

Minutes of meeting

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)

Date: Tuesday, 24 January 2006

Time: 4.30pm

Place: The Barn, Riverhouse Barn, Manor Road, Walton

Members present:

Surrey County Council

Mr Michael Bennison (Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott)

Mrs Margaret Hicks (Hersham)

Mr Ian Lake (Weybridge)

Mr Ernest Mallett (West Molesey)

Mrs Dorothy Mitchell (Cobham) – In the Chair

Mr Timothy Oliver (East Molesey & Esher)

Mr Thomas Phelps-Penry (Walton)

Mr Roy Taylor (Walton South & Oatlands)

Elmbridge Borough Council (for transportation matters)

Mr Gordon Chubb (Walton Central)

Mrs Rosemary Dane (Walton South)

Mr Glenn Dearlove (Weybridge South)

Mr Derek Denyer (Hersham South)

Mr Roy Green (Hersham North)

Mr Alan Hopkins (Molesey North)

Mr Torquil Stewart (Long Ditton)

Mrs Janet Turner (Hinchley Wood)

Also present:

Howard Jones, Youth Development Service

Linda Melham, Youth Development Service

Chris Paisley, Local Transportation Manager

Theresa Ricketts, Local Committee and Partnership Officer

Chris White, Area Director, North Surrey

Sean Wotherspoon, Local Transportation Team

All references to items refer to the agenda for the meeting.

PART A: County and Borough Members

IN PUBLIC

1/06 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTICES OF SUBSTITUTIONS (Item 1)

Apologies for absence had been received from County Councillor Peter Hickman.

2/06 MINUTES OF LAST MEETING (Item 2)

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of Surrey County Council's Local Committee (Elmbridge Area) held on 14 November 2005 be approved and signed as a correct record.

3/06 PETITIONS (Item 4)

Mr William Durston addressed the Committee on behalf of the Long Ditton Residents' Association (with additional signatures from Lower Sand Hills residents) concerning the implications of changed parking arrangements in Surbiton.

Mr Ian Nelson addressed the Committee concerning the installation of a puffin crossing in Stoke Road

RESOLVED

1. That the petitions be noted.
2. That the implications of changed parking arrangements in Surbiton be further considered under agenda item 11.

4/06 PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION (Item 5)

Questions had been submitted by Mrs Whitefield. Copies of the questions and responses were before the Committee and are appended to these minutes in Appendix A.

Mrs Whitefield addressed the Committee, expressing particular concerns about the signage.

RESOLVED

That the questions and responses be noted.

5/06 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (Item 6)

Questions had been submitted by Councillors Green and Stewart in accordance with Standing Order 46. Copies of the questions and

responses were before the Committee and are appended to these minutes in Appendix B.

On the issue of Hersham Library, Mrs Mitchell advised the Committee that recommendations under the Business Delivery Review being conducted by Surrey County Council were not yet finalised. She informed Members that Mrs Hicks would be attending a meeting on this specific issue on 25th January.

RESOLVED

That the questions and responses be noted.

6/06 LOCAL COMMITTEE DATES FOR 2006/07 (Item 7)

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee Meetings for the 2006/07 Municipal Year be held on 13 June and 6 November in 2006 and 26 March in 2007.

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS

PART B: County Members

7/06 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SERVICE ANNUAL REPORT (Item 8)

Howard Jones thanked the Committee for the opportunity to report on the work undertaken by the Youth Development Service over the past year. He highlighted in particular that the Youth Development Service is continually working in partnership with a wide range of other agencies, including Surrey Police, Elmbridge Borough Council, Healthcare Trusts and Connexions in order to deliver the best possible service to young people. He also thanked Members for their continued support, not least in providing funding for specific projects.

Mrs Hicks congratulated Mr Jones on such a full report, and asked whether the Youth Development Service would be looking to further enhance the relationship with Hersham Youth Club. Mr Jones explained that staffing had been increased from three to four evenings per week this year.

Mr Bennison echoed the complements on the contents of the report, and requested some discussion with the Youth Development Service regarding Claygate Youth Club.

