

# Economic Development Committee

Thursday 21 January 2010 7.30pm

Council Chamber  
Runnymede Civic Centre, Addlestone

## Members of the Committee

Councillors P I Roberts (Chairman), D A Cotty (Vice Chairman), A Alderson, J Broadhead, H A Butterfield, Mrs C E Gant, Mrs G M Kingerley, L C Pouyanne, A S T Ridge-Newman and P Taylor

## AGENDA

### Notes:

- 1) 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.
- 2) 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 M L White, Committee Section, Administration and Leisure Department, Runnymede Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone (Tel: Direct Line: 01932 425623). (Email: [malcolm.white@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:malcolm.white@runnymede.gov.uk)).**
- 3) Agendas and Minutes are available on a subscription basis. For details, please ring Mr B A Fleckney on 01932 425620. Agendas and Minutes for all the Council's Committees may also be viewed on [www.runnymede.gov.uk](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk).
- 4) 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.

'see overleaf'

**If you need help reading this document please contact Denise Morley on 01932 425610 who will try to provide a reading service, a large print version, or another format.**

## বাঙলা

আপনি যদি ইংরেজি পড়তে বা বলতে না পারেন, ও এই লেখাটি পড়তে যদি আপনার কোনও সাহায্য লাগে তাহলে অনুগ্রহ করে 01483 750548 নাম্বারে উইটস্ লিঙ্কলাইন (WITS Linkline)-এর সাথে যোগাযোগ করুন ও আপনার নিজের ভাষায় একটা মেসেজ রাখুন।

## 简体中文

如果您无法阅读或说英语，需要协助以明白此文件，请与和景翻译服务处之语言专线连络 01483 750548，并用您的母语留下讯息。

## Italiano

Qualora non siate in grado di leggere o di parlare l'inglese, e necessitate assistenza che vi permetta di capire il presente documento, siete pregati di contattare la WITS Linkline allo 01483 750548 e lasciare un messaggio nella vostra lingua.

## اردو

اگر آپ انگریزی زبان پڑھ اور بول نہیں سکتے ہیں اور آپ کو اس دستاویز کو سمجھنے میں دقت پیش آتی ہے؛ تو برائے مہربانی سے وٹس لنک لائن کو اس نمبر 01483 750548 پر رابطہ کریں اور اپنی زبان میں اپنا پیغام چھوڑیں۔

## Polski

Jeżeli nie potrafisz czytać lub mówić po angielsku i potrzebujesz pomocy w zrozumieniu tego dokumentu, proszę skontaktować się z Linją Telefoniczną WITS pod numerem 01483 750548, zostawiając wiadomość w języku ojczystym.

## Español

Si no puede leer o hablar inglés, y necesita ayuda para entender este documento, por favor contacte a WITS Linkline al 01483 750548 y deje un recado en su idioma.

## **LIST OF MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **PART I**

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

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
1. FIRE PRECAUTIONS	4
2. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP	4
3. MINUTES	4
4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	4
5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	4
6. REVENUE ESTIMATES 2010/11	4
7. CORPORATE PROPERTY STRATEGIC MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME	5
8. SURREY BUS REVIEW – PHASE ONE : CONSULTATION BY SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL	7
9. CONSULTATION ON CONTROLLED MOTORWAY SCHEME M25 : JUNCTIONS 7-10	10
10. REVIEW OF OFF-STREET PARKING CHARGES	11
11. NEW APPLICATION FOR STREET TRADING CONSENT – THE BROADWAY, NEW HAW	15
12. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC	22

### **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>	
13. QUEEN ELIZABETH HOUSE	23
14. FORMER COUNCIL OFFICES AND POLICE STATION AND ADJACENT COUNCIL PROPERTY	26
15. PROPERTY PORTFOLIO – PRESENTATION	29
b) <u>Confidential Information</u>	

(No reports to be considered under this heading)

1. FIRE PRECAUTIONS

The Chairman will read the Fire Precautions which set out the procedures to be followed in the event of fire and other emergency.

2. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

3. MINUTES

To confirm and sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 19 November 2009. These were included in the December 2009 Council Minute Book.

4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

5. 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.

6. REVENUE ESTIMATES FOR 2010/11 (DF)

Members are asked to consider the draft Revenue Estimates for 2010/11.

A budget is the expression in financial terms of the Council's policies over the next year and is a statement of intention against which achievement can be compared. The main objectives of budgeting are:

- Satisfaction of statutory requirements
- Determining the amount which needs to be raised from Council Tax or rents
- Assisting in the planning and policy making process
- Policy implementation and control
- A means of measurement, and
- Strategic planning

The report is attached as Appendix 'A'. This Appendix is circulated separately with the Agenda to Members of this Committee and relevant Officers only. A copy has been placed on the website for other Members and the public. The estimates are separated into the following sections:

- i) Economic Development Services Report & Estimates (Annex '1', pages 1 - 30);
- ii) Economic Development Services Fees and Charges (Annex '2' pages 31 - 34);
- iii) Highways Services Report & Estimates (Annex '3', pages 35 - 48);
- iv) Highways Services Fees and Charges (Annex '4' pages 49 - 50);
- v) Assumptions used in setting the budgets for 2010/11 (Annex '5' pages 51 - 56);
- vi) An Equalities Impact Assessment on the budget setting process (Annex '6' pages 57 - 59).

The Officers' Recommendation covers all the above service areas.

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -**

- i) the draft Revenue Estimates for 2010/11 be approved as submitted and the Corporate Management Committee be requested to make provision accordingly; and**
- ii) the proposed fees and charges for 2010/11, as set out in the Estimates (Appendix 'A'), be approved to be effective from 1 April 2010.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

Background Papers

None

7. CORPORATE PROPERTY STRATEGIC MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME (DTS)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to inform Members of progress in discussions with Spelthorne Borough Council on the possibility of partnering arrangements in relation to the planned and reactive property maintenance of corporate buildings.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 In line with the Council's policy on partnering, discussions have been taking place in relation to a possible joint partnering agreement for planned and reactive property maintenance between Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils. The basis of the discussions has been that significant savings both in economies of scale and resources can be expected by both Councils if a partnering arrangement is adopted.
- 2.2 This Committee approved the project in principle at its meeting on 6 November 2008. At that time it was reported that discussions had been under way within Spelthorne on the way they manage their responsive maintenance function and that, if both Councils reached agreement, Officers were aiming to begin the partnering arrangement with the management of reactive maintenance being taken over by Runnymede's Building Services team in the 2009/10 financial year and then the planned maintenance element in the 2010/11 financial year.
- 2.3 In 2002, the Corporate Management Committee approved a 5-year strategic maintenance programme to commence in the 2003/04 financial year and a revenue and capital budget was made available to carry out the works. Over the years a number of contractors have taken on the Contract and on 21 January 2007 the Repair and Maintenance Contract was terminated by Inspace Maintain Ltd. After consultation with Legal colleagues, a temporary contract with Crispin and Borst was set up immediately to ensure the Council had continuous cover for maintenance works. Crispin and Borst were one of the 4 original contractors invited to tender in 2002, having been short listed, following the lengthy checking procedure.

