

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL
24 September 2012**

MEMBER QUESTIONS

**Question 1 Cllr Julie Morris
Re: HGVs in Burgh Heath Road**

There is evidence to suggest that Unsuitable for HGV signs in Burgh Heath Road are not working. A double-container articulated lorry has been seen attempting to negotiate the S bend, potentially creating a dangerous situation both for pedestrians and traffic moving in the opposite direction. What are the criteria for being able to ban HGV from this road or is the only route to preventing HGV from using it to create a physical barrier, i.e. some kind of width restriction?

Officer Response:

An additional sign was recently added to the existing direction sign in Church Street advising drivers that Burgh Heath Road was unsuitable for HGVs.

The only way to physically prevent HGVs from using a road is to introduce a width restriction. It will stop HGV movements but will still allow access to an area. Width restrictions may not attract police enforcement, but careful consideration has to be given to the needs of the emergency services, in particular the Fire Brigade. Consideration must also be given to the effect upon necessary HGV journeys such as refuse collection, home removals lorries and home deliveries.

A balance has to be struck between the problem of the use of the road by the odd inappropriate vehicle and the inconvenience caused to local residents by imposing a restriction on all larger vehicles, that may result in such traffic being diverted on to other roads not currently affected by larger vehicles.

The additional sign has only just been introduced so it would be preferable to see the effect of the sign over a longer period and perhaps review in 12 months time.

**Question 2 Cllr Julie Morris
Re: Speed Humps in Burgh Heath Road**

A councillor surgery in the area of Burgh Heath Road earlier this month produced further complaints about the variation in size of road humps. Could we please be reminded of the situation and outcome of investigations? To summarise, the upper seven sets of road humps are the original size and can be sensibly driven at around 30mph, the lower sets are different and require a speed of 20mph and the set of humps approaching 59 Burgh Heath Road, upward, appear to be a different size again requiring an even slower speed.

Officer Response:

This site has been visited on several occasions following complaints after resurfacing work was carried out. Officers have measured the humps and have confirmed that they all accord with the design specification.

**Question 3 Chris Frost
Re: Secondary Traffic Lights**

A resident has questioned the need for secondary traffic lights, suggesting that they are not necessary and are a waste of electricity. (He defines secondary traffic lights as the additional ones often installed on a pedestrian island at a light controlled junction, in addition to the two either side of the stop line).

- a) Are there any plans to remove any deemed to be surplus?
- b) Will they continue to be installed when a new light-controlled junction is introduced?
- c) Is this a County Council policy, or a DfT one?
- d) If it is a County Council policy, are there any plans to review it?

Officer Response:

He is correct in saying these are secondary signals, but to be exact, they are "close associated secondary signals". They are installed for safety reasons as they provide the appropriate back up should the primary lamp fail but encourage drivers to watch and accommodate for what other drivers are actually doing rather than on the assumption of what they are doing.

- a) No. None are deemed to be surplus. All have been installed for very good safety reasons.
 - b) Yes. For the reasons included above - and that it is good design practice.
 - c) DfT Design Advice which may be used by all UK authorities. We adopt this practice because it works in reducing accidents.
 - d) Not applicable. All signal designs are site specific as all junctions and traffic movements (even "vehicle" types) differ from site to site.
-

**Question 4 Cllr Julie Morris
Re: Parking by St Martin's Infant School**

The Police were called, again, to St Martin's Infants School on Monday 10th September because of issues concerning parents and parking in the narrow section of Worple Road. What measures are proposed to remedy this problem please?

Officer Response:

Consideration will be given to implementing double yellow lines along the wall side, of Worple Road as part of the next parking review which will be considered by the Committee in December 2012.

Question 5 Cllr Paul Arden Jones
Re: Improvements to Malden Rushett Junction

At the meeting where we set out our priorities for the year, we agreed that the Malden Rushett junction should be high on the list. We therefore intended to press the parties (SCC/Kingston/TfL) for urgent action.

Could we please have a progress report on action to date and details of the future plans to achieve our objective?

Officer Response:

The following information has been received from TfL:

The modelling done on the interim scheme can now be utilised to develop the full scheme, which our design team have been reviewing alongside the interim. The latest proposal involves widening the B280 carriageway at the junction to enable a two lane approach to reduce congestion, revised method of control to address right turning collisions and introduction of a staggered green man pedestrian facilities on Fair Oak Lane. Informal pedestrian islands will also be made larger, and there will be opportunities for pedestrians to cross in between traffic stages.

Green man crossing facilities cannot be introduced on all arms of the junction without effecting capacity.

