

MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL**TUESDAY 23 MAY 2023****QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED UNDER THE PROVISIONS
OF STANDING ORDER 10.1****KEVIN DEANUS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY
RESILIENCE****1. ERNEST MALLETT MBE (WEST MOLESEY) TO ASK:**

You will be aware that the replacement Esher Road Bridge is now running near to two years delay from the original indicated start date.

- a) Do you have a firm start date?
- b) Are you aware that closure of this traffic route will increase the peak hour traffic arriving at the two junctions at the foot of Hampton Court Bridge by some 40%?
- c) Are there plans to install traffic lights at these Riverbank & Creek Road junctions for the duration of the construction, since right-hand turns are currently nearly impossible and all the new traffic arriving at these Hampton Court Way junctions, will be there because it needs to turn right?
- d) Does Surrey currently have an agreement with Elmbridge Borough Council to acquire or lease the Elmbridge owned land necessary for this project?
- e) Why is the construction time estimated to take one year when previously Elmbridge Borough Council installed a pre-constructed bridge across the River Mole at The Wilderness, which is not much smaller than the planned Esher Road bridge, over a few weeks?
- f) The electricity supply pit which lights Christmas trees on the adjacent Green will be destroyed by the new road width required. Will the project include replacement of this electricity supply pit?

RESPONSE:

- a) We do not yet have a firm start date. Further discussions need to be held with Thames Water regarding their water main at this location which currently is preventing us from installing the bridge as initially designed.
- b) Yes, we do understand that affected traffic will need to use adjacent routes, which will include Hampton Court Way. We will look to introduce mitigation measures wherever possible to alleviate this impact. The contractor delivering

the construction work will be requested to prioritise speed of delivery due to the sensitive location and the potential for increased traffic delays.

- c) In the lead up to the operational delivery of the project we will look to trial traffic alleviation measures including traffic signals and/or banning certain manoeuvres.
- d) The formal agreement has not been finalised as the design is still being completed however, in principle, it is agreed that the land can be dedicated as highway.
- e) We are estimating the construction time of Esher Road Bridge on the basis that this is a main transport link and therefore has specific requirements in terms of foundations and being able to carry abnormal loads. It also involves the demolition of an existing structure and the temporary diversion of BT, water, gas and electricity utility apparatus away from the bridge and then back into the new bridge. In addition, the work is being carried out in a restricted location on Esher Road. We will also need to re-align and build new approach footways and drainage systems. It is difficult to compare the construction time with another bridge project without knowing the details however it maybe that the example referenced was not subject to the same conditions or constraints as Esher Road bridge.
- f) The project will include replacement of any affected electricity supplies.

SINEAD MOONEY, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

2. CATHERINE POWELL (FARNHAM NORTH) TO ASK:

The Equality Impact Assessment into SCC funding of this service acknowledges that since the last review of commissioning in 2017/18:

- The cost to charities to provide this service have risen sharply.
- The number of children with Education, Health and Care Plans aged 0-18 has increased by **65%**.
- Children accessing short breaks who require 1:1 support reached 55% in 2021/22, against an original assumption of 40% in 2017/18.
- Many of the charities have long waiting lists.

The Assessment states that freezing funding will:

“reduce positive outcomes for children with disabilities and their families; and increased pressure within families of children with disabilities, which is likely to, in some cases, contribute to family breakdown if this is not mitigated – leading to increased cost for the local authority.”

Therefore, the decision made in the Budget to freeze funding:

- Is completely counter to the Council’s ambition of No One Left Behind
- Will lead to increased costs to the Council as without the services that are described as a lifeline by many families their needs will sadly escalate.

Since 1 April when the funding change came into effect, services have closed, waiting lists have been closed, families have been impacted and needs are escalating as predicated in the Equality Impact Assessment.

The successful grant application to the Department for Education's Short Breaks Innovation Fund for the 2023/24 financial year will increase the total budget by 30%, which is great news. This will allow the expansion of the Councils pilots for new Family Breaks for children and young people with complex needs, and their families.

Total frozen budget was £2.5million a year and additional 30% is great news but based on the increase in need and costs will still mean less support.

Today families currently have less support than they had in March, some will be left like that and many more will be left on waiting lists with no realistic potential of accessing the support that would really be a lifeline to provide some respite to families dealing with significant challenges.

- a) Will the Cabinet Member reconsider the funding for this critical support and prevention of escalation service, to reinstate the level of service that existed before for all service users and increase funding to allow waiting lists to be addressed?
- b) Will the Cabinet consider releasing contingency funds for these critical services immediately to allow Charities to reinstate the provision they have had to shut since the start of April?

This would minimise further escalation of need which will impact not just on children's services but other areas as clear negative impacts on the Health and Well Being of impacted families can already been seen, further increasing health inequalities.

[\(Equality Impact Assessment - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)\)](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/equality-impact-assessment)

RESPONSE:

We know how important short breaks are to children with disabilities and their families and that our third sector partner providers in Surrey deliver quality services that make a real difference, alongside those services that Surrey County Council itself provides. It is excellent news that, alongside the important decision taken by Surrey County Council to maintain its £2.5 million budget for short breaks delivered by local providers, we have been successful in securing an additional £907,000 of funding for a range of further short breaks services that target children with complex needs and their families. This is equivalent to a 36% increase in the budget for services in 2023/24. We are also pleased that all providers who bid for new short breaks contracts in the county have been awarded ongoing funding for delivery, which provides continuity for many children and families in terms of both staff and delivery venues.

Despite this overall countywide picture, it is important to acknowledge that there have been changes in the amounts of funding going to our different provider

partners. This does mean families will see some changes in the capacity of local services, with some increasing and some reducing. The context to this is that Surrey County Council was legally required to re-commission our short breaks offer ahead of April 2023, when historical contracts came to an end. Through this transparent process, the cost and quality of proposed services was evaluated, and different levels of funding have been awarded to providers as a result.

As we look ahead to 2024/25, we remain committed to delivering an impactful offer of short breaks services to local children and families, that both enables improved outcomes and fulfils our statutory responsibilities. As part of this, we will be actively reviewing the budget available for short breaks services for 2024/25, alongside other important services for children and families we commission and deliver, to ensure the money goes where it is most needed. We will also continue to work alongside our provider partners to draw additional funds into Surrey wherever possible, for the benefit of children with disabilities and their families.

Families who are eligible for a direct payment who are not able to identify a personal assistant to meet their child's needs, can with the services agreement, use their direct payment to fund alternative support.