Mr Green emphasised the importance of maintaining services for vulnerable young people.

RESOLVED

That the contents of the report be noted.

8/06 **PROPOSALS FOR EXPENDITURE OF LOCAL REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET (Item 9)**

RESOLVED

That the six proposals for expenditure from the Local Revenue Budget be agreed as follows:

1. Mike Bennison to contribute £500 towards restoration of the war memorial at Polyapes Scout camp site
2. Mike Bennison to contribute £1,000 towards installation of a permanent vehicle actuated sign on the D6827 Oaken Lane, Claygate.
3. Peter Hickman to contribute £3,250 towards the upgrading the public footway between Ash Path and Mercer Close.
4. Mike Bennison to contribute £2,560 towards upgrading the private footway in Manor Road North, Hinchley Wood.
5. Roy Taylor to contribute £8,000 towards the purchase of a second hand transit van.
6. Ian Lake to contribute £13,400 towards junction improvement at Bridge Road/Church Street, Weybridge.

9/06 **WALTON BRIDGE MEMBERS TASK GROUP (Item 10)**

RESOLVED

That Ian Lake and Roy Taylor be appointed to join the Walton Bridge Members' Task Group.

10/06 **LONG DITTON PARKING PROPOSALS (Item 11)**

Sean Wotherspoon outlined the effects of the controlled parking zone in the Royal Borough of Kingston, highlighting the results of surveys carried out to provide baseline data, and seeking agreement to the proposals set out in the report.

Mrs Mitchell read a statement she had received from Mr Hickman, agreeing with the proposals which he believed met residents' requirements.

(Mrs Hicks left the meeting)

During discussion, a number of Members raised concerns about the length of time it might take to implement proposals. Mr Lake moved an amendment to the original recommendation 3, empowering the Chairman to approve action, in consultation with the DPE group and Divisional Member, returning to the Committee only in the event of substantial concerns. The amendment was seconded, and a vote taken.

RESOLVED

1. That the work undertaken in assessing the effects of The Royal Borough of Kingston Controlled Parking Zone be noted.

2. That a consultation be undertaken by the NE Area Office (Elmbridge) by means of a letter drop and questionnaire, to determine the views of local residents.
3. That a further report be prepared, highlighting the views of residents, and proposing the progression of an identified scheme, and the Chairman be empowered to approve such action, in consultation with the DPE group and Divisional Member, returning to the Local Committee only in the event of substantial concerns;
4. That the proposed method of funding the proposals detailed in paragraph 3.1 be approved.

11/06 **HURST ROAD, EAST MOLESEY – REPORT BACK ON PETITION (Item 12)**

Chris Paisley updated the Committee on work undertaken since Mrs Collins presented a petition at the last meeting. The report highlighted a number of maintenance issues which will be undertaken. Mr Paisley mentioned that Mr Mallett had raised concerns about an obstruction caused by an adjacent property, which will be investigated. He advised the Committee that the Safe Routes to School Officer had also been in discussion with a representative from Island Barn Aggregates regarding the possible funding of the removal of an obstructive stack pipe. Mr Paisley confirmed that investigations and discussions would continue.

Mr Oliver supported the proposals, but raised general concerns about traffic speeds on all arterial routes. He suggested that all such routes should be reviewed and prioritised for safety signs. Mr Paisley noted his comments and confirmed that the effectiveness of these proposed additional measures would be monitored before and after their implementation.

RESOLVED

1. That the work undertaken in assessing the length of the Hurst Road since the presentation of the petition be noted;
2. That the additional work proposed in paragraph 2.12 be approved;
3. That the funding for the work proposed in paragraph 3.1 be approved.

(Mr Chubb left the meeting)

12/06 **WEYBRIDGE 20MPH ZONE (Item 13)**

Chris Paisley explained that the original proposal for a 20mph zone in Weybridge was presented to the Local Committee in March 2005. The area was subsequently advertised, and objections were received from Surrey Police, two local residents and one local school.

