

Runnymede Borough Council

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Thursday, 15 January 2004, at 7.30 p.m.

in the Council Chamber

at the Civic Offices, Addlestone



Members of the Committee

Councillors J.R. Furey (Chairman), J.E. Haas (Vice-Chairman), A. Alderson, M.J. Brown, A.J. Davis, D.P. Easton, R.J. Ray, B.J. Relph, Ms. C.M. Simmons and K.J.T. Walmsley.

AGENDA

Notes:

- i) Any report on the Agenda involving confidential information (as defined by section 100A(3) of the Local Government Act 1972) must be discussed in private. Any report involving exempt information (as defined by section 100I of the Local Government Act 1972), whether it appears in Part 1 or Part 2 below, may be discussed in private but only if the Committee so resolves.
- ii) The relevant 'background papers' are listed after each report in Part 1. Enquiries about any of the Agenda reports and background papers should be directed in the first instance to **Mr. G. Marson, Committee Section, Administration and Leisure Department, Civic Offices, Station Road, Addlestone (Tel. Direct Line: 01932 425625). (Email: gary.marson@runnymede.gov.uk).**
- iii) Agendas and Minutes are available on a subscription basis. For details, please ring Mr. B.A. Fleckney on 01932 425620.
- iv) in the unlikely event of an alarm sounding, members of the public should leave the building immediately, either using the staircase leading from the public gallery or following other instructions as appropriate.

LIST OF MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

PART I

Matters in respect of which reports have been made available for public inspection

	<u>Page</u>
1. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP	3
2. MINUTES	3
3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	3
4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	3
5. REVENUE ESTIMATES 2004/05	3
6. DECRIMINALISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT - AGENCY AGREEMENT	3
7. GUILDFORD STREET (NORTH), CHERTSEY IMPROVEMENTS - PROJECT OUTTURN REPORT	6
8. AVIATOR PARK CAR PARK (TO FOLLOW)	9
9. ACTION ADDLESTONE INITIATIVE MEMBER STEERING GROUP - MINUTES	9
10. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC	9

PART II

Matters involving Exempt or Confidential Information in respect of which reports have not been made available for public inspection.

a) Exempt Information

11. ADDLESTONE COMMUNITY CENTRE REPROVISION (TO FOLLOW)	10
12. COMMERCIAL PROPERTY PORTFOLIO	10
13. NON-OPERATIONAL PROPERTY REVIEW	13
14. EGHAM PRECINCT LEASE RESTRUCTURING	14
15. STONEYLANDS CLUB, EGHAM	16
16. 135/137 STATION ROAD, ADDLESTONE - LEASE ARRANGEMENTS	17

b) Confidential Information

(No reports to be considered under this heading)

1. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

2. MINUTES

To confirm and sign as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 13 November 2003.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

If Members have an interest in an item please record the interest on the form circulated with this Agenda and hand it to the Legal Representative or Committee Administrator at the start of the meeting. A supply of the form will also be available from the Committee Administrator at meetings.

Members who have previously declared interests which are recorded in the Minutes to be considered at this meeting need not repeat the declaration when attending the meeting. Members need take no further action unless the item in which they have an interest becomes the subject of debate, in which event the Member must leave the room if the interest is personal and prejudicial.

5. REVENUE ESTIMATES 2004/2005 (DF)

Members are asked to receive and consider the draft Revenue Estimates and fees and charges for the services under the remit of this Committee for 2004/05. The report of the Director of Finance is set out at Appendix 'A'. This comprises Estimates for both Highway Services (pages 1 to 16) and Economic Development (pages 17 to 41).

