

**Minutes of the meeting of Surrey County Council's
Local Committee in Elmbridge held at
4.00pm on Monday 27 July 2009 at
Elmbridge Civic Centre, Esher**

Members Present – Surrey County Council

Mr Michael Bennison (Vice Chairman)	Mr Ian Lake
Mr John Butcher	Mr Ernest Mallett
Mr Nigel Cooper	Mr Tom Phelps-Penry
Mr Peter Hickman	Mr Roy Taylor
Mrs Margaret Hicks (Chairman)	

Members Present – Elmbridge Borough Council

Cllr David Archer	Cllr Chris Elmer
Cllr Barry Fairbank	Cllr Timothy Grey
Cllr Alan Hopkins	Cllr John O'Reilly
Cllr Karen Randolph	Cllr Chris Sadler
Cllr David Tipping	

PART ONE

IN PUBLIC

01/ APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN

09

The appointment of Mrs Margaret Hicks and Mr Michael Bennison as Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the 2009/10 municipal year was noted.

02/ APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

09

There were no apologies for absence.

03/ MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

09

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2009, were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

04/ DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

09

There were no declarations of interest received.

**05/
09** **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman announced that the first Member Postbag session had received positive feedback. It was confirmed that the second session would be held on 7 August 2009.

**06/
09** **APPOINTMENT OF ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL CO-OPTED MEMBERS**

The appointment of the nine Elmbridge Borough Councillors and six Elmbridge Borough Council substitutes to the Surrey County Council Local Committee (Elmbridge) was noted as follows:

Members of the Committee:

Cllr David Archer	Cllr Chris Elmer
Cllr Barry Fairbank	Cllr Timothy Grey
Cllr Alan Hopkins	Cllr John O'Reilly
Cllr Karen Randolph	Cllr Chris Sadler
Cllr David Tipping	

Substitute Members of the Committee:

Cllr John Bartlett	Cllr Elizabeth Cooper
Cllr Michael Courtney	Cllr Ruth Lyon
Cllr John Sheldon	Cllr Ben White

**07/
09** **PETITIONS**

There were three Letters of Representation submitted as follows:

Oaken Lane, Claygate

A letter of representation on Oaken Lane, Claygate was submitted with 34 signatories. An online petition on this issue was also carried out and collected 111 responses in support.

"The speed of traffic on Oaken Lane is dangerous and causes a threat to public safety. It dissuades residents from using the footpaths, children walking to school, village hall, church and accessing local shops. Crossing the road is dangerous and there is no crossing point. Paving is inadequate either too narrow for a pram/scooter/wheelchair or non-existent forcing a pedestrian to cross. Something can be done and needs to be done soon. Claygate is a village, a community, not a through road from the A3 to Kingston and Esher".

The lead representative gave a presentation and spoke for three minutes.

The Local Highways Manager provided the following response:

A formal report on this issue will be presented to the Local Committee meeting on 7 December 2009. The delay in presenting this report is due to the August summer period. The matter needs to be fully investigated and any traffic surveys conducted in this period would distort the results.

Terrace Road, Rivernook Close and Sunny Side

A letter of representation on Terrace Road, Rivernook Close and Sunny Side was submitted with 58 signatories.

“For some time I have been concerned that Terrace Road, from Waterside Drive roundabout to the junction with Walton and Hurst Roads, only merits a 40 mph limit, despite having houses all the length of it, and carrying a considerable volume of traffic. I want the County Council to reduce it to 30mph”.

The letter of representation was submitted by County Councillor Mr Phelps-Penry who spoke on the letter for three minutes. Mr Phelps-Penry acknowledged that the submission of the letter and presentation on the matter at the Local Committee had predetermined his position on the matter.

The Local Highways Manager responded as follow:

A formal report on this issue will be presented to the Local Committee meeting on 7 December 2009. The delay in presenting this report is due to the August summer period. The matter needs to be fully investigated and any traffic surveys conducted in this period would distort the results.

West Grove, Walton-on-Thames

A letter of representation on West Grove, Walton-on-Thames was submitted with 2 signatories. This letter was submitted on behalf of 21 households.

“The matter we wish the Council to consider is the problem of congested commuter street parking with the dangerous side effect of poor sight lines and manoeuvrability in West Grove, Walton-on-Thames”.

