

**HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL**

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning and Development Committee  
held virtually on 08 December 2020, at 7.30 pm**

**Present** Cllrs Hannah Avery Mike George (Chairman) Martin Saunders  
James Baker Samantha Marshall Rob Spencer  
Giorgio Buttironi Simon Marshall Fiona Stimpson  
Jerry Hudson David Powell\*

**\* Absent**

**Also Present** Joan Walsh (Town Clerk)  
Judy Morgan (RFO and Planning Officer)

**P 6998 Virtual Meeting**

The Chairman opened the virtual meeting by welcoming a new Member, Cllr Hannah Avery.

***RESOLVED: that in view of the COVID-19 pandemic, the meeting of the Planning and Development Committee be held virtually.***

**P 6999 Apologies and Reasons for Absence**

***RESOLVED: that the apologies of Cllr Powell be accepted for reasons as specified in the Attendance Register.***

**P 7000 Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Non-Pecuniary Interests**

Councillor Simon Marshall declared a non-pecuniary interest in Planning Application 20/02445/TPO (8 Staffords Place, Horley) as he is a neighbour.

***RESOLVED: noted.***

**P 7001 Approval of Minutes  
Planning & Development Committee – 10 November 2020**

***RESOLVED: that the minutes of the above meeting of the Planning & Development Committee, be approved.***

**P 7002 Planning Updates**

**P 6954 Speeding Concerns - Wheatfield Way, Langshott Lane and Orchard Drive/Cross Oak Lane Junctions**

The Town Clerk reported that HTC were following up the issue with the Surrey Casualty Reduction Officer to see if anything further could be done in terms of instituting traffic calming measures at the above-mentioned locations. Once the Council had more clarity about possible follow up actions, the resident who originally raised the issue would be updated on the position.

***RESOLVED: that a further update on speeding concerns at Wheatfield Way, Langshott Lane and Orchard Drive/Cross Oak Lane junctions, be provided at the next Planning Committee Meeting.***

**P 6559 DfT Consultation: Managing Parking on Pavements**

***Resolved: it be noted that the Town Council's approved response (appended to these Minutes) had been submitted to the DfT.***

**P 7003 Determined Planning Applications**

Members reviewed the list of Planning Applications determined for the period **6 November – 3 December 2020.**

***RESOLVED: noted.***

**P 7004 Planning Applications received from Reigate & Banstead Borough Council for the period 6 November – 3 December 2020.**

***RESOLVED: that the Town Council's comments, as appended to the signed copy of the minutes and available on the Town Council and Borough Council websites, be approved.***

**P 7005 Planning Appeals, during the period 6 November – 3 December 2020.**

Members reviewed the list of Planning Appeals lodged, awaiting decision, and determined.

***RESOLVED: noted.***

**P 7006 Ongoing Planning Matters**

**NALC LTN 57 | Easements over common land and village greens**

The Town Clerk referred to the recently issued Legal Topic Note by NALC which had been circulated to all Members for information. She said that the LTN considered rights of way over common land and village greens and the relevant law. It concluded that whilst it was possible for Councils to grant an easement over a village green, whether or not an easement should be granted in any given case, would depend on the extent to which such use would injure the green. NALC's view was that it was likely that the government and the courts would not consider that minor or superficial damage to a green would prevent the grant of an easement but would expect councils to comply with the 1857 Act and the 1876 Act and refuse to grant easements where it would be necessary to do so as to prevent more serious damage being caused.

***RESOLVED: noted.***

**P 7007 [MHCLG Planning System Reform Consultation: White Paper: Planning for the future](#)**

The Town Clerk reported that the Town Council had received a copy of the response sent by the Borough Council (RBBC) which had been circulated to all Members for information and this had primarily aligned with the response that HTC had submitted. RBBC had highlighted a raft of concerns with the latest planning reform proposals in its thorough formal response. The Town Clerk

**P 7007)**

referred to the Press Release issued by RBBC on 25 November in which Cllr Richard Biggs, Executive Member for Planning Policy, commented that the borough needs more affordable homes and that councils and communities know their areas best. As such, the ability to apply local knowledge to the decision-making process must not be lost.

**RESOLVED: noted.**

### **Highways Matters**

**P 7008**

#### **Horley Pavement Audit Committee (HPAC)**

The HPAC Chair, Cllr Fiona Stimpson, reported that a remote meeting of the committee had taken place and there had been a good discussion to include the following issues:

- **Ladbroke Road** - inadequate pavement provision and the stretch by the allotments and housing nearby appears unstable, thereby often forcing pedestrians to use residents' driveways. There seemed to be sufficient space for a pavement, even outside the substation. The issue would be added to the list by the HPAC for follow up.
- **Chequers Drive** – a dropped pavement request to be put to the developer of the site had been made and the outcome was awaited.

The HPAC would continue to keep submitting comments on other areas identified as having serious pavement defects.

The Planning Chairman added that availability by SCC Highways Officers to inspect areas of concern seemed to be somewhat limited. He further explained that, on behalf of a resident, he had passed on information about flooding in Ringley Avenue after recent heavy rainfall and this had been logged online with SCC Highways by the HTC office. The resident had also contacted the local MP, however, the issue had yet to be resolved. It was thought that the drains were not effective enough to eliminate surface water completely and the camber of the road seemed to create further difficulty in this respect. The issue would continue to be monitored by HTC until a satisfactory solution had been reached.

**RESOLVED: noted.**

**P 7009**

#### **Outstanding Highways Matters**

The Town Clerk reported that there were several outstanding Highways issues which the Town Council was actively pursuing with Divisional Members, as summarised below:

- **Grass verge destruction by Langshott Primary School and Oakwood Secondary School due to inconsiderate parking:** To be followed up with a request for bollards to be installed and possibly covered through the SCC Members' Allocation Fund.
- **Drainage concerns by the A23/Victoria Road junction (near the Air Balloon Public House):** To be kept monitored to check if surface water remains after heavy rainfall.