Alongside Short Breaks provision, SCC is also in receipt of Holiday Activity and Food (HAF) funding from the Department for Education of £2.41 million. The funding covers holiday camp provision in the main school holiday periods (not half terms) and we commission providers to run inclusive camps for children aged 5-16 who are eligible for benefits-linked free school meals (FSM) across the whole county. Within the scope of the funding we are permitted to spend up to 15% of the budget on non-FSM delivery recognising that there may be cohorts of children with additional levels of need within the county. The governance board for HAF in Surrey has determined that one of these groups of children is those with additional needs and disabilities, and therefore we have commissioned a number of providers to run Additional Needs and Disabilities (AND) specific camps including provision for children requiring 1:1 support.

During the most recent holiday period (Easter 2023) a total of 2,861 primary aged children and 491 secondary aged young people attended HAF provision. Of these totals 29.6% of primary aged children had Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)/AND and 41.7% of secondary aged young people had SEND/AND.

KEVIN DEANUS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

3. FIONA DAVIDSON (GUILDFORD SOUTH-EAST) TO ASK:

There is already significant disquiet amongst residents in my division at the prospect of 'virtual' resident parking permits. Parking in the centre of Guildford is an extremely sensitive subject with residents. Many already complain that resident parking is insufficient within roughly a mile of shops, restaurants and other public facilities in the centre, as well as around both railway stations. Resident parking permits were originally introduced in response to resident demand where there was significant

contention between residents and non-residents. I am concerned at the potential risks that this new policy may create.

Resident parking in Guildford covers a large area. Paper permits provide a very important disincentive and are very reassuring to residents. I would argue that none of the existing towns which have introduced virtual parking permits have the same scale of shopping, hospitality and recreation activities that exist in Guildford. No other town in Surrey attracts as many non-residents, and few have the same number of residents living amongst the facilities used by non-residents.

I understand that there will be a consultation prior to the proposed introduction in September. Can you please advise:

- a) When the consultation will be held?
- b) How the consultation will be advertised?
- c) How residents will be able to respond to the consultation?

RESPONSE:

On street parking is in great demand in most Surrey towns and villages and where appropriate resident permit schemes are introduced to help balance the competing needs of local residents/businesses/commuters and visitors.

Whilst Guildford town has the largest permit scheme in Surrey, virtual permits are now in place in many other similar environments across London boroughs and large towns outside of the capital. West Sussex is also introducing virtual permits across the county this year. Whilst paper permits maybe a familiar sight that residents are used to, virtual permits offer greater flexibility for them in most circumstances and have a lower environmental impact. They also offer greater efficiencies for the Council, including opportunities to improve enforcement and compliance with technology such as Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) devices.

However, there are a few exceptions where a paper permit may still be preferable, for example, we are retaining paper versions of the carers permit that is issued to (often elderly) residents for their carers who may be friends/family or health professionals.

We plan to start the consultation about the use of virtual permits in Guildford during June.

Publicity about the changes will be put out by a notice in the local newspaper, through the council's social media channels and our web pages. We have also written to all residents within permit schemes explaining the changes to the enforcement service and mentioned specifically the adoption of virtual permits for most types of parking activity.

Residents will be able to respond to the us about the changes via our webpages or by the postal service as usual. We will consider all comments that we receive, and in particular, any substantive reasons put forward for the use of paper permits in certain circumstances.

KEVIN DEANUS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

4. JOANNE SEXTON (ASHFORD) TO ASK:

Any change is always going to have challenges but how we plan for the change, implement the change and react to the change is what impacts the residents of Surrey:

- a) Is there a Service Charter in place for the new contract that sets out items such as:
 - Frequency of visits from NSL (SCC's new parking enforcement contractor) to each borough/district council
 - Service Level Agreements
 - Key Performance Indicators
 - Working hours
 - Communication channels
- b) Was a list of Frequently Asked Questions and Answers prepared prior to the change?
 - If so, how was the shared with residents and councillors and how is this being updated?
 - If not, can one be prepared urgently, shared and updated?
- c) Who is responsible for managing this contract?
- d) Who is gathering lessons learned and when will they be shared with councillors?
- e) There has already been a noticeable increase in illegal parking since the change in approach was implemented.
 - How is Surrey County Council monitoring this?
 - What can be done to address this before it becomes an entrenched behaviour?
- f) There are different issues and challenges across the county, how is the contract set up to ensure that there is a local solution to the local issues and the Officers working in the area know the area?
- g) Has the Council defined what "good" and "excellent" service looks like in each of the borough and district councils or is it a generic view across the whole of Surrey? Can the vision of "good" be shared?
- h) Does NSL have sufficient resources in place to manage this contract?

RESPONSE:

- a) Within the terms of the contract there are KPIs and targets relating to numbers of deployed hours, response times, performance level maintenance, performance reporting, service improvement and achievement of the enforcement plan. Inevitably the service has changed with the new arrangements. The enforcement plan will include targets for how often enforcement takes place in different locations, but the patrols will no longer necessarily be borough centric. Although civil enforcement officers will tend to

carry out patrols of the same locations so that they can build up local knowledge, those patrols may cross borough/district boundaries.

- b) Information about the changes and its implications were published on our website prior to the change taking place and there was a wide-reaching communications plan put in place to publicise the change and direct people to the information on the website. The communications plan included a press release, posts on social media, a post on NextDoor, an article in Surrey Matters, as well as a communications toolkit for our colleagues in the district and borough councils and one for specifically for councillors. A separate frequently asked questions document was not produced as it was considered that the information provided by other means was sufficient. All resident permit holders were also sent a letter advising them of the changes and what that would mean for them in terms of their permits. In addition, councillors were sent regular updates which included answers to questions that had arisen leading up to and during the transition.
- c) A new Parking Enforcement Team has been established within Highways with responsibility for the day-to-day management of the contract.
- d) The Parking Enforcement Team is monitoring the implementation and mobilisation of the contract and issues arising, which are reviewed in regular meetings with the contractor. As the contract develops and we will be engaging with councillors via parking task groups and reporting to the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee and Cabinet Member.
- e) There have been mixed reports about the new enforcement operation since its inception. In some areas comments have been received which suggest an increased enforcement presence, the popularity of which has varied, while in others an apparent, or perceived, lack of enforcement has been identified. The Parking Enforcement Team keeps track of reports where more enforcement is needed and reviews these with the contractor. In addition to this, there is a dedicated email address for people to report illegal parking and enforcement requests. We can confirm that where problems are identified, additional targeted enforcement is arranged.
- f) The contract is set up to ensure a fair and consistent approach to enforcement across the county. In the lead up to the start of the new contract, information was requested from the borough and district council parking enforcement teams about local problem areas and enforcement hot spots, which was passed to the new contractor, along with information about where penalty charge notices had been issued in the previous twelve months or more. As a result, the contractor has been able to develop a parking enforcement plan that is based on localised knowledge and information. Where civil enforcement officers that had previously worked for the borough and district councils transferred to the new provider, they have been assigned to work in the same areas, where they can also pass on local knowledge to newer colleagues. In other cases, new civil enforcement officers will soon get

to know their areas, aided by information received and passed on from the previous enforcement teams.

