

Minutes: of the meeting of Surrey County Council's Local Committee in Epsom and Ewell held at 19.00 on Monday 25th April 2005, at the Ebbisham Centre, Epsom.

Members Present – Surrey County Council

Mr Chris Frost (Epsom and Ewell South East)	Jean Smith (Epsom and Ewell North)
Mrs Jan Mason (Epsom and Ewell West) (Chairman)	Mr Colin Taylor (Epsom and Ewell South West)
NRM Petrie Esq. MBE (Epsom and Ewell North East) (Vice Chairman)	

Members Present – Epsom and Ewell Borough Council

Cllr Pamela Bradley (Ewell)	Cllr Nigel Pavey (Stamford)
Cllr Graham Dudley (Cuddington)	Cllr Michael Richardson (Woodcote)

PART ONE

IN PUBLIC

[All references to items refer to the agenda for the meeting]

36/ **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS (Item 1)**

05

Apologies were received from Cllr Alan Carlson.

37/ **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETINGS (Item 2)**

05

The minutes of the 24th January and 14th March 2005 were confirmed with the following amendments:

24th January Item 3 Declarations of Interest, Jean Smith is a member of the Training Grounds Management Board not the Race Horse Trainers Association. On page 13 Informal Minutes of public question time, the Councillor response to Mr Taylor's question regarding magazine provision in libraries should read:

“The Councillor responded that the Community Services Select Committee has expressed regret that it has not been consulted about the decision to withdraw magazines from libraries. The Select Committee had therefore decided to review the situation after a 6 month period.”

38/
05 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**

Colin Taylor declared a personal interest in Item 9 by virtue of being a school governor at Stamford Green Primary School and in Item 10 by virtue of being a former work colleague of Mr Rowley who asked a public question regarding Item 10.

39/
05 **PETITIONS (Item 4)**

No petitions were received.

40/
05 **WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (Item 5)**

A written public question was received from Mr Barrie Taylor, the question and answer were circulated at the meeting (attached as an annexe to these minutes).

41/
05 **MEMBERS WRITTEN QUESTION TIME (Item 6]**

Members written questions were received from Mr Colin Taylor and Mr Chris Frost the questions and answers were circulated at the meeting (attached as an annexe to these minutes).

42/
05 **ADJOURNMENT [Item 7)**

The Committee agreed to adjourn for up to half an hour for questions from the public. The questions and responses are attached as an annexe to these minutes.

43/
05 **BLenheim ROAD HOUSEHOLD WASTE SITE [Item 8]**

The Officer introduced the report.

Members were concerned primarily about green waste and how it was dealt with and the sites capacity for green waste.

The Officer explained that site has limited capacity overall and its operation is constrained by the availability of open disposal or landfill sites. On the busiest days Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays, the Blenheim Road capacity for green waste can be less than a day, so access to disposal sites is critical if green waste windows are to remain open. The only option is to shut the windows that deal specifically with green waste if the sheds behind them cannot be emptied. The Officer did suggest that it may be possible to have an additional container for green waste at the site.

A Member asked about the possibility of other solutions, including for roadside collections of green waste.

The Officer replied that a project group had been commissioned to look urgently at these problems.

A Member advised that large composting machines can be obtained by organisations (such as scout groups) to aid localised composting and reduce the pressure on waste sites.

The Officer reported that the temporary traffic order re-routing traffic at weekends had worked well.

Members were supportive of the Road Traffic Order to try and ease the congestion in the surrounding areas both for the public and local businesses.

It was then

RESOLVED

- i) that a Traffic Regulation Order in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 be advertised, the effect of which will be to close Blenheim Road to the north-east of the entrance to Surrey County Council's Household Waste Site on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays only, when appropriate traffic signs and barriers be displayed. Vehicular access to adjacent properties and access for pedestrians be maintained; and
- ii) that any objections received be considered by the Chairman in conjunction with the Local Transportation Director.

44/ 05 SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT CHRIST CHURCH MOUNT [Item 9]

The Officer introduced the report.

Members were supportive of the scheme but highlighted a few issues that they would like Officers to consider. A Member asked Officers to ensure the proposed kerb build outs and raised table do not obstruct access to Kings Mill Cottage and if the bollards could be extended after property 2a. Members would also like assurances that the new turning radius into the school would be safe for pedestrians but also not too make the turn too sharp for large delivery vehicles.

