

Minutes: of the meeting of Surrey County Council's Local Committee in Epsom and Ewell held at 19.00 on Monday 10th April 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 (Chairman)

Jean Smith (Epsom & Ewell North)

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

Members Present – Epsom and Ewell Borough Council

Cllr Pamela Bradley (Ewell)

Cllr Robert Leach (Auriol)

Cllr Nigel Pavey (Stamford)

Cllr Michael Richardson (Woodcote)

PART ONE

IN PUBLIC

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

30/ **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**
06

Apologies were received from Cllr Graham Dudley and Cllr Alan Carlson. Cllr Robert Leach substituted for Cllr Graham Dudley.

31/ **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]**
06

The minutes of the meeting held on 27th February 2006 were agreed.

32/ **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**
06

Colin Taylor declared a personal interest in Item 9 by virtue of being a Borough Councillor.

33/ **PETITIONS [Item 4]**
06

No petitions were received.

34/ 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).

35/ MEMBERS WRITTEN QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

06

No written Members' questions were received.

36/ 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 is attached as an annexe to these minutes.

**37/ CRITERIA FOR INCLUSION INTO LONDON TRAVELCARD ZONE 6
[Item 8]**

06

The Officer from Southern Railways introduced the report.

A Member asked what level of subsidy would be required to include Epsom in zone 6.

The Officer replied that a subsidy was not usually required to cover the loss of revenue from a station, which had been included in zone 6. Stations that are included in zone 6 incur a loss of revenue because the fares are reduced as a result of being included in zone 6. The cost of reducing fares at a station in zone 6 is usually met by nominal fare increases at other stations. As Epsom is the third busiest station in Surrey other stations would have to see large increases in their fares to cover the loss of revenue from Epsom.

A Member asked would a rise in revenue not actually occur by including a station in zone 6 as the station would see an increase in the number of passengers and therefore an increase in revenue.

The Officer responded that this was not the case. The major supply of revenue is derived from peak time commuter passengers. These services are currently virtually at full capacity. It would be doubtful that the services could withstand a major increase in capacity and therefore a significantly large increase in revenue would not occur. Rail companies have been addressing the issues of capacity by a variety of means.

A Member enquired if discussions could ahead to see the inclusion of Ewell West in zone 6 despite possible difficulties with the inclusion of Epsom.

The Officer responded that Ewell West would require the backing of South West Trains as well as Southern. The inclusion of Ewell East and Ewell West would be more straight forward because they are not as busy as Epsom; are nearer to the start of zone 6 and as a consequence there would be less loss of revenue. To reduce the prices at Ewell East and Ewell West as a result of inclusion in zone 6 would not mean large fare increases at other stations, as Epsom would require.

It was then

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted the report and that the issues raised would be progressed via the Passenger Transport Forum.

38/06 LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN – TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL BUDGET [Item 9]

The Officer introduced the report.

A Member asked what schemes in the integrated transport programme would address congestion in the Town Centre.

Members responded that several schemes would address congestion in the Town Centre such as Decriminalised Parking Enforcement, Safe Routes to School Strategy and the Cycling Strategy.

A Member enquired about the funding put aside to underwrite the provision of increased enforcement of Waiting Restrictions by Epsom & Ewell Borough Council. The funding is not to be rolled on year on year, therefore, when would a decision be made to release the funding for construction work.

The Officer responded that realistically the decision would be made in October.

A Member asked if the large headline schemes such as the Safe Routes to School Strategy also contained within them smaller schemes not mentioned in the list and if so would those smaller schemes be brought back to the Committee.

The Officer responded that large schemes such as the Safe Routes to School Strategy do contain a number of options and that the specific options would be brought back to the Committee. However, if the scheme in the list is specific than it will not be brought back to the Committee for authorisation. Full consultation will take place with the Chairman and local Members.

A Member asked if the list of schemes would be prioritised.

The Officer responded that it was the intention that everything on the list would be progressed in this year. The only cause of delay to some of schemes would be if there was an overspend from the last financial year 2005/06. The overspend from last financial year 2005/06 would have to be found from this years budget which could mean that some of the schemes on the list might not happen this year 2006/07.

A Member asked when would the outturn figures be available.

The Officer responded that the outturn figures would be available by July and the Officer estimated that overall there would be an overspend on last year's budget.

Members enquired about what responsibilities the Police still had in regards to parking enforcement. Members requested that a Police be Officer be invited to attend a Local Committee meeting to discuss parking enforcement.

