# Supplementary Agenda

Epsom & Ewell
Local Committee

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

Supplementary Agenda

Item 4 Written Public Questions and Statements *(in addition to those on the main agenda)*

Item 7 Member Questions

## Venue

**Location:** Epsom Town Hall,
The Parade, Epsom
KT18 5BY

**Date:** Monday, 10
December 2018

**Time:** 2.00 pm

SURREY

## SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

**3 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS** (Pages 1 - 12)

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.

Responses to the questions already received are attached.

**7 MEMBER QUESTION TIME** (Pages 13 - 14)

To receive any written questions from Members under Standing Order 47. Notice should be given in writing to the Partnership Committee Officer by 12.00 noon four working days before the meeting.

SURREY

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**
**LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL**
**10 December 2018**

## PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

## QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO SCC SERVICES

**Question 4 – Silvana Coghe**
*(Supported by Clare Deeprose, Juliet Edwards, Chantal Walters, Toni Herschel, Jenny Watts and Lee Bowyer)*
**Re: Rosebank junction with West Street**

I understand that Councillor Kemp has confirmed that the county council will improve the operation of the traffic lights at the junction in West Street, where traffic from Rosebank meets that from West Hill.

One result of the recent changes to the one-way system in Epsom town centre is an improvement in the time taken to get from West Hill to Dorking Road. Improving the exit from Rosebank will obviously reduce this. How long is the delay likely to be in West Hill to get 10 minutes improvement in Rosebank?

**Officer Response:**

Surrey Officers in the Traffic Operations team continue to monitor and re-validate all the junctions in and around Epsom following the changes made to South Street and the ongoing works in the Town Centre. Operation of some signals is currently different to normal operation as the overarching "Urban Traffic Control" (UTC) Management of the signals is not currently operating across the whole Town Centre and cannot, whilst roadworks continue. Individual junctions are therefore still operating intelligently based on traffic movements detected by the sensors in the roads, but some are doing so in isolation as opposed to being linked by the UTC management.

Officers will continue to review the vehicle detection measures, programming and operation of all junctions as new traffic movements become clearer and more commonplace following the changes made and will seek to optimise the operation of each junction. When all works are completed and the full UTC operation is restored, further refinements can be made. Whilst we will consider the efficiency of all junctions, priority will always be given to keeping the traffic flowing on the main roads through Epsom and the one-way system. At this stage, it is not possible to provide specific detail to changes in travel times between junctions, until the UTC Region is fully re-validated by our Traffic Operations Team.

**Question 5 – Alison Kelly**
**Re: Visitor Parking Permits**

Currently people in a residents parking area are restricted to 120 visitor tickets per year. This restriction means that one can only have a visitor every 3 days.

This makes it very difficult when the visitor is not a registered carer. For example, when someone wants to have a family member visit to assist with child care or simply to provide company for someone who is unable to leave the house.

There don't seem to be any plans to change this outdated restriction, which I understand applies county-wide.

What procedure needs to be followed to call for a review of whether such a restriction is really necessary when a resident needs additional visitors' tickets for normal social purposes, or for reasons associated with their medical or mental health?

**Officer Response:**

The limit on the number of visitors permits that a household can apply for was reviewed in 2011 and was raised from 30 per year up to 120, as it was recognised that 30 was very low. The limit was agreed by the council as part of its parking strategy. The reason for having a limit is to help control use of the permits, in order to reduce the likelihood that they might be misused and/or sold on for profit, and to ensure that their overuse does not impact unduly on residents' ability to find a parking space.

Medical personnel are able to apply for an operational permit, at no cost, so that they can carry out visits to residents where there is a permit scheme in operation.

In the vast majority of cases 120 visitors permits per year is sufficient and we receive very few enquiries about raising the limit. However the council is about to undertake a review of its parking strategy, which will provide an opportunity to consider whether there is any need to increase the number of permits that a household can apply for, either in general or in particular circumstances.