- g) There are KPIs and performance targets associated with the contract against which the performance of the service provider will be measured. Meeting these KPIs and targets will result in a service that provides consistent and fair enforcement and good compliance with parking restrictions across the county.
- h) Some civil enforcement officers transferred over from borough and district parking teams and NSL started a recruitment drive as soon as they were awarded the contract. As an interim measure, NSL also brought in officers from other nearby contracts in order to provide cover while the recruitment is taking place. This meant there was an enforcement presence from the first day, which is increasing, as recruitment to NSL's enforcement team is ongoing, with a steady number of new civil enforcement officers being recruited and trained each week. NSL are part of a large organisation with considerable resources and a great deal of experience at managing contracts of this sort.

KEVIN DEANUS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

5. STEVEN MCCORMICK (EPSOM TOWN & DOWNS) TO ASK:

Given the extreme challenges this county council faces over the pure volume of potholes on our highways what alternative innovative methods, processes and repair options are being considered for example: Spray Injection Patching. What are other councils in other areas doing to address the problem we might consider adopting?

Example video:

[Repairing potholes in minutes | Watch how potholes are repaired in just a few minutes 🤖🚧 Velocity UK LTD | By Interesting Engineering | Facebook](#)

RESPONSE:

There are numerous solutions for fixing potholes and Surrey County Council currently uses several different methods, some of which are only suitable in certain locations and situations. We regularly interact with colleagues in other councils and our Highway contractors to identify and determine what new products are available for us to trial. We are also very fortunate to have a Highways Laboratory which enables us to robustly test new materials and processes in this regard.

In terms of some of the different methods we employ, we can confirm that we have been using Spray Injection Patching alongside other forms of pothole repairs for a number of years in Surrey. While this type of treatment is not suitable in all locations and for all types of defects, it is a key part of our pothole repair operation. We also use [Thermal Patching](#) where the road surface is heated up and recycled which provides a low carbon solution for pothole repairs. We have recently trialled the [JCB Pothole Pro](#), which enables larger patch repairs to be carried out and we are

currently assessing the results of that trial to determine if this is a tool that will add value to our future operational response. In the next few weeks, we will also be trialling a repair material called [mastic asphalt](#). This material is a more flexible material than traditional tarmac and is made using powdered rubber from tyres so will hopefully provide another useful option for defect repairs going forward.

KEVIN DEANUS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

6. CATHERINE BAART (EARLSWOOD AND REIGATE SOUTH) TO ASK:

Now that the County Council has taken back verge maintenance across Surrey, please explain approximately what % verges (by length) are classed as rural and what % as urban. Approximately what % (by length) of urban verges are covered by the Blue Hearts scheme, which is promoted to residents and councillors as the way to protect wildlife habitat (with appropriate consideration of safety for road users)?

RESPONSE:

The table below shows the approximate percentages of the urban and rural areas that receive verge maintenance.

Verge Maintenance Area	% Total
Rural	45%
Urban	55%

Unfortunately, the Blue Heart scheme data is not currently identifiable in the same way and the site lengths are very variable both in linear metres and widths, even in urban areas. However, at this present time we can advise that we have 112 Blue Heart sites across the county.

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND GROWTH

7. ROBERT EVANS OBE (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:

In response to my question at the March Council meeting, the Cabinet Member said that he had tried several times to set up a meeting with Transport for London (TfL) about the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ).

However, London's Deputy Mayor for Transport tells me no such request has been made by Surrey County Council.

Can the Cabinet Member clarify the situation please?

RESPONSE:

I provided a written response to TfL on the ULEZ consultation on the 29 July 2022, setting out ten major points of concern. I followed this with a letter to TfL on 31 January 2023. This stated that the Council had given TfL our views on their proposals back in July, but since then TfL had announced plans to expand ULEZ London-wide, and that it had done so whilst singularly failing to recognise any of our views and concerns, particularly the requested mitigation for residents and businesses in Surrey. The letter requested that TfL urgently consider our views and commence meaningful discussion on mitigation for our businesses and residents.

A virtual meeting with TfL, County Council officers and Elmbridge Borough Council officers was held on 21 February 2023. Our concerns on the impacts of a ULEZ expansion on Surrey residents and businesses were once again reiterated to TfL.

I can confirm that I have since written to the Director of Transport Strategy and Policy at Transport for London on the 2 May 2023 requesting a political meeting, asking how this could be best facilitated and expedited. I stated that I was, and indeed remain, happy to make suitable time available to make this happen as soon as possible, as we need to work together to support the interests of both Surrey and London residents and businesses.

To date, no response has been received.

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND GROWTH

8. STEVE BAX (EAST MOLESEY AND ESHER) TO ASK:

My residents in Molesey welcomed the arrival of Walton Heathside School, after more than a decade of campaigning for a secondary school locally. However, one of the main walking or cycling routes for Molesey children is the reservoir road (Walton Road) which has a national speed limit and a narrow pavement - it is highly dangerous and unsuitable.

- a) Have we approached Thames Water about moving their fence back to create a wider footpath?
- b) Additionally, could we introduce a bus service for before and after school?

RESPONSE:

- a) It is our aim to promote walking and cycling, particularly for school journeys. We receive very many more requests for schemes to provide improved facilities for vulnerable road users than it is possible to deliver, and so these requests are prioritised through various works programmes including the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs), Road Safety Schemes, or the Countywide Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) programme. Developments, including school expansions, can also provide for improved facilities as part of the planning consent.

I am pleased to be able to confirm that the speed limit on Walton Road is being reduced from the current 60 mph to 40 mph as a condition of the planning consent for the Heathside school expansion. The footpath alongside the road is also being improved as a condition of planning consent (it is not much more than gravel in places). Unfortunately, a timescale for this work is not yet available.

Contact was attempted with Thames Water as part of the planning condition discussions to see if in broad terms it could be possible to enter into negotiations with Thames Water for the land required to widen the pavement. Unfortunately, this contact was not successful, but could be attempted again should this scheme prioritise on to a future funded programme. The cost of this proposed scheme is likely to be above £1m.

- b) Heathside is a new secondary school that opened in September 2022 with a Year 7 intake and then one additional year group added each following year. Unfortunately, no funding was allocated to the provision of transport for pupils attending Heathside School. The Council is only able to guarantee home to school transport for eligible children as defined under the home to school travel assistance policy.

In June 2022 officers worked with bus operator Falcon Buses to divert journeys on their commercial service 461 to accommodate the school, which operates Kingston-Hampton Court-Molesey-Walton-Weybridge-Addlestone-St Peters Hospital.

