pruning. He explained that the residents are all angry at the loss of the trees which enhanced the Victorian street of charm and gave much pleasure.

Peter Hickman, the divisional Member, suggested that the trees which were valued by the residents were replaced with the same or another variety.

6/15 PETITION RESPONSE: REQUEST FOR PEDESTRIAN CROSSING AT DITTON REACH, PORTSMOUTH RD (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 5a]

Frank Apicella, the SCC Highways Engineer, introduced the report explaining that due to the location, particularly the bus stops close by; the best option would be to carry out a feasibility study to find the most appropriate solution.

Peter Hickman added it was a dangerous road, which was difficult to cross and the issue was also complicated by the fact that Kingston Council are looking at introducing a Mini Holland scheme, but that some action does need to be taken.

The officer assured the Committee that a feasibility study would take into account all road users including the elderly and the vulnerable.

The Local Committee resolved to:

(i) agree to include a feasibility study scheme on ITS schedule of works, which is to be programmed by this committee and the Divisional Member, in due course.

Reason for decision: a feasibility study will determine the most appropriate location and solution to be introduced, along the section of road, and enable a more holistic balance with other highway users.

7/15 PETITION RESPONSE UPDATE: ESHER ROAD SAFETY MEASURES REQUEST (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 5b]

Frank Apicella introduced the report by saying that this decision had been deferred from the meeting on 8th December 2014. Any short term solution would be difficult, expensive and the timescales would be lengthy so it was sensible to wait for the new bridge to be built, which will resolve the issues.

Stuart Selleck, the divisional Member, agreed that any short term solution would not be cost effective. Cllr Steve Bax also agreed it was the best solution, but expressed concern for the disruption when the bridge is built and also if there was any delay.

The officers explained the disruption was inevitable when the bridge is replaced, even though a lot of the construction will take place adjacent to the site. As regards the timetable, it is difficult to confirm until the budget is guaranteed.

The Local Committee resolved to agree:

(i) to wait the construction of the new bridge over the River Mole which will be designed to accommodate a wider carriageway and pedestrian footways on either side of the carriageway, subject to successful land purchase negotiations, thus negating the need for pedestrians to cross the road.

Reason for decision: The new bridge will be designed to provide a new footway on the west side, hence removing the need for pedestrians to cross the road. A feasibility study to look at short term measures, before the bridge can be built, would not be a good use of highways budgets.

8/15 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

One public question was received from Ken Huddart of Claygate Parish Council.

What reassurances can the Local Committee give that after considerable input from Claygate residents to a recent parking survey and to SCC's own current consultation on specific local proposals, identifying on street commuter parking as a major issue, that Claygate residents will not have to wait years for a review that leads to action to address this matter?

The response is attached as Annex C.

Ken Huddart asked in a supplementary question when the four solutions already recognised in Claygate would be completed. The Parking Team Manager explained Claygate is in the 2nd year of the new Parking Strategy cycle.

9/15 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

There were no Member questions received.

10/15 MANAGEMENT OF COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) LOCAL SPENDING BOARD APPLICATIONS (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 8]

Judith Jenkins (Elmbridge Borough Council Infrastructure Delivery Co-ordinator) gave a powerpoint presentation to explain to the Local Committee how the Community Infrastructure Levy local spending boards operate. The presentation is attached as Annex D. The amount that is in the pot for each settlement area is dependent on how much development has taken place in the area. If the area did not receive any bids last year then the funding will have been carried forward so a larger pot will have built up.

Members' comments included how well the fund had been used last year, how the publicity this year had been good and how important it was for the Councillors to be involved.

11/15 SOUTH EAST PERMIT SCHEME (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 9]

Kevin Orledge, the SCC Streetworks Team Manager, introduced the report informing the Local Committee that the South East Permit Scheme had been operating for 12 months. Companies who want to carry out work on the highway now must pay a fee for a permit. The income that these have produced is as predicted and the team now consists of 32 full time staff. This added resource has led to an increase of 60% in the number of inspections of road works taking place. At the moment SCC set their own conditions on the permits, but the Department for Transport (DfT) is looking to standardise the conditions set across all operating authorities. SCC is working with the DfT to look at the implications of the standardisation.

Members' comments included:

- The new scheme is providing a more co-ordinated approach to road works
- Compliments regarding communication about recent road works in Oxshott
- Questions about the fees charged and signs not being removed

The officer responded that the team generate income through other means including inspections, overrun charges and re-inspections. He also requested that any signs left behind by contractors be reported.