**Question 6 – Alison Kelly**
**Re: Rosebank and West Street Resurfacing**

Rosebank and West Street in Epsom are in a poor state of repair. The thin layer of tarmac has exposed the underlying concrete structure to the road and in places the gaps between the concrete slabs are deep and hazardous. This makes it particularly dangerous for motorbike riders and cyclists as wheels can easily get stuck in these gaps. This road is also used by children coming to and from St Josephs and Rosebery schools making it significantly busier than a normal residential road. There is so little tarmac remaining in places that the dis-repair has gone beyond the stage of filling pot holes.

(a) What plans does the council have to completely renovate the road surface of these roads?

(b) Are there any outstanding reports of potholes on these streets?

(c) Would action be taken if residents were to raise additional reports of the potholes?

**Officer Response:**

(a) Rosebank (from B280 West Street to the end of the road) is on Surrey County Council's list of carriageway resurfacing schemes for consideration for future

years. In terms of priority, at the time of publication of this list in July 2018, Rosebank was 7th priority for resurfacing in Epsom & Ewell, and 84th priority for Surrey as a whole. It is quite possible that the priority ranking of Rosebank might move up or down depending on how quickly the road deteriorates compared to others in the County. If the priorities were to remain as they were in July 2018, we would hope to resurface the road in the next five years. However this may be pushed back if other roads deteriorate more quickly than this one. For more details please see here https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/horizon-highway-maintenance-investment-programme

(b) At the time of writing this response (Monday 3rd December at 10:10am) there were two reported potholes in Rosebank, one of which had been scheduled for repair. Reports of potholes may be viewed any time on our website here https://www9.surreycc.gov.uk/highwayproblem/LocateProblem.aspx?GISDefectTypeId=8

(c) Yes. Any report of a pothole from residents is investigated to see whether it is a Safety Defect. If it is a Safety Defect then it would be repaired. If it is not a Safety Defect it would not be repaired. Either way the resident would be informed. For more details of our Highway Safety Inspection Standards and Procedures please see our website here https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/policies-plans-consultations/policies-and-plans/highway-safety-inspections-standards-and-procedures.

**Question 7 – Colin Taylor**
**Re: Proposed zebra crossing in Waterloo Road**

This question concerns item 8 on the agenda for 10th December 2018.
Annexe B to item 8 illustrates the scheme for a proposed Zebra crossing in Waterloo Road, Epsom, which is briefly discussed in the second paragraph 2.2.4 on page 20 of item 8 (not to be confused with the first paragraph 2.2.4 on page 17).

This proposal appears to be justified by the availability of some £50,000 of “section 106” funding arising out of the redevelopment of Epsom Station, rather than by the detailed logical procedure set forth in Annex C of item 8, which indicates that there are 5 other schemes offering greater benefit-to-cost ratios.

I was relieved to read that when officers “reviewed this outline design with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and local Divisional and Ward Members” it seems those members “expressed concern that three to four car lengths worth of parking would be lost if the Zebra Crossing were to be implemented” and that officers would “explore whether more parking could be preserved” whilst members would consult local business owners”.

Nevertheless, the report recommends this Local Committee “to authorise the Area Highway Manager to advertise the statutory notice for a new Zebra Crossing in Waterloo Road, and to implement this new Zebra Crossing using £50,000 s106 funding”.

I am painfully reminded that all the parking bays in front of these shops were lost under Phase 1 of the Epsom & Ewell Parking Review, when double yellow lines were forced through by the then chairman against the advice of the vice-chairman and local member, leading to the bankruptcy of the largest shop on this parade, the eventual provision of the current limited-time parking bays and the procedure still

followed by this committee to involve the local member as well as the chairman and vice chairman.