Members affirmed that the safety of children was paramount in their consideration of the scheme.

In answer to a question, the Officer reported that every effort would be made to construct the scheme during the summer holidays of 2005, but this could not be absolutely guaranteed.

It was then

RESOLVED

- i) that approval be given to design and construct a pedestrian scheme on Christ Church Mount outside Stamford Green Primary School as shown in Annexe 1;
- ii) that approval be given to advertise the proposed installation of road tables; and
- iii) that the Local Transportation Director be authorised to consider any objections received in response to the statutory notice in consultation with the Chairmen of the Local Committee, and local Borough and County members.

45/
05 **A2022 ALEXANDRA ROAD, EPSOM – INTRODUCTION OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS [Item 10]**

The Officer introduced the report.

Members were pleased with the scheme but were worried about the possibility of increased parking in surrounding roads such as Church Road. Members asked Officers to ensure the proposed waiting restrictions are in accordance with nearby existing waiting and parking restrictions. Members enquired if Officers would consider measures to ensure driveways in Church Road were not obstructed by displaced vehicles.

Officers stated that the surrounding areas would be included in the review of parking and waiting restrictions linked to Decriminalised Parking Enforcement, but acknowledged that there was every possibility of migration of parking into surrounding areas. Officers are happy to consider the white lining of driveways to ensure that residents can access their driveways. Officers informed the Committee that there was as yet no definite date for the commencement of the work, but that the statutory consultation would be commenced as soon as possible in the hope that the new restrictions could be in place in the summer.

It was then

RESOLVED

- i) that waiting restrictions and limited waiting parking restrictions shown in the plan attached as Annexe 1 be approved for introduction;
- ii) that authorisation be given to the making and advertising of the associated Traffic Regulation Orders; and
- iii) that the Local Transportation Director be authorised to consider any objections received in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee, and the local County and Borough Members.

46/
05 **DECriminalISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT AGENCY AGREEMENT
[Item 11]**

The Officer introduced the report.

Members asked when was enforcement due to start and if the Agency Agreement with the Borough Council was indefinite and if the Borough Council could subcontract the enforcement out.

The Officer replied that enforcement was due to start on 3rd May 2005. The Agency Agreement with the Borough is indefinite but would be reviewed after 2 years. Officers did not know if the agreement could be subcontracted out, but understood that this was not the intention of either party. Officers undertook to investigate if subcontracting was technically possible.

It was then

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed that the Agency Agreement between Surrey County Council and Epsom & Ewell Borough Council, which was recently approved by the Borough Council, be approved.

47/
05 **ANNUAL HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT PLAN 2005/06 [Item 12]**

The Officer introduced the report.

A Member asked if the list in Annexe D for proposed drainage work was comprehensive.

The Officer replied that the list was not comprehensive and that not all proposed repairs appear on the list.

Members congratulated the Officers on the level of detail in the report but expressed regret at the amount of funding that had been made available locally for maintenance work in the Borough.

It was then

RESOLVED

- i) that the Annual Highway Maintenance Plan for the Local Transportation service, Epsom & Ewell 2005-06 be approved; and
- ii) that it is regrettable that the total available funding is insufficient to meet all the outstanding maintenance needs of the Borough.

48/
05 **LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN – TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL BUDGET
(Item 13)**

The Officer introduced the report.

A Member pointed out the Members' Workshop could only make proposals, but that only the Committee in public session could agree it.

In response to a question on timing, the Officer explained that as the Executive is not able to agree the budget until February, the decision making process needs to move quickly in order to allow sufficient time to progress the schemes during the course of the year ahead.

It was then

RESOLVED

- i) that the transportation schemes that form the Epsom & Ewell LTP programme for 2005/06 be approved; and
- ii) that the progression of the transportation schemes in the programme be authorised.

49/
05 **MINOR HIGHWAYS/ LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN SCHEME
PROGRESS REPORT (Item 14)**

The Officer introduced the report.

A Member expressed disappointment that the funding for the Toucan Cycle Crossing on the A240 Kingston Road/ Riverview Road/ Worcester Park Road had had to be reassessed.

The Officer responded that funding would be made available to complete the scheme, but that it was still a requirement to ensure value for money was obtained.

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted the report.

50/
05 **FLEXIBLE FORWARD PROGRAMME (Item 15)**

It was

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted the report.

51/
05 **CHAIRMAN'S REPORT (Item 16)**

The Officer introduced the report.