Mr Paisley advised the Committee that, in his view, the key role of the A317 High Street was as a local distributor, and the Surrey County Council Appropriate Speed Criteria indicates that a 30 mph speed limit is the appropriate speed limit.

Mr Lake moved an amendment to the recommendations, which was seconded. He requested an additional recommendation, amending the proposed 20mph zone to that originally proposed in March 2005.

Mr Paisley emphasised that the additional area, included in the original proposals, but outside the scope proposed in his report, in his opinion falls outside the Surrey criteria for a 20mph zone. A vote was taken.

RESOLVED

1. That the results of the statutory consultation be noted, and the final 20mph zone be amended to consist of the original traffic calmed area together with Wey Road and Round Oak Road;
2. That a traffic management scheme be included to provide improved turning facilities at the High Street junction with Elm Grove Road, to be funded from the Local Capital Allocation for 2006/07;
3. That the 20mph zone be further amended to that originally proposed in item 22 of the meeting of Surrey County Council Local Committee (Elmbridge) on 24 March 2005.

The meeting closed at 5.55pm

.....(Chairman)

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)
24 JANUARY 2006**

The following questions have been received from a member of the public. The questions and responses are set out below.

**1 Junction improvement at Bridge Road/Church Street, Weybridge
(Mrs M. R. Whitefield)**

- i) Has the budget for the improvements to the existing road signing (highway furniture) been included in the total cost of the project?

Officer Response: The Weybridge CAAC is thanked for welcoming the improvements planned at the junction of Bridge Road and Church Street, Weybridge. The changes planned to the existing road signing have been included within the overall budget for the scheme.

- ii) Will measure be taken to safeguard the considerable amount of original granite kerbing and replace?

Officer Response: The existing granite kerbing will be taken up and re-laid where possible. The construction of the new central crossing island will use a "conservation" kerb.

- iii) Will the siting of the new signage respect the siting of the adjacent listed buildings?

Officer Response: I can confirm that any changes to sign location will respect the siting of the adjacent hotel buildings while still adhering safety requirements.

- iv) Have the SCC Highways Department consulted the SCC Heritage/Conservation Officer?

Officer Response: The scheme has been the subject of consultation with Elmbridge Borough Council's Principal Landscape and Heritage Officer, Clare

Smith.

- v) Will any replacement road surfaces/treatments highway furniture conform with the standard within a conservation area?

Officer Response: The schemes use of materials will reflect the fact that the site is in a conservation area and will be either identical or sympathetic with those already in use in the area.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)
24 JANUARY 2006

The following questions have been received from members in accordance with Standing Order 46. The questions, together with responses, are set out below.

1. Hersham Road, Hersham - Parking (Roy Green, Hersham North)

Would the county council consider "resident only" parking on Hersham Road, Hersham between the railway bridge and Audley Firs (both sides) and between Rydens Grove and Molesey Road (both sides) to alleviate the problems caused by car dealerships at both the Halfway and 218-200 Hersham Road. Residents are constantly having problems with staff cars parked outside all day (including weekends) and find it impossible to gain access to their premises?

Officer Response:

The introduction of Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE) commenced on 9th January 2006. There will now need to be a settling down period, which based on the experiences of other surrey Areas that have already gone "live", should be between 6-9 months.

Officers have already received request for the extension, reduction, implementation or removal of waiting and parking restrictions from across the area. These are being put on an assessment list and will be prioritised for investigation and development by the Members DPE Task Group.

It is anticipated that amendments to the DP Orders in future will take place one or two times a year. This will encompass the introduction of new restrictions and amendments to existing ones.

- **Resident Parking on Hersham Road, between the railway bridge and Audley Firs**

The length of road highlighted is just over 200m, and consists of a bus lay-by and single yellow line (08:00 - 18:00hrs Mon - Sat), by Felcott Road. The next section is a Puffin crossing and the road is controlled by zig-

zags. The remaining section is approximately 80m in length, fronting semi-detached properties with off-street parking.