No doubt the proposed crossing will be welcomed by the residents of the Wellington House sheltered homes on the opposite side of the road, which are not shown on the plans. Otherwise I am left wondering what advice the local member can be given about explaining to her constituents why a crossing is now proposed in Waterloo Road, in preference to the one they have been requesting for the last 10 or 12 years across Temple Road, or failing that, across Chase Road.

The residents of the block bounded by Temple Road, Chase Road, Hook Road and Pound Lane have no safe pedestrian access to the town centre. Their only pedestrian crossing is across Hook Road, west of the railway arch, which gets them to Screwfix but not the town centre.

As s106 funding from the station is mentioned, it might be thought that the proposed crossing is intended to help commuters walking between the station and the Hook Road car park, but even setting aside the fact that most regulars use the route behind the Ebbisham Centre alongside the railway, in preference to the marked route via Chase Road, which involves negotiating the railway arch, in both cases they still need a safe place to cross Hook Road.

The approved scheme to complete the pedestrian link through the traffic signals at the Hook Road to East Street junction would meet this need. This was initiated by the then Local Highways Director more than 12 years ago and it must be about 10 years since the design was agreed, but it has not been built because the required s106 funds were never available.

What is the problem? Is this crossing too far away from the station? What perceived purpose is this crossing in Waterloo Road intended to serve? It just seems to be using up the available funds – and although my friend in Wellington House would benefit, this should not be at the expense of losing any more of the Waterloo Road local shops.

Please put it in Temple Road instead.

**Officer Response:**

The proposed Zebra Crossing in Waterloo Road was suggested by local Members to assist residents of Wellington House cross Waterloo Road to access the shops. As suggested in the question, by reference to Annex C of the Highways Update report, the provision of a new Zebra Crossing in Waterloo Road is a low priority compared to other improvements schemes in Epsom & Ewell. The recommendation is intended to enable Committee to make a decision on whether to proceed with the proposed Zebra Crossing or not, given its priority compared to other schemes, and the likely loss of parking if the scheme were to go ahead. The terms of the s106 agreement, from which the funding for this project is derived, stipulate that the funding must be spent on “cycle, pedestrian and public transport facilities in Waterloo Road”. This means that the alternative schemes suggested in other roads, however worthy, cannot be funded using these monies.

## QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO ITEM 4 PETITIONS

**Question 8 – Toni Herschel**
*(Supported by Chantal Walters, Juliet Edwards, Clare Deeprose, Silvana Coghe, Lee Bowyer and Jenny Watts)*
**Re: Abelea Green Estate**

St Margaret Drive and the other roads on the Abelea Green estate are described as private roads. I understand this means they are unadopted.

Did Surrey County Council turn down this estate for adoption when it was built, or did the estate choose not to pay the council's fees and charges for its future maintenance?

In unadopted roads the residents pay for the roadway repairs and maintenance, but who pays for the street-lighting and the drainage, the residents or the council?

**Officer Response:**

St Margaret Drive, St Elizabeth Drive, St Edith Close, and part of St Theresa Close, are all adopted Public Highway, including their carriageways, footways, surface water drainage, streetlighting, etc.

Abelea Green – the grass area adjoining St Margaret Drive, St Elizabeth Drive and St Edith Close – is private property. The access road that connects St Margaret Drive to the car park at St Joseph's Church is part of Abelea Green, and as such is also private property.

**Question 9 – Resident of St Elizabeth Drive**
**Re: Relaxation of parking on St Margaret and St Elizabeth Drive**

(a) The parking restrictions on St Elizabeth Drive and St Margaret Drive are the same as those on other roads near White Horse Drive where there is access to St Joseph's. These other roads include Elmslie Close, Hylands Mews, Orchard Gardens, Westlands Ct, Hylands Drive and Woodcote Green Road. Any consideration to relax parking on St Elizabeth Drive and St Margaret Drive for the reasons stated by St Joseph's should also apply to all of these other roads. It is not fair to the residents of Abelea Green. We have had to organise our own petition (which an overwhelming majority of residents have supported), we've had to write to Councillors, and take time off work to come to these meetings because the church and the school has been able to press parents and parishoners into signing their petition. The Local Committee agreeing to consider this petition creates the opportunity for all other schools in Surrey (e.g. St Martins to petition for relaxation of parking on Jackson's Close and Leighton Way etc.) Where will this stop?

