

**MINUTES: of the meeting of the Tandridge Local Committee held at 10.15am on Friday 4<sup>th</sup> June 2010 at Tandridge District Council Offices, Oxted.**

**County Council Members**

- \* Mr N W Skellett - Chairman
- \* Mrs Sally Ann B Marks - Vice-chairman
- \* Mr Tony Elias
- \* Mr David Hodge
- \* Mr John Orrick
- \* Mr Michael Sydney

**District Council Members**

- Cllr Lisa Bangs
- Cllr Nick Childs
- \* Cllr Michael Cooper
- \* Cllr Martin Fisher
- \* Cllr Ken Harwood
- Cllr Marian Myland

\* = Present

**18/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from District Councillor Nick Childs. District Councillor Rose Thorn substituted.

**19/10 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 5 MARCH 2010 [Item 2]**

Deferred to 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2010.

**20/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

**21/10 PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS [Item 4]**

District Councillor Jill Caudle asked a question germane to the Parking Report [Item 6] and this was deferred to discussion of that item.

**22/10 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

There were none.

**23/10 TANDRIDGE PARKING REVIEW 2009/10 PART TWO LOCATIONS [Item 6]**

This report asked the Committee to consider the implementation of new waiting restrictions and amendments to existing restrictions at various locations across the district.

[NOTE: An amendment to Item 6, Annex A, Section 8 was recorded, namely that Commonwealth Road is in Caterham and not, as printed, in Oxted.]

The Chairman exercised his discretion to allow those members of the public attending to ask questions during the formal discussion of this report.

The attending officer clarified the purpose of bringing this report and assured those present that this item dealt only with those sites previously approved by Committee for further action and that new sites would be brought to Committee on 2 July as part of the annual Parking Review report which will form the next phase of activity. He explained that this was an iterative process. Those sites which had proved non-contentious had already been taken forward with the agreement of the local member. Mrs Marks said that it would be helpful to have a full list, including those sites, recorded publicly, perhaps as an information item to a future Committee meeting. The attending officer agreed to present all legal orders to local committee and to include this in the report scheduled for 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2010.

The officer clarified that there is a three-stage process involved: approval, consultation and implementation. Any times advertised can subsequently be reduced but not increased. Any increases to waiting times or other amendments would require starting the process afresh, thus creating delays. This is explained some of the discrepancies between what Members felt was reasonable and the times advertised in some cases. However the Local Committee has the overview of principles and locations and details may change in the iterative process.

Committee then looked at individual sites. The officer presented the results of the consultation exercise in Oxted which showed that there was no clear majority among that section of the community who responded so the percentage in favour was not large enough to proceed with restrictions in Amy Road and Johnsdale.

In Chichele Road, where there is extreme congestion at the Bluehouse Lane end, the solution was deemed proportionate to the problem as further incursions would lead to displacement creating difficulties in Silkham and Barrow Green Road. A local resident spoke in favour welcoming the speed of progress in addressing the issue but felt that this site needed further discussion before longer-term solutions could be implemented. Another local resident felt that it did not adequately address congestion at school dropping off times and asked whether officers would reconsider reinstating restrictions from the junction to No 8. However, the officer felt that the recommended proposals would resolve the issue. He was concerned that a curfew at one end would displace the problem and felt that the area should be reviewed as a whole before setting curfews in place. The safety of school children was considered a priority and, should the proposal be agreed, further consultation would then take place. In relation to timescales, the officer described the budget position as 'fluid' but hoped to move proposals forward by the end of this year.

The Chairman summed up by saying that the budget is diminishing but that he wished to reassure the public that the parking strategy is constantly under review. The relatively successful use of the station and its impact on the local economy and businesses conflicts with the needs of local residents in the area and, while he would like to be able to provide parking for everyone it is an expensive option and meanwhile the issues still needed to be addressed.

