

Minutes of the meeting of the
Runnymede JOINT COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 9 March 2020
at The Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone KT15 2AH.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr Mark Nuti (Vice-Chairman)
- Mrs Mary Angell
- * Mr Mel Few
- * Mr John Furey
- * Miss Marisa Heath
- Mrs Yvonna Lay

Borough / District Members:

- * Borough Councillor Mark Maddox (Chairman)
- * Borough Councillor Alan Alderson
- Borough Councillor David Anderson-Bassey
- * Borough Councillor Nigel King
- Borough Councillor Nick Prescott
- * Borough Councillor Donald Whyte

* In attendance

OPEN FORUM

Before the formal meeting began, there was a presentation about Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs). This was in response to many of the concerns about parking issues that were raised at the last meeting. The presentation has been published as an annex to the minutes.

After the presentation, the Chairman invited questions from the public on CPZs and of any other aspect of council services. The questions and responses have been published as an annex to the minutes.

36/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

From Surrey CC:

Mary Angell
Yvonna Lay

From Runnymede BC:

David Anderson-Bassey

37/19 MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes from the meeting of 25 November, 2019 were agreed as an accurate record.

38/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

39/19 DECISION TRACKER [Item 4]

The Committee acknowledged the progress of actions on the decision tracker.

40/19 PETITIONS AND PETITION RESPONSES [Item 5]

No petitions had been received.

41/19 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]

No members' questions had been received..

42/19 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 7]

Mrs Owen Davis' question was discussed by the Committee.

In a follow-up to her question, Mrs Owen Davis wanted to know more about the actions being taken, the budget for these activities and the input from the Borough Council.

It was reported back that the County Council had assigned £85 million to the green agenda which had been agreed by the full council. Policy was currently being formulated and advice will be taken from the report published by Leeds University.

In the Borough Council, all reports relating to the green agenda were being personally overseen by the Council's Chief Executive Officer. Only 3% of agreed developments relate to green belt land.

43/19 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 8]

The Area Highways Manager presented his report for the year ahead and invited questions from the Committee. The Committee were happy with the programme presented for 20/21 and decided the following:

The Joint Committee (Runnymede):

- (i) Noted the progress with schemes and revenue funded works for the 2019/20 financial year.
- (ii) Noted the budgetary position.
- (iii) Noted that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.
- (iv) Agreed the proposed capital works programme for 2020/21.

- (v) Authorised the Area Highways Manager to undertake all necessary actions to deliver the capital works programme, consulting with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Divisional Members where necessary.

Reasons:

The Joint Committee made these decisions to allow the Area Highways Manager to progress with the agreed programme for the upcoming municipal year.

44/19 CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 9]

This report was presented to the County Council in December 2019 and was brought to Joint Committee to give a further opportunity to give feedback.

No comments were put forward by the Committee members.

45/19 FORWARD PROGRAMME 2020/21 [Item 10]

The forward plan for the next meeting was agreed as published.

46/19 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 11]

The date of the next meeting is Wednesday 8 July in the Council Chamber, Runnymede Borough Council. It will commence with an Open Forum at 6.30pm

Meeting ended at: 20:30

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank



RUNNYMEDE JOINT COMMITTEE

9 March 2020

OPEN FORUM IN ADVANCE OF FORMAL MEETING

VERBAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES (CPZs)

A presentation was given about controlled parking zones (CPZs) by officers from both councils which outlined the benefits and considerations of these schemes and illustrated what residents should do if they wished to instigate them in their areas. The presentation slides have been included as a minute annex.

Key points that were covered:

- CPZs are normally implemented when there is a consensus of 70% of affected residents supporting the scheme or when it is part of a local transport strategy.
- Implementing a scheme would take between 6-12 months.
- Next steps: To outline a budget for a pilot scheme in Englefield Green to serve as a benchmark for future schemes.
- A parking services review will be undertaken by the Borough Council in the next municipal year. This would take account of current needs as well as those anticipated as part of plans for new housing development and shopping centres,

The Committee raised the following points in discussion.