Cllr Hudson added that blocked or damaged gullies at the A23/Victoria Road junctions appeared to be causing a lot of surface water and more

P 7009)

routine maintenance should be carried out as a preventative measure. Since the drain by the Air Balloon had been checked by SCC, it now seemed that the drain at the opposite site of the junction was causing the surface water to remain stagnant. The Planning Chairman said that the drain by the Air Balloon did not appear to retain water as it had done in the past so there was a slight improvement. Another Member commented that a new drain under the whole of the A23 in Horley was thought to be needed in order to reach a permanent solution.

- **Damaged pavement outside the post office at Consort Way, positioned on privately owned land:** HTC to continue to follow up the matter with the landowner and their contractor to ascertain when the necessary repairs would be carried out.
- **Increased traffic congestion on Bonehurst Road:** Thought to be the impact of the arrival of Amazon's distribution centre in the North Gatwick Gateway development. The need for an extensive Surrey travel plan was considered to be essential. The Planning Chairman added that SCC needs to take a much wider view of traffic management and look at the whole area. Cllr Hudson agreed, stating that SCC needed to look at the bigger picture.
- **Massetts Road – Pot Holes:** Members were of the view that the road was in a very poor state and needed urgent resurfacing. It was agreed that HTC Ward Members would inspect the area and take photographic evidence for forwarding on to SCC Highways as well as possibly submitting a petition should it become necessary. County Councillors would also be kept informed of the efforts made by HTC and their support sought for a satisfactory solution.

Members were of the view that in general the condition of many Horley roads had reached an unacceptable level with unattended areas or mere temporary patching which was not sustainable in the longer term. It was felt that the matter should be taken up with the SCC Cabinet Member for Transport, Cllr Matt Furniss, along with the provision of photographic evidence. The Planning Chairman advised that Cllr Furniss had already attended a joint meeting with Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council and Horley Town Council back in 2018 to address similar issues but many of the outcomes hoped for on the implementation of essential road repairs and maintenance had not been reached. It was agreed that HTC would remain steadfast on its aims to see the worst affected roads improved and to influence the Highways Authority on prioritising its programme of works to include these areas.

**RESOLVED: Noted.**

P 7010

**SCC Highways Bulletins**

**RESOLVED: that receipt be noted of the latest SCC Highways Bulletins (already circulated to members).**

**Airport Matters**

P 7011

**GATCOM: DfT Consultation: Stage 1 Night Flight Restrictions (Closing Date: 3 March 2021)**

**P 7011)**

The Town Clerk explained that the DfT was consulting on proposals to maintain existing night flight restrictions for designated airports (including Gatwick) from 2022, including a ban on QC4 aircraft movements between 23.30hrs and 06.00hrs. The consultation responses would be given consideration in making a final policy decision on the regime for the designated airports beyond 2022. The DfT was also seeking views and evidence on policy options of the Government's Future Night Flight Policy at the designated airports beyond 2024, including whether it should amend national protocol to include night noise policy, revising the Night Flight Dispensation Guidance and what the night flight regime should look like in the future. It was intended to publish Stage 2 of the consultation in 2022 to set out firm proposals to become effective from 2024. Further information was available on the [GAL website](#).

**RESOLVED: noted.**

**P 7012**

**GATCOM: Build Back Better and Greener at Gatwick**

The Town Clerk referred to a copy letter from the GATCOM Chairman to the Aviation Minister, Robert Courts MP where the Government's efforts in responding to the pandemic with various support packages had been duly acknowledged. The GATCOM Chairman had further highlighted the significant impact of the Coronavirus pandemic, including the crisis faced by the aviation industry and that GAL had suffered huge financial losses with unemployment in the Gatwick region becoming very high. He further put forward proposals to help enable the industry to establish a path to recovery. The Planning Chairman added that GATCOM had to balance a range of competing views on the overall impact.

**RESOLVED: noted.**

**P 7013**

**GAL Surface Access Meeting 17 November 2020**

The Planning Chairman reported that the key topic discussed at the Surface Access meeting was the introduction of forecourt charging. All airports were planning to introduce this system and the charge would be levied on vehicular pick up/drop off and applied after each visit with no actual barriers placed on the forecourt. The proposed system would use ANPR with a number of payment options provided, including post pay/credit and debit cards/pre-pay. A red route system would be implemented across the airport but restricted to roads on GAL property.

Concerns were expressed about disabled parking provision as well as the impact on local roads and bus laybys. It was reported that free access would be made available to blue badge holders although it was not yet known how this would operate. Taxis would also be subject to the £5 charge which would effectively double the fare for passengers commuting from Horley. Airport concession cars would, however, be exempt. A shuttle bus service to and from the terminals would be made available and two-hour free parking would be implemented at the long stay car park. The Planning Chairman said that it was inevitable that forecourt charging would be introduced at Gatwick like most national airports.

Cllr George further imparted the news that Uber had given up its lease of the car park at City Place, Manor Royal, Crawley. GAL was concerned that this could bring back the former issues of the company using local roads so had devoted a

**P 7013)** section of one of the car parks for Uber drivers to use. It was further planned to extend this to individual taxi firms with consideration for toilets and refreshment facilities to be given at a later stage. This was thought to be very good news for local communities and that GAL had sanctioned these arrangements despite its previous claims about having insufficient car parking capacity at the airport.

