

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET****DATE: 30 JANUARY 2018****REPORT OF: MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT****LEAD OFFICER: JASON RUSSELL, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE****SUBJECT: PAY & CONSERVE, CAR PARK CHARGING ON THE COUNTRYSIDE ESTATE****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

The Surrey County Council Countryside Estate comprises 10,000 acres of the Surrey countryside, all of which is open to the public. Ranging from the healthland of Ockham and Wisley Commons to the downland and woodland of Norbury Park, Surrey's Countryside is an integral part of what makes Surrey a wonderful place to live. Since 2002, the County Council has contracted with Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) to manage the Countryside Estate in order to deliver biodiversity, landscape and access benefits. The County Council's vision is for a financially sustainable Estate which is protected and enhanced for future generations.

Ongoing pressure on local government funding has meant the County Council has had to find savings in many areas since 2010. The County Council has been working with SWT to identify new ways of generating income in order to ensure the financial sustainability of the Countryside Estate. Since 2014 the value of the contract payment to SWT has fallen from £953,000 per annum to £575,000 with a plan to reduce that figure to zero by 2020/21. As well as environmental grants that support SWT's work, income is derived from property on the estate and trading and other activities such as events, location filming and weddings.

In line with a strategy pursued by many other landowners, the option of charging for car parking has been investigated as a potential source of income to support the county council's vision. This paper sets out a proposed approach to introduce car park charging at the five busiest countryside sites. This would mean charges at 15 out of over 30 car parks across the County Council's Countryside Estate. The proposal is based on public consultation carried out during Autumn 2017.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that:

1. Charging is introduced at 15 car parks across the 5 busiest sites as set out in Option 5 in paragraph 35 below.
2. Income from car park charging is ring-fenced for the benefit of the Surrey Countryside Estate.
3. The tariffs are agreed as set out in paragraph 26 below and thereafter forms part of the annual review process for fees and charges.

## **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

In order to ensure a secure future for the Countryside Estate in the stewardship of the County Council and Surrey Wildlife Trust, a steady revenue stream is critical. SWT are working with the County Council to develop a range of opportunities to produce that income and help to protect and enhance the Countryside Estate.

The Countryside Estate is greatly valued by the public, however it is coming under increasing pressure from reducing budgets. The best way to protect and enhance the countryside for the future is to make the Estate self-funding and better protected against declining public sector budgets. Paying for parking is an accepted cost of going to the countryside, demonstrated by the many sites that charge and are still very busy.

Without funding, the countryside will become more inaccessible, overgrown and littered. All car parks on the countryside estate need regular litter collection, management of trees and other vegetation, upkeep of signs and surfacing and car park resurfacing. Income from car park charges can help meet these costs and improve the biodiversity, landscape and access to this valuable asset.

The results of the consultation show us that the public would prefer not to pay to use the car parks however there is recognition that without a reliable income stream the result would be a deterioration in the quality of the estate and in access to the estate. Of the payment options available, cash would be the most acceptable to the public. However there are high operational costs and risks, for example theft and vandalism are more common where cash is collected in meters on remote sites. The National Trust are already reviewing their method of charging as a result of repeated vandalism. The next most popular payment option was by card (some 95% of adults in the UK now have bank cards).

Many countryside car parks in Surrey and other rural areas make charges. Following financial assessment, the analysis of the Pay and Conserve Public Consultation and recommendations from the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee, it is felt that the most appropriate way of generating the necessary income is to introduce charging at the 5 busiest sites with card-only Pay and Display machines plus the option to pay by mobile phone or to purchase an annual parking permit. The cost of an annual permit is £60 this equates to a daily cost of 16p.