With the pilot scheme targeting Englefield Green, it was asked if the Royal Holloway University could do more to help alleviate the problem. It was recognised that the university was working with residents and councillors to explore solutions like the proposed CPZ pilot but it was felt that measures they were taking to deter parking on their campus could be exacerbating the problem. Ideally, they would also be looking at providing shuttle buses to and from the site or implementing other ways to deter car usage.

Another point was raised about the how CPZ's would affect those who had driveways as vehicles who parked too close to drives could affect access and exit. It was explained that the design of the scheme was key to avoiding this problem.

A concern was raised that residents may not have the appropriate documentation to apply for permits. If for example a resident has a company car, then they will not have the V5 document to show that it is their vehicle. Similarly, students who apply may have a different address on their documentation such as their parents' home. This was noted and will be considered as part of any pilot scheme.

Rules on which residents are able to apply for permits can be written into the scheme according to the parking spaces available against the car ownership of affected residents.

The cost of permits was discussed. Surrey County Council had not raised the costs of permits since 2011 and the new permit prices represent a considerable increase. It was explained that increasing prices could only take place under a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and this costs the County Council around £40-50,000 to implement, hence why they seldom seek to increase prices. However, the council are looking at ways in which they can implement more frequent, incremental changes on a more cost-effective basis.

Concern was raised about the prices of permits and the financial burden for residents in meeting these charges especially when there are two or more cars in a household. It was noted that a paper was brought to Surrey County Council's cabinet meeting in January which outlines the projected revenue that will be raised by this increase. This concern was acknowledged, however to counter this, it was suggested that the price for two permits per household was equivalent to a cup of coffee per week. An enquiry was also raised as to whether or not money from developers (such as Section 106 or Community Infrastructure Levy) could be used to offset residents' contributions. If there is a development which would be affected by the scheme, this could be negotiated with them. Charges related to enforcement are set by central government and action is taken against serial offenders.

It was asked if permit prices be related to vehicle emissions in line with the County Council's recent climate emergency as has been done in Bristol. It was noted that this had not been a consideration in this review but as there will shortly be electric vehicle trials rolled out across some of the boroughs within Surrey, this could be a consideration for future changes.

The Chairman invited questions from members of the public:

Chris Fisher, Egham Residents Association.

Are the County Council in a position in the short term to fund a consultation for an area in Egham which might be able to benefit from this? Is there any flexibility on the 70% residents' support?

Mr Fisher was advised that the 70% support rate had been set to demonstrate a strong level of consensus in an area which meant that it was easier for officers to make a case for implementing the schemes. However it is recognised that in some areas, this might not be a realistic goal and so there is some flexibility for the County Council to implement schemes on a case-by-case basis when there is strong evidence that a scheme would benefit the area. The County Councillor for Englefield Green agreed to look into funding the consultation if Mr Fisher contacts her directly.

Breda Signorelli, local resident.

Will restrictions be placed on number of vehicles per household and on type of vehicle to deter parking being taken up by large commercial vehicles?

The Parking Manager advised that there are already limitations on certain commercial vehicles being parked on the roadside. Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) for example, have to have a registered operating base and can't be parked on the highway overnight. In the case of individual schemes: rules are set for each scheme based on the feedback from residents as to what will serve those residents best given the parking available on that street.

Mr Fisher asked

Why aren't Surrey County Council treating drainage issues on the highway as a matter of urgency? Their answer seems to be that the drains are not coping but no action seems to be taken to address this.

The response times for potholes that meet the criteria for repair is currently 28 days. However, more potholes are being reported than the service is able to address currently. In many cases (such as those in Egham where Mr Fisher lives) drainage solutions are based on soakaway ditches which are now already saturated and unable to hold any more fluid. Currently 300-400 new potholes are being reported each day and teams are working overtime to address them as quickly as possible.