**RESOLVED: noted.**

**P 7014 GATCOM: Weekly Newsletters and Updates**

The latest Newsletters and updates had previously been circulated to Members, for information. It was noted that receipt of these remained intermittent at present.

**RESOLVED: noted.**

**P 7015 Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN)**

The Planning Chairman said that he had attended a meeting about the future of aircraft noise. Consideration was being given to banning all night flights. He felt that the economic impact of such a ban on the local economy should be carefully considered and other sources of noise would also need to be taken into account. It was thought to be important to gain an understanding of the likely impact on all airports, otherwise there would not be a level playing field in terms of competition.

**RESOLVED: noted.**

**P 7016 Recent Airport Communications**

<b>From</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Received</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Eurocontrol</b>	Five Year Forecast 2020 – 2024: European flight movements and service units	12.11.20	Noted
<b>GAL</b>	Gatwick Surface Access Meeting notes	23.11.20	Noted
<b>GATCOM</b>	Draft letter to the minister for aviation	11.11.20	Noted
<b>GATCOM</b>	“Building Back Better” – GATCOM Approach agreed at its meeting on 15 October 2020	11.11.20	Noted
<b>GATCOM</b>	Detailed member comments	20.11.20	Noted
<b>GATCOM</b>	Revised letter to the minister for aviation	20.11.20	Noted
<b>GATCOM</b>	Response to views on draft letter to the minister of aviation	23.11.20	Noted

<b>P 7016)</b>	<b>GATCOM</b>	Build Back Better Letter	02.12.20	Noted
	<b>GATCOM</b>	CAA Consultation Notification	03.12.20	Noted
	<b>GATCOM</b>	Newsletters	12.11.20	Noted
	<b>NMB</b>	Meeting invitation	06.11.20	Noted

**RESOLVED: noted.**

#### **Proposed Horley Commercial Hub**

**P 7017** The Planning Chairman reported that the proposed Horley Commercial Hub had been discussed at the recent liaison meeting with RBBC/HTC. The Borough Council Leader, Cllr Mark Brunt, suggested that an approach be made to the Coast to Capital LEP in regard to a funding application and he would be pleased to facilitate an introduction. The next steps on the proposals had been set out by the Environment Group and headline figures had been sent to RBBC's Head of Economic Prosperity. A further meeting of the Environment Group was planned for 9 December and a further update would be given at the Full Council meeting on 15 December 2020.

**RESOLVED: noted.**

#### **P 7018 RBBC: 'Delivering Change' Horley Town Centre Refurbishment Projects**

The Town Clerk reported that steady progress had been made on the town centre improvement projects. SCC had given its support and talks with local businesses on the regeneration programme and timetable were in hand. The works would initially focus on the public realm improvements at the Subway and the pay on exit facility at the Victoria Road & Central car parks were scheduled to launch in April 2021. Parking at these sites would be free after 18.00 hrs and there would be a grace period of up to 30 minutes parking, free of charge. RBBC were currently evaluating tenders for the works to be undertaken.

She added that the High Street car park development would follow at a later stage and it was hoped that an inspection of the footbridge would also take place, subject to agreement with Network Rail. The Clerk further advised that RBBC's Project Managers were running a series of focus group meetings with HTC on the 'Delivering Change' regeneration scheme which were greatly beneficial and a full briefing would be provided for all Members prior to the next Planning Meeting, on 12 January 2021, starting promptly at 6.30 pm.

**RESOLVED: noted.**

#### **P 7019 Horley Strategic Business Park - draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

The Town Clerk advised that RBBC were progressing the draft SPD and were pleased to receive much valuable input at their series of workshops with HTC and other contributors, including the Horley Chamber of Commerce. A public

**P 7019)** consultation was expected to be launched in the summer and this would be shared with HTC along with further RBBC briefings on the draft proposals. It was pleasing to note that the Borough Council's commitment to provide a Town Park remained high on its list of priorities and this would further facilitate plans to increase biodiversity in the area.

It had also been made known that trees had recently been felled on land at Meadowcoft without permission and this was subsequently widely publicised on social media. RBBC Members and Officers had visited the desecrated site along with the Forestry Commission and the Police. The Forestry Commission planned to take action against those responsible for cutting down the trees and causing such devastation which had led to much upset and anger amongst the local community. Planning Policy Officers working on the draft SPD, advised that they would include Tree Preservation Orders for the groups of trees and would be working closely with their Communications Team to demonstrate that RBBC were acting responsibly.

**RESOLVED: noted**

**P 7020 Letters Received**

<b>From</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Received</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>ERTA</b>	Newsletter 34	09.11.20	Noted
	Notes on ERTA meeting 16.10.20	09.11.20	Noted
<b>Metrobus</b>	Stakeholders	13.11.20	Noted
	Newsletter	30.11.20	Noted
<b>WSCC</b>	Statement of representations procedure	05.11.20	Noted
<b>WSCC</b>	Stakeholder letter and papers, soft sand review	09.11.20 11.11.20	Noted

**RESOLVED: noted.**

**Diary Dates**

**P 7021** **RESOLVED: noted that the next virtual meetings to be held would be Full Council on 15 December and Planning and Development on 12 January.**

**P 7022** **Items for Future Consideration**  
**Trinity Oaks Primary School, Brookfield Drive - traffic calming measures on highways.**

**RESOLVED: noted.**

**P 7023** **Press Release**  
**RESOLVED: that comments on Planning Applications be released to the press and placed on the Town Council website.**

**Meeting closed at 20.38 pm Date of next meeting: 12 January 2021**



# Pavement parking

## Introduction

Thank you for responding to our consultation 'Pavement parking: options for change', your views will assist in deciding future policy for paving parking enforcement.

Closing date is 22 November 2020.

