

## SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

## LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)

DATE: 2 September 2013

LEAD OFFICER: Rikki Hill

SUBJECT: Parking Update

DIVISION: East Molesey &amp; Esher - Weybridge



<p><b><u>SUMMARY OF ISSUE:</u></b></p> <p>To consider the level of charge for business permits in the East Molesey controlled parking zone. To consider including residents of Elmgrove Mews in permit scheme F.</p>
<p><b><u>RECOMMENDATIONS:</u></b></p> <p><b>The Local Committee (Elmbridge) is asked to agree that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) the level of the charge for business permits in Elmbridge are changed or not in accordance with one of the options listed in paragraph 2.5;</li> <li>(ii) if a change to the level of charge is agreed it is subject to the standard statutory and procedural process necessary to make an amendment to the traffic regulation orders;</li> <li>(iii) residents of Elmgrove Mews in Weybridge are included in permit scheme F.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:</u></b></p> <p>The level of charge for business permits will have been considered. The parking situation for residents of Elmgrove Mews is improved.</p>

<p><b><u>1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:</u></b></p>
--

1.1 Business permits were first introduced in East Molesey on 4 November 1996 when the Borough of Elmbridge (East Molesey) (Parking Places) Order 1996 came into operation. At that time they cost £30.

1.2 The charge was increased by notice to £35 at some stage prior to decriminalisation and when the Surrey County Council East Molesey Controlled Parking Zone in the Borough of Elmbridge (Consolidation of Waiting Restrictions and On-Street Parking Places) Order 2006 came into operation on 9 January 2006 and replaced the 1996 order, the increased charge was retained.

## ITEM 12

- 1.3 In April 2011, the county council approved the Surrey Transport Plan, which contained a number of strategies, which are intended to help support and achieve the aims of the plan. Among these were a parking strategy, which considered the question of business permits and included the following comments:
- 1.4 “In certain limited cases, it may be necessary to consider issuing permits to businesses that operate in CPZs. The number of these should be very small, if any, and they should only be for vehicles that are essential for the operation of the business and for which no alternative parking (either on street or off street) is available. They should not be issued to allow staff to park all day while at work, and to this end it is best if their use is time limited during the course of the operational hours of the zone” and
- 1.5 “...there may on rare occasions be a case for issuing permits to businesses, but their issue and use should be tightly controlled. Such a permit should only be issued where commercial necessity is shown, and as such it is reasonable for the charge for a permit to reflect a rate more comparable to other commercial parking provision, such as car park season tickets. The minimum fee for a business permit should be £500.”
- 1.6 The transport plan and its contents were subject to an extensive and wide-spread consultation during 2010 before its adoption by the council.
- 1.7 In Surrey business permits are only included in the traffic regulation orders for controlled parking zones (CPZs) in Camberley, Woking, Esher Green and East Molesey. In Camberley they cost £995, in Woking £310 (although the Woking local committee has agreed a proposal to remove them from the traffic order as none have been bought for several years). In Esher Green and East Molesey the cost of the business permits had not been reviewed for a considerably long time, and so they were looked at as part of the 2011/12 parking review, and this committee agreed to increase them in line with the parking strategy.
- 1.8 On 7 May 2013 an amendment to the East Molesey and Esher Green CPZ traffic orders came into operation which increased the cost of business parking permits to £500.
- 1.9 At the meeting of this committee on 24 June 2013, Stuart Selleck, the member for East Molesey & Esher, having received representations from businesses in East Molesey about the increase, asked whether the level of charge should not be reviewed. (A copy of the question and answer can be found in Annex 1 to this report). Following a discussion at the meeting the committee decided to receive a report looking at options at today’s meeting.

## **2. ANALYSIS:**

- 2.1 The thinking behind the level as set in the parking strategy and the reasons behind the increase in the charge in East Molesey have been covered in the introduction and the answer to the original question.
- 2.2 There seem to be two main issues. One is that the business permit holders in the area do not seem to have been aware of the increase until they went to renew their permits. Although when we advertise changes to a TRO we not

only place an advert in a local newspaper, but also put up notices on lamp posts etc. in streets where changes are proposed, it would appear that this was not sufficient to bring the proposed change to the attention of the existing permit holders. The other is the scale of the increase from £35 to £500.