1. The County Council works with SWT who are contracted to manage the Estate on our behalf. SWT are responsible for ensuring paths can be safely used, dangerous trees and branches are made safe, sensitive habitats and species are protected and litter is removed. They also make sure residents can get to the countryside, which may mean providing somewhere for them to park, clearing paths and providing information on site. The contract is managed and monitored through a set of Key Performance Indicators and Service Level Agreements to ensure effective performance.
2. The current management cost of the SWT-managed Countryside Estate is £2.1 million per annum of which the County Council contributes £575,000 directly in a contract payment, with a further 27% in income from the property on the Estate and 28% from trading and other activities associated with the Estate. The remainder is funded through environmental grants from external sources.
3. Overall, the County Council's funding for its countryside functions has reduced from a net budget of £3.5m in 2011/12 to £1.6m net in 2017/18 with an MTFP savings target to move to an annual budget of £1m net by 2020/21. This is as a result of the ongoing reductions in local government funding and the increase in demand pressures on statutory services, in particular social care and school place provision.
4. In order to ensure the financial sustainability of the countryside can be secured, the County Council has been working closely with SWT since 2014 to develop and deliver a business plan for the Estate. The plan is updated annually and includes a range of activities that can generate income to support our overall vision. The plan is scrutinised by the County Council's Environment & Infrastructure Select Committee. This includes activities such as development of a woodfuel business, securing funding from other sources such as the Local Enterprise Partnerships and charitable trusts and income generating activities such as events and location filming.
5. In addition, in common with many other landowners such as the National Trust and Park Authorities, the opportunity to generate income from the introduction of car park charges has been investigated. There are over 30 car parks across the Estate, which range from formalised car parks with the capacity for 190 cars to informal car parks with just a few spaces. The County Council undertook a public consultation to gather views from residents and local organisations about the concept of charging for parking at the five busiest sites in order to support the management of the estate. The consultation ran from September to November 2017 for a period of six weeks. A total of 1,258 responses were received, the majority from residents with additional responses from 7 organisations.
6. This paper sets out the results of that consultation and a proposed approach to the introduction of car park charges at those busiest countryside sites, namely:
  - Chobham Common (6 car parks)
  - Whitmoor Common (2 car parks)
  - Norbury Park (3 car parks)
  - Ockham Common (3 car parks)
  - Rodborough Common (1 car park)
7. On 29 November 2017 a report was taken to the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee asking them to consider the output from the consultation, comment on the proposed options and provide a view on the

---

preferred option.

## **DETAILS:**

### **Pay and Conserve Consultation**

8. The Pay and Conserve consultation ran for a six-week period between September and November 2017. During that time, a mixture of digital, social and printed media was used, as well as printed media displays in car parks, district and borough council offices and libraries, in order to raise awareness and encourage participation.
9. The aim of the consultation was to understand more about how people currently use the sites, what they felt about paying to park, including how a scheme might be operated, and what the impacts of parking charges might be, for example on displacement parking. It also gave all residents an opportunity to comment on the possibility of car park charging, with a particular focus on residents in those areas most closely affected. The full details of the consultation are set out in Annex 1 to this report.
10. During the consultation period, a total of 1,258 individuals and organisations submitted their comments, the majority via a survey available online and in hard copy. Most of the responses were made by individuals in addition to 2 angling clubs, 1 local society and 4 Parish Councils. The countryside liaison groups associated with the busiest sites were also specifically consulted.
11. The majority of people responding to the consultation, just under 85%, drive to sites, with 26% travelling for less than 10 minutes and 52% travelling between 10 and 30 minutes, with almost half staying between one and two hours. Most people visit to go walking, often with one other adult. A smaller number visit with children.
12. Perhaps not surprisingly, the vast majority of respondents do not want to see car park charges introduced, with half saying they would seek free parking elsewhere or avoid coming. When asked to express a preference, 74.6% of respondents did not want to pay for parking, with 15.6% supporting charging in all car parks as their first preference and 10.3% charging in some as their first preference. There was a very strong view that less well used car parks should not be closed to reduce overall management costs.
13. In terms of the parking operation, cash payment was the most popular, with 59% of respondents preferring this option, followed by card payment with 46% prepared to pay via this method. Only 33% of respondents were supportive of payment by phone.
14. The survey gave people the opportunity to add any other comments. Some of the issues identified included the risk of deterring people from visiting the countryside, impacting negatively on health and wellbeing and the ability of less well-off people to access the countryside. There were concerns about paying to access common land, and that residents were already paying through council tax. Comments in support of car park charging included that it was the fairest means to fund the management of sites and that funds raised should be ring-fenced for countryside management. The table below provides further details on these themes and the County Council's response.