### Confidentiality and data protection

The Department for Transport (DfT) is carrying out this consultation to decide on the future of pavement parking enforcement policy including your:

- favoured option of enforcement
- views on all enforcement options
- views on the vehicles exempted from these proposals
- views on the effect of the policies on different societal groups

and your reasons in order to gain a thorough understanding of your viewpoint.

This consultation and the processing of personal data that it entails is necessary for the exercise of our functions as a government department. If your answers contain any information that allows you to be identified, DfT will, under data protection law, be the controller for this information.

In this consultation we're asking for:

- your name and email address, in case we need to ask you follow-up questions about your responses (you do not have to give us this personal information, but if you do provide it, we will use it only for the purpose of asking follow-up questions)
- whether you are representing an organisation and if so the name of that organisation

Plus as an individual we are asking for your views towards pavement parking in your local area and the reasons, to attempt to understand how much local action affects your viewpoint.

Additionally for an organisation we will ask:

- for the organisation name, for identification of the business
- if your organisation is a commercial business with deliveries and, if so, the amount of deliveries and your view towards the 20 minute delivery exemption, since this criteria is still open to change
- if your organisation is a council and, if so, for numerous extended views on the
  - impacts
  - issues
  - costs
  - problems
  - implementationof the options plus previous parking enforcement experience at a local level to better inform our final decision

Your personal data is processed on behalf of DfT by Smartsurvey, with respect that they run the survey collection software only but will not be shared with any other third parties. [DfT's privacy policy](#) has more information about your rights in relation to your personal data, how to complain and how to contact the Data Protection Officer.

Your information will be kept securely and destroyed within 12 months after the consultation has been completed. Any information provided through the online questionnaire will be moved to our internal systems within 2 months of the consultation end date.

## Personal details

### 1. Your (for contact purposes only):

name?

email?

### 2. Are you responding as: \*

- an individual?
- on behalf of an organisation? (Go to Organisation details question 6)

## Problem

### 3. Do you think vehicles being parked on the pavement is a problem in your area? \*

- Yes
- No (Go to Proposals question 14)
- Don't know? (Go to Proposals question 14)

## What problems?

### 4. Pavement parking causes you problems because:

- you have a sight impairment?
- you have a mobility impairment?
- you use a buggy or pram to transport children?
- of another issue?

**5. Would you leave home more often if there was no pavement parking?** (Go to Proposals question 14 after answering)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know?

## Organisation details

**6. Your organisation's name is?**

Horley Town Council

**7. Is your organisation a commercial business? \***

- Yes
- No (Go to Problem question 13)

## Deliveries

**8. Does your organisation routinely make deliveries as part of its business? \***

- Yes
- No (Go to Problem question 13)

## 20 minutes parking exemptions

We are suggesting 3 options to address the problem of pavement parking, two of these options, stated as "option 2" and "option 3", if implemented would also include a business vehicle exception for deliveries.

**This exception would allow 20 minutes, in line with existing London legislation, for a delivery to be completed.**

**9. Do you agree that 20 minutes of pavement parking would be adequate for a delivery? \***

- Yes (Go to Problem question 13)
- No

## **Against 20 minutes exemption**

**10. Why not?**

**11. Of all the daily deliveries that you may make, what percentage do you think will take longer than 20 minutes each to be completed? \***

- 0% (Go to Problem question 13)
- 1 to 10%
- 11 to 20%
- 21 to 30%
- 31 to 40%
- 41 to 50%
- 51 to 60%
- 61 to 70%
- 71 to 80%
- 81 to 90%
- 91 to 100%

## **Delivery types**

**12. In your opinion, what types of delivery that you make would require greater than 20 minutes?**

## Problem

**13. Do you think vehicles being parked on the pavement is a problem in your area?**

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know?

## Proposals

We are researching ways that we can address pavement parking problems and, as part of this, are already working to simplify the process for Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs), making them less time-consuming and burdensome to implement.

TRO's can be used by a council to prohibit pavement parking locally.

We are suggesting 3 options to address the problem of pavement parking, although we are not limited to these.

### Option 1

This involves completing the simplification work on TRO's but no additional action beyond this. TRO's allow councils to restrict pavement parking and set their own conditions for exceptions to these rules.

[Option 1 is explained in more detail in the consultation document.](#)

### Option 2

In addition to option 1 we would allow councils to enforce against 'unnecessary obstruction of the pavement'. This is not a general pavement parking prohibition like option 3, but instead empowers councils to issue Penalty Charge Notices in individual instances. However, this option, would include a suggested 20-minute exception, for business vehicles, allowing them to pavement park for up to this time in order to load or unload goods when no other choice exists, in places such as narrow streets. Standard exceptions would also apply for emergency service and utility vehicles.

[Option 2 is explained in more detail in the consultation document.](#)

### Option 3

In addition to option 1 we would introduce an England-wide pavement parking prohibition. Unlike option 2 which allows for enforcement of individual instances of obstructive pavement parking, this would prohibit pavement parking nationally, while allowing councils to implement local exemptions (such as for narrow streets where pavement parking is essential to ensure

traffic flows) which would be shown by use of traffic signs and bay markings. We also propose including a 20 minute exception, for business vehicles, allowing them to pavement park up to this time in order to load or unload goods when no other choice exists, in places such as narrow streets. Standard exceptions would also apply for emergency service and utility vehicles.

**Option 3 is explained in more detail in the consultation document.**

**14. Your preferred option is: \***

- 1, simplification of TRO's but no additional action? (Go to View on options)
- 2, in addition to option 1 allow councils to enforce against 'unnecessary obstruction of the pavement'? (Go to View on options)
- 3, in addition to option 1 introducing an England-wide pavement parking prohibition? (Go to View on options)
- an alternative option?