3. Report

Partnership Discussions with Spelthorne

- 3.1 At this Committee's meeting on 8 November 2008 it was reported that Officers from both Authorities have been investigating the benefits that may be available should both Councils pool their responsive and planned maintenance works. The conclusion reached is that there are benefits for both parties and they believed that combining both elements of planned and reactive works into one contract would result in a lower priced tender return due to the higher volumes of work and the greater interest from larger contractors. Unfortunately, progress has been slow in achieving this partnership.
- 3.2 Runnymede Officers have tried to move the negotiations forward but have been held up by issues within Spelthorne Borough Council. Preliminary discussions took place and Runnymede Officers provided suggestions on the way that the partnership could work.

Spelthorne Officers took the suggestions away for consideration. After a period of time Runnymede Officers contacted Spelthorne for a progress report and were told that Spelthorne was carrying out a 'full options analysis' covering their asset management. After a further period of time Officers enquired again and it was suggested that an internal staff restructuring at Spelthorne was delaying the process.

- 3.3 In November 2009 Officers were told that the decision had been made to start detailed negotiations with a view to reaching agreement between the two Councils but almost immediately we were informed that Spelthorne's Chief Executive had suggested that he would like discussion to take place between Runnymede, Spelthorne and Elmbridge on the possibility of partnering building maintenance between the three Councils.
- 3.4 Surrey County Council may also be interested in using our surveying and maintenance services for those buildings that are located within the Borough.
- 3.5 Runnymede Officers have continued to prepare for future partnering and have carried out the necessary condition surveys of all RBC corporate properties and, from the data obtained, have generated a 5 year programme of works that can be incorporated into any partnering agreement eventually entered into.
- 3.6 A further report will be presented to this Committee in due course on the process of discussions with Spelthorne, Elmbridge and SCC, as mentioned above.

#### Runnymede Corporate Property Maintenance

- 3.7 At the Economic Development Committee meeting in November 2008 it was reported that Crispin and Borst (C&B) were continuing to carry out Runnymede's corporate Property Maintenance Contract. Unfortunately, by early 2009, C&B was struggling to keep up with the accounting side of their work for Runnymede. Runnymede Officers tried to work hard with Crispin and Borst to rectify this but eventually the Contract between RBC and C&B was ended by mutual agreement in May 2009.
- 3.8 It had already been agreed by Officers and Members that only essential planned and reactive maintenance would be carried out within the 2009/10 financial year. Because of this, and due to the fact that no partnering agreement had yet been entered into, it was decided that a number of small contractors would be invited to tender for the works in small 'packages'. This work was tendered and contracts entered into in June 2009.
- 3.9 It is now likely that any partnering arrangement will not be in place until April 2011 due to the setting up of SLA agreements, generating tender documentation and the length of the OJEC process. Because of this it is recommended that the current programme of essential and planned maintenance works be extended to the 2010/11 financial year. As this is the second year that essential works only is being carried out there may be a rise in the number of reactive maintenance calls that we receive due to the reduction of normal planned maintenance works.

#### 4 Council Policy

- 4.1 The Corporate Management Committee on 27 March 2006 approved the Partnership Protocol for North West Surrey Authorities. The Committee considered and approved the endorsement of a proposed protocol to secure enhanced partnership working amongst the Boroughs of Spelthorne, Surrey Heath and Runnymede.
- 4.2 In January 2008, the Committee also considered proposals with a view to developing a new Surrey-wide Local Area Agreement (LAA) and a formal response to the Surrey Strategic Partnership (SSP) consultation exercise on emerging themes and priorities, together with draft governance arrangements for the LAA from April 2008 to 2011.

#### 5. Financial Implications

- 5.1 During 2009/10 only essential planned and reactive works have been carried out. It is intended to continue with essential works only during the 2010/11 financial year with identical reduced budgets of £177,800.00 planned and £135,000.00 reactive.

- 5.2 If lack of maintenance results in deterioration in the plant or appearance of income-producing assets such as the Leisure Centres, there is a risk that income will fall as users lose enthusiasm.
- 5.3 A further report on a 5 year strategic maintenance programme will be presented to Members once the partnering arrangements have been settled.
6. Legal Implications
- 6.1 The Council must maintain its properties in a condition to meet legislative requirements and to avoid foreseeable risk of injury to occupiers and visitors.
7. Sustainability and Equality Implications
- 7.1 If adequate planned maintenance is not carried out there is a potential that reactive maintenance costs will increase as equipment deteriorates.
- 7.2 In most of the buildings there is equipment that is installed specifically for the disabled. There is a danger that inadequate planned maintenance of this equipment will lead to more breakdowns.

**(FOR INFORMATION)**

Background Papers

None

8. SURREY BUS REVIEW – PHASE ONE : CONSULTATION BY SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL (DTS)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **To seek the views of the Committee on the Phase 1 review by Surrey County Council of the provision of bus services within the County. The Phase 1 review proposes a reduction in buses serving the Runnymede area.**
- 1.2 **Comments are requested by 31 January 2010.**
- 1.3 **This report will also be considered by the Planning Committee on 27 January 2010.**

2. Introduction

- 2.1 Following the principles of a bus network redesign process, Surrey County Council has set out proposals, as a possible way forward, for bus services in the Phase One area of Elmbridge, Reigate and Banstead, Runnymede, Spelthorne and the eastern part of Woking.
- 2.2 Surrey bus services are provided in two main ways:
- By bus operators as commercial ventures, without subsidy, contract or control from the County Council;
  - By bus operators with subsidy from Surrey County Council. These are felt necessary but are not commercially viable services. The bus companies run these under contractual arrangement to routes, frequencies and times set by Surrey County Council.
- 2.3 The consultation indicates that over the past 10 years costs in the bus industry have been rising much faster than general inflation. Many main bus services, including those in towns, have stopped being commercially viable, requiring Surrey County Council to spend much more in order to keep the network running. Many of the 250 or so bus services in Surrey require some degree of financial support. In 2001 the cost was around £4 million. Now, over £11 million net support is required each year. This amount of subsidy is continuing to rise and will soon become unaffordable over the coming years due to the budget pressures the Council are facing.