(b) Please explain why the Local Committee is not politely declining the petition from St Joseph's because it is clearly unfairly directed at the residents of Abelea Green by only asking for relaxation on St Elizabeth Drive and St Margaret Drive and not Elmslie Close, Hylands Mews, Orchard Gardens, Westlands Ct or Hylands Drive and Woodcote Green Road.

(c) What has the School done about staggering school start and end times each day to manage the flow of traffic in Rosebank?

(d) What has the Diocese done about using a small amount of the resources it has (well in excess of £40m) to create parking/ drop off and pick up/ drive in and out zone all within its own site to relieve congestion and flow of traffic in Rosebank? Surely if the Local Committee is doing its job properly it would pursue the Diocese and School to the fullest extent on this matter before putting on its agenda relaxation of parking on any of the roads. The School and Diocese has sufficient money and land within its own site to sort all of their problems out. This would make the greatest improvement to the residents of Rosebank and Whitehorse Drive. A win win for everyone.

(e) Why is the school not trialling their park and stride in the first instance from areas slightly further out where there are no parking restrictions at school drop off and pick up times (e.g. Wilmerhatch Lane). There are crossings on Woodcote Green Road. A walking bus would take less than 15 minutes to walk through Hylands Drive to the pedestrian crossing to Whitehorse Drive.

(f) Has the Local Committee considered making available one hour free parking in the Ashley Centre car park between 8am and 9am and 3.15pm and 4.15pm to facilitate park and stride through Mount Hill gardens to St Joseph's School? This has the positive upside of bringing more visitors into the shopping centre. Many of those using the parking for school pick up may well stay longer than an hour and pay the full fee and do some shopping.

**Officer Response:**

(a) In the majority of cases, the Local Committee considers and promotes changes to parking and waiting restrictions in response to requests from the community. If requests were to be received to change parking restrictions in the other roads mentioned in this part of the question, or indeed in any other road in Epsom & Ewell, the Local Committee would follow the same process for considering the requests and promoting any changes, if considered appropriate. This process includes a technical appraisal, statutory consultation, opportunities for representations by supporters and opponents of any proposed change, and ultimately the decision to proceed (or not).

(b) Any petition that meets the requirements of Surrey County Council's petitions scheme (https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/have-your-say/petitions) may be presented to the appropriate Committee for consideration.

(c) This question should be directed to the school.

(d) This questions should be directed to the diocese. It is not the role of the Local Committee to pursue a private organisation to use its resources in a particular way.

(e) Surrey County Council has agreed to assist by identifying existing on and off street parking opportunities that may facilitate park and stride by the school communities. It would then be up to the schools to promote these opportunities within their respective communities.

(f) The Ashley Centre car park is owned and operated by Epsom & Ewell Borough Council. The Local Committee is a Surrey County Council Committee, and has no authority to change the charging regime within this car park. This question should be directed to Epsom & Ewell Borough Council.

**Question 10 – Debbie Heffernan**
**Re: Whitehorse Drive**

(a) Within Surrey County Council, who authorised the handing over of the keys for emergency access to the cabbage patch at the end of White Horse Drive, to the Headteacher at St Joseph's primary school?

(b) Will the council please consider sharing the local pressure on access to St Joseph's school more fairly with Abelea Green roads, St Elizabeth & St Margaret Drives, in the full knowledge that White Horse Drive is already a heavily congested cul de sac servicing Rosebery school with its 1800 pupils & 100 staff, alongside all the daily and extracurricular activities associated with this large academy?