Members thanked the Officer for the report and stated that Members felt the Committee had been highly effective and successful this year.

It was then

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted report.

52/
05 **MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES (Item 17)**

It was

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted the report.

53/
05 **PROPOSED OPERATIONAL CHANGES TO THE POST OFFICE EPSOM
BRANCH (Item 18)**

The Officer introduced the report.

Members requested that the Committee respond to the consultation concerning the proposal to franchise the Epsom High Street Branch. Members would like assurances that the proposal will ensure the service at the Epsom branch be brought up to the same standards of a few years ago before the local sub post office branches were closed. The amount of business at the Epsom branch has dramatically increased due to the closures of the sub post offices and as a result of recent and proposed housing developments will further increase. Members requested that in the response the post office be asked to consider opening the branch on Sundays to ease the pressure during the week. When the refurbishments of the branch are carried out could the closure of the branch be for the shortest it amount of time and could local residents be informed of the nearest surrounding branches.

It was then

RESOLVED

- i) that the report be noted; and
- ii) that the Committee respond to the consultation on the Post Office proposal to franchise the Epsom High Street branch by expressing its concerns about standards of service.

Meeting Ended: 21.15

Chairman

Surrey County Council's Local Committee in Epsom & Ewell
25th April 2005
Public Question
Barrie Taylor

Q1) "We were given to understand that work on the various aspects of the long-awaited safety improvements in Ewell Village was to commence immediately after Easter. What are the precise reasons for the delays? When will the work start? When is it now expected to be completed? If the contractors are to blame for the present situation, will they be penalised?"

Officer Response

The works on the footpath widening in Spring Street require the carriageway to be reduced in width to protect the workforce. The traffic management associated with the job has increased the costs substantially. A final price reflecting these costs was made known to Officers two days before the job was due to start. Consequently, it was decided to postpone the works until the job could be re-tendered as part of the Ewell High Street traffic signals scheme, in order for the traffic management plan to be combined and achieve cost savings. The works are expected to be ready for construction in June 2005 and are programmed to last for an 8 week period.

Q2) "Agenda item 11 (Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Agency Agreement) page 2 item 1.6 can copies of the Agency Agreement also be made available for inspection by members of the public in the Town Hall, the Ebbisham Centre and at Bourne Hall? "

Officer Response

Copies of the signed agency agreement between Epsom & Ewell Borough Council and Surrey County Council will be available for the public to view at the Town Hall.

Q3) "In the unlikely event of the Borough Council suddenly becoming aware that it is supposed to be the Epsom & Ewell Council and if it then decided not to confine its Christmas Festive Lighting just to Epsom Town Centre but to also give some attention to Ewell Village and other key areas, could the County Council cope with the extra workload that this would entail?"

Officer Response

If Epsom & Ewell Borough Council decide they wish to involve Surrey County Council in the erection of Festive Lighting this Christmas and provide adequate notice and resource with which to do so, then we would be able to cope with the workload that this would entail.

Q4) “Last year, on what turned out to be one of the warmest summer days of the year, a filled salt bin was placed at the junction of Shaw Close and the A24 Epsom Road. This was soon overturned by vandals and a quantity of the contents was subsequently ‘posted’ in the adjacent Royal Mail pillar box. Subcontractors were called in to put matters right, although such hooliganism continues to prevail, can consideration be given to ways of combating and minimising the risk of such attacks?”

Officer Response

Salt Bins have always been re-charged during the Summer/ Autumn months so that they are ready to cope with any early incidents of snow. It also allows the salt to be purchased at a cheaper price than that available in January. Salt Bins are generally installed in areas where salt may be required, but which lie off the actual gritting routes. There are not kept locked to enable the public to access the boxes when the need arises. (i.e. - when it snows). Vandalism to salt boxes is a relatively rare event but may be increasing. Officers consequently agree to look into the potential for purchasing and maintaining vandal proof salt boxes if a market option is available.

Surrey County Council's Local Committee in Epsom & Ewell
25th April 2005
Members' Question
Cllr Colin Taylor

Traffic Issues in Epsom Town Centre

Q1) "Now that enforcement of parking rules under Decriminalised Parking Enforcement has commenced in the Borough, how soon can additional double yellow lines at critical locations be introduced?"