Key themes	SCC response
Concern that the income from charging will be used for other SCC services	Subject to Cabinet approval the income will be ring fenced for the countryside and noticeboards will be put in the car parks with information to explain to visitors where the money is being spent.
There is a concern that volunteers will be charged	It is proposed to make arrangements for volunteers to park for free when they are volunteering
SCC should lobby Central Government to improve the central public investment in the countryside.	The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport will continue to engage with the Secretary of State and other relevant ministers. The Secretary of State has been briefed on the issue of car park charging and other issues that threaten the future of the countryside.
The introduction of charging is seen as a form of additional taxation on the public that use the sites	The budgets for countryside management are being squeezed as the pressure on the overall County Council budget increases. This is unlikely to change in the next few years and therefore we need to find a way of making the budgets for countryside more resilient to these pressures. The best way of doing this is to generate an income from the countryside estate that can be ring fenced for the countryside budget. It should also be noted that it is not proposed to introduce car parking charges at all car parks on the countryside estate.
There is a negative impact of charging for those on a low income	We are aware this could be an issue, however this proposal would not introduce charging at all car parks. Surrey offers a wealth of greenspaces that can be accessed without charges. Charging may also encourage positive environmental changes such as car sharing.
That the introduction of car park charging will have a negative impact on the health and wellbeing of users of the sites	There is a potential issue for people who cannot or will not pay, however evidence from elsewhere suggests this does not appear to translate into a lower number of people using the car park. Charges are not being introduced in all car parks across the Estate, other local open spaces have free parking or are within walking or cycling distance of many residents. SCC and SWT will use some of the income to improve access by cycle and foot to sites where appropriate. In addition public transport access is also being looked at as an option.
SWT members should not have to pay for car parking	Further investigation will be made to see if there could be more benefit for Surrey Wildlife Trust members.
Concern was expressed about the impact of charges on displacement parking.	All the car parks where charging is proposed have been visited with Highways Engineers to assess the likely impact and plan suitable mitigation. For those sites in the SPA (Special Protection Area) the relevant assessments are being undertaken currently.

## The Proposed Approach

15. SCC and SWT have been working together over a period of years to explore how to secure the financial sustainability of the Countryside Estate, both to maintain but also to enable ongoing improvements to the biodiversity, landscape and access for the benefit of our residents and the natural environment.
16. A number of options are being developed to support this ambition, with car parking charges playing a key role in securing a sustainable income stream, whilst ensuring that those that benefit more from the countryside make a contribution towards its maintenance and improvement. This is in line with many other landowners, including the National Trust, other local authorities and National Park Authorities.
17. The work to date has focused on the 5 most visited sites within the Countryside Estate that are owned by SCC and managed by SWT under a lease agreement. The five sites are:
- Chobham Common (6 car parks)
  - Whitmoor Common (2 car parks)
  - Norbury Park (3 car parks)
  - Ockham and Wisley Commons (3 car parks)
  - Rodborough Common (1 car park)
18. Collectively, there are 15 car parks that serve the five sites and monitoring figures suggest that there are 446,000 cars visiting the sites annually. The largest of these car parks accommodates some 20,000 vehicles per month with the smallest accommodating less than 1,000 in a month.
19. Based on usage data and assumed parking charges, a number of options have been explored which seek to balance value for money with public acceptability. More information on this is set out in the Business Case below.
20. In developing the options, comparable sites were considered. The table below sets out details of a number of local sites that charge for parking and the current tariffs in place.

Length of stay	Box Hill (National Trust)	Frensham Little Pond (National Trust)	Alice Holt Forest (Forestry Commission)	The Lookout (Bracknell Forest Council)	Queen Elizabeth CP (Hants CC)
Up to 1 hr	£1.50	£1.50	£1.80	£2	£1.80
Up to 2 hrs	£1.50	£1.50	£3	£2	£1.80
Up to 3 hrs	£4	£4	£4.50	£2	£3.50
Up to 4 hrs	£4	£4	£6	£2	£3.50
Up to 5 hrs	£4	£4	£8	£4	£3.50
>5 hours	£6	£6	£8	£4	£3.50

21. For the Surrey Countryside Estate, the proposed tariff is set out below, with an annual permit available at a cost of £60 which would be valid at all car parks at

the 5 sites.

Up to 1 hour - £1.30  
Up to 2 hours – £2.60  
Up to 3 hours – £3.90  
Over 3 hours - £5.00

## Business Case

22. In order to develop the business case, five options were modelled, these are:

Option 1: Do nothing – no charges are introduced at any of the sites.

Option 2: Voluntary Donation – a voluntary donation scheme is introduced at the sites.

Option 3: Cash payment – charging is introduced with the option to pay by cash, card or phone. An annual permit is also available.