## Another option

**15. Describe your alternative approach.**

## View on options

As part of our research we are asking for your views on options 2 and 3, irrespective of what you chose as your preferred option.

## Option 2: allow councils to enforce against 'unnecessary obstruction of the pavement'

Option 2 - in addition to option 1 we would allow councils to enforce against 'unnecessary obstruction of the pavement'. This is not a general pavement parking prohibition, but instead empowers councils to issue Penalty Charge Notices in individual instances. However, this option would include a suggested 20 minute exception, only applicable to business vehicles, allowing them to pavement park for up to this time in order to load or unload goods when no other choice exists, in places such as narrow streets. Standard exceptions would also apply for emergency service and utility vehicles.

**16. How would you define an 'unnecessary obstruction of the pavement'?**

Parking fully on the pavement when not necessary.

**17. Do you think a warning notice should be given for first time offences of causing an unnecessary obstruction by parking on the pavement?**

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know?

**18. What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages associated with this option 2?**

## Option 3: an England-wide pavement parking prohibition

Option 3 - in addition to option 1 we would introduce an England-wide pavement parking prohibition. This would prohibit pavement parking as a default position, while allowing councils to implement local exemptions (such as for narrow streets where pavement parking is essential to ensure traffic flows) which would be shown by use of traffic signs and bay markings. This option would include a suggested 20 minute exception, only applicable to business vehicles, allowing them to pavement park for up to this time in order to load or unload goods when no other choice exists, in places such as narrow streets. Standard exceptions would also apply for emergency service and utility vehicles.

**19. Do you think a national prohibition should apply: \***

- on no roads (since you are against the proposal)? (Go to Option 3: an England-wide pavement parking prohibition question 21)  
 on all public roads within the country?  
 only on roads with speed limits up to 40mph (this includes roads in villages, towns and cities)?  
 in an alternative way of your description?

## National prohibition

**20. Should a national prohibition apply to:**

- pavements only?
- pavements and verges?

## Option 3: an England-wide pavement parking prohibition

Councils would exempt certain areas, where pavement parking remains essential such as narrow terraced streets with no off-street parking availability, by use of traffic signs and bay markings.

These signs and markings would be used to indicate to motorists where they were allowed to park.

### 21. What are your views on the impact this would have on the built and historic environment?

No comment

### 22. What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of option 3:

for rural areas including villages?

for suburban areas ?

for town and city centres?

overall?

## Option 2 environmental effect

### 23. Do you believe option 2 would have an impact on the environment?

- Yes



- No (Go to Option 3 environmental effect question 25)
- Don't know? (Go to Option 3 environmental effect question 25)

## Option 2 environmental impact

24. What impact?

## Option 3 environmental effect

25. Do you believe option 3 would have an impact on the environment?

- Yes
- No (Go to Exceptions question 27)
- Don't know? (Go to Exceptions question 27)

## Option 3 environmental impact

26. What impact?

## Exceptions

For both options 2 and 3 we propose exceptions for:

- fire brigade purposes
- police purposes
- parking in accordance with a direction given by a constable
- ambulance purposes
- the provision of, or in connection with, urgent or emergency health care, by a registered medical practitioner, registered nurse or registered midwife

- the purpose of saving life or responding to another similar emergency
- the purpose of providing assistance at an accident or breakdown
- postal services (within the meaning of section 125(1) of the Postal Services Act 2000)
- delivery, collection, loading or unloading of goods to, or from any premises, in the course of business (where this cannot reasonably be carried out without the vehicle being parked on a pavement; and the vehicle is so parked for no longer than is necessary for these purposes, and in any event for no more than a continuous period of 20 minutes)
- collection of refuse by, or on behalf of, the council
- street cleansing purposes by, or on behalf of, the council
- gritting or salting or the clearance of snow by, or on behalf of, the council
- road works by, or on behalf of, the council
- road maintenance (including street furniture) by, or on behalf of, the council
- street works by, or on behalf of, the council or statutory undertakers, including utility companies
- to comply with the duty in section 170 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 to stop after an accident

For option 3, we also propose an exception for any vehicle authorised by the council to be parked in a specified place at a specified time.

**27. What, if any, other additional vehicles or services would you like to exempt and why?**

## Equality

In developing its pavement parking policy, the department will give due regard to the objective of:

- eliminating discrimination
- advancing equality of opportunity
- fostering good relations

between people who share protected characteristics of:

- age
- disability
- gender reassignment
- pregnancy or maternity
- race
- religion or belief
- sex
- sexual orientation

**28. How do you think "option 2" will affect people who share the following protected characteristics of:**

	eliminating discrimination? (Positively/Negatively /No affect/Don't know?)	advancing equality of opportunity? (Positively/Negatively /No affect/Don't know?)	fostering good relations between people? (Positively/Negatively /No affect/Don't know?)
age, in respect of:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
disability, in respect of:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
gender reassignment, in respect of:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
pregnancy or maternity, in respect of:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
race, in respect of:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
religion or belief, in respect of:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
sex, in respect of:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
sexual orientation to:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know

Where you indicated negative impact, describe your reasons why?

**29. How do you think "option 3" will affect people who share the following protected characteristics of:**

	eliminating discrimination? (Positively/Negatively /No affect/Don't know?)	advancing equality of opportunity? (Positively/Negatively /No affect/Don't know?)	fostering good relations between people? (Positively/Negatively /No affect/Don't know?)
age, in respect of:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
disability, in respect of:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
gender reassignment, in respect of:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
pregnancy or maternity, in respect of:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
race, in respect of:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
religion or belief, in respect of:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
sex, in respect of:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
sexual orientation to:	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know

Where you indicated negative impact, describe your reasons why?