The Officer responded that a Police Officer would be invited to a Local Committee meeting to discuss parking enforcement.

It was then

RESOLVED

- i) that the £100,000 Local Allocation capital funding be added to the £390,000 Local Transport Plan capital funding allocated to the Local Committee for the purpose of implementing integrated transportation schemes in 2006/07;
- ii) that the programme of highway improvement schemes and projects for progression in 2006/07 as set out in Annexe 1 be approved;
- iii) that the Officers be authorised to proceed with any necessary actions including traffic order, advertisements and notices of intent in order to deliver these schemes and projects; and
- iv) that the Local Transportation Manager be authorised to consider any objections received in response to statutory notices in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee, and local Borough and County Members.

39/ SIGN CLEANING REPORT [Item 10]

06

The Officer introduced the report.

Members asked if drought order would affect the graffiti cleaning.

Officers responded that they would enquire if the graffiti removal teams would be affected by the drought order.

It was then

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted the report.

40/
06 **ANNUAL HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE MANGEMENT PLAN 2006/07**
[Item 11]

The Officer introduced the report and confirmed that the funding allocation for Epsom & Ewell as set out in Annexe B of the report had been agreed by the Executive.

A Member enquired as to how roads that needed major maintenance work were decided upon. The Member was surprised at the exclusion of Danetree Road and inclusion of Lansdown Road.

The Officer responded that the assessment of roads requiring major maintenance had changed. Roads have a lifetime and the County has now decided to prioritise those roads that are in the middle of their lifetime, by prioritising these roads it is hoped to prevent roads getting into very poor repair and in turn save money. The Officer stated that he would investigate the status of Lansdown Road.

A Member understood that there was a five year rolling programme for the area.

The Officer responded that there was a five year rolling programme and that it could be circulated to Members of the Committee.

A Member asked why was Pam's Way not on the list, as the Member had received assurances that it would be the first priority on the list for 2006/07.

The Officers responded that they would investigate the exclusion of Pam's Way.

It was then

RESOLVED

That the Committee agreed that the Annual Highway Maintenance Management Plan for the Local Transportation Service in Epsom & Ewell for 2006/07 be approved.

41/ **ST MARGARET DRIVE/ ST ELIZABETH DRIVE, EPSOM, ADOPTION AND**
06 **INTRODUCTION OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS [Item 12]**

The Officer introduced the report.

A Member stated that the Directors of Abelea Green Estate and the developers Persimmon have yet to complete negotiations, but are hopeful of achieving an agreement within 3 months.

A Member asked if the residents reached an agreement would the road remain private indefinitely or could the County Council be approached to adopt the road in the future.

The Officer responded that the County Council as a general rule did not adopt private roads. If the road is asked to be adopted by the County Council at a later stage a clause is written into the agreement stating that the road must be of an adoptable standard.

A Member asked if the County Council did have to adopt the road would Officers ensure that the introduction Waiting Restrictions coordinated with the Borough Council having the additional resources in place to enforce them. The Member suggested that recommendation iv) be amended to read 'and that the additional staff resources for enforcement be in place.'

Members agreed to the amendment to recommendation iv).

It was then

RESOLVED

- i) that the introduction of Waiting Restrictions , as detailed in paragraph 3 below and shown on the Ordnance Survey extract which is attached at Annexe 1, be approved;
- ii) that authorisation be given to the making and advertising of the associated Traffic Regulation Order;
- iii) that the Local Transportation Manager be authorised to consider any objections received, in consultation with the Chairman and the local Borough and County Councillors; and
- iv) that it be noted that adoption of the estate roads is a matter delegated to the Local Transportation Manager and that the adoption be arranged to coincide with the introduction of Waiting Restrictions and that the additional staff resources for enforcement be in place.

42/
06 **MINOR HIGHWAYS/ LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROGRESS
REPORT [Item 13]**

The Officer introduced the report.

A Member asked if Stage 3 of a safety audit could result in alterations being made to a road scheme.

The Officer responded that a stage 3 safety audit took place 6 months after completion of scheme and it could result in modifications being made.

The Member requested that local Members be informed of when these safety audits were being carried out.

It was then

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted the report.

43/
06 **FLEXIBLE FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 14]**

The Officer introduced the report.

It was then

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted the report.

44/
06 **CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

The Chairman introduced the report.

The Chairman wished it to be highlighted that in future all motions that the Committee makes should be referred to full Council and not to the Executive.

It was then

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted the report.