- 2.4 The bus review provides the opportunity to take a fresh look at the whole network, where people are travelling to and how often. The County wish to focus investment on the areas or travel opportunities where it is needed most.
- 2.5 For logistical reasons the County are looking at services in three phases by area. Any changes will start this September to coincide with the new school year.

- Phase 1 September 2010 – north Surrey (Elmbridge, Runnymede and Spelthorne) and the eastern side of Woking as well as Reigate and Banstead;
- Phase 2 September 2011 – Surrey Heath, western part of Woking and Tandridge;
- Phase 3 September 2012 – Epsom, Mole Valley and Waverley.

Most bus services in Guildford are run commercially, whilst the contracted services in the rural part will be dealt with at the same time as that for the Borough or District in which they also run.

### 3. Policy and Technical Considerations

#### 3.1 The review wishes to:

- focus on the areas with strong demand
- make the network work better, with routes that complement each other
- make the network simpler and easier to understand
- reduce the need for subsidy in the long term
- increase some services where needed
- maintain service to areas of greatest social need
- shorten routes to improve reliability
- reduce services which are under-used; and
- where possible, evenly space out services running along common sections of route.

#### 3.2 For Runnymede the services that are being reviewed or deleted are set out in Appendix 'B' but summarised as follows:

- Service 426 (Staines-Chertsey-St Peter's Hospital-Ottershaw-Woking) – withdrawn but see Service 446 for alternatives;
- Service 437 (Woking-Byfleet-Brooklands-Addlestone) – reduced from hourly to every two hours, but see Service 446;
- Service 446 (Staines-St Peter's Hospital-Addlestone-New Haw-Woking) – hourly service increased to every 30 minutes with possible diversion to serve Ottershaw;
- Service 451 (Kingston-Addlestone-Chertsey-Staines) – withdrawn. See Services 437, 461 and 471;
- Service 461 (Kingston-Addlestone-St Peter's Hospital-Chertsey-Staines – withdrawn between St Peter's Hospital and Staines but to run every 30 minutes (service enhancement);
- Service 471 (Kingston-Addlestone-Rowtown-New Haw-Woking) – reduced locally from hourly to every 2 hours. Option to create new route : Fordwater Road/Weir Road to access Chertsey;

- Service 557 (Addlestone-St Peter's Hospital-Heathrow) – withdrawn.
- Services 637, 305 and 837 and 646/656 serving the local secondary schools and Strodes College.

These service reductions reflect information about passenger numbers and use patterns (but not available in the Consultation Report).

#### Comment

3.3 *The three key issues are:*

- *The reduction or withdrawal of routes serving the Borough;*
- *The loss of local links to St Peter's Hospital; and*
- *The loss of school services.*

*The changes to these services is regretted but reflects the difficulties maintaining the level of services due to reduced use, increased cost and reduced funding available to support the bus network.*

3.4 *The reduction in the service available to the public and school users will inevitably give rise to an increase in car-generated journeys, particularly at peak times, giving rise to increased congestion on the local road network. The loss of local public transport services to St Peter's Hospital is of particular concern. These are contrary to the objectives of the Surrey Local Transport Plan 2006, particularly Objective 1 (Tackling Congestion) and Objective 2 (Increasing Accessibility to Key Services and Facilities). The Committee may wish to lodge an objection to the reduction in the bus service network as being contrary to the objectives of the Local Transport Plan 2006 (LTP). However, it is worthy of note that the LTP is dependent on funding being available.*

3.5 *The reduction of local bus services would also be contrary to guidance on Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 that seeks to reduce the need to travel by car and provide accessibility to jobs, retail, leisure and services.*

#### 4. Sustainability Issues

4.1 The reduction in bus service will have an impact on sustainable public transport.

#### 5. Equality Issues

5.1 The reduction in bus services will have a particularly adverse impact on those sectors of the community unable to access a car. The County review does not appear to have undertaken an Equality Impact Assessment. This will be drawn to the County Council's attention.

#### 6. Conclusion

6.1 Surrey County Council propose to reduce bus services in Runnymede (and other areas) to reflect reduced use, increased cost and reduced funding. The impact of this will be particularly noticeable on those who do not have access to a car. It will also be contrary to some of the objectives of the Surrey Local Transport Plan 2006. It is recommended that objections be made to the proposed reduction.

**OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION that the following comments, together with any other which Members may wish to make, be submitted to the Planning Committee:**

**Surrey County Council be advised that objection is raised to the reduction in the level of the bus transport network both for the impact on the local users of the services and as being contrary to the objectives 1 and 2 of the Surrey Local Transport Plan 2006 and PPG 13 for reasons set out in paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5 of this report.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

## Background Papers

None

### 9. CONSULTATION ON CONTROLLED MOTORWAY SCHEME, M25 JUNCTIONS 7 TO 10 (DTS)

#### 1. Purpose of Report

1.1 **To seek the Committee's view on a consultation from the Highways Agency on the implementation of a controlled motorway scheme between junction 7 and 10 of the M25 motorway.**

#### 2. Background Information

2.1 This is a proposed response to a consultation from the Highways Agency where comments are invited by 5 March 2010.

2.2 The proposed controlled motorway scheme involves the introduction of variable mandatory speed limits on both carriageways between junction 7 (M23/Merstham interchange) and junction 10 (A3/Wisley) of the M25. This will follow the same operating approach as the existing controlled motorway scheme operating on the M25 between junctions 10 and 16.

2.3 It will involve the provision of new gantry signals where speed limits will be displayed. As with the existing scheme, the signals will be capable of automatically displaying one of three mandatory settings, 40 mph, 50 mph, or 60 mph. The speed selected will take account of prevailing traffic conditions and is automatically calculated from sensors buried in the road surface. It will also be possible to manually set mandatory speed limit signals to show a speed below 40 mph.

2.4 As with the existing scheme, the speed shown will have a red circle around it signifying that it is mandatory and some gantries will be fitted with cameras for enforcement purposes.

2.5 During incident management, the signs and signals can be set in order to ensure the safety of road users, protect the scene of an incident and provide access to enable the emergency services to attend if required. Speed restrictions and lane availability will be indicated through the use of variable mandatory speed limits, lane divert arrow signals with flashing amber lanterns and red "X" signals, which can be displayed over any of the main carriageway lanes.