Option 4: Phone payment – charging is introduced with the option to pay by phone only. An annual permit is also available.

Option 5: Card payment – charging is introduced with the option to pay by card or phone. An annual permit is also available.

23. An analysis of each of the options is set out in Annex 2 to this report.

24. The business case modelling was based on the proposed tariff as set out in paragraph 26 above. The modelling focused on options 3, 4 and 5 on the basis that option 1 would not generate any income and based on information from elsewhere, income from option 2 is likely to be minimal and unpredictable.

### Financial Impacts

	Option 3: cash, card & phone <sup>1</sup>	Option 4: phone only <sup>1</sup>	Option 5: card & phone <sup>1</sup>
	£000s	£000s	£000s
Capital investment required in year 1 (2)	332	190	332
Total revenue (3)	6,717	6,717	6,717
Expenditure (including debt repayments) (4)	5,548	3,456	3,705
<b>Net revenue (3)</b>	<b>1,169</b>	<b>3, 262</b>	<b>3,012</b>
<b>Average per annum net revenue</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>201</b>
<b>Project NPV (5) at 5.5%</b>	<b>643</b>	<b>1,952</b>	<b>1,789</b>
<b>Project IRR (6)</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>51%</b>
<b>Project payback period Yrs (7)</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>

### Notes

- 1) Each option also includes the option to purchase an annual parking permit.
- 2) Capital investment includes all costs associated with security, meters, signage and measures to mitigate displacement.
- 3) Total revenue and net revenue figures are over 15 years.(although the number of cars are likely to fluctuate in slightly different ways over the 15



period, it has been assumed for this model that the income will be the same for all options over the full period of the business case.

- 4) Expenditure for options 3 and 5 includes assumptions around level of vandalism per annum, based on data from other rural sites.
- 5) NPV – the net of expected income and expenditure over the 15 year life of the project, expressed at today's value.
- 6) IRR – a measurement used to compare the attractiveness of different investment options.
- 7) Payback period is the notional period over which the initial capital cost is recovered through net cashflows.

### **Option Analysis**

25. In order to assess the options to develop a preferred option the following criteria were considered:

- **The contribution to the financial sustainability of the countryside** – the extent to which the option could support the vision to protect and enhance the countryside for current and future generations.
- **Public acceptability** – the extent to which the option was likely to be acceptable to the public, based on the feedback from the consultation and experience from elsewhere.

### **Financial Return**

26. Option 1 does not generate any income and, whilst in the medium term there may be other opportunities to generate income from other sources, the ability to generate sufficient income to offset funding reductions is limited. As such, this option would not support the financial sustainability of the Countryside Estate. Similarly with option 2, whilst some income may be generated, evidence from elsewhere suggests this is likely to be very low and is unlikely to make any meaningful contribution to the financial sustainability of the countryside estate.

27. Options 3, 4 and 5 all provide a positive business case, with net revenue making a positive contribution to the maintenance of the carparks and the wider estate. Option 4 (phone & permit only) provides the best return on investment. A cashless system with no meters on site will require a lower capital investment and incur lower annual running costs. The second most favourable return is provided by option 5, which also includes an option to pay by card, resulting in higher capital and running costs. The capital costs associated with option 3 are similar to those of option 5 but the running costs associated with option 3 are significantly higher due to the costs of cash collection and the risk of being subject to a high level of vandalism, theft and loss of income that results from having cash at the sites. As a result, the level of income generated for investment in maintaining the Surrey countryside is projected to be significantly lower with option 3 than either option 4 or 5.

### **Public Acceptability**

28. The results of the consultation show that options 1 and 2 would clearly be the most preferable, as both would mean that people would not need to pay for parking. However, this would result in deterioration in the quality of the Estate and in access to the Estate, such as the closure of car parks, which would result in much lower amenity value and impacts on biodiversity and landscape value. A number of respondents to the consultation recognised the need for



---

funding to pay for the countryside and emphasised the importance of the money raised being ring-fenced for protection and enhancement of the countryside.

29. Of the options that include charges (options 3, 4 and 5) option 3 the cash system, would be the most acceptable to the public as the consultation showed that 59% preferred to pay by cash. The next most popular payment option was by card at 46%. The consultation results showed that the least preferred payment option was the pay by phone only option.