(c) How were private contractors hired by St Joseph's school, (Poulsom Plant Hire and Agricultural Contracting) able to cut down trees and build a tarmac path on Borough council land up to St Joseph's school boundary enabling access to the school via White Horse Drive, without any formal planning notice or application?

**Officer response:**

(a) Surrey County Council's Highways service do not currently hold a key to the demountable bollards at the Whitehorse Drive end of the Cabbage Patch path. Epsom & Ewell Borough Council hold a set of keys for these bollards, to facilitate access for environmental maintenance (grass cutting, street cleansing, etc). Surrey County Council did receive a request to provide keys to facilitate access for contractors to construct the access onto the Cabbage Patch path. Surrey County Council had no reason to object to this access being constructed, and therefore directed the request to Epsom & Ewell Borough Council.

(b) There are two petitions being presented to the Local Committee relating to this question. There is a petition from the St Joseph's school community, seeking a relaxation of the parking restrictions in St Margaret Drive and St Elizabeth Drive, to enable parents to park and walk around the block (either via Mount Hill Gardens or Whitehorse Drive) to access St Joseph's school. There is also a petition from residents of St Margaret Drive, St Elizabeth Drive, and adjoining roads, opposing any relaxation of parking restrictions in these roads. In response to these petitions it is recommended that the Local Committee consider the requested change in the context of the next parking review, by which time the new travel patterns to St Joseph's school are expected to have settled down, and noting the opposing views on this matter.

(c) The new access to St Joseph's school at the Whitehorse Drive end of the Cabbage Patch path was commissioned by St Joseph's school. This question should be directed to the school and the Local Planning Authority, which is Epsom & Ewell Borough Council.

**Question 11 – St Margaret Drive Resident**
**Re: St Margaret Drive parking**

I refer here to previous request to extend parking restrictions of the exact same area made in August 2016. The request was denied to be included in the review. On speaking to Steve Clavey, Senior Engineer, Parking Team Surrey Highways I was told that the reason for this would be the cost of replacing the parking signs on the lampposts around Abelea Green being prohibitive.

(a) Please explain why when Surrey County Council is in far deeper financial crisis than 2016 that any consideration to parking changes in clear opposition to the residents' wishes will be given at all?

(b) When it is clear from the inclusions of the previous committee the Council is pursuing a systematic approach of further restricting nuisance parking in accordance with residents wishes, including specifically for the access of emergency vehicles which historically has twice now been denied, (once to a resident, and once to a parishioner inside the church), is it now deemed acceptable to consider the exact opposite, in the relaxation of restrictions, than every other member of the borough enjoys with the Councils' protection?

**Officer response:**

(a) Changes to parking and waiting restrictions in Epsom & Ewell are now fully funded using income derived from parking enforcement. Such income, by law, must be spent on the Public Highway, and cannot therefore be used to alleviate the financial challenges faced by Surrey County Council's social care business, for example.

(b) From a technical point of view it is quite possible to introduce parking opportunities in St Margaret Drive and / or St Elizabeth Drive that conform to the relevant standards, that do not obstruct through traffic, and that do not obstruct visibility to and from junctions.

**Question 12 – Nick Bathurst**
**Re: Parking**

In circumstances where the Council saw fit to consent to the petition presented by the Governors of St Joseph's School, the Council would effectively be voluntarily creating a primary school parking facility on a public road, accompanied by the various risks associated with the combination of young children and vehicles.

(a) What steps would the Council propose to take to manage and supervise this primary school parking facility?

How confident is the Council that its public liability insurance policy would respond, in the event that the Council found itself a Defendant to a claim presented by a child injured when using this facility, given the creation of the facility and its associated risks at the Council's own behest?

How would the Council propose to fund a high value claim, in circumstances where policy indemnity was declined by the Council's insurers, on the basis that the Council brought the very risk forming the subject matter of the claim upon itself voluntarily?

