

Minutes: of the meeting of Surrey County Council's Local Committee in Epsom and Ewell held at 19.00 on Monday 31st July 2006 at the Ebbisham Centre, Derby Square, Epsom.

Members Present – Surrey County Council

Mr Chris Frost (Epsom & Ewell South East)

Mrs Jan Mason (Epsom & Ewell West)

NRM Petrie Esq MBE (Epsom & Ewell North East)

Jean Smith (Epsom & Ewell North) (Chairman)

Mr Colin Taylor (Epsom & Ewell South West) (Vice-Chairman)

Members Present – Epsom and Ewell Borough Council

Cllr Brian Angus (Ewell)

Cllr Pamela Bradley (Ewell)

Cllr Graham Dudley (Cuddington)

Cllr Nigel Pavey (Stamford)

PART ONE

IN PUBLIC

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

45/ **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

06

Apologies were received from Cllr Mike Richardson. No substitutions were made.

46/ **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]**

06

The minutes of the meeting held on 10th April 2006 were agreed.

47/ **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

06

Jean Smith declared a personal interest in Item 8 by virtue of being a governor of Riverview Primary School.

48/ **PETITIONS [Item 4]**

06

No petitions were received.

49/ WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 5]

06

One 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).

50/ MEMBERS WRITTEN QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

06

Jan Mason and Colin Taylor submitted a written question. The question was circulated at the meeting and an answer will be provided at a later stage (question attached as an annexe to these minutes).

51/ ADJOURNMENT [Item 7]

06

The Committee agreed to adjourn for up to half an hour for questions from the public. A record of questions received from members of the public and the answers are attached as an annexe to these minutes.

52/ CHILDREN'S CENTRES [Item 8]

06

The Officer introduced the report.

Members asked what criteria had been used to decide which locations should have a children's centre and how were they ranked.

The Officer explained that the criteria consisted of several factors: each children's centre should have a catchment area of 800 families; the area should have a cross section of society to ensure that the centre is viable and sustainable.

A Member enquired if the centres would be funded by the income received from providing childcare.

The Officer responded that some of the income received from providing childcare would be used to fund the centres. The aim of children's centres is to provide good quality childcare. The first 27 areas would have the full core offer, which would include full day care. As a result of the June 8th meeting with the Sure Start Unit, it was agreed that some flexibility on the provision of full day care would be allowed.

A Member asked if Officers were liaising with neighbouring authorities to ensure that children's centres in different authorities were not built too close together.

The Officer replied that they were communicating with neighbouring authorities and that children's centres were not suppose to duplicate work but to fill the gaps.

Members asked if there were any existing children's centres in the county and what lessons had been learnt.

The Officer responded that there were four centres in the county at Guildford, Woking, Tadworth and Leatherhead. The Government had produced a new practice guidance based on the success of the original 546 Sure Start children's centres that had been developed.

A Member asked how would the staff from different agencies like health visitors, be resourced and who would fund them.

The Officer responded that no funding for additional staff from other agencies was available. Locating other agency staff to children's centres would have to be achieved via negotiations between agencies and the completion of Service Level Agreements.

It was then

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted the report.

53/ 06 **FIRE SERVICE [Item 9]**

The Officer introduced the report.

A Member asked if it was possible to quantify how many applications to join the Fire Service were received as a result of the 'Have A Go Day'.

The Officer responded that there was no direct way of quantifying the number of applicants received as a result of attending the 'Have A Go Day'. The Fire Service is always over subscribed. The main aim of the day was to recruit more women and ethnic minorities.

A Member asked how had a reduction in the number of vehicle fires been achieved.

The Officer responded that the reduction had been achieved by a variety of means; partly due to the legacy of Operation Cubit, which removed untaxed vehicles from the road, and to the hard work of Blue Watch in Epsom.

A Member asked if Epsom was to remain a two pump station, if the number of call outs had increased and whether this was because Epsom Fire Station responded to calls from areas outside of the Borough.

The Officer responded that Epsom would remain a two pump station and that the figures shown in the report were only for the Borough of Epsom & Ewell.

It was then

RESOLVED

- i) that the performance of the Service within Epsom & Ewell be noted;
- ii) that the achievements of the personnel at Epsom Fire Station be supported;
- iii) that the initiatives by the Service to reduce hazards of fires and other incidents in the community, especially where there are those most vulnerable, be endorsed;
- iv) that the initiatives by the Service to undertake collaboration/ partnerships that may realise economy of scales or effort and influence behaviour in the community be endorsed; and
- v) following evaluation of these initiatives further funding may be required in order for them to be successfully recognised.

54/
06 **LONGMEAD WASTE SITE [Item 10]**

The Officer introduced the report.

A Member enquired if any improvements would be made to the existing site at Longmead whilst the search for a new civic amenity site continued.

