

# Epsom & Ewell Local Committee

# Supplementary Agenda

We welcome you to  
**Epsom and Ewell Local Committee**  
Your Councillors, Your Community  
and the Issues that Matter to You

Supplementary Agenda

Item 6 Written Public Questions and  
Statements



## Venue

**Location:** Ewell Court House,  
Lakehurst Road,  
Ewell KT19 0EB

**Date:** Monday, 25 June  
2018

**Time:** 7.00 pm



## **SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

### **6 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS (Pages 1 - 6)**

To answer any questions or receive a statement from any member of the public who lives, works or studies in the Surrey County Council area in accordance with Standing Order 69. Notice should be given in writing or by e-mail to the Partnership Committee Officer at least by noon four working days before the meeting.



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL  
25 June 2018**

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS**

**Question 1 – Julie Morris  
Re: Yellow lines – Bridle Road**

Why were double yellow lines laid alongside the allotments boundary at the higher end of Bridle Road and why do they extend alongside the footpath/cycleway and grasscrete entrance to the allotments, where vehicular access is subsequently protected by robust wooden bollards, a sign and a litter bin and please can they be removed.

**BACKGROUND:**

- (a) The double yellow lines around the sharp bend, on the opposite side of Bridle Road where it meets Copse Edge Avenue, are not in question. All of the following relates to restrictions on the allotments side of Bridle Road.
- (b) There are some 250 plots on the Alexandra allotments site which has 3 entrances. Parking is now not possible in Church or Albert Roads because of the new Residents Parking Scheme, so Bridle Road is all that is available in close proximity to the site. Whilst it has always been heavily congested with commuter parking during the day, allotment holders had become accustomed to choosing their time and day so that some parking is available.
- (c) It has been confirmed that the restrictions in question were not requested by the County Councillor or Borough Councillors.
- (d) It has been confirmed that the restrictions were not an officer proposal based on highway safety.
- (e) It has not been possible to establish any incidences of obstruction or access problems of any kind which relate directly to the side of the road in question.
- (f) Despite evidence that there were objections following public consultation to the restrictions in question, it is apparently not possible to separate these from responses which also related to the Residents Parking Scheme in Church and Albert Roads. (The two arguably separate issues were treated as one). This may mean that there were actually no representations in support of these lines, whilst there were definitely some against.
- (g) The highway configuration on the allotments side of Bridle Road is not a mirror image of the sharp bend on the other side, indeed it is a cul-de-sac, and the layout would seem to be quite wide enough for parking to have continued as it was.

## ITEM 6

- (h) The knock-on effects of lines against the allotments have been widespread. People are now parking on the site itself and making access difficult for others because the track through is very narrow. Allotment holders are now parking in Copse Edge Avenue which is an unadopted road and incurring occasional abuse from residents there. They are also parking in the Alexandra Rec car park which is very small anyway and on the A2022 itself and walking. Some are parking further away from the site and trying to carry equipment.
- (i) The borough council cannot fund a parking area on the site itself.
- (j) Ultimately the viability of the entire site could be under threat simply because six parking spaces have been removed for reasons which seem obscure and which allotment holders fail to understand.

### **Officer Response:**

The original request came from residents in the local area, which is where most of our requests come from. This request was asking for yellow lines to be implemented to prevent obstructive parking and assist access for refuse vehicles and other larger vehicles.

The double yellow lines on the southern corner, do extend by ten metres in either direction, in accordance with the guidance in The Highway Code. The double yellow lines were originally proposed to be the same extents as the southern corner.

Subsequent correspondence with various representatives from the allotments have asked us to remove the double yellow on the north side - we feel that some of the lines should remain to keep the access to the allotments and the public footpath clear. We have proposed to revise part of the restrictions, so that they become a single yellow line that only operates for one hour in the morning - we think this will benefit allotment holders as commuters would not be able to park in the location, but allotment holders could after the restriction expires. (the proposal is from 9am-10am).

When we receive a request, we are obliged to assess the proposal and as a consequence the double yellow line proposal was put forward to committee, who agreed for the proposals to be advertised. We did receive some objections from allotment holders, however, it was felt at the time that the reasons for the proposals far outweighed the need of the allotment holders - in other words, keeping the junction clear and safe for all road users. Following subsequent objections, an engineer and councillor made a site visit to the location to assess the issues raised and had discussions with allotment holders.

There is access to and from the allotments, so that allotment holders can unload / load any heavy items (this task can also be carried out on yellow lines). We have been informed by EEBC that there are / have been plans to introduce a parking area within the allotment area, but that this is continuously thwarted, due to the area being used as a site for dumping rubbish.

The revised proposals can be seen in the parking review report which is being presented at Item 10 for this meeting.