(b) Would the Council be prepared to afford similar facilities to the various other schools in the Borough, which would doubtless take note of the precedent that consent to the petition presented by the Governors of St Joseph's School would necessarily set?

(c) Does the Council consider that provision of parking facilities is likely to encourage non-vehicular methods of travel to schools generally?

**Officer response**

(a) Parents who drive their children to and from school routinely park on public roads in the vast majority of cases. From a technical point of view it is quite possible to provide parking opportunities in St Margaret Drive and / or St Elizabeth Drive that conform to the relevant standards. The Council could only be liable if it implemented a change that did not conform to the relevant standards.

It is the responsibility of the driver to drive and park responsibly. It is the responsibility of parents and guardians to ensure that their children behave appropriately while in their care during the school run. The Council cannot be held liable for the decisions of road users, and does not supervise road users in their use of the road either outside schools or in any other context.

(b) The Council considers all requests for changes to parking and waiting restrictions, regardless of their context. Those requests that are technically feasible would be considered by the Local Committee in the context of its annual parking review.

(c) Provision of parking opportunities in the vicinity of schools can undermine the motivation for people to choose sustainable modes of transport.

**Question 13 – Lee Bowyer**
**Re: Walking Routes**

Please can the committee provide school parents with a list of the roads that are available for parents to utilise in order to park and stride to St Joseph's RC County School I am advised the council has identified many.

**Officer response**

There are a number of on and off street parking opportunities within a mile of Rosebery and St Joseph's Schools, which could be used for park and stride. Surrey County Council's Highways service officers have offered to assist the schools by identifying these locations, but as yet this piece of work has not been completed.

**QUESTIONS ON St JOSEPH'S SCHOOL TRAVEL PLAN**
**Question 14 – David Lloyd**

From previous discussions at the Local Committee St Margaret Drive was removed from the School Travel Plan as recommended by the Surrey Country /EEBC Councillors and alternative instructions were provided by St Josephs School to the Parents for the schools preferred and recommended alternative means of safe travel to the school.

It is stated that recommendations at this time were provided by Surrey County Council, whilst I appreciate that these are only recommendations and cannot be legally enforced please can you advise the following:-

(a) What are the detailed SCC recommendations?
(b) Have all of these recommendations been implemented?
(c) Has the school requested for any other assistance with this matter from highways dept, education dept or planning dept?

The schools current travel plan as published 2016, details clear recommendations for access to the school, and if the items noted such as the mis-timed traffic lights are corrected provides clear instructions for travel/access.

**Question 15 – Sue Niemira**

Why as this school does not have a viable travel plan is the council not insisting that one is put in place and monitored for one year before even considering changing parking on an unrelated road?

**Question 16 – Abelea Green Resident**

What steps can the Committee take to promote respect for third party property rights, proper process and community harmony, given it is understood it can only encourage (but not require) a voluntary aided school, to put in place a properly managed school travel plan?

**Officer response to questions 14-16:**

St Joseph's School has a current travel plan which is published on its website http://www.stjosephs-epsom.surrey.sch.uk/page/?title=Travel+Plan&pid=69 Surrey County Council does not provide detailed recommendations to schools regarding travel arrangements for the school run in the way that is suggested by these questions. It provides advice to schools to assist in the formulation of travel plans, but this is not by way of detailed recommendations that we expect schools to comply with. It is schools that draft, own, and are responsible for encouraging compliance with their travel plans and any concerns over the Plan should be directed to the School.

St Joseph's School has been in communication with Surrey County Council's Highways Service from time to time with regard to this matter, to request information, share concerns, to discuss what the potential impact of the change in access arrangements might be, and to discuss possible solutions. For example St Joseph's School made us aware of their proposal to reinstate a historical access on to the Cabbage Patch path near Whitehorse Drive.