Officer Response

It is proposed that Surrey County Council's Local Transportation Service for Epsom and Ewell (SCC LTS), will undertake a review of the impact of DPE 6 months after the commencement of enforcement. A transitional period prior to the review is necessary in order to assess the impact of parking migration away from the current restrictions.

Q2) "When can resources be made available to draw up a professional report to this Local Committee on the traffic congestion and parking issues in South Street and High Street in the evenings and the week ends?"

Officer Response

South Street and the High St, Epsom are subject to waiting restrictions that are enforceable from Mon-Fri 6.30a.m – 6.30pm and Saturday from 8.30 – 5.30. Additional loading restrictions apply Mon-Fri 7.30 – 9.30 a.m. and 4.30 – 6.30pm and on Saturdays from 8.30a.m – 5.30pm. The enforcement of these restrictions should result in a marked decrease in the levels of congestion that currently occur. However, in recognition of the problems that occur on a Sunday and in the evenings, it is expected that these roads be added to the review mentioned in **Q1**.

Q3) “How soon can a report be brought to the Local Committee on the short term possibility of changes to the sequence and timing of traffic lights at the ‘Spread Eagle’ junction, to avoid the tail back of traffic wishing to turn from the market area into Ashley Road, with the associated dangers to pedestrians crossing the road whilst vehicles ‘trapped’ by the lights are still trying to clear the junction?”

Officer Response

As the Local Committee is aware, Officers have been carrying out a full assessment using PARAMICS software of the traffic movements around the town centre. It is intended that initial options testing will commence in May, with a draft report being prepared for Members in July. It is important that Officers assess the full implications of undertaking even perceived minor changes to the junction as the ‘knock – on’ impact could be considerable. For example, increasing the Green time available for right turning traffic from the market area into Ashley Rd, would increase the Red time for vehicles wishing to turn left from the East St end of the High St, into Ashley Rd. This is likely to further congest the Church St / East St / High St junction.

Q4) “What is the timescale for the computer simulation of the town centre traffic to be ready and when will it be made available to local residents?”

Officer Response

It is intended that Officers develop the PARAMICS model over the next couple of months to a point whereby the model can be shown to a Members Working Group. It will be up to this group to look at the implications for the town centre of making any changes to the operation of traffic flow. A report on any recommendations of this working group, including consultation methods, will then need to be brought before the Local Committee.

Surrey County Council's Local Committee in Epsom & Ewell
25th April 2005
Members' Question
Cllr Chris Frost

Corporate Manslaughter

Q1) "Members have been told that they could be placing themselves and Officers at risk of a charge of corporate manslaughter if they fail to take remedial action at a site with a known history of personal injury accidents. As this is now something that we need to take very seriously in judging the merits of future highway schemes, could Officers inform Members of the Act of Parliament that introduced this sanction, and the Section numbers of the Act involved?"

Officer Response

There are three main areas of legislation that impact upon this issue:

1) "The Health and Safety at Work Act 1974"

This sets out various duties of care for the health and safety of others including

General duties of employees at work.

7. It shall be the duty of every employee while at work:

(A) to take reasonable care for the health and safety of himself and of other persons who may be affected by his acts or omissions at work; and

(B) as regards any duty or requirement imposed on his employer or any other person by or under any of the relevant statutory provisions, to co-operate with him so far as is necessary to enable that duty or requirement to be performed or complied with.

2) "The Road Traffic Act 1988"

39. (1) The Secretary of State may, with the approval of the Treasury, provide for promoting road safety by disseminating information or advice relating to the use of roads.

(2) Each local authority must prepare and carry out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety and may make contributions towards the cost of measures for promoting road safety taken by other authorities or bodies.

- (3) Without prejudice to the generality of subsection (2) above, in pursuance of their duty under that subsection each local authority—
- (b) must carry out studies into accidents arising out of the use of vehicles on roads or parts of roads, other than trunk roads, within their area,
 - (c) must, in the light of those studies, take such measures as appear to the authority to be appropriate to prevent such accidents, including the dissemination of information and advice relating to the use of roads, the giving of practical training to road users or any class or description of road users, the construction, improvement, maintenance or repair of roads for which they are the highway authority (in Scotland, local roads authority) and other measures taken in the exercise of their powers for controlling, protecting or assisting the movement of traffic on roads, and
 - (d) in constructing new roads, must take such measures as appear to the authority to be appropriate to reduce the possibilities of such accidents when the roads come into use.