The morning school journey is appropriately timed for the school day and one pupil regularly travels on this journey but alights along the regular bus route rather than the diversion to the stop outside the school. The afternoon journey which has been diverted arrives at the school 40 minutes after the school day finishes.

Officers are in regular contact with the Head of Heathside School and are exploring all opportunities to make further amendments to service 461 or other services that could better serve the school day from September 2023.

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND GROWTH

9. JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:

Please can you confirm the results of Surrey County Council's dialogue with the Mayor of London and Transport for London (TfL) with regard to ULEZ to date, specifically with respect to:

- a) The extent to which TfL bus services will be improved to/from Surrey as a result of ULEZ;
- b) The investment proposed into cycling and walking routes to improve active transport routes to/from London into Surrey; and

- c) How alongside implementing ULEZ, London proposes to change to Travelcard prices from areas bordering London, including Surrey.

In light of this, please confirm what Surrey County Council is requesting both of the Mayor of London and the Government to ensure that should the ULEZ scheme proposed for London proceed that Surrey residents and Surrey-based businesses are sufficiently incentivised to adopt more sustainable transport in their journeys between Surrey and London, thus providing the additional finance and/or powers to enable us to better deliver this change with our new Local Transport Strategy, LTP4.

RESPONSE:

Alongside challenging the proposed expansion of ULEZ through a Judicial Review, I have set out to Transport for London the mitigation required to support our residents and businesses should the ULEZ expansion proceed.

I wrote to TfL on 2 May stating that there is a real opportunity for TfL to invest in active travel across the border by providing match funding for Local Cycling and Walking and Infrastructure Plans (LCWIP) and to create Liveable Neighbourhoods. This will support the walking and wheeling objectives set out by Active Travel England. This Council would look to secure funding for these initiatives; however, Active Travel England guidance states they will be looking for match funding to support their investment. In Surrey, for the districts bordering London, we have developed and published LCWIPs for Elmbridge, Spelthorne and Reigate & Banstead. We are also developing LCWIPs for Mole Valley and Tandridge. In addition to the LCWIPs, we have started to develop complementary Liveable Neighbourhood Plans. We believe that TfL, as part of the required ULEZ mitigation, should provide a contribution to the delivery of these initiatives alongside Active Travel England and this Council. The cross-border routes that will be improved will allow residents in London as well as Surrey to access key services without incurring any expanded ULEZ charges and will contribute to our shared net zero ambition.

Turning to local bus services, all the ULEZ commentary from TfL is focussed on bus services within London, again failing to recognise the impact of an expanded ULEZ on those living on the Surrey side of the boundary. I have told TfL that they should fund cross-boundary bus service improvements and I have set out prioritised improvements to fourteen TfL bus services that come into Surrey encompassing a range of frequency enhancements, extended hours of operation, evening services and Sunday services. Further details of this are given below.

The proposed bus enhancements are, I believe, reasonable adjustments to existing services that will support many residents of London and Surrey by helping them to make journeys by more sustainable modes and avoid using a private vehicle altogether.

Overall, the net revenues from the ULEZ scheme could be used for additional investment in active travel and local bus services. This will help facilitate the implementation of the Mayor's Transport Strategy by investing in walking, cycling and public transport to improve London's air quality.

The Council is also working on a number of sustainable transport programmes as part of our Surrey Transport Plan. These include local cycle and walking plans and bus improvement plans that connect with London. A common objective running through all of these work programmes is to provide wider travel choice for residents. The modes being promoted are designed to fulfil our net-zero ambition and to help reduce the county's carbon emissions, including in and especially areas of Surrey that border London.

TfL are consulting on proposed Travelcard changes, with the consultation closing on 23 May. I have written to TfL to express my deep concern at the proposed withdrawal of the One Day Travelcard, Weekend Travelcards and the London Family Travelcard. More detailed on my response to TfL on this matter is contained in the reply to a question from Councillor Robert Evans on the meeting agenda.

Additional detail on bus service requests to TfL:

I have told TfL that it needs to consider and fund a number of cross-boundary bus service improvements, with the following services into Surrey being a priority:

166 West Croydon – Epsom

- *Increase the frequency of journeys that go to Epsom (currently only one bus per hour).*
- *Introduce earlier and later journeys to Epsom and a Sunday service.*

411 West Molesey – Kingston

- *Increase the evening services to every 30 minutes rather than becoming hourly from 21:00 onwards (or 19:00 onwards on Sundays).*

405 Croydon – Redhill

- *Increase the frequency of Mon – Sat evening services, which currently drops from every 15 to every 30 minutes after 20:00 until midnight.*

465 Dorking – Kingston

- *Increase peak Mon – Sat journeys from every 30 to every 20 minutes.*
- *Increase peak Sun journeys (09:00 – 17:00) from hourly to every 30 minutes.*

470 Colliers Wood – Epsom

- *Extend the operational day and introduce a Sunday service.*
- *Extend to serve Epsom Hospital.*

404 Caterham – Cane Hill (Coulston)

- *Extend the operational day until 21:00 or possibly 22:00.*

434 Coulston – Whyteleafe

- *Extend to run later into the evenings Mon – Sun (currently finishes at approximately 20:30)*
- *More frequent Mon – Sat services (from every 30 to every 20 minutes) at peak times.*

406/418 Epsom – Kingston

- *Increase the Mon-Sat evening frequency to every 20 minutes until 21:00.*
- *Increase the Sunday frequency to every 20 minutes.*

117 Staines – West Middlesex Hospital

- *Maintain the 20 min frequency Mon – Sat until 22:00 (currently every 20 minutes until 20:00 and then becomes every 30 minutes until 22:00).*

216 Staines – Kingston

- *Increase frequency of Sunday service from every 30 minutes to every 20 minutes between 09:00 and 17:00.*

K3 Esher – Roehampton Vale

- *Increase the evening services Mon – Sat to every 20 minutes (currently every 30 minutes) from 19:00.*
- *Provide additional Sunday early morning services to be introduced to maintain every 30 minutes throughout the day.*

467 Hook – Epsom

- *Extend operational day and introduce a Sunday service.*

464 Tatsfield – New Addington

- *Increase the frequency of Mon – Sat evening services, and Sunday peak services from hourly to every 30 minutes.*

DAVID LEWIS, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES

**10. ERNEST MALLETT MBE (WEST MOLESEY) TO ASK:
(2nd Question)**

I attended the interesting seminar on the county's Artificial Intelligence (AI) Development Programme. Whilst no costs were stated it is clear to me that the immediate budget must be some £500,000 and that this will easily escalate to £1 million to deliver a usable product. No end-use or economic case for this project was stated.

