



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL
7 June 2010**

MEMBER QUESTIONS

Question 1

Cllr Michael Arthur

Re: Bus Stand High Street East Epsom [westbound direction]

Over a year ago I raised the question of added congestion caused when the 460 bus "lays over" for 10 minutes, in each half hour during its operational hours.

The officer response at that time was that the Passenger Transport Group felt that the service should continue as existing.

However, other members and the public too have also raised this problem of a bus stand being located where it is. Indeed, it was observed quite clearly what a marked effect the bus stand has when the paramics modeling was shown on a members visit to the Leatherhead office and again at the Epsom Station planning application meeting.

Could a specific meeting be arranged, with a member's presence, to examine, in detail, this bus stand problem, in an endeavour to effect a solution?

Officer Response:

Buses stand in High Street immediately in advance of the stop in readiness to commence their next route at the appointed time. Routes are programmed and a surplus 10 minutes are scheduled in to allow for potential delays, which may result if roads are congested or other difficulties are encountered. Routes must be started at the appointed time in order to comply with the license issued by the Traffic Commissioner on behalf of the Government Office for the South East and stiff penalties may be imposed if not adhered to. The 10-minute stand is also intended as recovery time for the driver to meet welfare needs.

Opportunities to stand buses within Epsom Town Centre are at a premium and alternative positions for the bus to stand are extremely limited. One possibility would be to stand in Station Approach road but, given the journey time for the return trip, the 10-minute cushion, to ensure a punctual start on the next route, would be lost.

Officers have looked at this matter previously, and findings at that time were to leave the existing arrangement unchanged. There have been no changes in network layout or provisions for buses since that time and further investigation now is likely to prove fruitless.

Question 2

Cllr Alison Kelly posed this question to the Borough Council's meeting on 27 April 2010, to the Chair of the Environment Committee – Cllr Jean Smith. Cllr Smith now raises this question with the Local Committee:

Cllr Smith requests assurance from the Local Committee, that they will investigate ways of keeping the traffic flowing through Epsom High Street and reduce pollution levels therein, such investigations to include:

- (a) The use of CCTV footage to enforce yellow box junction infringements
- (b) A directive that refuse lorries do not pass through the High Street during the rush hour.

Officer Response:

a) Within Surrey, enforcement of yellow box markings is a Police function as contravention is deemed to be a moving traffic offence. Although there are existing CCTV cameras within the town centre, these will not comply with the specification necessary to undertake enforcement. The suggested arrangement would necessitate a considerable capital investment and it would be for Surrey Police to decide whether it would be of value. However, as with all public services at the present time, Surrey Police are committed to identifying areas where savings may be made and it is most unlikely this initiative is something they are in a position to progress for the moment.

b) Refuse lorries visit the County's waste site at Blenheim Road having made collections from rounds within Epsom & Ewell and surrounding Districts. Few will need to pass along High Street in order to reach the waste site and a ban on using the route would likely have minimum impact on overall congestion. Collections from premises within the High Street during the peak times have the potential to cause delay and it may prove beneficial if this could be avoided. However, refuse collection is the role of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council and the viability of imposing the suggested directive is something that must be discussed with officers from the Borough.

Question 3

Cllr Michael Arthur

Re: Highways Proposals Plan 'E'

"Plan "E" is an important part of the district council's Local Development Framework which is making progress towards formal adoption with its "examination in public" this summer with the inspector and programme officer having been both appointed.

Highways form a major section within the plan and, notably, the return of South Street to two-way working.

My question is that can consideration be given now to the allocation of funds to support the highways proposals within the plan, or at least, at this stage to support the commencement of design and early planning work for its implementation?

I would add that the paramics modelling shown to members six months ago really highlighted potential improvements to the town centre congestion with two way working in place in South Street. I believe that this introduction has now become more urgent with work having commenced on the Rosebery School site and the soon to be started station re-development let alone the approval recently given to the

reserved matters for West Park housing - all of which sites compound on West Street/South Street traffic.”

Officer Response

Surrey fully support the aims of Plan E and welcome the potential benefits that may be delivered for highways in reducing congestion and improving accessibility. Unfortunately the initiative comes at a time when funding for highway improvements has been suspended for an indefinite period to assist with Government savings.

The only available means of funding Plan E will be through developer contributions via the Planning Infrastructure Charge or under Section 106 Agreement. This is recognised by officers of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council and Surrey County Council who will endeavour to promote Plan E when seeking developer contributions linked to any new planning applications within the Town.

Question 4

Cllr Michael Arthur

Re: Dirdene Gardens

“Notwithstanding the report to be considered at item 11 to-night, I would like to make a plea for carriageway re-surfacing.

A “fairly hopeful promise” was given about two years ago by the then staff engineer that resurfacing was going to be done at that time, but this did not materialise.

The condition of this road remains very bad and I seek some current assurance that work may be soon carried out”

Officer Response

Dirdene Gardens appeared on a list of roads that would benefit from resurfacing, developed when an additional sum of money had been allocated to address residential roads that would not normally feature high on the resurfacing programme. Sadly, the additional sum was exhausted before we were able to attend to Dirdene Gardens.

Surrey Highways have reduced expenditure on road maintenance in response to Government imposed budget restraints that the County is obliged to meet. Our works programme and the treatments used, outlined in tonight's report, have been tailored to ensure we do not exceed the allocated budget and there is little opportunity to include additional roads in the programme. Dirdene Gardens features on the forward programme for resurfacing in a future year but, given the current financial uncertainties, it is impossible to forecast when works in this road will be carried out.