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

- i) the proposed fees and charges for 2004/2005 as set out in Appendix 'A' be approved to be effective from 1 April 2004 or as appropriate; and**
- ii) the draft Revenue Estimates for 2004/2005 be approved as submitted and the Corporate Management Committee be requested to make provision accordingly.**

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None stated

6. DECriminalISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT - AGENCY AGREEMENT (DTS)

(Ref: Minutes of Economic Development Committee, November 2003, page 999, para. 470)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to seek approval in principle for an Agency Agreement with Surrey County Council for managing Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE) and authorisation for Officers to negotiate and conclude an appropriate agreement.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 The Council's consultants attended the November 2003 meeting of the Committee to give a presentation on the continuing preparations for introducing Decriminalised Parking Enforcement in the Borough and to answer Members' questions on the subject.
- 2.2 The Road Traffic Act 1991 provides for the decriminalisation of most non-endorseable on-street parking offences in London and permits the introduction of similar arrangements elsewhere upon application to the Secretary of State. Enforcement is then the responsibility of local traffic authorities, which are able to retain the proceeds from Penalty Charge Notices (PCN's) to fund the enforcement and adjudication system. Any funding surplus is to be used for certain prescribed traffic management purposes.

- 2.3 Surrey Police has given notice of its intention to cease enforcement of on-street parking controls with effect from 1 April 2004. Surrey County Council is then due to assume responsibility for the function with, in most cases, individual Districts/Boroughs undertaking the enforcement role on their behalf. Implementation of the new regime in Runnymede is scheduled for October/November 2004.
- 2.4 The revenue consequences of DPE over time are extremely difficult to predict. Experience in Kent has revealed large variations in the financial performance of neighbouring authorities. The paradox of DPE is that an intensive and successful enforcement regime with high costs would have a correspondingly low income and very substantial operating deficit.
- 2.5 The preferred approach is, therefore, a policy of "controlled failure" to maximise income for a minimised cost. The financial performance depends critically on the productivity of the parking attendants. Accuracy in the issuing and processing of tickets is also important since errors will lead to appeals to the National Adjudication Service and, potentially, cost awards against the Council.
- 2.6 The Committee has emphasised that the principal objective of implementing DPE in Runnymede is to improve the environment and enhance road safety by discouraging unauthorised parked cars from the streets, not to raise additional revenue. Any cost/benefit appraisal of the regime needs to take account of these quality of life and safety issues alongside the financial model.
- 2.7 The DPE Member Working Group, comprising of two Borough and two County Members, is liaising with the Police regarding the arrangements for the interim period between the Police ceasing enforcement duties and the introduction of DPE.

3. Report

- 3.1 Surrey County Council is responsible for managing DPE so an Agency Agreement between the County Council and the Borough Council is necessary to enable Runnymede to manage the day-to-day operation of the scheme. An initial draft of the Agreement has been received from the County Council and is currently being examined by Officers.
- 3.2 The Agreement would set out the procedure in respect of a variety of agency issues including :-
- The collection of charges, including penalty charges, for on-street parking within the Permitted Parking Area, and the administration of residents' parking schemes and the collection of charges for permits.
 - The issue of Penalty Charge Notices in both Permitted Parking and Special Parking Areas.
 - The handling of representations, correspondence and appeals arising from issuing Penalty Charge Notices.
 - Steps to recover payments due, including instructing registered or certificated bailiffs.
 - The immobilisation and the removal, recovery, storage and disposal of vehicles and the collection of charges in relation to these services.
 - The registration of debts at the Traffic Enforcement Centre.
- 3.3 The Agreement would be for a five year period, but determinable by one year's notice to expire on 31 March.
- 3.4 The period of notice if either party breaches the Agreement is six months.
- 3.5 There is provision for an annual review. In addition, at the end of the second full financial year of the five year period a review of the costs, income and effectiveness of the arrangements during the preceding period of the Agreement will take place with the intention of agreeing an extension.

- 3.6 There is also provision in the Agreement for it to be varied at any time by agreement between the parties.
- 3.7 The Agreement would also require Runnymede to notify the County Council in advance of any proposed changes in the management of, and parking charges for, off-street car parks and to consider any response.
- 3.8 The enforcement regime for off-street parking would be unified with that for on-street parking. The implications of this need to be carefully considered.
- 3.9 The Borough Council must take reasonable steps to avoid conflict between its own requirements and those of the County Council and any dispute can be referred to arbitration.
- 3.10 In the event of termination, the party terminating will be required to indemnify the other party against any expenses, including redundancy.