The Local Committee resolved to

(i) note the contents of the report.

12/15 ELMBRIDGE PARKING STRATEGY (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 10]

Rikki Hill, the SCC Parking Team Manager, introduced the report, explaining how the previous parking reviews had taken a reactive approach, but the new Strategy will take a broader more comprehensive view.

Members' comments included:

- Positivity with the proposal

- How the public's mindset also needs to be changed as we must protect our local high streets and the public are only willing to walk a limited distance to shops
- The need to encourage businesses to look at new ways of getting their employees to work
- We must also treat residents with care when looking at the parking restrictions. Some are concerned by the idea of possibly removing yellow lines.

Rikki Hill followed up by adding that the aim is to focus on what restrictions are appropriate, not at removing or installing restrictions. If the lines are for safety reasons then they would not be removed. Consultants will be used, but it will be a closely controlled project and will include looking at parking patterns. After the planned 3 year period then the areas will be reconsidered.

The Local Committee resolved to agree:

- (i) to adopt a new more strategic approach to reviewing parking provision in Elmbridge.
- (ii) to use the surplus from the on street parking account to fund the reviews.

Reason for decision: In the past reviews have tended to be reactive in nature and concentrated on where parking was not desirable and so should be controlled or restricted. A more strategic approach would allow us to also consider where parking is needed and how those parking needs may be met.

13/15 ELMBRIDGE CYCLING PLAN (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 11]

Dave Sharpington, the SCC Cycling Programme Manager, introduced the report explaining this was a suggested approach for the development of a Local Cycling Plan for Elmbridge.

It was proposed that a Task Group be set up to develop the plan in full.

The Local Committee resolved to:

- (i) approve the methodology for developing the Elmbridge Cycling Plan
- (ii) agree to develop the Cycling Plan jointly between the County Council and the Borough Council
- (iii) agree to set up a task group to develop a full Plan
- (iv) agree the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Cycling Group (annex A)
- (v) nominate and agree the County Council and the Borough Council members of the Task Group (paragraph 3.1) **Margaret Hicks, Rachael I Lake, Peter Hickman, Cllr Andrew Davis, Cllr Jan Turner, Cllr Ian Donaldson**

Reason for decision: An Elmbridge Cycling Plan will support the Elmbridge Local Transport Strategy. A long-term, consistent approach to provision, that supports other programmes, will help its effectiveness.

14/15 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 12]

Nick Healey, the Area Highways Manager, introduced the report and the tabled addendum, attached as Annex E, and updated the Local Committee that Elmbridge had received £250,000 from the Project 400 flooding and winter damage repair programme.

Members asked a few questions in relation to the highway schemes funded this financial year. Cllr Peter Harman queried an issue in Cavendish Rd, about which Nick Healey promised to provide a response outside the meeting.

In relation to the tabled addendum to this item Nick Healey explained that following the recent Full Council meeting, changes had been made to the Local Committee highways budget for 2015-16. Firstly 25% of the capital maintenance budget must be used to assist with 'drainage' issues and secondly there was a reduction of £105,550 in the highways revenue budget. There was a discussion about the type of drainage work which could be classified as capital. It was agreed that Local Committee Members would notify the Highways service of drainage projects in their divisions by 13th March 2015. Nick Healey assured Members that once the drainage priorities were received he would try to split the £50,500 'drainage' budget as equitably as possible between the 9 divisions.

Moving on to the revenue budget, the Committee then agreed that they wanted to allocate £40,000 of the Local Committee Highways Allocation for 2015-16 to StreetSmart, which eliminated Options B & C from the list of 6 options proposed as possible ways of allocating the Local Committee highways budgets for 2015-6.

Members were not happy with the reduction in the budgets.

Members discussed the other options and Nick Healey provided further detail on how the 'Pooled Revenue' had been used in previous years. Members agreed to eliminate Option A then voted on the remaining options. 9 Members voted for Option D, and 3 each for Options E and F. The Chairman also agreed to write to the Full Council to express the Local Committee's concern with the reduction in the budgets.