2.6 The Highway Agency suggests that the following benefits will accrue from the proposals:

- Reduction in the impact and frequency of accidents/incidents;
- Allowing faster response to incidents and reduce clear-up times;
- Reduction in congestion at recognised bottlenecks;
- Reduction in vehicle emissions;
- Achieving best use of the existing road space and;
- Provide more reliable journey times.

#### 3. Report

3.1 The controlled speed scheme currently in place between junctions 10 and 16 of the M25 has been in place for a number of years and its effectiveness has been monitored regularly by the Transport Research Laboratory, who has found it to be effective in evening-out traffic flows and making best use of road space.

3.2 As part of the argument against the implementation of 'link-roads' proposed in the early 1990's, Runnymede Borough Council proposed the introduction of variable speed limits instead, as a novel means of traffic management, following research of methods adopted in other countries. This suggestion was subsequently taken up by the Department for Transport.

- 3.3 Although these proposals are for a part of the M25 motorway outside of Runnymede's administrative area, it is likely to have a beneficial impact on traffic flows through the Borough and it is recommended that the scheme be supported.

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –**

**the Highways Agency be informed that this Council supports the introduction of variable mandatory speed limits between junctions 7 and 10 of the M25 motorway.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

Background Papers

Controlled Motorway, M25 junctions 7 to 10, Consultation Paper, Highways Agency, November 2009  
Monitoring Reports from TRL, Highways Agency website

10. REVIEW OF OFF-STREET PARKING CHARGES (DTS)

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to review car parking charges in the Council's off-street car parks.**

2. Background

- 2.1 At its meeting on 21 September 2009 the Committee considered a report on the annual review of off street car parking charges in Borough operated car parks.

- 2.2 The Committee resolved that:

- i) no changes be made to the Council's car park tariffs before April 2010; and
- ii) a further Car Parking Charge Review report be made by Officers in January 2010.

- 2.3 During the discussion at that meeting Members noted that fewer commuters were using car parks and renewing season tickets thus reflecting the current economic climate. Members agreed that whilst some positive public response to the reductions in short stay charges in the out of town car parks had been reported it was likely that any increase in these charges could lead to resentment and a reluctance to use the facilities thus resulting in reduced usage and income. This was a view clearly supported by traders.

- 2.4 In considering the level of car parking charges to be set, the Committee needed to balance the Council's stated policy of encouraging economic prosperity in the Borough, with strong, local businesses and vibrant town centres, against the need to increase income from parking.

- 2.5 The Committee decided that in view of the continuing downturn, the prudent course of action would be to keep the existing charges unchanged until a further interim review could be carried out when more data would be available to assess whether increases in charges would achieve increased income.

3. Report

- 3.1. Comparisons of ticket sales in each of the pay and display car parks have been carried out throughout the year as compared to the same period in the preceding year.

- 3.2 The report last September contained a comparison of pay and display ticket sales between April and July 2008 and the same period in 2009. This showed that there had been an increase in ticket sales in many of the short stay car parks and a significant decrease in sales in the main commuter car parks in Egham and Virginia Water.

- 3.3 The Committee delayed a decision on the levels of parking charges in September in order to monitor parking trends for a further period. Table 1 below contains a further comparison of

ticket sales between August and November 2008 and 2009. These show that the trends indicated in the September Report had continued and that ticket sales in many of the short stay car parks had increased over the previous year whilst sales in the main commuter car parks in Egham and Virginia Water had decreased.

Table 1 - Comparison of number of pay and display tickets sold August to November 2008 and 2009

Car Park	August-November 2008	August-November 2009	% Difference
Precinct	42879	45815	7%
Precinct Extension	6820	7654	12%
Waspe Farm	7849	6078	-23%
Hummer Road	31430	31175	-1%
Victoria Street	1722	2252	30%
St Judes	3197	3015	-6%
Bourne	4746	2304	-52%
Memorial	4775	4490	-6%
Beomonds	3775	3869	2%
Chertsey Library	13371	13806	3%
Pooley Green	617	847	37%
Garfield Road	10134	11750	16%

- 3.4 Despite a reduction in use of the Borough commuter car parks the Network Rail car parks at Egham and Virginia Water are still very well used, often to capacity. The all day peak rate in these car parks at £4.50 per day is 50p more than the Borough car parks. There is no evidence of any displacement from these car parks onto surrounding roads. This suggests that fewer commuters are travelling and others are prepared to pay the higher rate in the Network Rail Car Parks. However, the train operators have said that number of commuters using their trains has not reduced by a similar degree during the same period. Therefore, it's uncertain why there is such a big reduction in ticket sales at the Bourne and Waspe Farm car parks.
- 3.5 It should be noted that the figures in Table 1 are the total number of tickets sold for all of the charges so the percentage increase or decrease in tickets sold does not necessarily coincide with the percentage increase or decrease in income. Due to the timing of the cash allocation it is not possible to identify the income from August to November but it is possible to calculate the total income from April to November 2009. To demonstrate this point, during the period April to November 2009 the total number of tickets sold at the Bourne car park in Virginia Water reduced by 63% but the income only reduced by 28% over the same period.
- 3.6 The reduction in charges in the village centres and out of town car parks has seen increases in usage in Victoria Street and Pooley Green although both of these car parks are still quite lightly used. Although the reduced charges have resulted in the increased use of the car parks this has not compensated for the loss of income. For example, during the period April – November 2009 the income reduced by 28% compared to the same period in 2008, before the scale of charges was reduced.
- 3.7 The current car parking charges are shown below:

Time Period	Current Charges (Town Centres)	Current Charges (Village/Out of town)
Up to 1 Hour	£0.50	£0.20
1 to 2 Hours	£1.00	£0.50
2 to 3 Hours	£1.50	£1.00
3 to 4 Hours	£2.00	£1.50
4 to 5 Hours	£2.50	£2.00
5 to 6 Hours	£3.50	£4.00
All Day	£4.00	£4.00

### Options for Future Parking Charges

- 3.8 The reduction in use of the longer stay commuter car parks is probably unrelated to the level of the parking charges and is a result of the current financial climate. The All Day charge in Network Rail car parks is £4.50 so an increase in RBC's charge would bring it up to this level with a result that some of our current users would probably move to the Network Rail car parks as they are nearer to the stations. Therefore, it is not appropriate to raise the All Day charges at this time.
- 3.9 Alternatively, the All Day Charge could be reduced by 50p to £3.50, the charge before the increase in January 2009. However, as mentioned before, long stay parking has been reducing for reasons unrelated to the charges so a reduced charge is unlikely to attract more use. Therefore, if the usage remained at current levels, reducing the All Day charge would result in a further reduction in income of about £22,200.
- 3.10 Short stay parking continues to increase so short stay charges could be increased. If the lowest three charges were increased by 20p (to 70p for 1 hour, £1.20 for 1 to 2 hours and £1.70 for 2 to 3 hours) income would be increased by about £56,500 if the usage was unchanged. However, this could deter visitors, reducing the level of the increase and reducing custom for local businesses.
- 3.11 Due to the uncertainty of the current financial climate it would be better not to alter the charges at this time. Although down on recent years the car parks are still producing a surplus.
- 3.12 The village centre car parks are subject to a lower scale of charges that was introduced following the review of charges in September 2008. As stated in paragraph 3.6, these car parks are only lightly used so it would not be appropriate to change these charges.