3) “Corporate Manslaughter: The Government’s Draft Bill for Reform”

This draft bill was laid before Parliament by the Home Secretary in March 2005 and is currently out to further consultation. The draft bill defines the offence thus:

- 1) An organisation to which this section applies is guilty of the offence of corporate manslaughter if the way in which any of the organisation’s activities are managed or organised by its senior managers:
 - a) causes a person’s death, and
 - b) amounts to a breach of a relevant duty of care owed by the organisation to the deceased.

The draft bill defines a “senior manager” thus:

A person is a ‘senior manager’ of an organisation if he plays a significant role in:

- a) the making of decisions about the whole or a substantial part of its activities are to be managed or about how the whole or a substantial part of its activities are to be managed or organised, or
- b) the actual managing or organising of the whole or a substantial part of those activities.

This is a complex bill that is aimed at complementing existing health and safety legislation. Its full implications will only emerge through use of its powers over the next few years, but its intent is to ensure that there is greater corporate accountability for disasters such as the sinking of the Herald of Free Enterprise and the rail crashes of recent years.

Surrey Police in common with the other police authorities have advised the County Council that, on the basis of guidance received from the Association of Chief Police Officers, all fatal road traffic accidents will be treated in the first instance as manslaughter and as such subject to a criminal investigation.

**Informal Minutes of Public Question Time at
Surrey County Council's Local Committee
In Epsom & Ewell
25th April 2005**

Jeff Bull, Road and Pavement Surfacing in the Town Centre

Speaking in a personal capacity.

Mr Bull asked when will the problem of large puddles forming on the carriageway and pavements be remedied by Officers and when will Councillors place sufficient pressure on Officers for the issue to be addressed.

Officer Response

The Officer responded that the main carrier drains are inadequate and the cost of full replacement is very high. A survey of drainage is being carried out in the Town Centre with a view to progressively installing a new drainage system. Localised remedial action can be effective in some instances, but will not be effective in every case as the entire system needed replacing. A note was taken of the problem areas listed by Mr Bull.

Kate Spencer, Commuter Parking

Speaking in a personal capacity.

Kate Spencer asked if Surrey County Council had any intentions of increasing the availability of commuter parking in Epsom.

Officer Response

The Officer responded that Surrey County Council had no intention to increase the levels of commuter parking as this would just lead to more commuter parking and further congestion in the Town Centre.

Charles Goldie, Christ Church Mount

Chair of Stamford Green School Governors, but speaking in a personal capacity.

Mr Goldie asked that the Committee should positively recommend the report and that when considering the report pupil safety should be paramount. Mr Goldie also enquired if there was a timetable for the consultation and work.

Officer Response

Please see above for the minute in relation to Item 9.

John Rowley, Alexandra Road

Speaking in a personal capacity.

Mr Rowley asked if Officers had given the issue of parking migration from Alexandra to Church Road consideration and if they would consider white lining driveways.

Officer Response

Please see above the minute in relation to Item 10.

Tim Murphy, Alexandra Road

Speaking in a personal capacity.

Mr Murphy asked when would the works in Alexandra Road start and be completed and what type of consultation would be carried out.

Officer Response

Please see above minute in relation to Item 10.

Eira Fesnoux, Adelphi Road

Speaking on behalf of residents in Adelphi Road

Eira Fesnoux asked what measure would Surrey County Council take to ensure that residents of Adelphi Road were able to park in Adelphi Road.

Officer Response

The Officer responded that a scheme could not be introduced to guarantee residents of any particular road that they could park in that road. To introduce such a scheme would in fact mean reducing the amount of parking available. The introduction of a residents' parking scheme had been consulted on several years ago, but this did not produce a mandate to introduce such a scheme.

Bernard Woolfe, Development of Rosebery School Playing Field

Speaking in a personal capacity.

Mr Woolfe wanted to know why has the development of the playing field at Rosebery school just ploughed ahead with no consultation of local residents. Mr Woolfe would like to know when consultation with the public will take place and what is the progress of the development.

Councillor Response

The Councillors responded that the development had yet to receive planning permission from either the County or the Borough Council. The County Council would have to agree the disposal of the land. The Borough Council would initially address the question of planning and would make its recommendations to the County Council, which would have to agree to the proposed development. Mr Woolfe would have an opportunity to make representations to both the Borough and County Planning Committees. The school is holding an open evening to consult on the proposed development on the 26th April.