## Council

The remainder of these questions, excluding the final comments section, are specifically about the impact on councils and only if responding officially on behalf of a local council should you respond.

**30. Are you representing a council? \***

- Yes, continue to council questions.
- No, go to final comments. (Go to question 54)

## Impact on councils

We are asking for your views on options 2 and 3 for pavement parking enforcement regarding:

- experiences
- staffing
- costs

**31. Has your council introduced a TRO, or TROs, to implement pavement parking restrictions? \***

- Yes (Go to Pavement parking restrictions question 33)
- No
- Don't know? (Go to Injury claims question 36)

## No pavement parking restrictions

**32. Why not?** (Go to Injury claims question 36 after answering)

## Pavement parking restrictions

**33. How many pavement parking TROs did your council issue in:**

2010?	
2011?	
2012?	
2013?	
2014?	
2015?	
2016?	
2017?	
2018?	
2019?	

**34. How long does a TRO take for you to put into place (in weeks)?**

**35. What is the average monetary cost (to the nearest £) of implementing a single TRO:**

overall?	
in administration cost?	
in legal cost?	
for advertising?	
for traffic sign or road marking creation and installation costs?	

## Injury claims

**36. What was the:**

	2019?	2018?	2017?	2016?	2015?
number of injury claims					

	2019?	2018?	2017?	2016?	2015?
made to your council in: number of injury claims made due to pavement parking in: number of injury claims for which compensation was paid in: number of injury claims made due to pavement parking for which compensation was paid in: total compensation paid for injury claims in: total compensation paid due to pavement parking in:					

## Pavement repairs

### 37. What was the:

	2019?	2018?	2017?	2016?	2015?
total spend on pavement repairs in: the percentage of this total spend due to pavement parking:					

## Option 2

Option 2 - in addition to option 1 we would allow councils to enforce against 'unnecessary obstruction of the pavement'. This is not a general pavement parking prohibition, but instead empowers councils to issue Penalty Charge Notices in individual instances. However, this option

would include a suggested 20-minute exception, only applicable to business vehicles, allowing them to pavement park for this time in order to load or unload goods when no other choice exists, such as narrow streets, plus standard exceptions for emergency service and utility vehicles.

**38. If your council has civil enforcement powers, and is permitted to enforce the offence of 'unnecessary obstruction', would your council elect to do this? \***

- Yes
- No (Go to Option 3 question 42)
- Don't know?

## Choosing to enforce option 2

**39. What number of staff, in your authority, would need to learn the new enforcement guidance?**

To enforce this offence your Civil Enforcement Officers would need to issue additional Penalty Charge Notices (PCN's). The cost of

- issuing
- processing

these PCN's is covered by the penalty income.

**40. Can you foresee any additional, unfunded costs outside of the normal costs of issuing and processing PCNs?**

- Yes
- No (Go to Option 3 question 42)
- Don't know? (Go to Option 3 question 42)

## Additional costs

**41. What are these costs (list the individual costs and the total average expenditure based on a per annum basis)?**

## Option 3

**42. In your authority area, estimate based on your total road network, on how much road pavement parking is necessary to ensure free-flowing traffic is maintained, give the amount:**

in kilometres?

as a percentage of the total road length?

**43. What do you expect an assessment of your road network, in order to identify exemptions, to cost overall and how do the costs break down individually (£)?**

**44. Would your authority need to provide more parking provision to implement option 3?**

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know?

Provide any relevant evidence to support this view.

**45. Provide an estimate of the cost of implementing exemptions in your area including:**

staff costs?

traffic signing costs?



bay marking costs?

removal of signage for previously implemented

TROs restricting pavement parking in your area?

To enforce these offences your Civil Enforcement Officers would need to issue additional Penalty Charge Notices (PCN's). The cost of

- issuing
- processing

these PCN's is covered by the penalty income.

**46. Can you foresee any additional costs beyond issuing and processing PCNs?**

- Yes
- No (Go to Benefits of option 3 question 51)
- Don't know? (Go to Benefits of option 3 question 51)

## Additional costs

**47. Give an explanation and breakdown of the number of additional:**

staff for your council?

salary costs for your council?

hiring costs for your council?

training costs for your council?

**48. What additional staff roles do you envisage?**

**49. Do you expect any other, non staff, costs to arise from a national parking prohibition?**

- Yes
- No (Go to Benefits of option 3 question 51)
- Don't know? (Go to Benefits of option 3 question 51)

## Non-staff costs

**50. What are these costs (list the individual costs and the total average expenditure based on a per annum basis)?**

## Benefits of option 3

**51. What, if any, potential benefits (including any monetary benefits) do you think there will be for your authority from a national parking prohibition (such as existing costs being reduced)?**

## Greater cycle facilities

The government is looking to local authorities to introduce more cycle facilities to encourage active travel.

**52. Do you think this will cause issues for a national pavement parking prohibition?**

- Yes
- No (Go to Final comments question 54)
- Don't know? (Go to Final comments question 54)

## Greater cycle facilities issues

**53. What issues?**

## Final comments

**54. Any other comments?**

Horley Town Council is not a highway authority and does not have any enforcement powers and has therefore chosen only to comment on the selected option.

The state of the pavements is more of a concern to residents. Many of the pavements in Horley require repair and many do not have dropped kerbs or they have dangerously steep drops. There are powers available to resolve much of the parking that causes problems but there is

insufficient enforcement.