### Disabled Parking

- 3.13 There is a small number of disabled parking bays in all of the car parks and Blue Disabled Badge holders can park in these bays free of charge with no time restriction. Similarly, Disabled Badge holders can also park free of charge for an unlimited time in the other parking bays. Observations have shown that a large number of Disabled Badge holders park all day.
- 3.14 Members could consider introducing charges for Disabled Badge holders. There is no information available about the number of Disabled Badge holders using the car parks but charging can only result in an increase in income.
- 3.15 This suggestion would undoubtedly be controversial and unpopular with Disabled Badge holders and groups that support the disabled. In Woking, non-resident Disabled Badge holders have to pay the normal parking charges but Borough residents with Disabled Badges can apply for a permit enabling them to park All Day free of charge. In Runnymede this option would require additional staff to administer and it is possible that the additional income from non-resident Disabled Badge holders would not cover the costs.
- 3.16 A further disadvantage to this suggestion is that Disabled Badge holders may choose to park on-street instead of in the car parks where they could still park free of charge. More on-street parking could result in increased traffic congestion in town centres.

### 4. Resource Implications

- 4.1 During the financial year 2004/05 the car parks ran at a considerable deficit of £136,000. Following the increase in charges in January 2006, part-way through the financial year, the deficit was reduced to £15,000. Over the last three financial years the service has operated at a surplus: 2006/07 in £83,000, 2007/08 in £126,000 and 2008/09 in £71,000. The budget for the current year assumes a surplus of £22,400. The reduction in 2008/09 and onwards is partially due to an increase in Capital Charges of approximately £40,000. The application of capital charges is part of normal local authority accounting procedures.

- 4.2 Of the options considered in Section 3 of this report, reducing the All Day charge at the current levels of car park usage would result in a further reduction in income of about £22,200 and increasing the lower three 'short term' charges would increase income by about £56,500 if the usage was unchanged. However, this could deter visitors, reducing the level of the increase and reducing custom for local businesses.
- 4.3 If the Committee decided to make changes to the current charges it can be inconvenient for drivers if the charge requires a combination of several coins as the pay and display machines do not give change.
- 4.4 Any changes to car park tariffs would require amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order, tariff boards and re-programming of the pay and display machines. These costs would be in the region of £3,500.
- 4.5 Provision was made for increasing income from car parking charges by £100,000 in January 2010 in both the October 2008 Financial Forecast and the October 2009 Financial Forecast. This additional income will not be achieved so the Council will need to make corresponding reductions in other budgets.

## 5. Council Policy

- 5.1 In March 2005 the Council approved a recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee following a detailed examination of initiatives as part of the revenue reductions exercise, which should be guided by the principles set out in the Statement by the then Leader of the Council, which included the following:

"Discretionary fees and charges (including car parking charges) need to, at least, reflect the cost of provision and/or comparative tariffs elsewhere."

- 5.2 The Council's Sustainable Community Strategy and Corporate Plan includes the following aims:
- to play an effective role in enhancing the quality of life for residents and providing an attractive environment for businesses and visitors.
  - A Runnymede that fosters economic prosperity, with strong, local businesses and vibrant town centres.
- 5.3 Members will wish to balance covering the costs of operating car parks with concerns about the impact on the viability and vitality of the towns and neighbourhood centres in the Borough.

## 6. Equality Impact Assessment

- 6.1 Parking Services has conducted and published an Equality Impact Assessment. Part of that assessment looked at the provision of parking facilities for disabled persons. All Borough car parks contain dedicated and marked provision for Disabled Badge holders who are also able to use the car parks without charge.
- 6.2 As part of the annual customer satisfaction survey users were asked to comment on the facilities for the disabled users of the car parks. In July 2008, 41% described them as good, 32% as acceptable and 27% as poor. In a similar survey in June 2009, 40% described them as good, 47% as acceptable and 13% as poor.

## 7. Legal Implications

- 7.1 Notice of any new charges must be given in a local newspaper and in the affected car parks at least 21 days before they are implemented.

### **OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –**

- i) due to the uncertainties about car park usage in the current financial climate the charges remain unchanged until the next Car Park Charges Review in January 2011; and**

- ii) **if recommendation i) is agreed, the £100,000 shortfall in income compared to the Financial Forecast will need to be referred to the Corporate Management Committee and added to the Council's Savings Target.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

Background Papers

Economic Development Committee September 2005  
Economic Development Committee September 2006  
Economic Development Committee September 2007  
Economic Development Committee January 2008  
Economic Development Committee June 2008  
Economic Development Committee September 2008  
Economic Development Committee September 2009

11. NEW APPLICATION FOR STREET TRADING CONSENT – THE BROADWAY, NEW HAW (DAL)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **To consider an application for a new street trading consent at The Broadway, New Haw.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 A new street trading application has been received as follows:-

Mr D Anthony (Tony) Gunewardena and Angeline Gunewardena, trading as Tony's Daily Fresh Meals, to trade at The Broadway, New Haw in home fresh steak pies, toasted cheese baguettes, salads, olive bread, pepperoni pizza, steak baguettes, German jumbo sausages, local farm burgers, dry salami, sandwiches etc for 7 days a week (if possible) from 6.00am to 11.00pm (if possible). The trader recognises that it may not be possible for him to trade for the length of time that he has requested, which is why he has requested these hours, if possible.

- 2.2 The trader proposes to trade from a standard box trailer whose dimensions are 16 feet (length), 7 feet (width) and 7 feet (height).