You will be aware that all the world dominant computer software companies, including the Chinese oddly backed by American funds, are spending amounts estimated not in £millions but in £billions on AI development.

- a) Has Surrey County Council carried out an investigation into the economics and performance likely to result by producing its own AI software?
- b) What sorts of end-uses are likely from the county's AI developments?

RESPONSE:

- a) An Artificial Intelligence (AI) strategic roadmap is being developed for Surrey County Council. The investment figure of £500,000 appears very high and does not match the current investment projections. A business case setting

out required investment and expected benefits will be developed alongside the roadmap AI is a huge and rapidly developing field with various potential business applications. The intention is to equip SCC with sufficient understanding of this emerging capability to set out an adoption route that aligns to the corporate priorities, organisation maturity and maximises collaboration opportunities with university sector and commercial partners. As part of the Data Strategy an ethical framework is being developed in order to assess the potential risks including ethical use, data privacy and risk of failure and reputational damage and on-going AI governance framework to ensure fairness, transparency and accountability.

b) The application of AI has yet to be defined, however, from the early stages of the exploration and development the following lines of enquiry appear to offer opportunities as potential uses of AI:

- Empowering our communities and improved access to Services and Information
- Built environment and transport infrastructure planning and use
- Sustainability and energy use
- Supporting education and personalised learning
- Health and Wellbeing, and independent living

KEVIN DEANUS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

11. CATHERINE POWELL (FARNHAM NORTH) TO ASK: (2nd Question)

One of the changes associated with the SCC taking Parking Enforcement back from the Districts and Boroughs is the cross-county move towards Virtual Parking Permits. As part of implementing this change all holders of existing permits were sent a letter which advised them of the change from boroughs and districts to SCC and that:

“From April, we will no longer be issuing paper permits. Instead, your Vehicle Registration Number (VRN) will become your unique identifier, from which civil enforcement officers will be able to establish whether you have paid for a permit for your vehicle.”

As soon as the letters started arriving through letter boxes in Farnham complaints started to arise around this change. Eventually it was established that as for five boroughs and districts (Waverley, Tandridge, Runnymede, Reigate & Banstead and Guildford) consultation would be required to support the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to change to virtual parking permits.

Consultations for the first four of these boroughs and districts was launched on 30 March and ran until 27 April. Guildford’s consultation is planned for the summer. However, there was no mention of the consultation in the letters that I believe were sent to holders of existing parking permits. I have seen no communication to local members apart from in response to questions raised initially by residents and then by Councillors.

a) How were the consultations publicised?

Given that the consultation websites states:

“The legislation we must follow before introducing this scheme means that we need to allow objections and comments from the public to be considered before a final decision is reached about whether or not to go ahead with our preferred scheme in its current form.”

b) Does the Cabinet Member feel comfortable with the launch of virtual parking permits as the only form of permit issued on the 1 April when the consultations did not finish until the 27 April for four boroughs and districts and Guildford’s still has not started?

c) Whilst there are benefits in terms of not issuing paper permits in terms of the cost and materials / energy associated with issuing the paper permits, has the Cabinet Member reviewed the disadvantages? Specifically has the Cabinet Member considered:

- The time it takes for an Enforcement Officer to scan each number plate and pull up the data to see if it has a permit rather than just looking at a paper permit?
- Given the time taken to scan and review each number plate and the number of parking permit spaces in Surrey how many times can each space be visited in each week by the planned number of Enforcement Officers in each borough and district, assuming they only visited parking permit spaces and did no enforcement of yellow lines?
- The likely increased level of friction in areas where there is a high level of demand for spaces and conflict between residents and other road users with the associated the potential for increased need police involvement?

RESPONSE:

a) The Cabinet approved our current on street parking strategy at their meeting on 28 January 2020 with one of the objectives being to move from paper to virtual permits. Virtual permits are so termed because no physical permit is issued, rather the Vehicle Registration Number (VRN) becomes the identifier for enforcement purposes (much like the changes that have taken place with the vehicle tax disc).

The change to the use of virtual permits is essentially a technical exercise as it relates to just the form of a permit and makes no difference to any of the substantive rules about permits, such as eligibility, numbers that can be applied for or cost. For this reason, given that approval had been given in principle by Cabinet, we felt it reasonable and appropriate to introduce virtual permits even though the formal process for changing the TROs had not been completed, thus avoiding the costs associated with a short-term interim paper permit system.

The transition to the use of virtual permits requires formalising by an administrative change to the relevant Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) that set out permit scheme rules across some parts of the County and consequently this is being carried out for areas where it is needed (Waverley, Tandridge, Runnymede, Reigate & Banstead and Guildford).

The process for amending a TRO requires a statutory notice to be placed in the local newspapers however we also use our web pages to publicise relevant information. In March we also wrote to all permit holders providing information about the changes to parking enforcement and explained the switch to virtual permits in the letter.

- b) Virtual permits, whilst new to Surrey are used in many towns, cities and regions across the UK. Phone payment for visitor parking is also widely used around the UK (such as RingGo in most Surrey off street car parks).

Although we have not completed the process of formally amending our permit scheme rules, as explained in a) above, because virtual permits are being used so widely elsewhere, we do not believe there will be a substantive reason not to use them for most types of parking permit across Surrey.

However, there are exceptions such as the carers permit where we decided to retain a paper version. This is issued for free to residents who (are perhaps elderly and) rely on regular care visits often from friends and family as well as medical professionals.

Residents who do not feel comfortable with online applications can also contact NSL on the phone and send documents in the post in order to obtain their virtual permits.

When the statutory consultations are complete we will review the responses if there are any substantive reasons why paper permits should be used for any other purpose then this will be considered.

- c) Permit schemes around the county have historically used paper permits displayed in vehicle windscreens as a means of identifying those that are entitled to park in permit parking spaces. The permits have been ordered/printed and sent out in the post to residents as required.

Resident permits are usually issued once per year, however visitor permits can be issued on an ad hoc basis and are often in the form of scratchcards (or books of scratchcards).

Approximately 10,000 annual resident permits are issued each year along with around 150,000 visitor permits/scratchcards and waivers.

NSL report that Enforcement Officers find it quicker to scan a VRN with their ANPR device than to read a paper permit and compare it against the VRN on the vehicle. Paper visitor permits or scratch cards can also be more complex

to check. The Enforcement Officers handheld ANPR device is linked to a secure online database holding all valid VRNs for each permit scheme.

The use of a virtual permit system could also enable the future use of ANPR camera vehicles to check permit schemes, leading to further efficiencies and better compliance.

Even a small time saving per permit check (perhaps only 10s for a virtual permit over a paper one) can add up over time when there are around 10,000 permits in circulation on a typical day.