4. Resource Implications

- 4.1 Surrey County Council will meet all the agreed start up costs for on-street enforcement from Local Transportation Plan funding, as well as revenue costs for the first two years of the operation. The County Council will, in turn, retain the income from on-street PCN's over this period.
- 4.2 The initial financial consequences for Runnymede will be neutral at worst. There could be an increase in income arising from increased usage of the Council's off-street car parks, assuming that motorists are successfully deterred from on-street parking. This off-street parking income, which is forecast to rise by between 2.5%-7.5%, is not part of the DPE balance sheet, and will continue to be retained by the Borough Council.
- 4.3 The Council's consultants have produced two alternative financial scenarios in order to illustrate the uncertainties. The optimistic model assumes that income will be high initially before stabilising over time and that increases in revenue costs will be restricted to 10% over 5 years. This provides a cumulative operating deficit of £72,200 over 2 years and £158,575 over 5 years. The pessimistic model assumed low levels of initial income, falling over time as compliance improves, and revenue costs increasing by 20% over the five year period. This would produce a deficit of £166,435 by the end of the second year and £438,320 by year five. In practice, however, ongoing deficits of this nature would require some form of early intervention.
- 4.4 In confirming Runnymede's agreement to the principle of the funding arrangements, it was indicated that CCTV would be used to help direct parking enforcement, and that it was expected that this would be reflected in a suitable recharge. This will be pursued with the County Council as part of the agreement.
- 4.5 The County Council is committed to meeting deficits for the first two years of the scheme and Runnymede would have to give its consent to any alterations in the financial arrangements thereafter.

5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 There are a number of matters in the draft Agreement which require clarification and/or amendment. In particular, any provisions which limit Runnymede's ability to determine policy in relation to off street parking or which have potentially significant financial implications will need very careful consideration.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

the principle of entering into an Agency Agreement with Surrey County Council in respect of the implementation of DPE be approved and the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to negotiate and conclude an appropriate agreement in consultation with the Chairman or, in his absence, the Vice-Chairman.

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None Stated.

7. GUILDFORD STREET (NORTH), CHERTSEY IMPROVEMENTS - PROJECT OUTTURN REPORT (DTS)

(Ref: Minutes of Economic Development Committee, March 2003, page 1144, para. 710)

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to advise Members of the financial outturn in respect of the Guildford Street (North) Improvements Scheme and report on the lessons learnt from the project.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 The main aims of the project were to enhance the appearance of the area in keeping with its historical character, to improve accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and people with disabilities and to rationalise parking to try to make it 'self policing'.
- 2.2 Following a resolution by the former Policy and Resources on 24 June 1999, the Council carried out a tendering process and appointed the consultant WS Atkins to prepare initial proposals for the conceptual design of environmental improvements for the northern part of Chertsey town centre. This included Guildford Street, between Heriot Road and Windsor Street, and Windsor Street itself and the western end of London Street.
- 2.3 In preparing their conceptual proposals W S Atkins carried out a Townscape Appraisal, which looked at the history and development of the town and of the streets involved. The appraisal also considered planning and conservation issues and looked at vehicle and pedestrian movements through the town. They also investigated appropriate paving and landscaping materials.
- 2.4 An extensive consultation process was carried out consisting of a public exhibition, a public meeting and meetings with interest groups, including the Chertsey Society, the Chamber of Commerce and the Runnymede Access Liaison Group.
- 2.5 WS Atkins' final report for the conceptual design proposed a layout for Windsor Street and three options for Guildford Street. For financial and logistical reasons it was decided that the scheme should proceed on a phased basis. Guildford Street was seen as the priority for enhancement and WS Atkins was appointed in January 2002 to prepare the detailed design and to supervise the construction of the scheme.
- 2.6 Further consultation was carried out in preparing the detailed design. This involved more meetings and site visits with the Chamber of Commerce, the Chertsey Society and the Runnymede Access Liaison Group, the County Councillor for Chertsey and the Chairman of the Surrey County Council Local Committee. Another public exhibition was held in June 2002 at Chertsey Hall to enable the public to comment on the details of the scheme.
- 2.7 The Economic Development Committee authorised Officers to invite tenders for the implementation of the scheme, subject to Surrey County Council Local Committee consent, at its meeting in June 2002.
- 2.8 The Highways Agency Agreement, under which the Borough Council managed Runnymede's highways, ended on 31 March 2002, along with similar Agreements in Elmbridge, Epsom and Ewell, Spelthorne, Surrey Heath, Reigate and Banstead and Woking. As a result it was necessary to obtain the approval of the Local Committee for Runnymede in order to construct the scheme.
- 2.9 Following a competitive tendering exercise John Crowley (Maidstone) Limited was awarded the construction contract and work began on site in September 2002.