- 2.3 The above-mentioned road is designated as a consent street in the Woodham Ward. Traders are only permitted to operate in such a road in a specific location with the benefit of a consent issued by the Council. Trading is prohibited on all other publicly maintainable roads.

3. Report

- 3.1 The trading location is at the eastern service road adjacent to the street, from the northern boundary of the Black Prince Public House for a distance of 15 metres in a northerly direction. A plan of the location is attached at Appendix 'C'.

- 3.2 Various traders operated from this location, selling hot fast food (i.e. burgers, etc.), each day of the week from 1993 to 2002. There was only one trader operating from the location at any one time. The last trader decided not to renew his consent in 2002. The trading hours were initially from 6 p.m. to midnight, from 1993 to December 1996. This was changed to 5.30 p.m. to 11.00 p.m. from December 1996 to 2002, in view of public order difficulties at the site, which were understood to be attributable to customers of the trader and the effects such difficulties had upon local residents. When the trader was required to finish an hour earlier than previously, the number of complaints reduced and no incidents were reported which could be directly attributable to the customers of the trader. When the consent was considered by Members for renewal in March of each year, the trader continued to seek an extension until midnight, which was not granted in view of the improvement in public order resulting from the 11 p.m. finish. There were no problems reported resulting from a 5.30 p.m. rather than a 6 p.m. start.

- 3.3 At its meeting on 7 June 2007, the Committee considered an application for a new street trading consent from another trader who wished to trade in fast food (i.e. burgers, kebabs) at The Broadway, New Haw. The Committee decided to refuse this application on the grounds of the noise and nuisance which it was anticipated would result from hot food trading at this particular location, which would be detrimental to the peace and quiet enjoyment of residents in the vicinity.
- 3.4 Issues Raised By The Trader Concerning The Application
- 3.4.1 The trader has raised three issues in connection with the application. The first item he has referred to is how electricity would be provided for him to trade. He would need to provide his own generator, as confirmed by Surrey County Council West Area Transportation Service (see paragraph 3.5.8). The second issue he has referred to is how he might trade with the recycling bins in the vicinity. This report looks at this issue. The trader has also asked which way the trading unit might face – i.e. towards the street or towards the properties in the vicinity. This report also looks at this issue.
- 3.4.2 The trader has taken six photographs of the trading location and forwarded these on to Officers. Copies of these photographs are at Appendix 'D'.
- 3.5 Comments from Surrey County Council West Area Transportation Service
- 3.5.1 The comments of the Surrey County Council West Area Transportation Service relating to highways issues on this application are set out below.
- 3.5.2 The Service comment that as highlighted by Surrey Police (see paragraphs 3.8.2 to 3.8.4 below) and the Runnymede Borough Council Parking Manager (see paragraph 3.7.1 below) the trading location is currently well used as a parking area. Parking is at a premium in the Broadway and demand often exceeds availability which can result in illegal parking taking place. It is unclear exactly how much parking would be removed if the application were approved (the description of the site refers to a distance of 15m whilst the required length for trading appears to be 18 feet). However, removing any of the existing available parking may increase occurrences of illegal/dangerous parking.
- 3.5.3 Due to the high level of demand for parking, there are likely to be occasions where other vehicles are parked in the proposed site preventing access for the trader. The site cannot be reserved specifically for the use of the trader. Paragraph 3.8.3 of this report refers to this issue. It would not be acceptable for the trailer to be left at the site permanently.
- 3.5.4 In the absence of any parking restrictions on the eastern side of the service road, the existing informal parking often extends right up to the access to the pub car park. However, Surrey County Council could not condone such parking which already causes partial obstruction of visibility for vehicles exiting the car park and contravenes advice in the Highway Code. Allowing a large trailer to be parked at the location would further restrict visibility for vehicles exiting the car park.
- 3.5.5 It would not be acceptable on highway safety grounds for the unit to face the road since this would create potential conflict between vehicles and queuing customers.
- 3.5.6 Due to the presence of the recycling bins, the available footway width adjacent to the proposed trading site is reduced to approximately 1.7m. As such, there would inevitably be occasions where customers of the trader would obstruct the footway. In order to minimise any obstruction it would be necessary to relocate the recycling bins.
- 3.5.7 The total width of the service road at the proposed trading site is approximately 15 feet 9 inches (4.8m). As highlighted by Surrey Police, (see paragraphs 3.8.2 to 3.8.4 below), the available carriageway width would therefore be extremely restricted after allowing for the required 8ft trading width and could cause difficulty for the passage of larger vehicles.
- 3.5.8 The trader would have to provide his own source of electricity.

- 3.5.9 Fly tipping would be a possibility and clearance would be undertaken by Runnymede. If the presence of youths in the area did lead to broken glass on the highway, if it were an emergency (i.e. a danger to highway users), Surrey County Council would clear it up and if were not deemed to be dangerous, Runnymede would clear it up. A standard condition of previous street trading consents has been to require the trader to clean the site after every trading session.
- 3.5.10 In the light of the highway concerns highlighted above and the comments made by Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Officer, Surrey County Council West Area Transportation Service would recommend that the current application is refused. Furthermore, unless measures were taken to mitigate the highway concerns, then Surrey County Council would not agree to the trader operating from the public highway at the proposed location. Even if the highway safety concerns could be mitigated, Surrey County Council would require the seven conditions as set out below to be in place:-
- i) Any trading to take place on the footway side of the trailer for road safety reasons,
  - ii) No discharge of foul water or other substances to be permitted onto the highway or into the highway drainage system,
  - iii) The trailer would need to be removed as necessary for street cleansing and other operations on the highway,
  - iv) The trailer would have to be removed during non-trading hours,
  - v) Any canopy opening from the trailer must be 2.4 metres high,
  - vi) Any light source emitted from the trailer must be shielded and must not cause glare or discomfort to users of the highway and passers by,
  - vii) The trader must have £10 million public liability insurance.
- 3.6 Comments from Runnymede Environmental Protection (incorporates comments made by the Police and local businesses etc after consultation)
- 3.6.1 Runnymede Environmental Protection comment that the previous hot food traders at this location drew crowds of teenagers resulting in problems through noise and discord between customers of traders, local residents and pub regulars. The pub garden was used as a café when previous vendors traded here and there were regular concerns over rubbish and behaviour there, as a result of customers loitering around the van. Concerns had been expressed by the police and the Black Prince public house landlord about anti – social behaviour when young people had congregated at previous trading units at this location.
- 3.6.2 Environmental Protection comment that the siting of the unit would be directly adjacent to several recycling containers. The containers are placed here to give people the opportunity to park when they are recycling glass and other heavy materials. There would be potential for food and other waste to end up in the bins and for access to empty them being blocked. For safety reasons the trailer would not be allowed to be moved to allow access to the bins if the trader was cooking at the time the bins required emptying.
- 3.6.3 Environmental Protection comment that the trading unit would take up valuable parking space. The vehicle that would tow the trading unit may also need to be parked somewhere, which would also take up further parking space. Customers of the trader would also need to park and the pub would not allow them to use their car park and parking for local residents shopping would be further restricted. Generator noise would need to be controlled and there would need to be additional space for the generator.
- 3.6.4 As the trading unit would be 7 feet wide, Environmental Protection suggest that this would block the access to the road along the unit's length and the trailer's service counter may protrude over the pavement and restrict disabled access between the counter and the recycling bins. If the servery were facing the road they suggest that this would close the road, that pedestrian safety would be in jeopardy and that there may be the potential for grease from the cooking process to accumulate on the pavement or on parked cars. There is also the potential for passing shoppers to complain of cooking odours/grease, etc.