**List of Planning Comments**  
**Registered by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council**  
**During the period 6 November – 3 December**  
**To see plans please CTRL+click on the application number to follow the link**

<b>01. RBBC Letter Dated: 11/11/20</b>	<b>Application No: <a href="#">20/02266/HHOLD</a></b>
LOCATION:	16 Williamson Road Horley Surrey RH6 9RQ
DESCRIPTION:	Erection of single storey rear extension and enclosure of front overhang to form porch
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (ratified 08/12/20)</b>	<b>No objections</b>

<b>02. RBBC Letter Dated: 12/11/20</b>	<b>Application No: <a href="#">20/02088/HHOLD</a></b>
LOCATION:	2 Middlefield Horley Surrey RH6 9XP
DESCRIPTION:	Proposed single storey, flat roof rear extension. Existing conservatory to be removed.
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (ratified 08/12/20)</b>	<b>No objections</b>

<b>03. RBBC Letter Dated: 13/11/20</b>	<b>Application No: <a href="#">20/02490/HHOLD</a></b>
LOCATION:	75 Hevers Avenue Horley Surrey RH6 8BZ
DESCRIPTION:	Single storey rear extension
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (ratified 08/12/20)</b>	<b>No objections</b>

<b>04. RBBC Letter Dated: 18/11/20</b>	<b>Application No: <a href="#">20/02184/S73</a></b>
LOCATION:	Ringwood 85 Parkhurst Road Horley Surrey RH6 8EX
DESCRIPTION:	Proposed detached bungalow. Variation of condition 1 of permission 20/00690/F amendment to approved plans, increase in depth and amendments to fenestration. As amended on 17/11/2020.
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (ratified 08/12/20)</b>	<b>No objections</b>

**List of Planning Comments**  
**Registered by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council**  
**During the period 6 November – 3 December**  
**To see plans please CTRL+click on the application number to follow the link**

<b>05. RBBC Letter Dated: 19/11/20</b>	<b>Application No: <u><a href="#">20/02294/HHOLD</a></u></b>
LOCATION:	20 Fairfield Avenue Horley Surrey RH6 7PD
DESCRIPTION:	Demolish garage on left hand side of house. Excavate and dig sufficient foundations in to comply with building regulations. Build a 2 storey extension in place of garage, but to same external dimensions as the old garage.  The walls will be a 300 mm insulated cavity construction with an external render to match the rest of the house and the roof will be extended within the same pitch to match the existing house. A new reception room with an utility area and WC will replace old garage with 2 new bedrooms above.
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (08/12/20)</b>	<b>No objections</b>

<b>06. RBBC Letter Dated: 19/11/20</b>	<b>Application No: <u><a href="#">20/01376/CU</a></u></b>
LOCATION:	Little Limes 11 Limes Avenue Horley Surrey RH6 9DH
DESCRIPTION:	An application for the repositioning of existing fence, alterations to existing porch, single storey side extension and first floor rear extension. As amended on 26/10/2020.
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (08/12/20)</b>	<b>No objections</b>

<b>07. RBBC Letter Dated: 26/11/20</b>	<b>Application No: <u><a href="#">20/02429/HHOLD</a></u></b>
LOCATION:	49 The Crescent Horley Surrey RH6 7NT
DESCRIPTION:	Ground floor and first floor roof extension to form 2 new bedrooms and bathroom on first floor.
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (08/12/20)</b>	<b>No objections</b>

**List of Planning Comments**  
**Registered by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council**  
**During the period 6 November – 3 December**  
**To see plans please CTRL+click on the application number to follow the link**

<b>08. RBBC Letter Dated: 26/11/20</b>	<b>Application No: <a href="#">20/02263/HHOLD</a></b>
LOCATION:	18 Twyner Close Langshott Horley Surrey RH6 9XW
DESCRIPTION:	Proposed garage conversion
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (08/12/20)</b>	<b>No objections</b>

<b>09. RBBC Letter Dated: n/a</b>	<b>Application No: <a href="#">20/02306/F</a></b>
LOCATION:	78 Kingsley Road Horley Surrey RH6 8AW
DESCRIPTION:	The conversion and single storey front and rear extension of an existing two-storey side extension to create a new independent dwelling.
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (08/12/20)</b>	<b>No objections, however the Town Council has concerns over the inadequate parking provision</b>

<b>10. RBBC Letter Dated: 02/12/20</b>	<b>Application No: <a href="#">20/02551/HHOLD</a></b>
LOCATION:	Cloverlea 6 Limes Avenue Horley Surrey RH6 9DH
DESCRIPTION:	Proposed single / two storey rear extension and internal alterations
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (08/12/20)</b>	<b>No objections</b>

<b>11. RBBC Letter Dated: 03/12/20</b>	<b>Application No: <a href="#">20/02514/HHOLD</a></b>
LOCATION:	9 Mallard Close Horley Surrey RH6 8QW
DESCRIPTION:	Two story side 3pprox.3n and garage conversion
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (08/12/20)</b>	<b>No objections</b>

**List of Planning Comments**  
**Registered by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council**  
**During the period 6 November – 3 December**  
**To see plans please CTRL+click on the application number to follow the link**

**Tree Works (Non-Felling)**

<b>A. RBBC Letter Dated: 11/11/20</b>	<b>Application No: <a href="#">20/02445/TPO</a></b>
LOCATION:	8 Staffords Place Horley Surrey RH6 9GY
DESCRIPTION:	Ash (T1) – crown reduce by 2 – 2.5m
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (Planning Officer delegation):</b>	<b>No objections, subject to no adverse comments from the Tree Officer.</b>