Whilst it is understood that some residents wish to monitor parking and visitors' vehicles in their street, (and a visible permit helps them do this) it is not desirable or necessary for residents to police their own permit schemes or challenge motorists parking on public roads. We plan to provide sufficient enforcement resources and are using technology such as handheld ANPR devices for Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) to achieve this. In time it may also be possible to use ANPR vehicles to help improve compliance with resident permit schemes.

DAVID LEWIS, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES

12. STEVEN MCCORMICK (EPSOM TOWN & DOWNS) TO ASK: (2nd Question)

Following the SAP upgrade project which the Council has embarked on since 2020 which is now nearing completion and full implementation, can the expected total project cost on completion compared with original budget be shared with Members along with a summary of lessons learnt and improvements implemented?

Could a full list of other ongoing IT projects with a projection as to whether or not they are likely to come in on budget based on current performance/progress be provided?

RESPONSE:

There is a longstanding agreement with the current Chair of the Resources and Performance Select Committee that a full lessons learned review will be undertaken on the ERP implementation following the system going live, overseen by the Select Committee. This will of course include a full analysis of the finances related to the project.

Budget monitoring is undertaken as a key activity as part of IT & Digital led projects. Typically, these projects include the implementation of new IT systems and infrastructure, and upgrades to existing technology capabilities. Monthly project indicators, including budget monitoring, are reported on a monthly basis. A copy of this will be available to those Members that request it.

CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION AND LEARNING

**13. CATHERINE BAART (EARLSWOOD AND REIGATE SOUTH) TO ASK:
(2nd Question)**

Please could the latest figures for the Council's performance in deciding the outcome of new Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) applications, and carrying out reviews of existing EHCPs, compared to how the Council was doing last year be provided?

RESPONSE:

Demand for EHC needs assessment is currently 20% more than the previous year of 2021/2022. This increase in demand has placed pressure on services that contribute to the statutory assessment process at a time when there are national shortages of the professionals involved.

In April 2022, timeliness for issuing EHCPs was at 49% and over the summer months, timeliness began to drop. This trend was recognised and a recovery plan was put in place immediately. Since the introduction of this, in 2023 the timeliness of issuing EHCPs has seen steady improvement to 16% in April 2023. March saw 21% timeliness which is the highest since July 2022, and May data suggests that we will see an even bigger improvement with the current timeliness being 33%. Overall county wide data masks quadrant timeliness performance, with considerable variance across the county.

There has been difficulty with the migration of the annual review data into the new Early Help Module (EHM) system. Our manual records show that annual reviews have been carried out in 50% of cases. There is a recovery plan which is monitored on a weekly basis by the Director of Education and Lifelong Learning.

The focus of work over the summer and autumn terms is to update the records so that case officers can ensure that all children and young people have an in-time Annual Review where delays have been identified. There are additional staff in each quadrant SEN team specifically dedicated to this task. Their focus will be complete the work and specifically prioritise those who have additional vulnerabilities or are in a key stage transition year to be the first focus of this work in the summer term.

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND GROWTH

**14. ROBERT EVANS OBE (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:
(2nd Question)**

Has Surrey County Council had any discussions with Transport for London (TfL) about the impending withdrawal of daily Travelcards which combine travel on South Western Railway, London buses and the London Underground network, when travelling from Surrey stations?

RESPONSE:

TfL are consulting on proposed Travelcard changes. The consultation closes on 23 May 2023.

I have written to TfL to express my deep concern at the proposed withdrawal of the One Day Travelcard, Weekend Travelcards and the London Family Travelcard.

The One Day Travelcard is a convenient, affordable and integrated option for those who need to use public transport for a single day and, is something that has been in existence for decades. It provides flexibility and ease of use for those residents who do not have an Oyster card or do not wish to use a contactless payment, along with those who do not have a contactless payment method. The proposed withdrawal of this option would mean many Surrey residents, and residents in other Local Authorities, will be forced to pay more for their travel or make alternative arrangements.

There will be negative financial impacts on residents as a result of this proposed change, alongside a worsening of transport integration. It will result in passengers paying more; ultimately the £0.5bn - £1bn of revenue that TfL are hopeful that will be generated from the withdrawal of these ticketing products. The concept of withdrawing the One Day Travelcard now will be a frightening prospect for many during a deepening cost of living crisis that is already creating financial difficulties for many households.

The Child Day Travelcard will create a barrier to travelling if children have to apply for a Zip Card given the £14 administration fee, something that is required in advance of travel. Those travelling into London very occasionally or those making ad hoc journeys may not have the opportunity to pre-purchase an Oyster Zip Card and may not see the benefits of this £14 charge. The alternative for these travellers will be to pay the adult fare. That will not encourage families to travel into London sustainably, if at all. That's bad for the environment and bad for the economy of London. The alternative of a Child Visitors Oyster also has to be purchased in advance and then registered at a Tube station, requiring travel into London to do this, making it a costly option.

Surrey residents will be required to pay more for their journey to a London station and then use contactless, obtain an Oyster Card or purchase a paper ticket for onward travel. The integration between bus and rail/underground will also be lost, something that I know TfL and many councils have strived to achieve over many years making the premise illogical; other than for financial gain.

I have set this all out to TfL, telling them this is a short-sighted decision that will ultimately deter people from using public transport at a time when we are all looking to achieve the opposite. I have also asked TfL to explain how people will shift to public transport as part of the proposed ULEZ expansion given these proposed changes will make their travel even more expensive and more complex in terms of ticketing.

The withdrawal of this well used, easily understood and affordable product will have a negative impact on sustainable journeys. I have told TfL that this is not something the Council can support. I have urged TfL to explore alternative option to address the financial challenges that do not have such a negative impact on TfL’s passengers and our residents, given that passengers paying higher fares will have a greater financial effect on those travelling into London from outside of the Oyster zone, including from Surrey.

KEVIN DEANUS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

**15. JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:
(2nd Question)**

- a) What is the process and service standard for identifying whether a pothole is considered to be dangerous when the engineer sprays a mark around a pothole committing that it will be filled, and what are the response times to deliver against that?
- b) Please could the performance against response targets for pothole repairs that have different response times in the months to date under the new highway maintenance contract be provided?