- 3.6.5 Environmental Protection also observe that there are no toilet facilities in the vicinity for the vendor to use and it is not anticipated that the pub would allow the trader to use their toilet. This could lead to food safety issues.
- 3.6.6 Environmental Protection consider that the trading hours requested are excessive and that if a consent were to be granted there should be restricted hours of operation.
- 3.6.7 Environmental Protection also comment that there is the potential for rubbish and food waste to accumulate and the possibility that it may end up in the recycling banks. However, one of the standard conditions of any consents which have previously been granted is for the trader to place refuse arising from trading in suitably covered containers, which are also to be removed from the site when trading ceases. However, if there were to be an increase in litter in the area, there may be increased costs incurred by Runnymede Borough Council in clearing it up.
- 3.6.8 Environmental Protection have also observed that the trading location is close to residential property, giving rise to concern about noise (especially in warmer weather) and odour nuisance.

### 3.7 Comments From The Council's Engineering Services Section

- 3.7.1 The Council's Parking Manager comments that the trading location is the service road running alongside the Broadway. The Broadway side of the service road is subject to a double yellow line restriction to prevent its obstruction. The trading location is at the Woodham end of the service road adjacent to the Black Prince Public House's car park entrance. This area is currently used by a substantial number of parked vehicles. On street parking is in continuous demand and there are frequent complaints received of pavement parking in the near proximity of the proposed location. Although this area is currently used for parking, advice in the Highway Code is that parking should not take place within 10 metres of a junction. The junction where the service road rejoins the Broadway would be directly adjacent to the trading site. It may be considered that that rule is designed to prevent visual obstruction of a junction which might not occur in this case, apart from for vehicles leaving the pub car park. Despite this the Council may wish to consider whether it is appropriate to allow a unit to trade from a location against Highway Code advice. There would be no way of reserving the location for the sole use of the trader. Paragraph 3.8.3 of this report discusses that issue.
- 3.7.2 Engineering Services have suggested that the application should be refused as traders and shoppers already consider that there is inadequate parking in the area. This was apparent in a recent public consultation which the Council has undertaken on environmental improvements to The Broadway area. The details of this scheme were reported to the Council's Corporate Management Committee meeting on 3 September 2009, where it was agreed that a full package of environmental improvements should be implemented at an estimated cost of £80,000.

### 3.8 Comments from Surrey Police

- 3.8.1 The Police Road Safety And Traffic Management Officer comments that there would be environmental concerns over noise caused by any generator used for trading and disturbance caused by people using the trading facility. Trading at this location would be a nuisance to the older people who reside in Ilex House, due to the proximity of this property, at any time of the day, but particularly after 6.00 p.m.
- 3.8.2 The Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Officer also raises road safety concerns. The required width of the trading area is given as 8 feet. The actual width of the service road is under 16 feet. This only allows approximately 7 feet of remaining carriageway width for a vehicle to pass the trailer. He does not consider this to be a sufficient width and this would certainly cause problems for any vehicle other than a private car. In addition, with the trailer being parked close to the car park exit of the Black Prince Pub, it would obstruct the sightline of drivers exiting this car park.
- 3.8.3 The Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Officer also states that as the trading site may be occupied by other vehicles this may lead to conflict between these road users and

the trader. This point has also been made by the Council's Parking Manager (see paragraph 3.7.1). If the Committee is minded to grant a consent to trade in this location, the trader would be issued with a street trading consent. This would allow the trader to trade at a specific location but would not guarantee that the trader could trade there if, for example, a parked vehicle was preventing him from doing so. The trader would have to be in the location before other vehicles, to establish his trading position. The Council would be under no obligation to enforce against other vehicles in the area, in order to allow the trader to trade. Equally, if drivers of vehicles in the area were to complain to the Council that they were unable to park in the location because of the presence of the trader, if the trader had a consent to trade in a particular location, then the Council would not be empowered to remove the trader.

- 3.8.4 The Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Officer also comments that parking in the area of The Broadway is already at a premium and the removal of 2-3 places would only make matters worse, which could lead to other unlawful parking. The trading location is also adjacent to the recycling bins and there would be problems of obstruction of the footway by other persons using the trader, as this area has already been narrowed by these bins. Concerning the way that the trading unit should face, the Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Officer points out that this service road is one way, as shown by the 'No Entry' signs situated at the southern end by the Black Prince car park. Therefore the trailer could only be towed into position from the northern direction, and unless it was a specially adapted trailer it would only be able to serve to the footway side.
- 3.8.5 The Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Officer also states that there would be a requirement for a trailer of this nature to have lights at night to conform to Regulation 24 of the Road Vehicle Lighting Regulation 1989. There may also be a requirement under this legislation for the trailer to be marked by rear marker boards.
- 3.8.6 The Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Officer considers that the application should be refused on the grounds that he has indicated above.
- 3.8.7 The police sergeant responsible for operational policing in the New Haw area comments that since 2007 he has noted that the anti-social behaviour has decreased at this location. There is a group of youths that gathers in The Broadway in the summer months who become drunk and the Police move them on to Heathervale Recreation Ground or use other enforcement powers against them. The local Police Constable has done some good community work with young people in the area in the last two years. If trading started then it would only encourage the youths to gather instead of disperse. The local police sergeant remembers that a number of years ago the Police had to deal with incidents in the area when a trader was operating and considers that allowing trading here now could have a negative impact, especially with the new development of The Broadway, as referred to at paragraph 3.7.2. If the application were to be granted, he considers that trading should cease at 9.00 p.m.
- 3.9 Comments of Runnymede Community Safety Manager
- 3.9.1 The Runnymede Community Safety Manager comments that the potential for disorder remains in this area. Historically when street trading took place at this location there were problems. Since there has been no trading the problems have virtually disappeared. A great deal of effort has been made by the Police to encourage young people to engage in activities away from The Broadway where they have caused a nuisance to many local residents, including some who were elderly. In New Haw there are currently ongoing issues with school children and other young people and he considers that nothing should be done to make any problems worse.
- 3.10 Comments from Runnymede Planning Department
- 3.10.1 The Runnymede Planning Department comment that the trailer would be sited close to the existing recycling bins and consider that there could be a conflict between customers and pedestrians/users of the recycling facilities.
- 3.10.2 The Planning Department also consider that trading for 7 days a week seems out of character with the area and suggest that Sundays and Bank Holidays might be kept free. Regarding the orientation of the unit, the Planning section suggest that there would be a public safety issue arising from customers queuing adjacent to the main highway in The