To illustrate the problem, the deputy Chairman reported that during the period of September – November 2019, there were 3,500 pothole repairs completed. In January 2020 there was 6,547 alone and 5455 in February.

Crews are being deployed to conduct repairs around the clock but the potholes caused by the unprecedented rainfall has meant this has been an uphill challenge.

This page is intentionally left blank

Permit Parking Schemes

(Residents Parking and Controlled Parking Zones)

Surrey County Council – manage highways and implement parking schemes

Runnymede Borough Council – enforce and administer parking restrictions



SUR

Background

A highway authority has powers (not a duty) to designate parking space on the road for different uses. Traffic Orders are created to impose restrictions.

Page 10

- **Residents parking**
- Limited waiting bays near shops
- Disabled bays
- Loading bays

Criteria for a Permit Scheme

- **There must be a need for residents to park on street**
- **There must be a significant amount of non-resident parking**
- **The majority of residents must be in favour of a permit scheme (70%)**
 - Or part of a local transport plan adopted by the local committee
- **Resources available to implement, operate and enforce**

Main types of permit scheme

1) Permit parking areas. These are schemes where there are no road markings, only signs which say "Permit holders only past this point", at the entry points to the area.



Main types of permit scheme

2) Permit parking bays with signs

Parking bays are marked where appropriate with yellow lines elsewhere



Considerations – Permit Schemes

- When do the restrictions apply ?
- Who is eligible ?
- What about blue badge holders ?
- How many permits are available ?
- What vehicles can have permits ?
- What about visitors and carers ?

Permit Costs

- First resident permit £50 (changing to £80)
- Second resident permit £75 (changing to £100 and £130)
- Visitors £2 per day (Changing to £1 for 2 hours and £2 all day)
- Carers £10 (changing to free)

Runnymede Borough Council Functions Relating to CPZ's

Borough Functions - Summary

• The core requirements of Runnymede Borough Council in relation to CPZ's are as follows:

- Preparation and notification to potential permit holders
- Processing of permit applications
- Receipt of payment for permits
- Ongoing administration of permit renewals, changes, replacements etc.
- Enforcement of CPZ's and issue of penalty notices
- Payments of fines, appeals and dispute resolution

CPZ Administration

Notification to Potential Permit Holders

- Collating the database of households
- Writing to potential permit holders
- Dealing with set up queries in response to correspondence.
- Assessment of premises: Off street parking provision

CPZ Administration

Processing of Permit Applications and Payments

- Assessment of applications
- Evidence of entitlement to permits: V5 registration document and Council Tax references
- Issue of permits
- Receipt of payments

All need to be completed by commencement date!

CPZ Administration

Ongoing Administration Requirements

- Vehicle changes
- Resident changes
- Annual permit renewal – via application
- Visitor permits application and issue
- Carers Permits: assessment and issue
- Operational Permits

CPZ Enforcement

- Patrol of areas during operating times
- Issuing of Penalty Charge Notices for contraventions
- Reactive enforcement patrols in response to complaints
- Enforcement of CPZ's currently included as part of wider working pattern re enforcement

Appeals and Dispute Resolution

- Dealing with challenges, representations and appeals in relation to PCNs
- Assessment of applications for permits where there is a dispute.
- Assessment of applications for Carers and Operational Permits
- Complaints and disputes

Challenges Identified by Partners in Delivering CPZ's

- Timeliness of CPZ's from initiation to implementation
- Capacity within SCC relating to new parking schemes
- SCC financial constraints relating to initiation and implementation
- Capacity within RBC in relation to administration, enforcement and management of CPZ's
- Cost of implementation of permit schemes

Next Steps

- With conversations at advanced stage in regards to sizeable CPZ's in Englefield Green it is proposed that the following work is completed by SCC/RBC as a pilot:
 - Plan for the implementation, ongoing administration and enforcement of CPZ's to be written
 - Budget covering the financial requirements in regards to implementation, ongoing administration and enforcement to be written
- RBC's Parking Services review in 2020/2021 to consider how CPZ's can be supported more widely across borough