TfL will be utilising further resource to finalise whether the scheme is technically feasible in September. Once the scheme has been confirmed as technically feasible, consultation will be carried out with residents and other key stakeholders. The scheme will then progress to detailed design and implementation. It is expected that it will be ready for consultation by November 2012.

Question 6 Cllr Ian Booker
Re: St Ebba's/Longmead Estates Link

On the St Ebba's estate there has recently been constructed a link between the new estate and the Longmead estate. Surrey officials later intervened after the work was completed (as proposed) and instructed a less restrictive barrier to be constructed. The result being any 4x4 can use this route and a rat run from Longmead to the new estate has been established, I have witnessed this. Can Surrey CC please explain this change and who did they consult before coming to their decision?

Officer Response:

The bus link on the new St Ebba's Development, Parkview, has recently been opened up to allow the bus service to operate. The link was constructed as per the approved drawing. Unfortunately the developer had not completed all of the signing works required before the bus service came into operation and this led to vehicles other than buses using the link when it was first opened. Consultation took place between SCC's Development Control and Passenger Transport services prior to the development of the site.

A new, more robust, feature has now been constructed to deter vehicles other than buses from using the link, although the link does not offer a shortcut to traffic wishing to access Hook Road. The width of the deterrent paving blocks has to remain at 1.5m due to the rear axles of the buses having double wheels. The height of the deterrent paving has now been

increased. This may result in other vehicles attempting to drive through the link but there will be permanent signs indicating the link is for buses only, similar to links on Manor Park and Livingston Park estates.

Question 7 Cllr Ian Booker
Re: St Ebba's Estate bus route

A new bus route has been established that runs through the new St Ebba's estate into the Longmead estate. The road surface throughout the St Ebba's estate was not constructed with the passage of fast moving buses and severe vibration is now experienced in houses next to the block paved crossings in the St Ebbas's estate. The vibration is severe and residents are woken up when the first bus passes by at 06:30 in the morning. I would ask what consultation took place before this route was sanctioned ?

Officer Response:

The construction of the road surface throughout the estate is in accordance with SCC standards and the construction was agreed with the Developer and SCC's Development Control Department prior to construction of the estate.

The bus route was agreed with Development Control and Passenger Transport and was an integral part of planning permission.

At this time the road is not adopted by the County and any resident who feels there is undue vibration should take this up with the developer.

Question 8 Colin Taylor
Re: Parking restrictions in Waterloo Road

At the Local Committee meeting on 5 December 2011, according to minute 48/11 it was agreed that "the advertised restrictions in Waterloo Road of 20 minutes parking Monday-Sunday 8.00-18.30 no return within 1 hour should be retained but that no pay and display be implemented at this site."

It had been expected that this would actually be implemented along with Phase 6 parking restrictions, which were intended to make further adjustments in Waterloo Road.

However because of other problems with the advertised details of phase 6, Waterloo Road was held over. At the time this was expected to be a delay of only a few weeks, but subsequently it became clear that these issues will not be resolved before Phase 7.

The promised change from 30 minutes to 20 minutes is of vital importance to the viability of many of the shops in Waterloo Road and the damage to their businesses is such that the shopkeepers cannot afford to wait until Phase 7 is implemented in 2013/2014.

As there is a proposal on the Agenda for 24 September for a TRO affecting Station Approach, could a simple addition please be made to this to include the already agreed change from 30 minutes to 20 minutes outside the shops in Waterloo Road, leaving the other changes requested for this road until Phase 7?

Officer Response:

The 20 minute restriction was agreed at Committee and was extracted from the Pay and Display proposals - as yet none of the signing has been erected for Phase 6, but this is due to start at the beginning of October. The revised restrictions in Waterloo Road will be part of this work.

In respect to the yellow lines across the Borough the engineer will be out on site with the lining contractor to help finish off and tidy up any loose ends. There has inevitably been issues with parked cars in certain areas that will require coning off for completion.

Question 9 Colin Taylor
Re: Damage to highway in Rosebank

Contractors working for the developers of Dalmeny Way off Rosebank caused damage to the highway in Rosebank.

The worst remaining damage affects the grassy bank on the opposite side of Rosebank just past Dalmeny Way before reaching St Joseph's school.

Here not only has the edge of the bank been scored away, the adjacent edge of the highway has sunk and there seems to be evidence of damage to buried drainage pipes.

The borough council's planning enforcement officer has managed to get other damage to kerbs and grass verges etc put right by the developers, but it seems that getting the damage to the highway made good is down to SCC Highways to arrange at the developer's expense.

I understand that this damage has been inspected, yet a local resident has told me that when she enquired when the work would be done she was told that SCC was not now intending to take any action to force the developer to pay for the necessary work.