The Local Committee resolved to:

- (i) agree that Members identify drainage projects in their division in which to invest the £50,500 capital drainage allocation**
- (ii) agree to allocate £40,000 from the Local Committee Highways Allocation for 2015-16 to StreetSmart, as in previous financial years 2013/14 and 2014/15**
- (iii) agree option D for the allocation of the 2015-16 Local Committee Highways budgets**

(iv) agree to extend the divisional programme in table 5 from 2015-16 to 2015-17

(v) authorise the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

Reason for decision: to take into account the recently announced changes to the Local Committees highways budgets.

15/15 INFRASTRUCTURE PRIORITIES FOR COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) FUNDING (SERVICE MONITORING & ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 13]

This report, and the tabled additional recommendation attached as Annex F, with the proposed bids to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Strategic Board was presented by Nick Healey (Area Team Manager NE), Melanie Harris (School Commissioning Officer) and David Ligertwood (Transport Projects Team Manager).

Members posed questions relating to:

- The nursery provision at Hurst Park
- The relative cost of the Real Time Passenger Information(RTPI) and how it operates with multiple bus companies

David Ligertwood explained that the recent Local Transport Review showed support for the RTPI and that as SCC is the provider of the bus stop infrastructure then we are the only agency who can provide the system. He confirmed that all bus service providers will be able to use the technology.

The Local Committee resolved to:

(i) approve the submission of one bid for transport scheme detailed in Table 1 and Annex 2 below

(ii) approve the submission of five bids for education schemes detailed in Table 1

(iii) engage with the Area Team Manager and the School Commissioning Officer in the development of the approved bids, to ensure that Divisional and Ward Members are fully apprised of the proposed schemes (paragraph 4.1 refers)

(iv) authorise the Head of School Commissioning in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Member(s) and Ward Member(s) to agree a final list of CIL applications for education schemes for the April 2015 deadline.

Reason for decision: Before bids are submitted to Elmbridge Borough Council they should be approved by the Local Committee.

Cllrs Peter Harman and Dorothy Mitchell left the meeting.

16/15 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AWARD OF LOCAL PREVENTION WORK FUNDING (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 14]

Jeremy Crouch, SCC Contract Performance Officer – Youth Work, introduced the report.

The Local Committee resolved to:

(i) approve the Youth Task Group recommendation to award a contract for a 36 month period for One to One Work from 01 September 2015 to Surrey Care Trust for the value of £65,000 per annum (subject to future changes in SYP budgets). Within the contract there is the opportunity to extend the service for further two years, subject to budget changes, provider performance and any changes in the needs of the young people.

(ii) approve the Youth Task Group recommendation to award a grant for a 36 month period for Neighbourhood Work from 01 September 2015 to the following providers:

(i) The Lifetrain Trust for 50% of the grant value

(ii) Eikon for 50% of the grant value

Within this grant agreement there is the opportunity to extend the service for further two years, subject to budget changes, provider performance and any changes in the needs of the young people.

Reason for decision: The recommendations will support the Council's priority to ensure that all young people in Surrey are employable.

17/15 LOCAL COMMITTEE BUDGETS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION) [Item 15]

The Local Committee resolved to note:

(i) The amounts that have been spent from the Members' allocation and Local Committees capital budgets, as set out in Annex 1 of this report.

Meeting ended at: 7.00 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank



SURREY

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 23 February 2015

AGENDA ITEM 5

PETITIONS

1. To receive a petition, in relation to the Jolly Boatman/Hampton Court Station site, with 91 signatures from Tony Nockles requesting:

‘Surrey County Council to immediately commission a revised Road Safety Audit (Stage 1) using published drawings available in 2008 and in 2012’.

2. To receive a petition with 83 signatures from Sue Kittelsen stating ‘travelling from Byfleet Road to the Painshill junction with the A3 and the other way towards West Byfleet along Parvis Road has become a nightmare on a regular basis due to road works. We ask Surrey County Council to restrict all non emergency work to between 10 pm and 5 am on this very busy route’.

