



SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL 14 September 2009

MEMBER QUESTIONS

Question 1

C. Cllr Colin Taylor Re:Chantilly Way

This Local Committee agreed in July 2005 (agenda item 11) to advertise the making of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for a change in speed limit from 40mph to 30mph on the section of Hook Road "as described in Annexe 1", that is the section including the junction with the then new "Brettgrave Link" (now part of Chantilly Way) built by the Horton developers.

In Hook Road the 40mph zone commences between the Brettgrave and Chantilly Way junctions. Because Chantilly Way is intended to be within the 30mph zone, the report proposed extending the 30mph zone in Hook Road just past the entrance to St Ebbas.

It was expected that when St Ebbas was redeveloped there would be a new roundabout at the Hook Road entrance to the site. The report recommended extending the 30mph speed without delay, so there would be no need to amend the speed limit in the future. It was also explained in the meeting that this would avoid the need to install 30mph signs in Chantilly Way only to remove them later.

In the event the 30mph zone has not yet been extended. I have recently been told that the reason is that the hospital cluster plan assigns this work to the St Ebbas developers. However because this proposal had been agreed, the Horton developers did not erect 30mph signs at the Hook Road end of Chantilly Way, only at the Horton Lane end.

This has resulted in dangerous speeding in Chantilly Way. I have been told that a vehicle overturned on the bend where the old and new parts of this road meet, due to its speed being too high for the corner. Residents in Livingstone Park have complained about road safety. Residents in Brettgrave have complained about noise from squealing tyres late at night. The Surrey Police have complained that they are prevented from enforcing any speed limit in this road because it is labelled ambiguously.

As these complaints had no effect, I submitted a written question at the Local Committee meeting in March 2008 asking formally when the TRO would be implemented. The reply was that the TRO had not yet been advertised, but this would be done when the St Ebbas developers installed the new 40mph signs.

The new entrance to the St Ebbas site opened recently. There is no roundabout and it is further along Hook Road than the original entrance. In view of the complaints mentioned above, I am concerned that no further delays occur in moving the start of the 30mph speed limit. Please confirm:

- (a) When will the 40mph signs be moved past the new entrance to the St Ebbas site?
- (b) When will the TRO be advertised?

In view of various differences between the proposals agreed in July 2005 and the current plans, to avoid any delays when drafting the TRO it might be advisable for this Local Committee to re-confirm its approval. Please confirm that the following resolution would be appropriate:

“That approval is given to advertise the making of a Traffic Regulation Order for a change in speed limit from 40mph to 30mph on the section of Hook Road from the its present location to a suitable location just beyond the new entrance to the former St Ebbas site.”

Officer Response:

The current proposal is to extend the 30mph limit in Hook Road beyond Chantilly Way. Chantilly Way is already subject to a 30 mph limit, but the proposed amendment will obviate the need to place terminal signs for drivers to see as they enter from Hook Road. As a major development is in progress alongside Chantilly Road, the opportunity is being taken to have the developer place new signs in accordance with the proposed changes as part of a package of highway alterations appended to their planning consent. A Traffic Order has been already been advertised to allow enforcement of the amendments and arrangements are in place with the developer to place the signs within the next four weeks.

Question 2

Cllr Jean Smith Re: Joint Parking Group

Please would you confirm?

- A] The intention to set up a Joint Parking Group?
- B] When this will be set up?
- C] What will be the terms of reference?
- D] Whether its membership will comprise 3 County Councillors and 3 Borough Councillors?

Officer Response:

Informal discussions have taken place between Surrey's Local Highway Manager and Operations Manager of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council with a view to set up a discussion group looking at the Borough Council's Parking Strategy. The strategy would comprise a mix of on and off-street parking initiatives and it is therefore thought appropriate to engage with both Borough and County Members. It is suggested the County and Borough should be represented equally and the group should be of a size small enough to be effective but large enough to offer a spectrum of views.

Three County Members and three Borough Members may be considered appropriate for the task in hand but debate on this point is invited. In order to avoid holiday commitments, it is proposed November would be a suitable time for a meeting to be convened. Terms of reference have yet to be determined.

Question 3

C. Cllr Jan Mason Re: Maintenance of VAS's:

Over the last few years a number of Vehicle Actuated Signs VAS's have been installed in Epsom & Ewell. These have been funded in a variety of ways, including Members' Allocations and through the High Sheriff. Two of the VAS's in my Division are not working. I understand that there are no plans to repair them because there is no budget for their maintenance. What is the reason for this?