The objective of the proposals would have to be clear. Resident parking would come under a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). Due to the number of driveways in the remaining section, bays would be limited. Furthermore, it is unlikely that the residents would be parking on the road, and therefore unlikely that they would purchase permits.

It may therefore be that detailed investigation may suggest that to address the problems caused by staff parking from local business that a waiting restriction could be more appropriate.

It would also be necessary to consider displacement, which may affect surrounding roads, which would have to be considered. This request has been added to the assessment list of schemes.

- **Resident Parking on Hersham Road, between Rydens Grove and Molesey Road**

This length of road is approximately 200m and consists of terraced residential properties with a Garage (car dealer) in the middle. It would be unlikely that this short length of Hersham Road would be considered suitable as CPZ in isolation.

Similar demands for on-street parking are likely in Rydens Grove, Albany Road and Molesey Road. If considered as an area, majority support would be required, with significantly less parking being available in a CPZ scheme.

Resident only parking would not automatically allow visitors. Resident permits would be available at a cost, as would visitor permits (if included). Other road users would have to be considered, possibly allowing bays for non resident permit holders at some times. Significant cost and time implications are involved in CPZ's, therefore strong support would be required initially. This request has been added to the assessment list of schemes.

It should be noted that a major problem with CPZ's in areas of narrow terraced properties is that most properties have two cars, and the available highway frontage of the property is generally the width of only one car. After taking into account junctions, bends, driveways etc, there are fewer bays than properties. There are therefore more cars than properties and more properties than spaces, and if the majority of properties purchase two permits, vehicles with permits are unable to park. In many cases, the existing uncontrolled road "squeezes in" a higher number of vehicles and is more favoured by residents.

2. **Junction Molesey Road and Thrupps Lane, Hersham (Roy Green, Hersham North)**

Would the county council consider a double yellow line around the triangle at this junction where cars parking is causing a problem for residents trying to gain access to Molesey Road?

Officer Response:

The request for the introduction of waiting restrictions at the above location has been added to our assessment list, and if prioritised, can be included in a future amendment of the DPE Orders.

3. Hersham Library, Molesey Road, Hersham (Roy Green, Hersham North)

Could the county confirm that the officers have plans to close Hersham library?

Officer Response:

The County Council is consulting on the closure of six libraries, including Hersham. The rationale for this proposal is that the service requires investment in order to improve, and reducing the number of libraries allows that investment to take place. The attached document (appendix A) describes this in more detail.

4. Hersham Library, Molesey Road, Hersham (Roy Green, Hersham North)

Why was council tax payers (including two Hersham Elmbridge Councillors) banned from standing in front of the Library (on Library Car Park) on Saturday 14th January, 2006 to have their photograph taken by the local press in protest at the proposed closure?

Officer Response:

Library staff have been advised that it would be inappropriate for them to become involved in lobbying or campaigning activities, or for library premises to be used for demonstrations. On Saturday 14 January the library manager requested that a group of people with banners protesting about cuts in library services should move from the car park, where they could cause an obstruction, to the grass verge.

5. Hersham Library, Molesey Road, Hersham (Roy Green, Hersham North)

Would the Elmbridge Local Committee join the people of Hersham in making the strongest possible protest at the proposal to close Hersham library?

Officer Response:

Individual members of the County Council will argue the case and vote as think appropriate. The officers of the Council request that the Committee considers the case for investment in the library service, and the source of funding for that service.

6. Long Ditton Parking Proposals (Torquil Stewart, Long Ditton)

Para 1.3 of Item 11 states "...a number of parking surveys were undertaken.... Results of these... indicated that there had **not been an increase** in the number of vehicles parking on the public highway within the area".

This is palpably not the case a year after those surveys were taken.

The problem is increasingly difficult in Prospect Road, whilst Windmill Lane now has parking right up to the pavilion area and I find I am receiving increasing complaints from residents as far down as the Southbank and Ferry Road areas.

In considering the unneighbourly escalation of these parking problems, what are the officers' intentions with regard to a remedy for residents in *this* part of Long Ditton?