Response attached

3. To receive a petition with 454 signatures, in relation to the junction of Ewell Rd and Rushett Rd, Long Ditton, from Sarah Spence requesting ‘SCC to implement traffic calming measures on Ewell Road’ stating that the junction is a dangerous blind corner, but a busy crossing place particularly for adults taking young children to nursery and school and that there is no alternative safe crossing along Ewell Rd from Long Ditton roundabout to Thorkhill Rd.
-

4. To receive a petition with 38 signatures from the residents of Prospect Rd., Long Ditton requesting ‘the replacement of the ‘flowering’ cherry trees in Prospect Road, Long Ditton. It states ‘we the undersigned residents hereby request that all six trees that have been removed by Surrey County Council be replaced and replanted as soon as possible.’
-

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)



DATE:

LEAD OFFICER: KEVIN ORLEDGE
STREET WORKS MANAGER

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO PETITION: PARVIS ROAD/BYFLEET RD
DIVISION: ELMBRIDGE /WOKING

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

- 1.1 A petition containing 83 signatures has been submitted for consideration at both the Elmbridge Local Committee and the Woking Joint Committee.

Wording of the petition:

- 1.2 Travelling from Byfleet Road to the Painshill junction with the A3 and the other way towards West Byfleet along Parvis Road has become a nightmare on a regular basis due to road works. We ask Surrey County Council to restrict all non emergency work to between 10pm and 5am on this very busy route.

BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The A245 Parvis Road extends from its junction in the centre of West Byfleet with the Old Woking Road to the roundabout junction with the Byfleet Road and Brooklands Road, a distance of approximately 1.4 miles.

The A245 Byfleet Road extends from the junction with the Parvis Road through to the Painshill Roundabout junction with the A3 trunk road. A distance of approximately 1.6 miles.

Both roads are defined as Traffic Sensitive' under the Department for Transport (DfT) classification between the hours of 06:30 to 09:30 and 16:00 to 18:30. These are periods when works that disrupt traffic flows will have the greatest adverse effect.

The roads have high significance in the Surrey road network being prime routes servicing the A3 and M25 and also the commerce area of Brooklands as well as being through routes connecting the towns of Woking, Weybridge Cobham and Esher and locations further afield.

Residential areas, whilst in most cases not considered dense, exist at various locations along the length of the road.

- 2.2 Works on the highway take many forms from general street cleansing to works requiring excavations and major changes to road layouts. The type of works will dictate the type of traffic management necessary and the ability to confine activities to less busy or “off peak” periods.

The necessity for any traffic management and the layout of the traffic management is defined in the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. Works on streets of 50 mph restriction and below being covered by the publication “Safety at Street Works and Road Works”.

Legislation dictates that it is compulsory that this document is followed for all works defined as Street Works (generally understood to be works by utility companies such as gas, water electric or telecom) and Works for Road Purposes (road repairs and improvement by the highway authority).

The type of traffic management (portable traffic signals, stop and go boards, road closure, give and take, priority working, etc.) dictates the effect on traffic movements and combined with traffic flows, the disruption levels.

RESPONSE

- 3.1 No advantage would be gained by limiting the time periods in which works that do not require any traffic management and hence do not interfere with vehicle movements, could be undertaken.

- 3.2 In limiting works that do have an effect on traffic flows to off peak periods, such as over night, consideration has to be given to the ability of the works and the associated traffic management to be cleared from the carriageway during other hours to restore the road to full use.

In the case of excavation works by utility companies, this is generally not practicable with most services (pipes, ducts, cables, etc,) being 1 metre or more sub surface.

- 3.3 Works on the highway are by their nature hazardous. Safety of both site operatives and the general public is paramount at all times. To be able to undertake works during periods of darkness artificial lighting is necessary. This creates issues with both shadows and moving between lit and non lit areas particularly when working in excavations. Surrey County Council would not instruct works to be undertaken using a methodology that puts operatives at a higher level of risk to personal injury.

Environmental issues of both noise and light pollution from night works require specific approval from the local Environmental Health (EH) authority. Experience indicates the EH authority will bias any decision in favour of residents over the travelling public.

- 3.4 Surrey County Council welcomes the use of innovative techniques and other methods by which the road can be fully available to traffic at peak periods.

On occasions plating of excavations can be considered however road plates have a maximum speed over of 10mph which if exceeded can create a

hazardous situation. Road plates would not be suitable for a road such as the Parvis Road or the Byfleet Road.

Techniques such as insertion, pipe bursting and directional drilling are encouraged where ground conditions and existing services allow.

- 3.5 Wherever works type and safety factors allow, Surrey County Council will instruct works on any street defined as traffic sensitive in the Surrey highway network that uses positive stop traffic management such as temporary traffic signals to be undertaken outside of the Traffic Sensitive' times.