The lead representative spoke for three minutes.

The Chairman responded that a report would be presented on the matter to the Local Committee meeting on 21 September 2009. It was also noted that West Grove was in Hersham and not Walton-on-Thames.

**08/
09 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

There were six public questions received as set out in Annex A with the answers.

Supplementary questions were asked on public questions two, four, five and six.

**09/
09 MEMBER QUESTIONS**

There were three Member questions received as set out in Annex A with the answers.

Supplementary questions were asked on Member questions one, two and three.

**10/
09 CYCLING IN ELMBRIDGE
LETTER OF REPRESENTATION**

The report was presented to the Local Committee following the submission of a letter of representation on cycling in Elmbridge to the Local Committee meeting in March 2009.

The Local Highways Manager presented the report and the Local Committee debated the matter.

RESOLVED:

The Surrey County Council Local Committee (Elmbridge) noted the report for information.

**11/
09 WOLSEY ROAD, EAST MOLESEY
LETTER OF REPRESENTATION**

The report was presented to the Local Committee following the submission of a letter of representation to the Local Committee meeting in March 2009.

The Parking Projects Manager presented the report to the Local Committee. The report stated that Wolsey Road would be added to the list of roads in Elmbridge to be assessed to determine if waiting restrictions are necessary. The results of this assessment would be reported to the Local Committee at a later stage.

RESOLVED:

The Surrey County Council Local Committee (Elmbridge) noted the report for information.

**12/
09 INTEGRATED TRANSPORT SCHEMES 2009/10 – 2013/14**

The Local Highways Manager presented the report and the Local Committee asked various questions on the Integrated Transport Schemes. It was confirmed there was little flexibility in the programme for the first three years. However, Members were invited to show preferences in determining the detail on the schemes in 2012/13 and 2013/14.

RESOLVED:

The Surrey County Council Local Committee (Elmbridge) approved:

1. The financial outturn for the previous financial year for the Integrated Transport Schemes (2008-09).
2. The programme of Integrated Transport Schemes for Elmbridge for progression in 2009/10 – 2013/14 funded by the Local Transport Plan and Local Allocation as set out within Annex A of the report.
3. Expenditure for the additional £100,000 revenue budget, on the progression of the revenue element of the LTP and in particular parking schemes in this year's programme (2009-10).

**13/
09 TILT ROAD CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE
CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS**

The report was presented by the Parking Projects Manager following the receipt of six objections to the proposed scheme. As a result of these objections it was proposed that the scheme be amended to provide more on street residential parking though this would incur an additional cost.

The Elmbridge Borough Council Leader, Mr Taylor, confirmed that they would be prepared to fund the entire scheme including the necessary revisions and would write to Surrey County Council confirming this accordingly.

RESOLVED:

The Surrey County Council Local Committee (Elmbridge) agreed that the proposal for a controlled parking zone in Tilt Road be revised to include more on street residents parking provision, and then re-advertised, subject to confirmation from Elmbridge Borough Council that they are able to fund the scheme.

**14/
09 DECRIMINALISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT
TASK GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Local Committee and Partnerships Officer presented the report and confirmed that the group is now called the 'Civil Parking Enforcement' Task Group. It was confirmed that the report is

presented on an annual basis and the terms of reference remained unchanged from 2008/09.

Members asked that the Task Group provide an update on their work following each meeting to the Local Committee.

RESOLVED:

The Surrey County Council Local Committee (Elmbridge) approved:

1. The terms of reference for the Task Group subject to the following amendment:
The Task Group is to provide a report on its work after every meeting to the Surrey County Council Local Committee (Elmbridge).
2. That the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Borough Portfolio holder for highways be appointed to the Task Group in 2009/10.

**15/
09 TRADING STANDARDS IN ELMBRIDGE**

The Senior Trading Standards Officer presented the report and provided an update on the current work of Surrey County Council Trading Standards in Elmbridge.

RESOLVED:

The Surrey County Council Local Committee (Elmbridge) noted the activities being undertaken in Elmbridge by the Trading Standards Service and in particular the initiatives in Elmbridge.