Officer Response:

Paragraph 1.3 of Item 11 refers to the parking surveys undertaken before and after the A309 Portsmouth Road Cycle Scheme (during 2004). The baseline data was obtained in June'04, the scheme was introduced in August'04 and the "after" data was taken in November'04. Details are listed below.

Total parking within the survey area

SURVEY TIME	JUNE'04	NOVEMBER'04	DIFFERENCE (+/-)
Thursday Afternoon	343	289	-54
Saturday Morning	286	254	-32
Sunday Morning (Portsmouth Road only)	21	10	-11
Monday Morning	359	292	-67
Wednesday Evening	258	266	+8

Taking these figures into account, in the area as a whole there was a decrease between June'04 and Nov'04.

In relation to the specific roads mentioned in the question, Ferry Road was not included in the surveys. The results of the parking surveys undertaken to date in Prospect Road, Windmill Lane and Southbank are presented below.

Monday Morning

ROAD	JUN'04	NOV'04	JAN'05	MAR'05	NOV'05
PROSPECT ROAD	40	36	38	32	35
WINDMILL LANE	48	43	48	43	44
WINDMILL LANE (PRIVATE)	11	13	12	20	9
SOUTHBANK	17	17	19	19	20

Thursday Afternoon

ROAD	JUN'04	NOV'04	JAN'05	MAR'05	NOV'05
PROSPECT ROAD	37	32	30	33	40
WINDMILL LANE	44	46	42	38	45
WINDMILL LANE (PRIVATE)	10	7	18	16	10
SOUTHBANK	17	21	17	17	17

Wednesday Evening

ROAD	JUN'04	NOV'04	JAN'05	MAR'05	NOV'05
PROSPECT ROAD	27	34	24	31	37
WINDMILL LANE	22	22	25	30	30
WINDMILL LANE (PRIVATE)	1	1	1	0	2
SOUTHBANK	28	26	31	35	38

Saturday Morning

ROAD	JUN'04	NOV'04	JAN'05	MAR'05	NOV'05
PROSPECT ROAD	33	30	34	32	32
WINDMILL LANE	25	21	36	30	28
WINDMILL LANE (PRIVATE)	0	1	0	0	0
SOUTHBANK	31	28	27	28	30

From the details above, it can be seen that apart from some time and seasonal variations, there are no significant changes in parking patterns. In the roads where parking is not restricted, vehicles are parked in general to capacity (which would not be achievable within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)). Due to the cost and time implications in introducing CPZ's, strong support from local residents would have to be evident.

There seems to be three main options that are available:

- "Do-nothing" - unrestricted roads can be parked by those currently parking there. No priority given to anyone.
- Waiting restrictions (yellow lines) - a combination of double yellow lines (where it is not suitable to park) and single yellow lines (parking allowed outside restricted times). This could cover a few hours or the working day. However, during operational times no-one can park.
- Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) - Should cover an area, not just a road. Needs majority support of local residents and should be self-financing. The entire area must be covered by either a parking bay or waiting restriction. Bays can allow for "residents only" within certain times. Resident permits would be available at a cost. Generally the number of marked parking bays available would be significantly less than currently available.

The request for consideration of the parking problems in the roads mentioned is noted and has been added to the assessment list that is being compiled and will be prioritised for investigation and development by the Members DPE Task Group.

It is anticipated that amendments to the DPE Orders in future will take place one or two times a year. This will encompass the introduction of new restrictions and amendments to existing ones.

Appendix to Member Questions

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL'S REVIEW TO CUT COSTS AND IMPROVE SERVICES

Surrey County Council's Executive has give the go ahead to start formal consultation on the biggest ever review (Business Delivery Review) of how the council delivers services to the residents of Surrey. The county council is determined to improve services further and protect council tax payers. The review aims to sharpen the council's responsiveness to the changing needs of its residents, while achieving even better value for money.

The proposals for the new organisation includes - Reducing the number of buildings used by the council so that the money can be invested in services. The closure of 6 libraries is part of this recommendation.