RESPONSE:

- a) The Council has a defined policy for determining whether a defect on the Highway including potholes requires a reactive repair and a link to this is provided below:

[Highway Safety Inspections - standards and procedures - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](http://surreycc.gov.uk/highway-safety-inspections-standards-procedures)

In regards potholes specifically the classification is as shown in the table below:

Type	Description	Priority
Pothole As a general rule, the diameter, at the surface level, should be >75mm on cycle lanes and >150mm on carriageways	Cycle lanes > 25mm depth in marked cycle lanes and at recognised crossing points (normally in town centre situations)	P2
Pothole As a general rule, the diameter, at the surface level, should be >75mm on cycle lanes and >150mm on carriageways	All other locations > 40mm depth at all other locations	P2
Pothole As a general rule, the diameter, at the surface level, should be >75mm on cycle lanes and >150mm on carriageways	Cycle lanes: Approaching 25mm depth, with likelihood of worsening in short term. Advanced local crazing likely to pothole	P3

Pothole As a general rule, the diameter, at the surface level, should be >75mm on cycle lanes and >150mm on carriageways	All other locations: Approaching 40mm depth, with likelihood of worsening in short term. Advanced local crazing likely to pothole	P3
--	--	----

The target for completing P2 defects is 5 working days* following the classification of the defect and for completing P3 defects is 20 working days following classification. **Where a P2 defect cannot be permanently repaired within 5 days a temporary repair/make safe will be undertaken within 5 days and a further permanent repair should be completed within 20 working days.*

- b) As has been widely publicised there has been a significant increase in the number of defects which have materialised which started in the second half of December and continued exponentially over the subsequent three months.

Period	Q2	Q3	Q4
	Jul 22 – Sept 22	Oct 22 – Dec 22	Jan 23 – Mar 23
Total P2 Defects Recorded	6942	7086	15602
Defects repaired within timescales	5805	6580	9682
% Defects repaired within timescales	84%	93%	62%
Period	Q2	Q3	Q4
	Jul 22 – Sept 22	Oct 22 – Dec 22	Jan 23 – Mar 23
Total P3 Defects Recorded	2307	1796	2466
Defects repaired within timescales	1943	1521	1876
% Defects repaired within timescales	84%	85%	76%
Period	Q2	Q3	Q4
	Jul 22 – Sept 22	Oct 22 – Dec 22	Jan 23 – Mar 23
Total Combined Defects Recorded	9249	8882	18068
Defects repaired within timescales	7748	8101	11558
% Defects repaired within timescales	84%	91%	64%

The above data reflects the increasing trend in both performance outcomes as 2022 progressed with the new ways of working and the new Maintenance

Contractor bedding in - for example increased repairs sizes which take longer to complete.

It is important to note that whilst some defects have not been completed within the stated timescales this does not mean they are outstanding, just that their completion fell beyond the target timescales.

The increase in recorded defects has in some cases changed the way jobs are scheduled to maximise productivity by scheduling as many jobs close to each other as possible rather than by recorded/due for repair date which will have an impact on these results.

The number of gangs operating on the network remains significantly above the business-as-usual average in order to be able to respond to the increase in defects and continue to improve performance against the response targets.

DENISE TURNER-STEWART, DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

**16. CATHERINE POWELL (FARNHAM NORTH) TO ASK:
(3rd Question)**

Birds dying because of Avian Flu are increasing in Surrey.

- a) What is Surrey County Council's policy for dealing with dead birds on their land?
- b) Where Surrey County Council is the landowner for nature reserves is a different policy in place because of the potential for naturally higher numbers of birds? I am particularly concerned regarding Tice's Meadow Nature Reserve, which is now owned by Surrey County Council and is recognised as being one of the South East's best wetland nature reserves.
- c) Who is responsible for the removal of dead birds and contacting Defra on land owned by Surrey County Council?

RESPONSE:

- a) Surrey County Council would be responsible for disposing of the birds in the appropriate legal manner and would follow Defra advice and guidance in doing so.

[Removing and disposing of dead wild birds - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk)

- b) The policy is the same irrespective of setting. On sites where there are large numbers of birds, advisory posters may be displayed to alert the public of the risks in relation to bird flu and how to report suspect cases.

[Bird flu \(avian influenza\): posters for land managers - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk)

- c) The guidance is for any person who sees a dead bird to report it to Defra, regardless of where it is. If it is reported to SCC then SCC would subsequently report it to Defra.

[Report dead wild birds - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk)

In some cases, Defra may collect dead birds for testing purposes but if this is not the case, the responsibility for disposal remains with the landowner.

[Removing and disposing of dead wild birds - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk)

The level of risk to human health from avian influenza remains very low to the general population.

KEVIN DEANUS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

17. STEVEN MCCORMICK (EPSOM TOWN & DOWNS) TO ASK: (3rd Question)

During the recent borough elections, a key item on the doorstep was on potholes which we know is a large problem for the county.

An easy-to-use logging app called FixMyStreet which allows easy fast, accurate logging of many issues related to both county and borough councils is available.

My question is on the integration of this app with Surrey systems. How well integrated is the app and can this integration be improved and leveraged and promoted to our residents as an easier faster way to communicate with us and notify us of problems and issues?

The app exists already, is already very well used by other authorities and I believe this council can reap significant benefits from improved integration and promotion.

A recent item came to the Resources and Performance Select Committee on Digital Inclusion, and I would see this integration work as further expanding the goals of digital inclusion with our residents and ensuring no one gets left behind.

If the above is not an option at this point could we consider adapting the current SCC system to allow other reports within a 15m² area of an existing report to be added to the existing report? Rather than creating a new file/report as the new process introduced should mean that the inspection team look at a 15m² area around each report anyway?

RESPONSE:

The Council's online reporting tool has been developed over the past ten years with several major upgrades allowing residents and other road users to report a variety of defects and issues along with accurate map locations, descriptions and where taken, photos to help describe defects and aid the teams in locating and carrying out the repairs. It also has the functionality to show any outstanding defect reports to save

residents having to re-report the same defect. The reporting tool allows users to report defects from different devices including mobile phones, tablets, laptops and PCs negating the need for a series of dedicated operating system (i.e. Android, iOS) Apps which individually need support and maintenance.

The Council currently has a low level of integration with FixMyStreet such that reports made by residents are sent to the Council's system and transferred into the Council's Customer Management and Work Management System. The information is provided by FixMyStreet via email in an agreed format which is transferred via automation separating out the various elements into the correct fields in the Council's system to be able to progress the report through to investigation and rectification. Anyone who reports a defect via FixMyStreet and provides a contact email address will also receive updates as they would if they had reported directly through the Council's website.

Further integration with FixMyStreet has been considered previously, however, to date the consideration has been that the additional cost to integrate further has not provided sufficient additional benefit to the online reporting process. This will remain under review though as we continue to develop and embed our new Work Management System.

Notwithstanding the above, the Council reviews its approach to reporting on a regular basis and is currently exploring whether there are any opportunities for further enhancement of our existing systems, including the potential for someone to "subscribe" to updates for an existing report rather than creating a new report if they are believed to be the same one.

In terms of the inspection process for potholes, the team do currently assess the immediate vicinity of reported issues and so should be capturing all the defects that are considered to be a safety risk at the same visit.