**16/
09 ELMBRIDGE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP UPDATE**

The Elmbridge Community Safety Manager presented the update from the Elmbridge Community Safety Partnership for the last quarter. The Surrey County Council Area Director for North Surrey presented the financial element of the report and explained the issue of community safety devolved funding to the Local Committee, £12,000 of which is ring fenced for the provision of a domestic abuse outreach service.

RESOLVED:

The Surrey County Council Local Committee (Elmbridge) approved:

1. That the budget of £14,500 devolved to the Local Committee for community safety be delegated to the Surrey County Council Area Director (North Surrey).
2. To note the activities of the Elmbridge Community Safety Partnership between April and June 2009.
3. To note the end of year report on activities for 2008/09.
4. To note the details of the Partnership Action Plan for 2009/10.

**17/
09** **ELMBRIDGE LOCAL PROTOCOL**

The Local Committee and Partnerships Officer presented the report and explained that the Local Protocol must be approved on an annual basis. The Local Protocol had been amended since 2008/09 and the proposed changes were explained in full.

RESOLVED:

The Surrey County Council Local Committee (Elmbridge) approved the Local Protocol as set out in Annex A.

**18/
09** **REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES**

The Local Committee and Partnerships Officer presented the report. An update was provided on the report and it was proposed that Mr Bennison represent Surrey County Council on the Elmbridge Environment Forum.

RESOLVED:

The Surrey County Council Local Committee (Elmbridge) approved:

1. To appoint Members of the Local Committee to the outside bodies as listed in the report for 2009/10 municipal year.
2. To note the requirement that Members appointed to outside bodies should update the Local Committee on the group/service they are appointed to represent on a six monthly basis.

**19/
09** **MEMBER ALLOCATIONS – ANNUAL REPORT 2008/09**

The Local Committee and Partnerships Officer presented the report. The report was accompanied by a display on the projects funded in 2008/09.

RESOLVED:

The Surrey County Council Local Committee (Elmbridge) noted the report for information.

**20/
09** **MEMBER ALLOCATIONS**

The Member Allocations report was presented by the Local Committee and Partnerships Officer.

Members asked that in 2010/11 the use of Capital funding by individual Members be limited to ensure equal expenditure across the Borough. The Guidance Note and Criteria will be updated and presented to the first meeting of the 2010/11 municipal year.

RESOLVED:

The Surrey County Council Local Committee (Elmbridge) approved:

1. The Criteria and Guidance Note for the use of Members' Allocations as set out in Annex A and B of the report.
2. The approval of Member Allocations under delegated authority by the Area Director, in consultation with the Chairman, up to and including, applications for £1,000 subject to the conditions set out in the Criteria for use of funds for 2009/10.
3. To note the funding approved under delegated authority (paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2).
4. To note the returned/reallocated revenue funding (paragraphs 4.1-4.5).
5. An application for funding of £2,000 towards Burhill Children's Centre, Hersham lean-to canopy to be funded from Mrs Hicks' allocation.
6. An application for funding of £2,500 towards Love of Learning – Play & Stay Connected through Art projects £1,500 to be funded from Mr Hickman's allocation for Long Ditton C of E Junior School and £1,000 from Mr Bennison's allocation for Royal Kent C of E Primary School, Oxshott.
7. An application for funding of £1,442 towards Molesey Carnival Committee for carnival support to be funded £721 from Mr Cooper's allocation and £721 from Mr Mallett's allocation.
8. An application for funding of £250 towards Elmbridge Young Persons of Honour Awards Event £125 to be funded from Mr Cooper's allocation and £125 from Mr Mallett's allocation.
9. An application for funding of £800 towards the Molesey Residents Association Christmas Lights £400 to be funded from Mr Mallett's allocation and £400 from Mr Cooper's allocation.
10. An application for funding of £700 towards Fleetside Community Group for the provision of public benches on Molesey Heath, £350 to be funded from Mr Mallett's allocation and £350 from Mr Cooper's allocation.
11. An application for funding of £6,000 towards St Paul's Church, East Molesey external repairs to roof £3,000 to be funded from Mr Mallett's allocation and £3,000 from Mr Cooper's allocation.
12. An application for funding of £1,093 towards St Peter's Church, West Molesey replacement of tables and chairs. £546.50 to be funded from Mr Cooper's allocation and £546.50 from Mr Mallett's allocation.
13. An application for funding of £6,000 towards 1st Molesey Scout Group hut extension, £3,000 to be funded from Mr Cooper's allocation and £3,000 from Mr Mallett's allocation.
14. An application for Capital funding of £9,470 towards Burhill Children's Centre lean-to canopy.
15. An application for Capital funding of £650 towards support for Molesey Carnival.
16. An application for Capital funding of £485 towards West Molesey Residents Association Christmas lights.
17. An application for Capital funding of £300 towards Fleetside Community Group provision of public benches on Molesey Heath.