Is this correct? If so why is the developer being allowed to get away with damaging the public highway? In any case is the road going to be repaired - and if so when?

Officer Response:

An officer from transport development planning has inspected the now completed site. In his opinion it is unlikely that the developer is responsible for the damaged grass bank and carriageway which is located past the site entrance as there would be no need for site vehicles to drive over this area. It is more likely that the damage has been caused by cars being parked on one side of the road restricting the space available for vehicles to pass, resulting in larger vehicles having to pass over the verge causing the damage.

The developer was instructed by SCC to repair some kerbs and verge which are situated opposite the site entrance. This area which was repaired with new kerbs and grass seed has now also been driven over causing rutting on the verge.

Arrangements will be made for the repair work to be priced, this will involve resetting a number of kerbs and reinstating areas of verge and carriageway. Depending on the cost of these works there is a possibility it can be carried out this financial year. If the funding for this maintenance work is not available it can be raised and programmed for the new financial year. In this case the works can be scheduled from April 2013.

Question 10 Colin Taylor
Re: Stones Road Tunnel

The process of replacing the railway footbridge between Stones Road and the Longmead industrial estate by an underpass or "tunnel" has been drawn out over many years. It is now basically complete, including the lighting, but there are outstanding issues with the final details as follows:

- the reported problem with water seepage does not seem to have been cured, as there are growing signs of efflorescence in numerous places.
- the promised anti-graffiti paint has either not been applied yet (perhaps because of the water seepage) or is ineffective and there is a lot of graffiti.
- the barriers guaranteed by the then Local Highways Manager, Martyn Williams to prevent the underpass being used by motor-cycles and to force cyclists to dismount and walk through the underpass have not been provided.

The initial ineffective barrier at one end has now been replaced by two stainless steel posts, but these are spaced so far apart that it is easy to ride a motor cycle between them let alone a bicycle, so people are cycling straight through without dismounting. There is no sign of the promised barrier at the other end. Local residents were guaranteed the type of barrier at both ends that would force cyclists to dismount and prevent access by mopeds and motor-cycles whilst allowing access by mobility scooters and double-buggies and wheelchairs. The Local Committee only agreed to the underpass on condition that this would be done, because Stones Road residents had expressed severe concerns about the potential for vandalism and crime if the underpass was opened.

When is it anticipated that the seepage will be cured? What is the situation with anti-graffiti paint? When will the type of barriers that were guaranteed in order to overcome the fears expressed by Stones Road residents be provided?

Officer Response:

Stones Road subway is not fully watertight. The only way to have achieved this would have been to apply a waterproofing system to the top of the structure, underneath the railway track which was not possible for obvious reasons. This is, of course, a common problem on old Network Rail arch structures that were built with no waterproofing. Modern systems which attempt, with moderate success, to address water seepage from within the structure are available and we did use one of these systems, that has Network Rail approval, at Stones Road subway. It was only partially effective in this case, as construction details are necessarily complex due to the strengthening works.

While damp to the touch in places, moisture does not drip onto or inconvenience users. This moisture has, however, prevented the subway from being painted and the presence of graffiti has been noted. As a result, the site has been added on our Structures cyclical graffiti clearance programme. The initial visit by our Engineer and our graffiti clearance contractor, Community Clean, to agree details the best way to manage graffiti here is taking place on 27th of September. Routine cyclical visits by the contractor will then take place twice a year but if offensive graffiti is reported (swear words or offensive personal insults), this will be cleared within 24 hours.

The barriers in place are designed to allow passage of mobility scooters, while preventing access by vehicles. Any barrier which permits passage of a mobility scooter will, of course, also allow passage of a motorcycle. The police were consulted about this and said they would take action if a problem with motor cycle usage actually arose. We have not been made aware of any usage of the route by motorcycles but have seen motorised scooters use the route on a number of occasions. Vehicular access is not possible from the Stones Road

end and so no barrier is needed there. The definitive statement for the public right of way here does not allow for any significant obstructions of this route.

The former footbridge in this location had reached the end of its life and needed to be replaced to keep the public right of way open. There was not sufficient land to build a new footbridge with long approach ramps that would cater for mobility impaired users and so Network Rail's subway represented the only possible solution that would open up this route to mobility impaired users and provide access for everyone. When we first approached Network Rail, the subway was in poor condition and, as the owners, they wanted to fill it in with concrete as a cheap permanent solution, from their point of view. We managed, instead, to negotiate an agreement whereby we strengthened it and secured its use for the public right of way as an alternative to the footbridge. This wasn't straight-forward so, while the scheme, as a whole, did take a long time, there was more complexity (technical and legal) than was immediately apparent.