Broadway and if the unit was to face The Broadway, then it would need to be positioned to enable people to queue safely on the pavement.

### 3.11 Comments from Woodham Ward Members

3.11.1 Comments have been received from two of the Ward Members.

3.11.2 The first Ward Member strongly objects to the granting of a street trading consent for the following reasons:-

- i) There are four take away food outlets within 100 metres of the trading location.
- ii) Noise nuisance to the older people living in Ilex House, the residential flats which are adjacent to the trading site.
- iii) Litter which would result.
- iv) Public nuisance which would be likely to result.
- v) Blockage of access to recycling containers in the vicinity.

3.11.3 The first Ward Member has also commented that he does not consider that the landlord of the Black Prince Public House would support trading at the location and that trading here would be out of keeping with the package of environmental improvements to the area agreed by the Corporate Management Committee on 3 September 2009, as referred to at paragraph 3.7.2 of this report.

3.11.4 The second Ward Member states that granting this application would be inappropriate as there are a more than adequate number of food outlets in the area. This Member considers that the disruption and nuisance to residents of Ilex House, the potential increase in litter, the lack of parking and the likelihood of numbers of people congregating in the area (on the slip road) make granting this application wholly unacceptable.

3.11.5 Regarding the points made by the Ward Members about the presence of take away food outlets in the vicinity of the trading location, this Committee can only consider the suitability of trading specifically at this location in The Broadway. Commercial considerations such as the amount of trade are for the trader to assess. Concerning the points which the Ward Members have made about an increase in litter, the trader would be required to clear up litter as a standard condition of any consent.

### 3.12 Comments from the Trader

3.12.1 A copy of this report has been sent to the trader who has been invited to comment if he so wishes. Any comments received will be reported to the meeting.

## 4. Resource Implications

4.1 Street Trading consents run from 1 April to 31 March. The basic annual fee is £720 per year plus an additional annual charge of £168 for each day of the week the trader is licensed to operate. The maximum fee for a trader operating seven days a week for a year is therefore £1,896.

## 5. Council Policy

5.1 Council Policy is to give due consideration to the suitability of all applications to trade on consent streets and to prohibit trading in all streets where it will be detrimental to road safety and where evidence of detriment to public amenity exists.

## 6. Legal Implications

6.1 Schedule 4 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 gives local authorities discretion when issuing consents. Schedule 4 does not specify any particular grounds on which such decisions may, or may not, be made but while the Committee is able to refuse a consent it must do so for sound and valid reasons and has a duty to act

reasonably at all times bearing in mind the consequences to the trader. While a trader has no right of appeal under Schedule 4 he is at liberty to take other legal action if the Council is seen to act unfairly or unreasonably or has reached its decision without due consideration of all material facts.

- 6.2 Under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, the Council has a duty to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area. Clearly, if there were to be demonstrable disorder resulting from the existence of street trading, then this is a material consideration in the determination of this issue.
- 6.3 The European Convention on Human Rights secures certain fundamental human rights. The Human Rights Act 1998, which came into force on 2 October 2000, makes it unlawful for a local authority to act in a way which is incompatible with a convention right.
- 6.4 Under the Convention, an individual is entitled to fair and prompt process for determining his or her civil rights and obligations.
- 6.5 It must be remembered that local residents as well as prospective traders enjoy Convention Rights. Clearly, when considering whether or not a consent should be granted the Council should seek to balance the interests of the person seeking to trade against those of any objectors. The power to attach conditions to any consent, and to restrict hours of trading to levels which are considered to be appropriate, may enable the Council to achieve a balance between the opposing interests.

## 7. Conclusion

- 7.1 On the basis of the comments made by Surrey County Council West Area Transportation Service, Runnymede Environmental Protection, Runnymede Engineering Services, Surrey Police and Runnymede Planning Department, there are major difficulties relating to the placement of the trading unit in this location. Difficulties relating to insufficient space for vehicles to pass, parking, visibility, insufficient space to trade and recycling bins, have all been identified.
- 7.2 A potential lack of toilet facilities for the trader has also been identified.
- 7.3 Runnymede Environmental Protection, the Runnymede Community Safety Manager, and the Ward Members have referred to noise and nuisance which it is anticipated would result from hot food trading at this location. Surrey Police have also referred to the circumstances which apply to this locality and the susceptibility of this particular location to disorder.
- 7.4 Accordingly, Officers consider that the application should be refused for the reasons set out in the recommendations below.

### **OFFICERS RECOMMENDATION that -**

#### **the application be refused for the following reasons:-**

- i) no suitable location can be found for the placement of the trading unit which does not give rise to highways difficulties; and**
- ii) the noise and nuisance which it is anticipated would result from hot food trading at this particular location, which would be detrimental to the peace and quiet enjoyment of residents in the vicinity.**

### **(TO RESOLVE)**

#### Background Papers

Relevant papers on DAL file 64.26

12. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –**

**the press and public be excluded from the meeting during discussion of the following report under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the report in question would be likely to involve disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 3 of Part I of 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**

<b>a)</b>	<b><u>Exempt Information</u></b>	<b><u>Para</u></b>
13.	QUEEN ELIZABETH HOUSE, ENGLEFIELD GREEN	3
14.	FORMER COUNCIL OFFICES AND POLICE STATION SITE AND ADJACENT COUNCIL PROPERTY	3
15.	PROPERTY PORTFOLIO – PRESENTATION	3
<b>b)</b>	<b><u>Confidential Information</u></b>	
	(No reports to be considered under this heading)	