---

### **PREFERRED OPTION**

---

30. Taking account of the assessments above, option 5 (card & phone payment plus annual permit) offers a system that balances financial return and public acceptability. There may be a need in a small number of smaller car parks to introduce a phone only system for operational reasons. Whilst in purely financial terms, option 4 would be preferable, the consultation made clear that many people would not be happy with a scheme where payment by phone or annual permit were the only options. As such, option 5 offers the additional option to pay using a card (around 95% of adults in the UK have a debit or credit card), but removes the very significant risks and costs associated with a scheme that includes cash payments. The proposed scheme will have the following features:

**Enforcement** – enforcement will be carried out as an extension to existing enforcement activity run by the County Council. This arrangement provides flexibility to ensure the level and type of enforcement deemed appropriate for the sites.

**Resident engagement** – the introduction of the charging will be combined with information for visitors, both to provide early warning of the charges and how the system will work and to provide information for visitors about how the income is being reinvested in Surrey's countryside. Wardens will be present during the early phase to answer questions and provide support. Information boards at the sites will provide more information on how the income from car parking is being reinvested in supporting the Surrey countryside.

**Mitigation** – measures to mitigate the impacts of displacement parking will be critical. The County Council's parking team and local highways teams are advising on mitigation measures. In addition Habitat Assessments work is being undertaken to assess the additional mitigation work required on the sites covered by the SPA (Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area) Measures will be appropriate and sympathetic to the local environment where appropriate. Monitoring of displacement parking will be part of the early implementation plan and funding is built into the project to support rapid implementation of further mitigation once the scheme is implemented should the need arise.

**Exemptions** – visitors to the car parks will be exempt from paying for parking if they are volunteering at the site or are blue badge holders.

---

### **RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:**

---

31. The following risks have been identified as part of development of the project.

Risk Identified	Risk Management Actions
Negative publicity from the users of the car parks as a result of introduction of charging	Clear communication with users of the site about the reasons for the introducing charging, including how income from this is being used to protect the countryside. Seeking Cabinet approval to ensure that all money raised from car park charges is reinvested in protecting and enhancing the countryside.
Negative impact on those on low incomes	Whilst there are a number of rural car parks in Surrey that now charge for parking, there remain many green spaces in Surrey that can still be accessed by car without having to pay for parking, both in rural Surrey and in more urban areas. The cost of implementing a means tested payment system would be prohibitive but we will continue to monitor to identify if there is any evidence of people on low incomes being excluded from accessing green space.
Displacement parking on roadside verges	All the car parks have been visited by SCC Highways engineers and their advice has informed the plans drawn up to mitigate the displacement parking. In addition the report on the Habitats Regulations will also inform those plans. Where necessary displacement parking measures will be implemented that are practical and sympathetic to the environment prior to any charges being implemented.
Vandalism, theft and loss of income	By implementing a cashless system the likelihood of this is significantly reduced.
Income levels that are significantly lower than projected, resulting in a reduced level of income to invest in the countryside	The business case has been modelled based on a set of assumptions, recognising that SCC has limited historic data about rural carpark income. For example, the model has assumed levels of decline, certainly initially, in levels of car park use. SWT have a number of income generating projects planned and if the income is lower than expected, other projects will be accelerated to ensure there is no loss of planned income.
Lack of capacity to effectively deliver the project	The County Council and SWT are working closely together to develop the project including assigning project management capacity to ensure that the scheme is effectively delivered.
Feasibility of the cashless system	The mobile signal has been checked in all car parks to ensure that a cashless system will work. This would be rechecked prior to the system going live. Further information on the outcome of the signal testing is included in Annex 3 to this report.

### **Financial and Value for Money Implications**

32. The table in paragraph 29 above sets out the capital investment required to install the necessary equipment and signs. The table sets out the projected annual average income (after allowing for the revenue implications of capital borrowing) and the project payback period for the three options that have been

modelled. Generating this income will allow SWT to help manage the planned reduction in local government funding and move the Countryside Estate towards a self-financing position and therefore continue to protect that part of the service from further pressure on local government funding. This will also help the service to meet the savings outlined in the Medium Term Financial Plan while continuing to manage the Estate.