<b>B. RBBC Letter Dated: 11/11/20</b>	<b>Application No: <a href="#">20/02443/TPO</a></b>
LOCATION:	5 Raymer Walk Langshott Horley Surrey RH6 9XQ
DESCRIPTION:	1 English Oak Crown Reduction – Reducing the height and spread of the tree by up to 2 metres. All pruning cuts shall be made to suitable secondary growth points and shall maintain a stable platform for the expected regrowth Height pre works 23m post works 21m. Crown spread pre works 16m post works 14m 2 English Oak Crown Reduction – Reducing the height and spread of the tree by up to 2 metres. All pruning cuts shall be made to suitable secondary growth points and shall maintain a stable platform for the expected regrowth Height pre works 23m post works 21m Crown spread pre 8m post works 6m Works required to allow more light into garden and property and cut away from building.
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (Planning Officer delegation):</b>	<b>No objections, subject to no adverse comments from the Tree Officer.</b>

<b>C. RBBC Letter Dated: 11/11/20</b>	<b>Application No: <a href="#">20/02134/TPO</a></b>
LOCATION:	26 Cheyne Walk Horley Surrey RH6 7PF
DESCRIPTION:	T1-Oak Tree in rear garden requires upkeep. Proposed works: Reduce lateral branches by 2m and lift canopy to 5m.
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (Planning Officer delegation):</b>	<b>No objections, subject to no adverse comments from the Tree Officer.</b>



**List of Planning Comments**  
**Registered by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council**  
**During the period 6 November – 3 December**  
**To see plans please CTRL+click on the application number to follow the link**

<b>D. RBBC Letter Dated: 30/11/20</b>	<b>Application No: <a href="#">20/02583/TPO</a></b>
LOCATION:	6 Ferndown Horley Surrey RH6 8ED
DESCRIPTION:	T1 – Rear Garden – Oak Tree: Crown reduce and re-shape by approximately 2.5-3m (approximately 25-30%) and remove the dead and diseased wood. Reasons: To generate more light into the property & gardens, its a huge tree in very close proximity to houses & rear gardens causing significant shade. Current crown height is 5pprox. 22 m & spread is 5pprox. 20m.
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (Planning Officer delegation):</b>	<b>No objections, subject to no adverse comments from the Tree Officer.</b>

<b>E. RBBC Letter Dated: 30/11/20</b>	<b>Application No: <a href="#">20/02605/TPO</a></b>
LOCATION:	11 Parsons Close Horley Surrey RH6 8SE
DESCRIPTION:	Oak – Reduce the crown by 25%. This being a branch length reduction of one meter.
<b>HORLEY TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS (Planning Officer delegation):</b>	<b>No objections, subject to no adverse comments from the Tree Officer.</b>

**List of Planning Comments**  
**Registered by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council**  
**During the period 6 November – 3 December**  
**To see plans please CTRL+click on the application number to follow the link**

<b>The following applications are for information only</b>
<b>Applications validated week beginning 09 November</b>
<p><u>20/01376/CU</u> – Little Limes 11 Limes Avenue Horley Surrey RH6 9DH   An application for the repositioning of existing fence, alterations to existing porch, single storey side extension and first floor rear extension. As amended on 26/10/2020.</p> <p><u>04/02120/DET05J</u> – Horley North West Development Meath Green Lane Horley Surrey   Submission of Method of Construction Statement details pursuant to Condition 5 of permission 04/02120/OUT. Comprehensive mixed use development to comprise housing (6pprox. 1510 dwellings), neighbourhood centre, primary school, recreation and open space uses, plus associated infrastructure and access roads linking the development to A23 and A217.</p> <p><u>19/02530/DET11</u> – The Paddocks 50 Meath Green Lane Horley Surrey RH6 8HY   Submission of drainage details pursuant to condition 11 of permission 19/02530/F. Construction of one detached house with associated landscaping.</p> <p><u>04/02120/RM2D/DET18</u> – Horley North West Development Phase Two Webber Street Horley Surrey   Submission of drainage verification report details pursuant to condition 18 of permission 04/02120/RM2D. Reserved Matters Application for Phase 2 of development at North West Horley (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to 04/02120/OUT for the erection of 152no. dwellings and associated car parking, play area, levels and drainage.</p> <p><u>14/02653/NMAMD2</u> – Saxley Court 121 – 129 Victoria Road Horley Surrey RH6 7AS   Non-Material Amendment to 14/02653/S73 : Timber boarding replaced with timber effect non-combustible boarding. Smoke ventilation to stair, roof access and man safe system to roof. Stair widths increased for fire purposes. Lift overrun height increased to manufacturers details. Simplification of fenestration details and balustrading. Brick effect render replaces K Rend. Floor to floor heights increased to provide improved internal ceiling heights, roof parapet omitted. Improvements to internal apartment 1.</p>
<b>Applications validated week beginning 16 November</b>
None
<b>Applications validated week beginning 23 November</b>
<p><u>20/02617/CAN</u> – The Lawn 30 Massetts Road Horley Surrey RH6 7DF   To fell 2 Pine Trees in position along the border with the side road Ringley Avenue. Tree is now too big/tall and therefore the roots have lifted the ground and could also possibly be causing damage to house foundations. Also it is leaning forwards towards the house and noticeably sways during storms and high winds and is likely to snap and cause extensive damage to house. Both trees overshadow the lawn/grass area and so it struggles to grow. Both trees cause extensive pine needles mess and makes property and surrounding footpaths etc unsightly. I am looking to replace trees with lolly pop trees (small trees with round top) along the border in front of the hedging with feature uplighting to bring a smart look.</p> <p><u>18/00058/NMAMD1</u> – Don Ruffles 138 Victoria Road Horley Surrey RH6 7BF   Non-Material Amendment to 18/00058/F : Alteration to south-west corner near entrance (angled wall to suit boundary line), and walls around northern edge to move walls away from boundary line. Eastern bay altered to suit. Photovoltaic cells now shown on southern roof slope in accordance with approved energy report.</p>
<b>Applications validated week beginning 30 November</b>
None