- 2.10 The construction was substantially completed by mid February 2003. As part of the Contract, construction work was suspended during December 2002 to avoid affecting Christmas shopping. The opening ceremony was performed by the Mayor on 10 April 2003.
- 2.11 The footways were widened where possible and car parking formalised into bays. Pedestrian crossing points have been emphasised with the use of raised road tables, which also reduce traffic speeds. The footways have been repaved in high quality and durable York Stone paving and new street furniture has been installed.
- 2.12 Street furniture, particularly bollards, was originally kept to a minimum to avoid clutter and obstructions. Unfortunately inconsiderate drivers have taken advantage of this by parking on the footways. As a result, more bollards have been installed to avoid conflict with pedestrians and damage to the paving. Surrey Police agreed to give some attention to the reduction of footway parking and Safer Runnymede is monitoring the situation with CCTV cameras. When Decriminalised Parking Enforcement is introduced in November 2004 the Borough's Parking Officers will be able to enforce the waiting restrictions more rigorously than the Police have been able to. In the meantime, Officers are monitoring the situation and it is likely that more bollards will be needed in strategic positions.

3. Financial Outturn

- 3.1 Appendix 'B' contains a spreadsheet containing details of the costs.
- 3.2 In accordance with Standing Orders, four contractors were invited to tender for the construction, drawn from Surrey County Council's select list for highway works. Three submitted Tenders and the fourth declined. The lowest Tender, at £429,000, was accepted.
- 3.3 During the course of the works some significant additional costs were identified. Despite prior testing, the existing carriageway was found to be inadequate to allow construction of the road tables along a limited length and carriageway reconstruction work amounting to about £55,000 had to be undertaken. Also, several other items of equipment were needed that had not been previously identified, amounting to further costs of about £55,000. The Committee was notified in March 2003 that the final cost of the scheme was likely to exceed the approved contract sum by more than 5%.
- 3.4 Although the additional works and equipment were inevitably needed, Officers considered that the consultant should have identified this earlier so that the costs could have been anticipated. Following negotiations the consultancy reduced its fees by approximately £21,000 as compensation for its omissions.

4. Environmental and Community Planning Implications

- 4.1 The highway lighting in Guildford Street was improved in the summer of 1999. The wider footways, improved pedestrian and cycle facilities, together with the enhanced surfacing materials and quality street furniture were intended to improve the safety, ambience and atmosphere of the street and to encourage shopping trips and improve the viability of businesses.

5. Lessons Learnt

- 5.1 It was established before construction started that some of the key materials, such as the natural stone paving, had a long delivery time. These materials were pre-ordered so that they were available to the contractor at the appropriate time and that construction was not delayed as a result. It is therefore important to check the availability of specific materials or equipment at an early stage to ensure availability.
- 5.2 Extensive public consultation was carried out on the various aspects of the scheme from conception through detailed design and construction with various individuals and organisations. Public exhibitions and meetings were also held. It is important that a Consultation Plan is established and agreed at an early stage defining the levels of consultation and the individuals and organisations to be specifically approached.