### **Section 151 Officer Commentary**

33. The County Council is facing a very serious financial situation, whereby there are still substantial actions to be identified and delivered to achieve a balanced budget in the current year and a sustainable budget plan for future years.
34. This report sets out how the introduction of car parking charges on the Countryside Estate can help the council to deliver its Medium Term Financial Plan by moving the Countryside Estate further towards a self-funding position. The financial implications of introducing charges are set out in paragraphs 29 – 32. The preferred option does not produce the highest financial benefit but is considered by the service to present the best balance between financial benefits and public acceptability. The exact level of income will be dependent on visitor numbers and length of stay, which could vary from the level assumed. These risks are borne by the County Council.
35. The Council's Investment Panel have reviewed and support the proposal.

### **Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer**

36. The Council, as landowner, is able to introduce charges for car parking on the chosen sites. The intention is that the arrangements will be managed on behalf of the Council by SWT under its existing lease.
37. The public sector equality duty applies to this decision. This means that, in deciding on the recommendations, members must have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity to people with protected characteristics, foster good relationships between such groups and eliminate any unlawful discrimination, which includes considering any disproportionate impact on any particular protected group. An Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed for the project and is annexed to this report, which members should take into account in making their decision.

### **Equalities and Diversity**

38. An Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out for the project and is included in Annex 4 to this paper. A summary of the impacts and key actions is set out below.

<b>Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis</b>	Liaison Group Meetings, feedback from the public, stakeholders and interest groups.
<b>Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics</b>	Charging for parking may discourage people from using the site and therefore missing out on the health and wellbeing benefits of accessing the countryside but by not charging in all locations this provides an alternative for those who do not want to or cannot afford to pay.

	<p>The elderly may be less likely to own a mobile phone but most will own a debit or credit card and could purchase an annual permit.</p> <p>Investment in better infrastructure such as improved trails and surfaces will benefit people with mobility issues.</p>
<b>Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA</b>	Preferred option to offer card as well as phone payment, recognising that some equalities groups may be less likely to feel comfortable using a pay by phone option.
<b>Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative impacts</b>	N/A
<b>Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated</b>	The imposition of a charge, necessary for the financial sustainability of the site, may stop some people from visiting the sites where car park charging is implemented but this does not differentially impact any equalities group.

#### **Environmental sustainability implications**

39. Nature and landscape conservation and associated access facilities must draw on a budget for revenue costs and periodic capital works. It is considered reasonable for car parking charging to contribute to this budget; the alternative being for these costs to fall on the council tax payer generally or for landscape and habitats to come under threat through lack of management.
40. An independent ecological consultant has been appointed to carry out a Habitat Regulations Assessment Report (Stage 1) to screen for likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (Thames Basin Heaths SPA) that may arise as a result of introducing car park charging. This consultant will also prepare the Appropriate Assessment Report (Stage 2) as required by Natural England for this project and develop mitigation measures for the implementation of car park charging.

#### **Public Health implications**

41. The County Council and Surrey Wildlife Trust work together to ensure that the Countryside Estate is open and accessible for the public to come and enjoy the countryside for health and wellbeing.
42. Without funding, the countryside will become inaccessible, overgrown and littered. A small car park on the countryside estate needs regular collection of rubbish and cutting back of the trees and bushes round the edges, and making dangerous. There are additional costs when repairs are needed after vandalism of information signs and benches, when barriers need replacing, or when re-surfacing and other infrastructure work is needed in the car park and along waymarked trails leading from it.
43. There is a risk of the public not visiting these sites as a result of car park charges, but there is little or no evidence from other local authorities and landowners to suggest that this is the case. We will also look at providing better access to sites by cycle and on foot as part of the future improvements

---

that the income will make possible.

**WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

Project Milestones:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Month / Year</b>
Formal and informal consultation	July - Nov 2017
Project and business case development	Sept – Nov 2017
Securing necessary approvals	Nov – Feb 2018
Procurement and implementation	Feb - July 2018

**Contact Officer:**

Lisa Creaye-Griffin. Countryside Manager, Environment and Infrastructure  
0208 541 9404

**Consulted:**

SCC Residents  
SCC Members  
District and Borough Members  
Secretary of State  
Liaison Groups  
Natural England  
SCC Highways Parking Team

**Annexes:**

Annex 1 - Analysis of the Pay & Conserve Consultation  
Annex 2 – Pay and Conserve Options Analysis  
Annex 3 – Operational Feasibility  
Annex 4 – Equalities Impact Assessment

**Sources/background papers:**

- Pay & Conserve Consultation
- Environment & Infrastructure Select Committee Report – Pay & Conserve, Car Park Charging on the Countryside Estate. November 2017

This page is intentionally left blank