18. An application for Capital funding of £6,000 from St Paul's Church, East Molesey towards external repairs to church roof.
19. An application for Capital funding of £4,000 from the 1st Molesey Scout Group towards an extension to the scout hut.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS**Question 1: Mr Couchman****Kingston & Wimbledon YMCA**

Will the Elmbridge Local Committee add its support to the call for Surrey County Council to take over the three care homes currently owned by Kingston & Wimbledon YMCA? These are Rodney House in Walton and The Summers and Langdown in Molesey. A recent tendering process fell through after months of uncertainty. Surrey County Council are paying hundreds of thousands of pounds to KWYMCA for empty beds as both staffing and occupancy levels were scaled down prior to the proposed sale. SCC could use its compulsory purchase powers to take over these homes and provide the quality and consistency of care greatly needed by residents and staff.

Officer response:

The cost of placements is determined by a formal binding contract the terms of which were set some years ago. However, we accept that the present terms are unrealistic, that time has passed and the situation has changed. The terms of the contract do allow for variation and we are in discussions with KWYMCA about that. However, as you will be aware, the proper processes have to be gone through to ensure both a level of mutuality on the one hand together with contract compliance and also to preserve the wellbeing of existing residents whose terms could be affected by any changes. This will take a little time.

So far as the purchase of the homes is concerned it remains the case that the County Council is not in a position to buy the homes back. Apart from the financial considerations and the strategic shift to supported living rather than residential care it is against the broader context of the role of local authorities set by Central Government. There are three themes to this. The first is *Best Value* and the second is that local authorities are increasingly moving towards being commissioners rather than providers of services. Surrey is no exception to this. The third theme is one of quality of service. This is determined in two ways. The first through the commissioning, service specification and contract process. This is and will remain the responsibility of the County Council. The second lies with the Regulator the *Care Quality Commission (CQC)*. Their standards are particularly rigorous.

Also, Surrey County Council is already considered to have too many people living in residential care and this will become the subject of increasing scrutiny in the near future. Under these circumstances alone it does not seem then reasonable for the County Council to take steps to acquire more residential homes.

Question 2: Councillor Turner**Highways U-Turn from A309 into Heathside/Harefield/Medina Estate at Hinchley Wood**

I have been asked by some 40 residents of this estate to draw your attention to their concerns with respect to use of the entrance to the estate by vehicles carrying out U-Turns.

On this estate there are about 200 houses with approximately 400 cars, and only one entrance which is on to the A309 and because this road is a dual carriageway at this point, all vehicles leaving the estate have to make a left turn on to the A309, and travel towards the Scilly Isles roundabout.

To enter the estate from the Scilly Isles direction (London bound lane), drivers use the opening in the dual carriageway to turn right into the estate. There is a 'No U-Turn' sign here prohibiting U-turns on the A309.

Problems are caused when drivers use the entrance to the estate to do a U-turn around the small traffic island that is located there, and so avoid having to travel another ¼ mile along the A309 to turn right at the traffic lights.

At busy times this can cause a build up of traffic trying to enter the estate, but are prevented from doing so by drivers carrying out these U-turns!

So far there have only been minor accidents, but as the traffic increases the chance of a serious incident is more likely.

To ascertain the extent of use of this junction for U-turns, a survey was carried out over three days, with the following observations:

9 th April 9 (7am-7pm)	<u>264</u> U-turns including 17 illegal turns on the A309
10 th April (Good Friday 8am-1pm)	<u>30</u> U-turns including 1 illegal
29 th April (7am-7pm)	<u>204</u> U-turns including 9 illegal

I have contacted Surrey Police with regard to the illegal U-turns, and they are dealing with this.

Could you confirm the Local Committee will treat this matter with some urgency as the residents are getting desperate about the situation, living as they do on an estate with only one exit/entrance, which is on to an extremely busy highway?