Officer Response:

Officers have always been eager to comply with requests to provide VAS where capital funding has been identified and where a clear need can be demonstrated. As a relatively new product, the effectiveness and reliability of VAS has been on trial as set out in part 3 of the answer to Cllr Taylor. Up until the recent review a VAS have come with a 12 month guarantee but, beyond this, all repairs have had to be paid for from the Council's maintenance budget. In some cases, where the cause of a fault to a VAS has been investigated, the projected cost of repair has been prohibitive. There are many demands on the maintenance budget and the priorities have been to repair the highway where a safety issue has been identified, such as a deep pothole in the carriageway.

The County's proposal to address the problem of maintenance has been to ensure all approved suppliers provide a guarantee of at least two years although there remains no formal framework for repair and maintenance beyond that period or of existing units.

Question 4

C Cllr Colin Taylor [2nd question] Re: Station Approach:

On the corner of Station Approach and Waterloo Road, outside the new Co-op, there are the remains of 4 old traffic light control boxes and power feeder pillars plus one old cut down lamppost. The old traffic light boxes were originally against the wall of the former buildings at this point, but as the developers have widened the footways, these boxes are now effectively obstructing the current footways. I was advised in March that EDF had disconnected the power from the traffic light boxes.

When is it expected that these traffic light boxes will be removed?

Will it also be possible to remove the old lamppost?

Officer Response:

The pillars in question house power control equipment for signal apparatus, lighting columns and illuminated street furniture in the vicinity. They were originally at the back of path during construction of the Co-op store but became within the centre of the path when hoarding for the site was removed and the premises opened. The pillars are feed by mains electric supply and, contrary to previous information that may have been offered, are still connected. The Council is not permitted to make any alteration to mains supplies, which are the property of and managed by EDF Energy. The Council has placed an order with EDF Energy to disconnect and remove the pillars and the work is on their forward programme for completion during September. EDF strive to offer the best service available to their customers and prioritise the work they do to meet the service levels they aspire to maintain. High priority is awarded to hospitals and care centres; medium priority to domestic dwellings and commerce; low priority to highways. Although the Council recognise the importance of the system operated, it sometimes means there are delays in receipt of service.

Question 5

C Cllr Colin Taylor [3rd question] **Re: Vehicle Actuated Signs (VAS)**

When is it expected that the following VAS's, that are already agreed and funded will be installed:

- [a] Two in Church Street
- [b] Hook Road
- [C] Wells Road

Officer Response:

Over the last few years, Surrey County Council has taken full advantage of technological improvements that have been made in vehicle-activated signs (VAS) and there are many that can be seen throughout Epsom and Ewell. However, there are numerous suppliers of this type of equipment and it has been only recently that the Council has been able to make judgments about capital cost, life span, reliability and maintenance. A review was completed in August, which considered these factors and enabled us to develop a list of approved suppliers, which has now been distributed to officers. Site visits have been conducted at Church Street, Hook Road and Wells Road in advance of issuing orders to a supplier. It is expected to place the signs within the current financial year.

Question 6

C Cllr Colin Taylor [4th question] **Re: Yellow Line Parking Restrictions:**

When is it expected that the "phase 4" yellow lines agreed at the March 2009 meeting of this Local Committee will be advertised for public consultation?

At that meeting "Parking Task Group" was agreed. Is it intended to hold a meeting of this group?

I understand that officers of Epsom & Ewell Borough Council have been advised that there is already a "phase 5 wish list" that will soon be closed.

If this list exists, why have members of this committee not been told about it?

What is the deadline for adding proposals to this list?

Officer Response:

- a) The County Parking Team is currently preparing documentation for consultation and advertisement of phase 4 waiting restrictions. Subject to the results of consultations, it is anticipated restrictions will be implemented towards the end of the current financial year.
- b) Given approval has been awarded to proceed with consultation, it is suggested the task group would next meet once results from the consultation have been received.
- c) Requests for parking amendments have been considered as part of a rolling programme with a review to be carried out each year. Those issues not included with phase 4 together with any new issues which have been received will be considered for inclusion in phase 5. The County Parking Team hope to bring a report to this Committee for decision when it meets on 17th December listing issues for consultation and implementation in 2010/11. Any issues Members may wish to have included in next year's review should be submitted no later than mid November.