Question 11 Colin Taylor
Re: School Places

How many places were available in total at SCC schools (taken together) within the Borough of Epsom & Ewell for admission in September 2012 to primary and infants schools for the Reception year, to Junior schools in year 3 and to secondary schools in year 7? How many children were actually admitted compared to the total number of places available in each of these three categories?

What were the corresponding figures for places and actual admissions in September 2011, September 2010 and September 2009?

What are the corresponding expected total numbers of children requiring admission in September 2013, September 2014 and September 2015 and the total numbers of places planned to be made available at SCC schools within the Borough of Epsom & Ewell in these years?

Officer Response:

| | School | 2009 | | 2010 | | 2011 | | 2012 | | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | |
|-------------------------|----------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|--------|------|----------|------|----------|------|----------|
| | | PAN | Intake | PAN | Intake | PAN | Intake | PAN | Intake | PAN | Forecast | PAN | Forecast | PAN | Forecast |
| RECEPTION PLACES | Cuddington P | 30 | 30 | 30 | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | | | | | | |
| | Cudd Croft | 60 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 59 | 60 | 60 | | | | | | |
| | Epsom P | 60 | 32 | 60 | 67 | 60 | 59 | 60 | 60 | | | | | | |
| | Ewell Grove | 70 | 67 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | | | | | | |
| | Mead | 90 | 92 | 90 | 92 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | | | | | | |
| | Meadow | 90 | 75 | 90 | 72 | 90 | 86 | 90 | 86 | | | | | | |
| | Riverview | 30 | 28 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 29 | 30 | 29 | | | | | | |
| | St Clements | 30 | 29 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | | | | | | |
| | St Josephs | 60 | 60 | 60 | 58 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | | | | | | |
| | St Martins Inf | 60 | 57 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 58 | 90 | 89 | | | | | | |
| | Southfield P | 60 | 60 | 60 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | | | | | | |
| | Stamford G | 60 | 60 | 60 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | | | | | | |
| | Vale | 30 | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 29 | 30 | 30 | | | | | | |
| | Wallace F Inf | 90 | 90 | 60 | 62 | 60 | 59 | 60 | 60 | | | | | | |
| W Ewell | 90 | 86 | 90 | 91 | 90 | 92 | 120 | 120 | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 910 | 852 | 880 | 867 | 880 | 871 | 940 | 934 | 940 | 950 | 970 | 970 | 970 | 969 |

Item 7

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|------------|-----|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| YEAR 3 PLACES | Auriol Jun | 90 | 86 | 90 | 95 | 90 | 94 | 90 | 90 | | | | | | |
| | Danetree J | 128 | 87 | 128 | 94 | 128 | 123 | 128 | 106 | | | | | | |
| | St Martin's J | 64 | 57 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 61 | 64 | 64 | | | | | | |
| | Wallace F J | 68 | 68 | 68 | 70 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 | | | | | | |
| | Cudd Croft | 60 | 64 | 60 | 68 | 60 | 66 | 60 | 66 | | | | | | |
| | Cuddington P | 30 | 28 | 30 | 29 | 30 | 28 | 30 | 30 | | | | | | |
| | Epsom P | 60 | 54 | 60 | 59 | 60 | 57 | 60 | 55 | | | | | | |
| | Meadow | 90 | 75 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 81 | 90 | 90 | | | | | | |
| | Riverview | 30 | 28 | 30 | 29 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | | | | | | |
| | Southfield P | 30 | 30 | 30 | 31 | 30 | 30 | 60 | 60 | | | | | | |
| | St Clements | 30 | 30 | 30 | 33 | 30 | 32 | 30 | 30 | | | | | | |
| | St Josephs | 45 | 45 | 45 | 47 | 45 | 48 | 60 | 60 | | | | | | |
| | Stamford G | 60 | 59 | 60 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | | | | | | |
| | Vale | 30 | 31 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 29 | 30 | 23 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 815 | 742 | 815 | 798 | 815 | 807 | 860 | 832 | 866 | 844 | 866 | 855 | 896 | 903 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| YEAR 7 PLACES | Blenheim | 240 | 240 | 240 | 240 | 240 | 235 | 240 | 216 | | | | | | |
| | Epsom and E | 180 | 81 | 180 | 157 | 180 | 138 | 210 | 149 | | | | | | |
| | Glyn | 240 | 240 | 240 | 249 | 240 | 240 | 240 | 240 | | | | | | |
| | Rosebery | 240 | 237 | 240 | 240 | 240 | 243 | 240 | 239 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 900 | 798 | 900 | 886 | 900 | 856 | 930 | 844 | 930 | 821 | 930 | 847 | 930 | 879 |