In my opinion a simple solution would be to extend the length of the existing traffic island into the estate making it difficult for vehicles to carry out a U-turn there, and at the same time make it safer for pedestrians to cross at that point.

Officer response:

Thank you for your question on this issue.

The concerns highlighted have, in fact, been brought to the attention of officers on a number of occasions in the past and, although the problems associated with the U turn around the small island at the mouth of Heathside are recognised, discussions over the years, including reference to both the Metropolitan Police and Surrey Police, have consistently concluded that extending the island site as suggested might well create more problems than it sought to resolve.

In this regard, the expressed view of those engaged in addressing this issue has always been that, if the island were reformed in such a manner as to prevent the U turn manoeuvre, the likelihood was that drivers would merely move further into Heathside and either turn in private driveways or circumnavigate the large grassed area at the junction with Medina Avenue. This would almost certainly be seen by a large number of the offending motorists as still being preferable to travelling the extra distance to use the traffic signals at the A309 junction with Manor Road North and South or the Claygate Lane roundabout.

Additionally it would directly influence the ability of HGV vehicles, carrying out the left hand turn into the road, whether this be deliveries, refuse vehicles, removal vehicles etc.

The alternative solution is to physically close the gap in the central reserve to prevent this occurrence completely and force all vehicles to carry out the additional ¼ mile, however this will have a direct effect on the residents.

There is an order to cover the U turn ban which is clearly signed and if vehicles are blatantly flaunting the law, as is being suggested, then the Police have powers to deal with this quickly and effectively.

Question 3: Mr Sheppard – Chairman of Claygate Parish Council

Street Lighting

"You have told us about improvements to the front office (for reports of street light and sign lighting failures) and escalation processes for highway and street lighting faults, but not about the back office process whereby work is allocated to the correct agents and its progress tracked? Our customer experience suggests this is where the problems occur with street lighting repairs".

Officer response:

Any fault enquiry (however received i.e. telephone, web page etc) is logged onto our Confirm Database. This is then checked at least 3 times a day and the faults are raised as jobs and passed electronically to our Street Lighting Contractors. They then download these at the end of each day.

Our Contractors will attend to these faults within 3 working days and affect an immediate repair wherever possible. Should major works be required i.e.

replacement lantern, new column or the job has to be forwarded to the local energy supplier (EDF Energy) these works will take longer.

Any works carried out by the contractors are entered onto Confirm giving a full audit trail.

When a member of the public phones in they can then be given a full update either by the contact centre or the Highways Department.

Due to the present severe budget restrictions we are having to prioritise our works and are only able to carry out essential repairs which is affecting our performance.

Question 4: Mr Palmer

Weybridge Representation on the Local Committee

I note the membership of the Elmbridge Local Committee now no longer includes any representative from Weybridge – neither County nor Borough Councillors! As one of the biggest settlements in Elmbridge we should be represented by elected representatives from both authorities! All other settlements are well represented, with Walton and the Dittons areas having multiple Borough and County Councillors! What will be done to make the Committee more representative?

Officer response:

Thank you for question to the Local Committee. The membership of the Local Committee does include representation from the Weybridge area. Mr Lake is elected to represent Weybridge and the omission of his name from the front page of the agenda was an error. The agenda has since been amended.

Elmbridge Borough Council is responsible for annually nominating borough representatives to the Local Committee. These nominations, though approved by the Surrey County Council Chief Executive, are not the decision of the County Council.

Question 5: Mr Taylor-Gregson

Cycling in Elmbridge Report

If funds are lacking from Surrey County Council that it cannot implement an incentive to study where new cycle lanes could be put in place, would any County Council Members be prepared to commission such a study from their own funding resources, in order to make cycling safer in the Borough?

This relates to the Cycling in Elmbridge report (Item 8).

Officer response:

Members of the Committee need to be mindful of the limited LTP funds available to them aimed at all highway improvement and traffic management projects. Cycling is one of the many functions that are carried out on the highway and there are schemes included on the programme to improve the network for users.

It would not be advantageous to carry out feasibility studies for schemes from other sources, if the capital funds are not in place to construct these proposals, as this would create unachievable public expectation.

The County policy on cycling has been to attempt to include facilities within new projects wherever possible, and then as funds permit, attempt to connect these together with more meaningful longer length routes.