Another local resident urged the County Council to put pressure on the railway companies to accept responsibility for the congestion around stations. He also suggested that, at school times, parents be encouraged to park further from the school and to walk for health and fitness as well as reducing congestion. He suggested that supermarkets might subsidise roads by sponsorship scheme eg roundabout advertising. Another resident said that double yellow lines don't help local residents and wondered whether Tower Gate could be persuaded to adopt a green travel plan for its staff. The Chairman ascertained that travel plans are a voluntary option and the local authorities have no powers to enforce them. The District Council has also pushed the railway companies, who are lengthening the platform, over the restrictions imposed

while work goes ahead, by trying to reduce the length of road currently out of use for parking. However it falls outside their statutory duties. Agreed that consultation should go ahead reporting back to Committee on 24 September 2010.

Greenhurst Lane was considered to be in need of an overall review.

[Note: Page 19 should read ‘Caterham Valley’ on the map location].

District Councillor Jill Caudle, speaking as a local resident, asked whether consultation would offer options. The Chairman clarified that the issue concerned the geographical position of the proposals and that these needed to include the electricity substation where the road is narrow and can create problems for emergency vehicles. The officer agreed to add this to the proposals and it was then agreed.

Harestone raised some debate about the practice of taxis who took up more parking than just the allocated rank. Officer to investigate the legalities. District Councillor Michael Cooper suggested that the only workable solution was to widen the road for which there are no funds. The proposals were subsequently agreed.

Hillbury Road recently was the subject of a public meeting attended by Mrs Sally Marks who was concerned that congestion would endanger school children and who spoke strongly in favour of introducing resident parking. She was fully supported by a local resident who felt that people would be prepared to pay for a curfew restriction that would discourage commuter all day parking. There was concern that this would be an innovative move for Tandridge and that the outlay costs might exceed the returns at a time when funds were a serious consideration for the County Council. Although the officer made it clear that he had had discussions with the District Council parking manager who had agreed that this was workable, Mr Tony Elias, in his role as a District Councillor, disputed this.

In terms of policing, a local resident confirmed that local residents were very likely to police the use of the bays themselves as they had a vested interest and that they would be willing to report issues through the proper channels but also to challenge anyone mis-using the bays. Mr Tony Elias remained unconvinced as he felt that this would lead to implementation in other areas, where it was neither necessary nor desirable given the rural nature of the District, on grounds of economic expediency. He doubted whether the current District parking team provision was adequately resourced to deal with it and questioned the economic viability.

Mrs Marks made the point that Hillbury Road was uniquely difficult being more urban than other parts of the District and that the Committee had to adjust to the challenges of a changing environment and to make it cost effective by charging appropriately. The Chairman argued the case that it was important to go to consultation as quickly as possible and to follow up on costing the business case in the meantime. However, District Councillor Michael Cooper argued that this would raise expectations in the community that might not be realised and called for figures to be established first.

Mr John Orrick asked how long this would take and whether the decision could be delegated. This was met with opposition and the Chairman ended the debate by putting it to the vote which was lost by seven to three. The outcome was to defer this item for costing and to bring a report to the next formal meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> July.

High Street; Godstone Road and East Grinstead Road, Lingfield were taken together and after a brief discussion were withdrawn pending further consultation.

The officer then confirmed that all of the agreed schemes would be advertised together.

**RESOLVED** that the Local Committee (Tandridge) AGREE:

- (i) the recommendations detailed in Annex A [of the report] **with the exception of Hillbury Road, which was deferred to 2<sup>nd</sup> July pending further information on costing, and the Lingfield locations withdrawn at the request of the local Member pending further consultation.**
- (ii) that the county council make amendments to existing traffic regulation orders for the recommended parking controls to be implemented
- (iii) that the recommended parking controls be implemented
- (iv) to allocate the necessary funding to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments.

24/10 **REVIEW OF OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED SPEED LIMITS IN TANDRIDGE**  
[Item 7]

Following approval by the Local Committee, several changes to speed limits on roads in Tandridge have been formally advertised over the last few months. This report asked the Local Committee to consider objections received to these proposed speed limits following the statutory consultation process and to decide on how best to proceed.

**RESOLVED** that the Local Committee

- (i) consider the objections to the proposed speed limits as detailed in the report and annex
- (ii) approve the imposition of new speed limits as advertised at Judges Corner, Nutfield Marsh Road, Westerham Road and Little and Big Common Lanes.

**[Meeting Ended: 12.05 pm]**

---

**Chairman**