**Question 2 - Mr Colin Taylor**  
**Re: Tree Works**

I am asking this on behalf of a number of residents of Stamford ward, Epsom West.

There is a large tree close to the corner of West Street and Station Approach. "Suckers" around the foot of this tree are blocking visibility at this junction and obscuring the indicator lights of cars from pedestrians, including large numbers of children attending Rosebery school plus some attending St Joseph's.

There used to be an annual programme for removal of such suckers from highway trees. I am told that this tree used to be pruned about July/August time. It wasn't done last year, so a local resident went to the Town Hall, where they were told it was Surrey County Council's responsibility. However when they contacted SCC, they were told the tree came under the jurisdiction of Epsom & Ewell.

Is this a question of a Highway Authority responsibility having been sub-contracted to the borough, with the borough council failing to update the data sheets issued to receptionists – as well as failing to brief the relevant work team?

Or is it perhaps a subtle difference between a highway tree in a grass verge and a borough tree in a raised flower bed surrounded by a stone wall?

Whose job is it?

More importantly, is it going to be trimmed this year – and if so when?

**Officer Response:**

The tree is already on the annual maintenance schedule for basal growth clearance. These works are programmed between June and September; Surrey's contractor will be alerted to local concerns in order to respond as soon as possible.

**Question 3 – Mr David Gulland**  
**Re: Parking Restrictions – Tintagel Close**

Parking restrictions were recently instituted in Tintagel Close, along with other roads in the same area. Residents believe that the motivation for this was to free them from the problem of parking by commuters. Is this correct?

If so, why do the restrictions apply all day and up to 8pm?

Was "curfew parking" considered, with 2 hour restrictions mid-morning and early afternoon?

Also, why do the restrictions include Saturdays?

Monday to Saturday up to 8pm may be needed in roads near the town centre, such as The Parade, because of parking by shoppers, but not further out. Residents are complaining that it is not reasonable to have to use visitor permits for friends arriving at 7pm or family visiting on a Saturday.

What process should they follow now to get the times reviewed and hopefully changed?

**Officer Response:**

The recent introduction of a residents permit scheme in the Tintagel Close area, was following a consultation with residents, where the proposal was Monday to Saturday 9am-8pm. The majority of residents who responded to the consultation were in agreement with the proposals, hence the reason that the proposals went ahead as they are.

The timescales were introduced because, we were informed, that visitors to the cinema, pubs and local restaurants were also using the area to park in, rather than the Upper High Street car park, which meant residents were often not able to park close to their properties when returning home after work or on shopping days, such as Saturday.

The only way that any amendments could be made to the times, would be if residents were to put together a petition (with at least 70% in favour), of changing the times - this would have to apply to the entire area rather than individual roads, as a change in time in individual roads would lead to confusion with signing and therefore enforcement. This could then be considered in a future parking review.

**Question 4 – Cllr Martin Olney**  
**Re: Parking for Shops – Manor Green Road**

The residents of The Wells estate are concerned about the inaction to improve the junction between Wells Road and the A24. It is extremely difficult to exit The Wells at this junction. It is particularly difficult to make a right turn towards Ashtead during the rush hour. As far as I am aware traffic lights or a roundabout have been rejected as being too costly. However there is a low cost option that should make things a little easier. Travelling into Epsom from The Wells the speed limit is reduced from 40 Mph to 30 Mph some 300 metres beyond Wells Road. Residents have suggested that the speed limit reduction should happen on the Ashtead side of the junction. This will alert drivers to the junction. This is especially important because it is difficult to see the junction when travelling from Ashtead as there is an upward slope on the road that partially obscures the junction.

Will the Local Committee investigate the cost and feasibility of moving the speed limit change to the Ashtead side of Wells Road?

**Officer response:**

Surrey County Council (SCC) currently receives funding to be used specifically to reduce road casualties. We monitor casualties in partnership with Surrey Police across the county and focus our road safety resources on those sites where there are patterns of casualties, because we can then be reasonably confident of identifying whether an engineering intervention might help reduce the frequency of casualties at a particular site. We then prioritise investment in those sites with the highest frequency of casualties, where we believe an engineering intervention would be beneficial. Given the number of existing sites where there are patterns of casualties, when considering investment in road safety we are obliged to prioritise those sites with the greatest frequency of casualties, ahead of those sites with a lesser frequency of casualties.

In terms of recorded collisions, Surrey Police regularly shares information with the council and patterns can then be investigated to see which measures may be

appropriate. Locations of collisions where an injury has been sustained are shown on the public website Crashmap. Please see details at <http://www.crashmap.co.uk/>

Records show that there have been two collisions involving injury in the last three year period, one involving a motorcyclist and another involving a reversing bus. However, Surrey Police do not maintain records of damage-only collisions or near misses.