The Hampton Court Way project which is due to be implemented this year, is just one example where this can be demonstrated. Both on and off road shared and specific lanes will be introduced to provide the missing links and connect various measures introduced previously, including the Toucan crossing near Ember Court Road, and the segregated facilities from Summer Road to Hampton Court Station.

If a member of the public did want to approach the County Council members of the Local Committee to fund a project, they would be asked to contact the relevant Councillor directly to discuss the scheme in the first instance. If the County Councillor is minded to support the scheme, a bid would then be developed and submitted to the Local Committee for approval.

Please note that the Member Allocations Guidance Note does include the following on Highways schemes:

“Members’ allocations should rarely be used to ‘top up’ the Highways budget agreed by the County Council, especially where the additional £100,000 capital allocation has been allocated to the Local Committee for Highways purposes. However, it is recognised that small street scene improvements, i.e. additional tree cutting or planting, can be a positive and welcome use of Members’ Allocations.

Any such proposals should initially be shared with the East Area Group Manager/Local Highways Manager for a view on appropriateness of the proposed expenditure bearing in mind any priority lists and the capacity for additional work to be carried out without damaging the implementation of the agreed work programme for the service”.

Question 6: Ms Molony

**Junction of Grotto Road and Thames Street,
Weybridge**

Will Surrey County Council take action on urgently needed safety issues at the junction of Grotto Road and Thames Street?

There is no pavement at the north side of Grotto Road at this junction which is regularly used by children walking to and from school at St James and St Georges and St Charles Borromeo primary schools, and visiting the corner shop. Even with no parked cars, visibility is poor turning into the road from Thames Street, and pedestrians are regularly confronted with near misses there. It is only a matter of time before somebody is seriously injured or killed. Parents at school drop off times seriously worsen the problem by parking all the way along the green at the corner of Grotto Road, right up to the junction, thereby making the road too narrow for traffic to navigate, let alone pedestrians. They appear oblivious to the Highway Code and ignore the white lines that have been painted nearby to try and prevent parking on corners. The 20mph speed limit ends at the entrance into this road.

The corner urgently needs double yellow lines all along the green and opposite the shop, and strict enforcement of same. Fifty local residents have recently signed up to collect signatures for a petition about this junction and many expressed disappointment that this long standing problem has still not been resolved.

Officer response:

The lack of footway in Grotto Road was raised when the traffic calming was introduced in the area. In a genuine attempt to afford some improvement in the situation an extended kerb build out was introduced, outside the shop, which afforded the additional small section of footway to be constructed on the corner, complete with tactile paving, to improve sight line visibility, and allow safer access to the existing footway on the other side of Grotto Road.

The principal obstacle to providing a continuous footway at this location is the existing road width along Grotto Road. There is not currently sufficient width within the public highway boundary to accommodate a new footway, and there is no 'quick and easy' solution other than the re-opening of Elmbridge Housing Trust's private pathway. Highways have discussed this with them, but in the light of the problems of noise, litter and vandalism experienced, they were understandably reluctant.

The following is an extract from the Highway Code:-

243

DO NOT stop or park

- near a school entrance
- anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services
- at or near a bus or tram stop or taxi rank
- on the approach to a level crossing/tramway crossing

- opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space
- near the brow of a hill or hump bridge
- opposite a traffic island or (if this would cause an obstruction) another parked vehicle
- where you would force other traffic to enter a tram lane
- where the kerb has been lowered to help wheelchair users and powered mobility vehicles
- in front of an entrance to a property
- on a bend
- where you would obstruct cyclists' use of cycle facilities except when forced to do so by stationary traffic

244

You MUST NOT park partially or wholly on the pavement in London, and should not do so elsewhere unless signs permit it. Parking on the pavement can obstruct and seriously inconvenience pedestrians, people in wheelchairs or with visual impairments and people with prams or pushchairs.

[Law GL (GP) A sect 15]

As you will see from the above it is an offence to park either opposite or within 10m of a junction, and this is even in the absence of yellow line waiting restrictions. This applies additionally in front of a pedestrian drop crossing where the kerb has been dropped to assist pedestrians, or indeed on the footway itself.