Operationally we are also developing a find and fix approach as part of our response to defects with the aim to repair more defects at the first visit, some of which may not have been reported by residents or the inspection team. This should provide further benefit in so much as it will hopefully minimise the need for residents to have to report defects in the future.

NATALIE BRAMHALL, CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY AND WASTE

18. CATHERINE BAART (EARLSWOOD AND REIGATE SOUTH) TO ASK: (3rd Question)

I note in the proposed redevelopment of Reigate Fire Station there will be surplus land north of Wray Park.

- a) How big is this area of surplus land in acres?
- b) What possibilities have been or are being considered for this surplus land?

RESPONSE:

The current indications are that the northern part of Wray Park (St David's and the adjacent urban open land known locally as the "cricket field") will not be required by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS). However, final plans have yet to be confirmed and still need to consider the re-siting of core infrastructure elements to support a self-contained SFRS facility on the southern part at Wray Park. Work between Land and Property and SFRS is ongoing regarding the Wray Park site; a proposal is expected to be presented to Cabinet later this year.

- a) The land north of Wray Park is approximately 4.5 acres (of which over half is the cricket field); it has not been formally declared as surplus. The land is within the Wray Common Conservation Area.
- b) Potential options for the St David's area only (not including the cricket field) range from retention to open market disposal of all, or part, of the area:
 - Disposal could be on either a conditional (i.e. subject to planning) or unconditional sale basis.
 - Potential value options of the main St David's building have considered converting the main building into flats with a new residential development on the land surrounding the main building.

Any future development and/or change of use for residential usage will be subject to planning decisions and affordable housing policies.

With regards to the cricket field area, the pavilion at the north-west corner of the field is a Locally Listed Building, and at this time there are no specific proposals for development/re-purposing the field. The field is a designated area of urban open space as well as being designated as an area for temporary mass body storage during a major emergency incident or an increase in deaths across the county under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004. Therefore, any potential site disposal plans will require detailed consideration to maintain continuity of such functions.

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND GROWTH

19. ROBERT EVANS OBE (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK: (3rd Question)

In the recent local elections several Conservative candidates indicated that a vote for them would enhance entry into Transport for London's (TfL) Zone 6 with all the benefits of the Oyster Card system.

Whilst TfL and South Western Railway support extending Zone 6, the Department for Transport does not.

As transport is not a specific responsibility of boroughs and districts can the Cabinet Member please update Council on this matter?

RESPONSE:

Extending the Zone 6 Travelcard scheme to include parts of Surrey such as Staines and Ashford has been raised by the County Council with Transport for London (TfL) previously. I have recently written to TfL as part of my response to the proposed expansion of the Ultra Low Emission Zone, requesting again that TfL engages fully on extending Zone 6 into Surrey. TfL must also engage with the Train Operating Companies to facilitate this change. This important intervention will help to mitigate the disproportionate impact on our residents and businesses of the proposed ULEZ expansion.

KEVIN DEANUS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

20. JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK: (3rd Question)

- a) Please could comparative data on the level of parking enforcement personnel deployed (such as in full time equivalent employees) and level of ticketing for the first month of the new parking enforcement contract and how this compares to the previous regime be provided?
- b) Please could the details of the performance targets which are now being used to track the effectiveness of the new arrangements in terms of outcomes - such as deterring parking in inappropriate locations, such in appropriate locations outside schools at the start and end of the school day be provided?

RESPONSE:

- a) Twelve Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) transferred from the district and borough teams to NSL under TUPE regulations on 1 April. This was a smaller number than hoped, however NSL provided staff from their surrounding teams and continued with a recruitment drive, and as of the second week of May, there are now approximately 40 NSL CEOs working on our Surrey contract. Appointments at NSL have also included 3 base managers, supervisors and a contract analyst who will concentrate on reporting enforcement data and identifying/targeting enforcement activity where needed as well as other improvements to the service.

During April there were 4,154 hours of enforcement activity with 10,965 vehicle observations resulting in 3,423 Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) being issued across the county.

We will be able to compare the performance of the new service with the previous arrangements after about twelve months of operation.

- b) There are Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) associated with the contract and we will be to monitor NSL's performance and help ensure that a high-quality

service is provided under the contract. The main KPIs will become active during month 4 of the contract and relate to:

- Providing sufficient enforcement staff to achieve the enforcement plan
- Meeting response times against enforcement requests
- Completing activities in agreed timescales (e.g. permit requests/renewals and PCN processing)
- Minimising complaints and errors (particularly associated with issuing PCNs)
- Minimising downtime of software/back office systems and camera equipment.
- The new Parking Enforcement Team will monitor these KPIs as well as contract expenditure/income at regular meetings with the new supplier, providing reports as needed.

In terms of tracking performance we will produce a report at least annually about the performance of the service including data on PCNs, financial returns and enforcement activity in general, including schools.

Once the new service has bedded in and new staff are in place (from August) we will be able to engage more with members and local communities about local parking issues in the form of parking task groups. These will help monitor parking performance locally.

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND GROWTH

21. STEVEN MCCORMICK (EPSOM TOWN & DOWNS) TO ASK: (4th Question)

Recently this Council has finally determined a long-standing planning application for the Chalk Pit in Epsom.

Work continues to progress with planning and enforcement officers but my question is on the communication this Council has had with the local impacted residents; what communications have been issued or shared with residents please? Can we as Members help?

Could a Community Liaison Group be set up with the Chalk Pit, the Council and local residents to work through the issues, improve communications and allow issues to be systematically addressed? They are used a lot on quarry/landfill sites.

RESPONSE:

The County Council acknowledges the impact that the Chalk Pit has had on local residents and appreciates the concern residents might have with planning consent being granted. The Council would like to reassure residents that in giving consent for the former NJB site we are now able to put in place strict conditions to mitigate the impacts of the operation. The control that the County Planning Authority has over the operations on site has now increased, particularly through conditions relating to the noise and dust being created by the processing of waste, which should now only be

undertaken in a building. In addition, there are conditions that will restrict the volume of waste recycled, the number of HGV movements and the hours of operation. These conditions will all be subject to enforcement.

The Council, the Environment Agency and Epsom & Ewell Borough Council continue to work together to address the ongoing issues at the wider Chalk Pit site, including the production of joint updates to residents. All of the residents who made representations to the County Council on the former NJB site planning application were notified when the permission was issued. Further communications are planned shortly which will update residents on the current position, including potential enforcement activity should the conditions not be complied with. This will also include information on how residents can contact the County Planning Authority.

As recognised in the question, Community Liaison Groups have worked well in other parts of the county and I am happy to support such a group being created for this site. I will discuss with local members the membership and remit of the group. Ideally it will involve all regulatory partners, businesses, the landowner and representatives of the community.

This page is intentionally left blank