An example of this being recent works in Copsem Lane, Oxshott, (a main M25 A3 link) where Sutton and East Surrey Water were instructed to only work between the hours of 09:30 and 15:30 Monday to Friday with the road returned to full use outside of these hours.

- 3.6 Where works that have the potential of creating significant traffic disruption are unavoidable, Surrey County Council will instruct the works promoter to work extended hours, most usually 07:00 to 19:00 (light permitting) and also to work the weekend period provided EH authority approval is gained.
- 3.7 In summary, it is not possible to limit non emergency works to take place between the hours of 10pm and 5am. Officers do carefully consider each application for works, taking into account various factors including type of works and environmental and safety issues, and place conditions on the times at which they can be undertaken as described in 3.5 and 3.6 above.

COMMENT ON RECENT WORKS

- 4.1 Major works were undertaken on the A245 Parvis Road last summer as part of the West Hall Care Home Development.

These works included widening of the footways, realignment of the carriageway and the installation of a pedestrian refuge area in the centre of the carriageway. It is acknowledged that these works caused significant traffic disruption in and around the area.

The timing of these works was coordinated to avoid the closure of the adjacent Newark Lane whilst meeting the planning requirement dictating completion by mid September and used part of the school summer vacation period. These works had an overall duration of seven weeks.

Due to the nature of the works, particularly the widening of the footway on the northern side and the necessity to provide an alternative pedestrian walkway in the carriageway, it was not possible to limit these works to off peak periods only.

Contact Officer:

Kevin Orledge, Street Works Manager
0300 200 1003

Consulted:

N/A

Sources:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/321056/safety-at-streetworks.pdf

**SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 23 February 2015****AGENDA ITEM 6****PUBLIC QUESTIONS****Question 1: Ken Huddart (Claygate Parish Council)**

Claygate Parish Council recognises the desirability of a more strategic, holistic approach to parking across Elmbridge.

What reassurances can the Local Committee give that after considerable input from Claygate residents to a recent parking survey and to SCC's own current consultation on specific local proposals, identifying on street commuter parking as a major issue, that Claygate residents will not have to wait years for a review that leads to action to address this matter?

Response from SCC Parking team:

Unfortunately Claygate is not alone in feeling the effects of parking by commuters; it is a common and often increasing issue for residents across many parts of borough of Elmbridge, not to mention elsewhere in the county. Indeed it is an issue commonly highlighted in all the locations mentioned in the Elmbridge Parking Strategy report, at item 10 of today's agenda. However, as mentioned in that report, if the new approach is adopted, we aim to have completed a review of the whole borough, and implemented any appropriate changes to parking controls, within three years.

Although it is to be expected that each town and village would like to be subject to a review as early as possible, it is not realistic to look at the whole borough at the same time. As mentioned in the report, we considered the number of requests for changes to parking controls that had been made in each of the areas that we will be looking at, as an aid to deciding the order for the reviews. On the current programme we expect issues in Claygate to be addressed in the second year of the three year cycle.

This page is intentionally left blank



Elmbridge
Borough Council

... bridging the communities ...

MINUTES
ANNEX D

Item 8

Local Community Infrastructure Levy funding

Elmbridge Local Committee

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Charge on some forms of new development that raises funds towards infrastructure needed to support development.

How is CIL allocated?

- Since April 2013 over £3 million collected
- 25% to local communities where development took place
- 75% for strategic infrastructure



Local CIL totals

CIL currently available

- Claygate - £4,453
- Cobham, Oxshott, Stoke D'Abernon and Downside - £142,953
- East and West Molesey - £40,592
- Esher - £30,025
- Hersham - £36,657
- Thames Ditton, Long Ditton, Hinchley Wood and Weston Green - £12,920
- Walton on Thames - £148,936
- Weybridge - £72,975



Spending criteria

Rules on spending

(a) provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure

(b) Anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands of development



Local Spending Boards

Role of the Local Spending Board

Formal sub- committees of EBC with decision making powers.