Surrey Highways, in partnership with the police and travel advisors, identify locations with a poor safety record by analysing collision data and trends. Locations of community concern are also considered, when residents, elected members or community surveys have highlighted locations where it is thought that there may be a traffic problem. Assessment potentially leads to the development of measures such as physical changes, enforcement, or educational campaigns. The concerns regarding this section of road and the junction with Wells Road have been raised to the road safety partnership. With consideration of other locations and patterns of collisions, there are no current plans to allocate specific road safety funding to Wells Road.

As well as schemes to specifically address problems evidenced by a history of injuries, Surrey County Council does introduce other local highways improvement schemes. For example, these may be to improve traffic flow, relieve congestion, provide facilities such as pedestrian crossings, or to address locations where residents have highlighted areas of concern. Schemes may also aim to improve the quality of life and general environment for residents, as well as address safety concerns. These are the types of schemes promoted via Epsom and Ewell Local Committee. Within the current highways programme there are no plans to investigate the cost and feasibility of moving the speed limit change to the Ashtead side of Wells Road.

A lowering of the speed limit on the A24 would need to have a positive effect on driver behaviour. Unfortunately, past experience as well as research shows that merely changing speed limit signs or their position has minimal impact on vehicle speeds. The environment presented to the driver is a key source of information in terms of their selected speed.

To introduce a successful speed limit, the average speeds of vehicles need to be close to 30mph (in this case) as speed limits need to be self-enforcing. Surrey's speed limit policy has set criteria on measuring speeds and determining the appropriate limit. Details are available at

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-safety-and-emergencies/speed-limits>

The setting of speed limits takes into account the types of vehicles the roads carry as well as the purpose of the road within the network. Should significant traffic calming measures be required to regulate speeds these would not be appropriate at this location. A nearby example is Craddocks Avenue which has quite harsh traffic calming measures. As Dorking Road forms part of the A24 strategic route any restrictions would divert traffic onto less appropriate routes. Therefore we would not consider these types of traffic calming measures on Dorking Road.

In this instance, should funding be allocated for an assessment to be progressed, it would be in accordance with Surrey's Speed Limit Policy which aligns with the approaches of the Department for Transport and Surrey Police. It may conclude that

## ITEM 6

40mph is a suitable limit for the road, which is relatively wide with footways and verges on each side and few direct accesses from the road. That is not to say that 40mph will always be a suitable speed of travel, depending on road conditions and levels of traffic. As well as being the legal limit, speed limits are a key source of information to road users, particularly as an indicator of the nature and risks posed by that road both to themselves and to all other road users. The setting of a suitable speed limit aims to ensure that the majority of drivers will naturally drive at the appropriate speed. This enables the police to target drivers that are deliberately driving at inappropriate speeds.

There are a number of locations where the speed limit has been raised (e.g. Chantilly Way in Epsom raised from 30mph to 40mph). Monitoring has shown that speeds here actually reduced following implementation. Conversely, in Elmbridge a speed limit was recently changed from 40mph to 30mph which led to an increase in speeds. This demonstrates that the correct setting of speed limits can have a positive impact, despite sometimes seeming to be counter-intuitive.

In all instances, concerns regarding vehicle speeds and driver behaviour may be raised to Surrey Police as the sole authority with enforcement powers.

However, the concerns around the layout and visibility of the junction are appreciated and have been raised to officers by the Local Divisional Member. Surrey Highways officers have reviewed and are in discussion with the Local Divisional Member regarding signing improvements.

### **Question 5 – Cllr Martin Olney Re: Yellow Lines – Wheelers Lane**

Recently the double yellow lines at the bottom of Wheelers Lane from West Street have been repainted. This was done to include a new 3 or 4 metre stretch of yellow lines across the alley from Hookfield (from last year's parking review). I have previously asked that the yellow lines be renewed all the way up Wheelers Lane. The lines are in an appalling state. Some of them have been washed away completely, others have faded and terminators have been obscured. This leads to the commuters more or less parking where they like because they can always claim the lines were indistinct. In this financial climate it is inexcusable that we are ignoring a revenue stream. If the lines were clear and correctly marked parking would be much more orderly and we would be in a better position to collect PCNs.

Will the Local Committee commit funds to replace the faded and irregular yellow lines all the way up Wheelers Lane?

#### **Officer response:**

SCC has asked that the yellow lines are refreshed 'as necessary' along Wheelers Lane. I do know that yellow lines have been refreshed recently.

Wheelers Lane is being looked at in the latest parking review, with a view to introducing a resident's permit scheme - if this is approved then additional markings will be introduced further along Wheelers Lane. If there are any additional lines that need refreshing at this stage, then the works will be ordered at the same time.