



## **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