- 5.3 Public consultation can be an expensive and labour intensive process so a specific budget should be provided and staff resources made available to carry out the consultation adequately.
- 5.4 During the consultation it was important that comments from individuals and organisations, particularly businesses were recorded, as one consultee later claimed to have made comments that the records proved to be incorrect.
- 5.5 A consultant was employed to carry out the design, as insufficient in-house resources were available. However, adequate supervision by Officers was still needed to ensure that consultants delivered what was required to a suitable standard and this took up significant amounts of Officer time.

6. Satisfaction Survey

- 6.1 Following completion of the scheme 250 freepost questionnaires were issued to residents and businesses in the immediate area of Guildford Street to gather feedback on various aspects of the project. The questionnaire asked respondents to mark nine aspects of the scheme on a scale of 1 (poor) to 10 (excellent). Forty-seven responses were received, a return of approximately 20%. The questions and average marks for each were as follows:-

Question	Average Marks out of 10
1. Do you consider that the scheme achieved its objectives?	5.6
2. Do you consider that you were adequately consulted over the scheme both before construction and during the works?	4.1
3. Were any complaints that you had during construction dealt with quickly and efficiently?	6.2
4. Do you consider that the sectionalised working along the street kept any disruption to a minimum?	4.8
5. Do you consider that the use of natural York stone paving throughout the scheme was a benefit to the town centre appearance as a whole?	7.7
6. Do you consider the carriageway speed table/crossing points to be an advantage to pedestrians?	6.5
7. How would you rate the quality of workmanship on the completed project?	6.4
8. Do you feel that the project as a whole has enhanced the appearance of Guildford Street and made it a more pleasurable shopping experience?	5.9
9. Do you consider the scheme as a whole to be a success?	5.5

- 6.2 These results indicate a reasonable degree of support for these aspects of the scheme. The responses to question 2 show the difficulty in achieving an acceptable level of consultation, considering the amount that was carried out during the feasibility and detailed design stages. Despite the suspension of works during the Christmas shopping period a small number of shopkeepers complained about a loss of trade as a result of the works. This could be reflected in the responses to questions 2 and 4, despite the fact that site engineers liaised with shopkeepers throughout the construction period.
- 6.3 A common comment was the concern at the number of vehicles driving over and parking on the footways and this affected the responses to questions 1 and 9. Respondents felt that this affected the overall success of the scheme. Additional bollards have now been installed to deter footway parking.
- 6.4 Responses to questions 5 and 7 show that the public supports the use of quality materials and that there is a good level of satisfaction with the standard of workmanship.

(FOR INFORMATION)

Background Papers

None

8. AVIATOR PARK CAR PARK (DTS)

Report to follow.

9. ACTION ADDLESTONE INITIATIVE MEMBER STEERING GROUP - MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Action Addlestone Initiative Member Steering Group held on 16 October 2003 are attached at Appendix 'C'.

(FOR INFORMATION)

Background Papers

None

10. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

the press and public be excluded from the meeting during discussion of the following reports under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the reports in question would be likely to involve disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 3, 7, 8 and 9 of Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Act.

(TO RESOLVE)

PART II

Matters involving Exempt or Confidential Information in respect of which reports have not been made available for public inspection.

a)	<u>Exempt Information</u>	<u>Para</u>
11.	ADDLESTONE COMMUNITY CENTRE REPROVISION	7, 8 and 9
12.	COMMERCIAL PROPERTY PORTFOLIO	7 and 9
13.	NON-OPERATIONAL PROPERTY REVIEW	7 and 9
14.	EGHAM PRECINCT LEASE RESTRUCTURING	7
15.	STONEYLANDS CLUB, EGHAM	7
16.	135/137 STATION ROAD, ADDLESTONE - LEASE ARRANGEMENTS	3 and 7

b) Confidential Information

(No reports to be considered under this heading).