Meeting Ended: 22:00

Chairman

Surrey County Council's Local Committee in Epsom & Ewell
10th April 2006
Public Question
Barrie Taylor

Q1) 'On Friday, March 3 2006, nine lamp posts were erected in Snakey Alley, Ewell by contractors acting on behalf of Surrey County Council. Please may we have a full written statement as to:

- a) The reasons for this work, which department of Surrey County Council commissioned it, and on whose specific authority was the work carried out?
- b) The eventual total cost of the project?
- c) A complete list of all the parties consulted before work was started including
 - i) County and Borough Councillors
 - ii) Officers of Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
 - iii) Surrey Police
 - iv) neighbouring residents in properties likely to be affected by the scheme (and in particular those with properties adjacent to or likely to be affected by the work and those in the adjoining private road call Hessele Grove) and
 - v) Ewell Village Resident's Association?

Officer Response

The street lighting scheme was carried out as part of Surrey County Council's 'Safer Routes to School' initiative. Its purpose is to provide a safer environment for all members of the public using Snakey Alley, in particular those pupils attending Glyn School. Not only is Snakey Alley subject to regular graffiti attack and a widespread littering problem, but also there have been several serious incidents reported to the Police in recent years. There is a bullying issue in Snakey Alley that has been reported to Surrey County Council by pupils of Glyn School. The school runs before and after school clubs.

The street lighting scheme will help to achieve the County Council's objectives of encouraging more people to forsake their motorcars when making the journey to and from school and Crime and Disorder Act objectives by reducing the fear of crime in the community.

The work was commissioned by the Local Transportation Service for Epsom & Ewell and authorised by the Senior Local Transportation Manager for North East Surrey.

The estimated cost of the scheme is £13,000.

Consultation on the scheme was carried out with the County and Borough Members of the Local Committee and with Glyn School.

The County Council as the Highway Authority would not normally undertake any wider consultation in respect of improvement works of this routine nature that are implemented on the highway.

**Informal Minutes of Public Question Time at
Surrey County Council's Local Committee
In Epsom & Ewell
10th April 2006**

Miss Biggart, Variable Messaging Signs (VMS)

Miss Biggart asked where was the remaining balance of £130,000 to be found to fund the installation of VMS in the Town Centre and which developer funding would be used.

Officer Response

The Officer responded that contributions were being made from various sources including the Business Community £20,000, the Borough Council and developer funding. It was not yet known which developer funding would be used. The Officer agreed to write to Miss Biggart informing her of the developer funding that would be used.

Derek Phillips, London Travelcard Zone 6

Mr Phillips asked with reference to paragraph 3.3 in Item 8 on the agenda could both SCC and Southern comment on the current Department of Transport consultation regarding the extension of the Mayor of London's powers to include rail services out of Greater London, which is at odds with the statements in paragraph 3.3 and 3.6 of the Item 8. With reference to 3.4 of Item 8 whom would initiate discussions between Southwest Trains and Southern Railways as to the inclusion of Ewell East and Ewell West into Zone 6. Could an explanation of how train subsidises are arranged in London and outer London.

Officer Response

The questions will be answered during the main debate on the item, please see above under Item 8 for the responses.

Mr George Chew, Buss Passes

Mr George Chew asked if it would be possible to extend the free travel for Old Age Pensioners (OAPs) within Surrey to London. Many OAPs have to frequently travel in and out of London for hospital appointments and are unable to drive so therefore have to use public transport.

Chairman Response

The ability to extend free OAP travel into London is not within the gift of Surrey County Council. This issue could be raised at the Passenger Transport Forum.

Mr Michael Harris, Disabled Access at Railway Stations

Mr Harris asked what could be done to enable greater access for disabled people at local railway stations particularly for those people who use wheelchairs. At present people who use a wheelchair need to go to Worcester Park Train station, would it not be possible that whilst upgrading the tracks that disabled access could also be improved.

Chairman Response

The Chairman responded that a written response would be provided.

Mr Trevor Bellinger, Highways Issues

Mr Bellinger asked what provisions would be made for people to drop down and pick people up within the Town Centre when the new waiting restriction were implemented and what improvements could be made to the junction where Ashley Avenue joins South Street.

Officer Response

The Officer responded that there would be no additional facilities for setting down and picking up people within the Town Centre, the only provision would be the existing one outside Natwest Bank in the High Street. The Local Committee and the Local Transportation Service is currently investigating how the Town Centre works and is looking to improve the safety and capacity of the Town Centre. The junction that Mt Bellinger had mentioned could lend itself to improvements.