More recently Highways officers met with the Divisional Member and the head teachers of both St Joseph's and Rosebery Schools at the end of October to discuss the emerging situation. At this meeting a number of different potential solutions were discussed, and Surrey County Council agreed to assist with this matter in a number of ways, including:

- Fix the traffic signal detector at the end of Rosebank.
- Consideration of new bollards to prevent drivers mounting the footway in Whitehorse Drive.
- Consideration of new parking provision in Rosebank and / or Whitehorse Drive to assist with traffic flow, subject to consultation with the residents.
- Identification of park and stride opportunities.

We will continue to advise any party that has an interest in this matter, and provide information in response to requests that we receive. With the exception of our business as usual activities to maintain the fabric of the Highway, any change that is made would be subject to funding being made available by the Local Committee.

The Local Committee's role is to consider requests for changes to the Public Highway, taking into account technical advice from officers, and the views of different sections of communities that have different views about the changes that are requested. The Local Committee has powers to make changes to the Public Highway, subject to the limitations of its budgets, and subject to the proper statutory processes that must be followed when making certain changes. It is unusual for a change promoted by any of Surrey County Council's eleven Local and Joint Committees to be unanimously supported by everyone that is affected. Local and Joint Committees must therefore make difficult decisions in balancing the conflicting views of the communities they serve

Surrey County Council would always advise that driving children to school should always be the last resort. The benefits of using a sustainable means of transport for the school run include reduced congestion and pollution, improved fitness, health and concentration for those walking or cycling (or scooting), and of coursed reduced impact on the communities living near schools. If children were not driven to schools, many of the problems experienced at peak times during term time could be resolved.

No organisation has any legal power to dictate how people should travel. Ultimately parents are responsible for their school run travel choices.

**QUESTIONS ON ROSEBANK SAFETY**

**Question 17: Toni Herschel**

The congestion at the foot of Rosebank caused by the car hire company is causing unnecessary danger to our children and other pedestrians. Would councillors commit here today to take effective and long-lasting action to ensure that the car hire company are stopped from breaking the law by parking on yellow lines and obstructing the road and footway?

**Question 18: Jenny Watts**

Please would councillors agree to visit Rosebank regularly to observe how Enterprise Car Hire are putting our children in danger by blocking the roads, parking on the pavements and, as a result, causing other vehicles to mount the pavement.

**Question 19: Chantel Mehta**

Our young people from Rosebank and St Joseph's school walk up and down Rosebank each day. They take their lives in their hands because Enterprise car hire is parking on double yellow lines and blocking the road. This makes cars mount the pavement to pass. Could the council carry out their duties properly and insist that traffic wardens do their jobs properly every day?

**Officer response to questions 17-19**

It is up to individual Members whether they wish to visit Rosebank to observe the alleged behaviour for themselves.

Epsom & Ewell Borough Council undertake the enforcement of on-street parking and waiting restrictions. There are a large number of schools in the Borough where there are potential parking issues and it is not possible for enforcement officers to be present on a regular basis although problem sites are targeted. Surrey Police have powers to respond to drivers who drive without due care and attention, or who park

vehicles so as to cause an obstruction. These questions should be directed to Epsom & Ewell Borough Council and / or Surrey Police as appropriate.

## OTHER QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO ITEM 4 TO WHICH AN OFFICER RESPONSE WAS NOT REQUIRED

**St Margaret Drive Resident**
We were wondering why there is again discussion regarding the altering of the parking restrictions in Abelea Green?
Surely the existing time frames have been in place for many years? They were introduced once the estate's roads were adopted by the council many years ago. As a long term resident, to my knowledge they have been perfectly adequate, so I see no reason to change them.

**Whitehorse Drive Resident**
Will the council please relieve the pressure on Whitehorse Drive by allowing St Joseph's parents to park and stride from St Margaret's and St Elizabeth's drives.