The Officer responded that the contractor had improved arrangements for haulage and feedback about the site had improved. It was unlikely that investment would be made to improve the internal layout of the site as it is hoped to have re-located within 18 months.

A Member asked what impact would there be on traffic levels in Epsom as a result of waste being diverted from landfill to an 'energy from waste' plant in Allington, Kent, specifically as the majority of the waste would be sourced from Epsom.

The Officer responded that there would be no increased throughput at the Epsom site and therefore no increase in the levels of traffic in and out of the site: the waste vehicles would use the same routes as they do presently in and out of Epsom.

It was then

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted the report.

55/
06 **MEMBERS' ALLOCATIONS [Item 11]**

The Officer introduced the report.

The Officer explained that Family Links – Nurturing Programme formed part of the self reliance action plan for Court & Ruxley and the aim of the scheme is to improve emotional literacy. Family Links had replaced PATHS (Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies) on the action plan and is strongly supported by the schools and the community. The Officer explained that the £35k capital grant could be used to fund the costs of purchasing text books for the three schools which amounted to £900.

A Member agreed to re-allocate the funding of £784 from PATHS towards Family Links.

The Committee agreed to fund half of the total costs of the scheme which is £7,425. The remaining half will be funded from the self reliance budget.

It was then

RESOLVED

Funding from the Members' Allocation budget:

- i) £1,560 towards the People's Theatre Company to cover the costs of room hire (Jean Smith);
- ii) £3,000 towards purchasing interactive whiteboards for every classroom at Stamford Green Primary School (Colin Taylor); and
- iii) £5,741 towards the Family Links –Nurturing Programme (Chris Frost £1,000, Jan Mason £1,508, Nigel Petrie £784 re-allocated and £216 from the current financial year, Jean Smith £1,508, Colin Taylor £1,508).

Funding from the £35k capital allocation grant:

- i) £900 towards the Family Links – Nurturing Programme

56/
06 **REVIEW OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS IN THE BOROUGH OF EPSOM AND EWELL PHASE 2 [Item 12]**

The Officer introduced the report.

A Member asked what was the process to revoke waiting restrictions that had become unnecessary or unsuitable. For example if alterations are made to the services provided at Epsom General Hospital, a decrease in staff parking may occur.

The Officer responded that the same process existed both for the implementation and removal of waiting restrictions.

A Member asked if the restrictions would be monitored to see if any displacement parking was occurring.

The Officer responded that all waiting restrictions would be monitored to see how successful they were.

Several Members put forward specific alterations to the waiting restrictions proposed, these included alterations to West Hill Avenue, Meadway, Chalk Lane and Plough Road.

The Officer agreed that the proposed alterations could be incorporated.

It was then

RESOLVED

- i) that the introduction of waiting restrictions as detailed in the plans attached as annexe 2 be approved;
- ii) that the introduction of an enforceable disabled parking bay outside Kelly's pharmacy, Ewell House Parade, as detailed in the plan attached as annexe 3 be approved;
- iii) that authorisation be given to the advertising and making of the associated Traffic Regulation Order(s);
- iv) that the Local Transportation Manager be authorised to consider any objections received, in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee and the Members' Working Group for the Review of Waiting Restrictions and agree any amendments supported by the Working Group; and
- v) that the amended priorities requested by the Members' Working Group for the Review of Waiting Restrictions (detailed in paragraph 2.4 and 2.5) be approved.

57/
06 **ANNUAL HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE EAST SURREY
TRANSPORTATION SERVICE 2006-07 [Item 13]**

The Officer introduced the report.

A Member asked if the moratorium on investigations had been lifted and if so had a camera been used to find out why Beaufort Way had flooded so severely.

The Officer responded that the investigation had been carried out, but they would get back to the Member with the results.

It was then

RESOLVED

- i) that the Annual Highway Management Plan for the Local Transportation Service in Epsom and Ewell for 2006/07 be approved;
- ii) that the outturn figures for the Maintenance Programme for 2006-07 be noted; and
- iii) that the Area Transportation Director in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman have the discretion to vire up to 100% of the indicative allocation for each expenditure head within the revenue budget whilst retaining the County Council's policies and standards be noted.

58/
06 **SCHEME PROGRESS REPORT [Item 14]**

The Officer introduced the report.

It was then

RESOLVED

That the report was noted.

59/
06 **FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 15]**

The Officer introduced the report.

Members were asked to note that the 2nd April 2007 Local Committee meeting has been moved to the 19th March 2007.

It was then

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted the report.

Meeting Ended: 22.10

Chairman

Surrey County Council's Local Committee in Epsom & Ewell
31st July 2006
Public Question
Barrie Taylor

Q1) “In view of my failure to secure answers to the ten written questions I put to officers on May 3, may we please have, as an interim measure only, a progress (or lack-of-progress!) report on the intended installation of lights in Snakey Alley. The lamp standards were erected nearly five months ago on March 3 2006 (Page 8 of the minutes of the April meeting refers). Will the officers please make particular reference (a) to any further anticipated revisions to the total cost of the scheme; and (b) to the belated and unsuccessful negotiations with the residents of Hessle Grove. Will they also attempt some forecast as to if and when it is expected that the lights may become operational and when I can expect a full written reply to my previously submitted questions sent over 12 weeks ago?”