Questions and Answers

1. You claim that the review is based around the user and local services – so why cut libraries, youth services etc?

The review proposals are focused on improving services across the county as a whole. To achieve this the review looks at each service individually and the investment required to improve access, levels of service and resources to provide this service. This means that in some instances the council needs to reduce the number of buildings it uses so that the money can be invested in providing services in a variety of ways to suit the needs of different users.

2. The libraries identified are very popular in their communities and offer an excellent standard of service. On what basis did the Business Delivery Review team select these libraries for closure?

The library service as a whole is highly valued by people, and the recommendations were based on the need to secure the necessary investment to improve libraries, for example by increasing the book stock, making more computers available and extending opening hours. In addition, the council refurbished two libraries last year and six this year, but the ongoing improvement programme requires further substantial investment that can only be released by reducing the overall number of buildings.

The review team deliberately avoided choosing libraries on the basis of visitor numbers alone, since this might disadvantage rural communities with sparser populations. Instead it looked at the location of libraries with overlapping catchment areas so that in a situation where the nearest facility closes then a community is still relatively close to another library. The council is also investigating providing alternatives for people in certain areas.

3. How does this apply to the six libraries earmarked for closure?

Bagshot – Major investment in neighbouring Camberley library will benefit the Bagshot area.

Virginia Water – A similar case applies to Virginia Water, where there may also be scope to provide alternative provision.

Caterham Hill – The presence of the nearby Caterham Valley library, which will benefit from the investment programme, means the community will retain a significant library facility.

Ewell Court – The area continues to be well served by other libraries, including Bourne Hall in Ewell, Stoneleigh and, of course, the flagship library at the Ebbisham Centre in Epsom town centre.

Hersham – Negotiations for a large new library in Walton are nearing completion, which will provide the area with a major modern facility, supplemented by mobile and/or mini-library provision.

New Haw – Again the area is well served by other libraries, including Addlestone and Byfleet.

4. What sort of alternatives could be offered to communities?

This is still work in progress but could include a range of solutions depending on what works best in a particular community. There are a number of options, such as mobile libraries, using schools and other community facilities, such as leisure centres, and installing mini-libraries in local post offices, for example. A mini-library might involve a small stock of books permanently on the premises, with a library computer terminal so that people could look at the Surrey library catalogue online and reserve their books, which could then be delivered to the mini-library.

5. What will happen to the staff?

The review's aim is to improve the library service. Some libraries are being closed to free-up investment to achieve that, but this is in no way a reflection on the calibre of staff or the quality of service they provide. We think the proposals are going to be largely neutral in terms of the overall impact on the number of library staff, currently around 600. No one wants to see compulsory redundancies and in the vast majority of cases we expect to be able to offer redeployment because we'll need people to provide the extended opening hours across the rest of the network. But it's possible, of course, that redeployment won't appeal to everyone. That's something we will manage as people consider any alternatives nearer the time.

6. Consultation with local people has so far shown no support for cutting the number of libraries, which are the hubs of their communities. The Council tried to do it some years ago but then dropped the idea. How is this any different?

Libraries do play an important role in their communities, despite the fact that library usage in Surrey has declined by nearly a fifth (18%) over the last five years. High profile booksellers such as Borders and Waterstones have cut into the market, as have online suppliers like Amazon. And people are increasingly turning to the internet for research and information. To compete for their attention we have to make our libraries better, with more books, more computers and longer opening hours, one of the key criteria on which our library service is judged. The council believes it is better to re-direct investment into making those improvements across the library service rather than spending money on

maintaining small libraries with limited opening hours that are more expensive to run and often don't meet people's needs.

What happens next?

If you wish to express your views please write, or fill in a comment form and send it to the Head of Libraries, or you may wish to contact your local county councillor if you are concerned about local services.

Timescale

- **11 April** – Executive meeting considers the overall outcome of the consultation and engagement process
- **18 April** – special meeting of Council to consider final decision on the recommendations of the Executive.

Chris Norris
Head of Libraries
Community Services
Room 176
County Hall
Kingston upon Thames
KT1 2DJ