- 2.3 It is too late now to make any changes to the process by which the TRO amendment was made, as the process is long since completed and the order has been in place since 7 May 2013.
- 2.4 The question is therefore whether there is any scope for a change to the level of charge. (It is important to remember that if any change is agreed it would be necessary to go through the appropriate statutory process to make the necessary amendment to the TRO).
- 2.5 There are a number of options.
- leave the charge as it is.
  - overturn the increase and the reduce the charge to its original level.
  - reduce the charge to a level higher than the previous one, but lower than the new one.
  - reduce the charge to a lower level with an agreed increase in each subsequent parking review until it reaches the level in the parking strategy.
- 2.6 Leaving the charge as it is would mean that it fits in with the council's parking strategy. Also by the time any further change could be introduced, the charge would have been at a higher level for several months.
- 2.7 Reducing the charge to its original level would seem to be an overreaction and would mean that a business permit would cost less than a residents permit.
- 2.8 Setting the charge at a level in between the old one and the new one would allow for a review of the charge, which has not happened for many years, but would mean that the scale of the increase could be reduced.
- 2.9 Reducing the charge to a lower level with a gradual increase to the level in the parking strategy would be a compromise between the options in paragraphs 2.6 and 2.8. It would mean that the scale of the increase would be reduced, but there would be a clear commitment to the council's parking strategy.
- 2.10 If the committee selects one of the options described in paragraph 2.8 or 2.9, it may be appropriate to carry out a consultation with the residents and businesses in the CPZ to see whether a reduction had widespread support and to help determine what new level of charge would be suitable.

### **Elmgrove Mews**

- 2.11 Elmgrove Mews in Weybridge is a small mews which exits into Elmgrove Road in between numbers 45 and 47 Elmgrove Road. The mews was not included in the area F permit scheme when this was extended into

Elmgrove Road as we thought that residents of this private road had off street parking available to them. This is not in fact the case and so, following the extension of the scheme, the residents of the mews have not been able to park in Elmgrove Road, and so have had to park some considerable distance from their homes. This was not our intention and so we have included a proposal to include the residents Elmgrove Mews in permit scheme F in the advert which is currently open.

**3. OPTIONS:**

- 3.1 Make no change to the level of charge for business permits.
- 3.2 Change the level of charge for business permits in line with one of the suggestions in paragraphs 2.7, 2.8 or 2.9.
- 3.3 Agree to allow residents of Elmgrove Mews being made eligible for permits in area F, subject to the completion of the due process.
- 3.4 Leave residents of Elmgrove Mews excluded from permit scheme F.

**4. CONSULTATIONS:**

- 4.1 If any change is agreed, as part of the process of formally advertising our intention to make the changes to the TRO, we will undertake the necessary statutory consultation, and if agreed informal consultation with residents and businesses in the East Molesey CPZ.

**5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:**

- 5.1 The cost of advertising a change to the TRO in respect of business permits would be in the region of £500, which could be met from existing budgets.

**6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:**

- 6.1 There are no equalities and diversity implications arising from this report.

**7. LOCALISM:**

- 7.1 If a consultation on reducing the charge was carried out, local businesses and residents would have an input into the levels of parking charges in their area.

**8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report.

Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report.

## **9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 9.1 The committee considers the level of charge in the East Molesey CPZ and decides whether or not to change it.
- 9.2 The committee approves the inclusion of the residents of Elmgrove Mews in permit scheme F, subject to completion of the due process.

## **10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

- 10.1 To be determined.

### **Contact Officer:**

Rikki Hill, Parking Project Team Leader, 0300 200 1003

### **Consulted:**

### **Annexes:**

Annex 1 – member question from previous meeting

### **Sources/background papers:**

This page is intentionally left blank