Decision making

1. Recommend a local scheme(s) to be funded/part funded
2. Retain the money until next year



Promotion of process

Publicity

- Press releases, online, posters
- Email/letter direct to Resident Associations, amenity groups, churches etc
- Promoted to Elmbridge schools
- Promoted to strategic organisations that may have local schemes – Environment Agency, SW Trains



2015 process

- Application period open until March 31st
- Application forms and guidance available on website www.elmbridge.gov.uk/CI spend
- Community consultation April-May
- Officer report with feedback
- Spending Boards June/July 2015



Questions



SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)



DATE: 23rd FEBRUARY 2015
LEAD OFFICER: NICK HEALEY, AREA TEAM MANAGER (NE)

SUBJECT: HIGHWAYS UPDATE

DIVISION: ALL

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

This report summarises progress with the Local Committee's programme of Highways works for the current Financial Year 2014-15. Preparations are well advanced to deliver the Local Committee's programme of Highways works for the Financial Year 2015-16.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Elmbridge) is asked to:

- (i) agree that members identify drainage projects in their division in which to invest the £50,500 capital drainage allocation;
- (ii) agree whether or not to allocate £40,000 from the Local Committee Highways Allocation for 2015-16 to StreetSmart, as in previous financial years 2013/14 and 2014/15;
- (iii) agree an option for the allocation of the 2015-16 Local Committee Highways budgets;
- (iv) agree to extend the divisional Programme in table 5 from 2015-16 to 2015-17;
- (v) authorise the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Programmes of work for each Division have been agreed with Divisional Members. Committee is asked to provide the necessary authorisation to deliver those programmes of work in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Member without the need to revert to the Committee as a whole.

2015-16 Budget Allocations

At Full Council on 10th February 2015 it was decided to make the following allocations to the Local Committees for 2015-16:

- £2.15m revenue, including the £5,000 per Member Community Enhancement fund;
- £2.0m capital maintenance;
- £2.0m capital integrated transport.

This represents a reduction in the revenue allocation of £1m compared to 2014-15.

As in previous years, it is for the Local Committee to determine how they choose to allocate their funds and they continue to have the flexibility to move capital between the two headings of maintenance and integrated transport. However, this year in view of the flooding challenges that have tested Surrey, the Political Leadership have determined that 25% of the capital maintenance budget under the control of the Local Committees must be used to assist with “drainage” issues such as gullies and drains. For example, Local Committees may wish to use the capital to provide additional drainage assets (new gullies / soakaways / drains etc) or perhaps the allocation will be used as part of a wider scheme to improve maintenance in an area which will have a direct positive benefit on the local drainage network – again, for example the Local Committees may wish to undertake local resurfacing works and as part of that improve the drainage channels in the carriageway, improve gully capacity and renew the drains.

The Highways Update report for the meeting of the Elmbridge Local Committee on 23rd February was drafted before Full Council, and so carries the assumption that the 2015-16 Highways budgets would be the same as the 2014-15 Highways budgets. The Area Team Manager apologises for any confusion that this may cause.

The Local Committee must now decide how to manage the impact of the changes decided and announced at Full Council.

The split of the £1m revenue reduction is not even, as the different Boroughs / Districts are not evenly sized. The Elmbridge Local Committee ordinarily receives a higher level of Highways funding, as it is one of the larger Boroughs. For Elmbridge the decision at Full Council will mean a total Highways Revenue budget reduction of £105,550. Taking into account the decisions and announcements at Full Council, the Local Committee in Elmbridge has been delegated Highway budgets in the current Financial Year 2015-16 as follows:

- Local Revenue: £161,050
- Community Enhancement: £45,000
- Capital Integrated Transport Schemes: £202,000
- Capital Maintenance (drainage): £50,500
- Capital Maintenance (general): £151,500
- **Total: £610,050**

Six options are presented below, for different possible allocations of the Local Committee's Highways budgets.

Options for next FY 2015-16 allocations:

Option A		
Pooled Revenue	£ 166,050.00	
Street Smart	£ 40,000.00	
Capital to be used for drainage	£ 50,500.00	
Divisional Allocations	£ 353,500.00	(£ 39,277.78 per Division)

Option B		
Pooled Revenue	£ 175,000.00	
Street Smart	£ 20,000.00	
Capital to be used for drainage	£ 50,500.00	
Divisional Allocations	£ 364,550.00	(£ 40,505.56 per Division)

Option C		
Pooled Revenue	£ 175,000.00	
Street Smart	£ -	
Capital to be used for drainage	£ 50,500.00	
Divisional Allocations	£ 384,550.00	(£ 42,727.78 per Division)

Option D		
Pooled Revenue	£ 150,000.00	
Street Smart	£ 40,000.00	
Capital to be used for drainage	£ 50,500.00	
Divisional Allocations	£ 369,550.00	(£ 41,061.11 per Division)

