

## ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE

### Item under consideration:

### Operation of Civil Parking Enforcement in Surrey

**Date considered: 19 September 2012**

1. The Select Committee considered a report on the operation of civil parking enforcement in Surrey. The report provided an update to the Committee on proposed enforcement arrangements to ensure that the Committee's views would be reflected in a report to Cabinet in October 2012.

### Key issues:

2. The Committee strongly expressed the view that surpluses received from on-street parking charges should be re-invested in the towns and wards in which they were raised, and not be used to subsidise other areas. Concern was also expressed that in cases where a local authority was enforcing in another area it could be seen to export its share of the surplus to its own area. It was confirmed that it would be the decision of the relevant Local Committee as to where any surplus was allocated and that it would not be used to subsidise the deficits incurred by enforcement authorities.
3. The Committee expressed the view that each Local Committee should have a local scrutiny role for on-street parking enforcement within its area.
4. The main concern expressed by the Committee regarded the proposed 60/20/20 split of surpluses between the Local Committee, enforcement agent and County Council respectively. Particular concern was raised as to how the 20% figure for the County Council had been decided and the Committee requested that a detailed explanation be provided.
5. It was confirmed that there may be local variation in the percentage split of surpluses and that the 60/20/20 proposal was notional. The Committee asked that the specific circumstances under which this split could vary be clarified. Members were informed that the final figure would be determined by the Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport and Assistant Director for Highways in consultation with the relevant Local Committee Chairman.
6. The Committee was informed that the County's 20% would be used to fund the Parking Team and general Highways services, though this would not be ringfenced for any particular Borough. Concern at this fact was expressed by the Committee as it had suggested that there should be no use of surpluses as a cross-subsidy. Justification for this spending was given on the grounds that parking enforcement was a County Council function, and that although Districts and Boroughs paid the cost of such measures as road markings, their contribution did not cover the full costs of enforcement.

7. The Committee expressed concern at proposals that in situations whereby Districts and Boroughs were the enforcing authority, they would be able to keep their share of the 20% surplus and decide how it should be spent independently of the Local Committee. The Select Committee felt that it was not equitable for County Members to have no influence over the use of the 20% share, while Borough Members would have influence over their 60% share through their Membership of the Local Committee.
8. Further concern was expressed at two specific cases, whereby the enforcing agency was a neighbouring District or Borough and it was not felt equitable that 20% of any surplus should be 'exported' from the area in which this surplus was raised. In these cases, the Select Committee felt that consideration should be given to the 20% also coming back to the Local Committee from where the surplus was raised (as per recommendation b), so that disbursement would be decided by the relevant Local Committee, or an alternative split be proposed.
9. The recommendations agreed by the Select Committee are set out below. Following a vote these were supported unanimously by Members.

**The Select Committee recommends to Cabinet:**

- a) That the introduction of new agency agreements be supported in line with the terms specified within the report. However, the Committee expresses concern at the 60/20/20 split of surplus and asks for clarification of its justification and purpose.
- b) That the Assistant Director, in consultation with the Cabinet Member, be authorised to enter into suitable alternative short-term arrangements to ensure continuation of on-street parking enforcement.
- c) That the ability for Local Committees to have a formal scrutiny role for on-street parking enforcement within their area be supported.

**Steve Renshaw**  
**Chairman of Environment & Transport Select Committee**