Officer Response

Surrey County Council has already provided Mr Taylor with a full response to his previous questions regarding the street lighting scheme in Snakey Alley. No further written response is intended.

The final cost of the scheme is not known at this time.

The residents of Hessle Grove have indicated that they wish the two columns, that are presently located in land to which they claim ownership, be removed.

These two columns will be relocated within the adopted length of Snakey Alley.

The remaining seven columns are programmed for connection to an electrical supply within two weeks.

**Informal Minutes of Public Question Time at
Surrey County Council's Local Committee
In Epsom & Ewell
31st July 2006**

Mr Derek Smith, Waiting Restrictions

Mr Smith enquired about the possibility of putting in place parking restrictions in the roads surrounding Epsom General Hospital, in particular Woodcote Park Road, Hyland Close and Woodcote Road. Residents have seen a dramatic increase in parking by hospital staff, due to an increase in parking charges at the hospital.

Officer Response

The Officer responded that it would be difficult to enforce piecemeal controlled parking zones due to a lack of enforcement resources.

Mr Andrew MacDonald, Waiting Restrictions

Mr MacDonald asked if it would be possible to have some form of controlled parking zone in the area of Woodcote Park Road and if there are any reasons why controlled parking zones cannot be implemented in small specific areas?

Officer Response

The Officer responded that it was not a good idea to introduce controlled parking areas in a piecemeal fashion. It was preferable to look at the problem as a whole, because of the issues surrounding displacement of parking. Controlled parking zones do not guarantee that a resident will be able to park outside their house. The Officer did emphasise that the Council did not have a closed mind about controlled parking zones and if this was something that came through in the consultation then Officers would look at the merits.

Mr Lionel Blackman, Waiting Restrictions

Mr Blackman asked for assurances of when the waiting restrictions that form part of phase 1 and 2 of the review of waiting restrictions would actually be implemented?

Officer Response

The Officer responded that the yellow lines for the first phase would be implemented in September/ October time.

Mr Jeff Bull, Advertising Boards

Mr Bull asked about the offence of advertising boards causing obstructions on the footway, with particular reference to the advertising boards outside the Trattoria Stifani. Mr Bull also asked why had he not yet received a response to the query regarding this that he placed on the County Council website a month ago?

Officer and Chairman

The Officer responded that delay in responding to Mr Bull's query logged on the website, was due partly to the fact that Epsom & Ewell now only has one highway steward. The issue of obstruction from A-boards outside the Trattoria Stiffani will be brought to the owner's attention. The Chairman agreed to write to the owners of the trattoria (copied to the Business Partnership) and request that they be more considerate when placing the A-boards on the pavement.

Mr Philip Baker, Waiting Restrictions

Mr Baker asked if there was a legal requirement to paint yellow lines on to the road as part of waiting restrictions and if it would be possible to have some limited waiting restrictions to cope with the anticipated displacement of commuter parking from Meadway to West Hill Avenue.

Officer Response

The Officer responded that painting yellow lines on the road was a legal requirement of waiting restrictions. The Officer also explained that it would be difficult to enforce waiting restrictions of one/ two hours across the borough to stop commuter parking. When the waiting restrictions are advertised any comments made by residents will be taken into account.

Mr David Whitfield, Waiting Restrictions

Mr Whitfield asked why was it necessary to have parking restrictions along West Hill Avenue. At present there is no problem with parking along West Hill Avenue. By introducing waiting restrictions those residents who have no off street parking will be inconvenienced, particularly those with young families.

Officer Response

The Officer responded that currently no parking problems may exist along West Hill Avenue, but waiting restrictions for the area have been included to allow for possible displaced commuter parking from Meadway.

Elizabeth Legge, Waiting Restrictions

Elizabeth Legge asked the Committee what processes are in place to allow a controlled parking zone to be considered at the former convent site (St Margaret Drive, St Elizabeth Drive, St Theresa's Close) and if the former convent site had been taken into account when the review of waiting restrictions was being carried out.

Officer Response

The Officer responded that site had been considered when the review had been carried out and the County Council will endeavour to ensure that the roads are adopted at the same time as the waiting restrictions are implemented in October. Residents will have an opportunity to comment on the restrictions as part of the consultation.

Mr Derek Phillips, Clearing of Drains

Mr Phillips showed the Committee a photograph of a drain that had become blocked by vegetation and not cleared and asked for evidence of the clearing schedule for drains within the Borough.

Officer Response

The Officer responded that a written answer would be provided explaining what the schedule was and how drains/ gullies are cleared.