**Owner/Manager of the Kindergarten at St Joseph's**
The Kindergarten on Rosebank provides nursery places for 25 children aged 2½ to 4 years and 40 places for wrap around care each day of the week. Would the council please be mindful that ensuring safe access to the nursery for these very young children is paramount and anything that can be done by transferring some of that pressure to St Margaret Drive and St Elizabeth Drive is in the best interests of the community?

**Niamh Conroy**
Four educational establishments - Rosebery, St. Joseph's, The Kindergarten and Shapes Nursery (over 2,000 young people) create a significant amount of pedestrian and vehicular pressure on Rosebank and Whitehorse Drive.
Does the Local Committee agree that it would significantly improve the safety and wellbeing of our children and young people to alleviate the excess pressure on these local roads by introducing additional short-term parking bays on St Elizabeth Drive and St Margaret Drive to encourage families to "park and stride"?

**Abelea Green Resident**
What right do people, who do NOT live in homes that are directly affected, propose yellow line changes that will affect the daily lives of people who DO live in homes that are directly affected?

**Headteacher Roseberry School**
Over 2000 students access Rosebery and St Joseph's schools each day, using the heavily congested routes through Rosebank and down Whitehorse Drive. Would the council prioritise the safety of the young people of Epsom who attend these schools when considering the decision to provide school-hours parking on St Margaret and St Elizabeth Drive?

SURREY

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**
**LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL**
**10 December 2018**

**MEMBER QUESTIONS**

**Question 1: Cllr Michael Arthur**
**Re: Bus Stand High Street East**

Despite being informally informed that this is no longer a Bus Stand and alternative arrangements made, it is road marked as such (twice) and busses are standing over.

I receive regular complaints of the impedance to traffic caused by buses standing especially at peak times and the consequent traffic tailback. This has been an issue for several years and currently continues.

On 4th December around 09.45 to 10.10 I observed in succession 480/460/480 on stand, in two cases the drivers left their vehicle, locked the bus, and went away presumably for a refreshment break. At one point there were two busses concurrently on stand. The period of being "bus stand free" could be measured in seconds. Effectively, it was that as one bus departed another one drew up. Additionally, after allowing passengers to board, the bus continues to wait for several minutes before departing.

I believe that this is an entirely inappropriate location for a bus to wait any longer than required for the sequence of discharging passengers and immediately allow boarding just like any normal bus stop.

Could the Officers consider my comments to ameliorate the situation?

**Officer Response:**

Prior to the works commencing in the town centre bus service 318 did use bus stop K in the High Street. The timetable for service 318 was revised in August 2017 and this service now uses bus stop F located in Waterloo Road.

As part of the town centre works local bus services 460/480 were re-routed to operate into Epsom via Ashley Road/ Treadwell Road/Downs Road/Church Street and temporarily terminate and pick up passengers at stop K in the High Street. Buses then depart from this stop and operate out of Epsom via Ashley Road. This is a temporary arrangement that has been set up to assist in keeping the town centre traffic moving by reducing traffic in the High Street (W) while works are ongoing. This has helped bus services retain their punctuality for passengers while also assisting in reducing the traffic around South Street to allow other Bus Operators to maintain their services as best as operationally possible. Works in the High Street (W) are scheduled to continue during 2019, as such the current 460/480 routing and standing arrangements will remain as currently operated.

From a town centre operational viewpoint, it is of the upmost importance that the town centre traffic is kept flowing as best and safe as practicable whilst the works take place. We want

to encourage people to continue using this form of transport rather than driving to / through the town centre and adding to the volume of traffic.

I would like to provide reassurance that SCC's Scheme Delivery team and Passenger Transport team are fully engaged with the bus operators to constantly review the performance of buses whilst the works take place and finding ways to balance the needs of bus operators & passengers against general traffic and other operational requirements.

Once all the town centre Highway and public realm works have been completed and new traffic patterns established, a review of the current bus stand arrangements will be undertaken to seek the most acceptable locations to minimise disruption to the town centre. Until then temporary bus stand locations will be required.