Advisory white junction protection markings have been introduced previously to deter motorists from parking close to junctions and remind drivers of their responsibility under the Highway Code, and this additionally assists the Police enforcement. Many of the pictures you have kindly submitted clearly show offences being committed, in direct contravention of the above, which the Police have powers to enforce very quickly and effectively, and a sustained regime would deter many persistent offenders.

Surrey County Council's Elmbridge Community Travel adviser visits schools on a regular basis and assists in the production of their School Travel Plan (STP), for which the school receives a government grant of some £7,000. Both St James's and St Charles have STP's but not St. George's.

The School Travel Adviser will be writing to all Surrey schools at the beginning of the summer term with details of the road safety and sustainable travel services on offer. These 3 schools may wish to utilise the services offered in order to improve road safety at the school, including some ideas to discourage parents from causing unsafe parking situations.

The issue of waiting restrictions will then be discussed with the schools and if deemed appropriate, this will be added to the list of sites for the next annual amendment order of waiting restrictions.

MEMBER QUESTIONS

Question 1: Councillor Sadler

Street Lighting Walton

There are quite a few street lights out of operation in Walton. One local resident asked when a particular damaged street light column would be replaced and received the following answer:

Subject: Highways Enquiry Update - Enquiry 62907712

Date: Wed, 1 Jul 2009 12:05:22 +0100

From: scc_systemagent@mail.confirm.co.uk

To: xxxxxx@hotmail.com

Please find below the response to your Enquiry Number 62907712, for NORMANHURST ROAD, illuminated bollard damaged, ~Lights, illuminated bollards and illuminated signs~I am following up on my query number 62906626, which I sent you in May.

Can you please tell me what is happening. I was told that you would contact me to let me know what was going on.

"To Mrs xxxxxxxx, Thank you for your email regarding the lamp column in Normanhurst Road, I can confirm that the column is to be replaced. However, Surrey County Council Street Lighting Services are prioritising their works due to very severe budget restrictions. Should additional funding become available we will endeavour to program these works for completion. I regret I am unable to give a more positive response. Surrey Highways (East)"

Is it not possible for SCC Highways to provide an indicative timing, say to the nearest 3 months, for when street lights are likely to be repaired given current funding levels. The answer provided really does not tell the enquirer anything that was not known before. Please can you advise the Local Committee when this particular piece of work is likely to be scheduled.

Officer response:

The above is our standard response which is fairly self explanatory.

In addition to this, the impending start of the Street Lighting Private Finance Initiative (PFI), which will involve the replacement of the majority of the County's Street Lights, has led to a limited lighting budget. Therefore, the Council is keen to avoid undertaking expensive repairs to street lights that will subsequently be replaced as part of the PFI.

We are at present awaiting details of the PFI lantern and lamp column specifications, to ensure a cost effective and integrated approach to installing new lighting equipment during the 'lead up' to commencement of the PFI contract.

Question 2: Councillor O'Reilly

Mayfield Road, Hersham

Further to the answer given to Councillor Sadler's question at the last Local Committee meeting, what further progress has there been in preparing for this important safety related work, and what timescale is envisaged for completion?

Officer response:

In the previous response to the original question, reference was made to the necessity to carry out certain investigations and address land ownership. It has now been determined that many of the areas of concern do not form part of the public highway, and remain in ownership of South West Trains (SWT).

This will undoubtedly reduce the effectiveness of any improvement at this location, with the limited funds made available by the Passenger Transport Group of Surrey County Council last year. It was with this in mind that the comments were also made in the last response that it was the Highways view, that if these ramp works were to be a means of improving access to the station for all users, then it did appear to be somewhat short sighted not to have included these additional measures within the overall scope of SWT's proposal.

Highways will continue to liaise with SWT in an attempt to introduce the most appropriate solution on the available land, with the limited budget available.

It is anticipated that the design solution will be reached in the next few months, with construction anticipated by the end of 2009.

Question 3: Councillor O'Reilly

Albany Bridge

Further to the answers given to Mrs. Hicks at the last Committee meeting, and repeated assurances that the bridge will be re-opened to two lane traffic in both directions (as well as provision for cyclists), what is the timescale envisages for this to actually happen?

Officer response:

Design work is now substantially complete and the documents have been passed to Ringway for pricing.

The date for construction will depend on the affordability of the project given the many other demands on this year's bridge strengthening budget.