Option E		
Pooled Revenue	£ 125,000.00	
Street Smart	£ 40,000.00	
Capital to be used for drainage	£ 50,500.00	
Divisional Allocations	£ 394,550.00	(£ 43,838.89 per Division)

Option F		
Pooled Revenue	£ 100,000.00	
Street Smart	£ 40,000.00	
Capital to be used for drainage	£ 50,500.00	
Divisional Allocations	£ 419,550.00	(£ 46,616.67 per Division)

The Pooled Revenue is used to cover various revenue concerns across the Borough for example: drainage and ditching, patching and kerb works, parking, minor safety schemes, extra vegetation. The Community Gang would be funded from this allocation. A significant

reduction in the Pooled Revenue would have a significant impact on officers' ability to be able to respond to day to day maintenance concerns raised by Members and residents. The Street Smart allocation is a grant to Elmbridge Borough Council to support their ad hoc environmental maintenance gang. The Street Smart gang spend approximately 2.5 days per week attending to vegetation on the Public Highway.

The Divisional Allocations are the monies prioritised by individual Divisional Members for schemes within their respective Divisions. In 2014-15 these Divisional Allocations were approximately £55,000 per Division. A modest reduction in the Divisional Allocations could be absorbed without a significant impact on officers' ability to deliver Members' priorities. A significant reduction would result in a significant risk that officers' would be unable to deliver Members' priorities in their respective Divisions. Members' priorities for their Divisions have been reported to Committee on the main agenda for its meeting of 23rd February – detailed in Table 5 of the Highways Update report.

Committee must now decide how to manage the impact of the decisions and announcements at Full Council on 10th February 2015.

Ref.2.9

Customer Services Update

The continued mild weather in the last quarter has meant the downward trend has continued since the extremely high volume in the first part of the year. Overall volumes remain high with over 149,000 received for the 2014 calendar year, giving an average of approximately 12,400 per month, down from 13,100 in the third quarter.

For Elmbridge specifically, 15,991 enquiries have been received since January of which 7,321 were directed to the local area office for action, 96% of these have been resolved. This response rate is slightly above the countywide average of 95%. Although the response rate remains high, we are working hard in conjunction with our contractors to improve the service we provide. The new Works Management System has allowed greater visibility throughout the life of a customer enquiry and officers are able to view better information and works schedules.

Although there have been a reduction in customer contacts, complaints have remained high with 524 at Stage 1 compared to 487 for 2013. The North East have received 121. The main reasons for these being communication and the failure to carry out works to either the required standard or timescale. In addition 18 complaints have been escalated to Stage 2 of which we were found to be at fault in ten. Seven complaints have been made to the Local Government Ombudsman about the Service, none of which have been upheld.

Work continues to improve performance and we are currently undertaking a Key Driver Analysis of the annual National Highways and Transport survey to better understand customer satisfaction. In addition the Customer Service Excellence Member Reference Group is reviewing our response standards and Customer Charter.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL



SURREY

LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)

DATE: 23RD FEBRUARY 2015
LEAD OFFICER: NICK HEALEY, AREA TEAM MANAGER (NE)
MELANIE HARRIS, SCHOOL COMMISSIONING OFFICER (NE)

SUBJECT: INFRASTRUCTURE PRIORITIES FOR COMMUNITY
INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) FUNDING

DIVISION: ALL

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

In Autumn 2014 Elmbridge Borough Council awarded CIL funding to six transport schemes and one education scheme promoted by Surrey County Council.

The deadline for the next opportunity to bid to Elmbridge Borough Council for CIL funding is April 2015, with Elmbridge Borough Council's Strategic Spending Board anticipated to meet in Summer 2015. This report summarises the successful bids and proposes new bids for the April 2015 deadline.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Elmbridge) is asked to:

- (i) Approve the submission of one bid for transport scheme detailed in Table 1 and Annex 2 below;
- (ii) Approve the submission of five bids for education schemes detailed in Table 1;
- (iii) Engage with the Area Team Manager and School Commissioning Officer in the development of the approved bids, to ensure that Divisional and Ward Members are fully apprised of the proposed schemes (paragraph 4.1 refers);
- (iv) Authorise the Head of School Commissioning in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Member(s) to agree a final list of CIL applications for education schemes for the April 2015 deadline.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Before bids are submitted to Elmbridge Borough Council they should be approved by the Local Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank