

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

Item 9 Member Question Time



Venue

Location: Virtual meeting

Date: Monday, 5 October
2020

Time: 2.00 pm

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

6 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS (Pages 1 - 4)

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.

9 MEMBER QUESTION TIME (Pages 5 - 6)

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 COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL
5 October 2020**

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

Question 1

Re: School Streets

Anonymous

When will the committee propose "School Streets" for Epsom and Ewell as is the case in many other local boroughs?

Derk Oosthoek

Has the Committee considered closing Whitehorse Drive for all traffic during drop off pick up times by designating the road as 'School Street', similar to what has been recently implemented at various schools in London such as Lavender Primary School in Enfield?"

Officer Response:

Effective enforcement and / or management is crucial to the success of a designated school street. Within the Greater London area Highway Authorities (including Transport for London and the London Boroughs) have powers to enforce school streets using CCTV to register number plates. Being outside of the Greater London area, we do not have this power available.

Any school street would need to include exemptions for residents and their legitimate visitors, and also for deliveries to premises within the controlled area. This means that in the absence of CCTV enforcement, the closure of a school street would need to be deployed and operated manually, with the operator responsible for allowing in legitimate vehicles, whilst excluding school drop off and pick up traffic. Whoever was to deploy and operate the closure would need to be suitably qualified under the New Roads and Street Works Act, and also prepared to manage potentially confrontational situations with drivers.

Surrey County Council are watching the school streets initiative with interest. However, unless and until the Government gives Highway Authorities outside the Greater London area the powers to undertake CCTV enforcement, in our view these schemes remain unfeasible within Surrey. If the Government were to provide the necessary enforcement powers, there are a number of sites across the County that might benefit from a school street, and we would likely pilot one or two more straightforward sites to prove the concept and tease out any potential pitfalls.

Question 2 – Chris Grise

Re: Parking Review Decision

Why has the committee departed from the usual practise of deferring parking decisions to the divisional member?

ITEM 6

Officer Response:

Individual members are not able to make decisions but may be consulted by officers to whom decisions may be delegated. It is within the powers of the Committee to ask for matters which have been delegated to officers, to instead be considered by the Committee or indeed for officers to make this request. This can be for several reasons but would usually be where a matter is controversial, and officers may not wish to make the decision, or where it is considered that the decision is better made in public to provide transparency.

Question 3 – Debbie Heffernan

Re: Parking on St Margaret and St Elizabeth Drive

Why is St Margaret Drive & St Elizabeth Drive protected from public parking? They are just as capable of supporting some on-street public parking as other narrow local streets and could ease the burden on those streets. Is preference to be given to the Abelea Green residents just because an influential Councillor lives there?

Officer response:

The current parking restrictions were introduced prior to 2008, when Surrey County Councils parking team was established – this means that they would have been introduced by the Borough Council, probably in line with planning applications that were made for the estate.

Surrey County Council has now advertised proposals to amend these parking restrictions on two occasions.

The first occasion brought to light a covenant over the access to the church / school, which has forced the access to close, therefore meaning that parents cannot legally use the car park / access to get to the school.

We are currently dealing with the second proposal, and because of the controversy and public interest surrounding the proposal, it has been decided to make any decisions on the outcome at a public meeting.

All parking proposals are subject to advertising, where we invite the public to give us their opinions – these opinions are used to inform the Committee decision on whether or not a scheme is to progress further. We cannot impose parking restrictions in areas unless there is an immediate danger to life, so have to go through a democratic process of advertising to determine the outcome.

The Councillor who is resident in the area has not been present at any meetings or involved in any discussions in relation to parking proposals in this area.

Question 4 –

Re: Parking/traffic statistics

Vicky Watson

Can you please provide factual information that statistically shows how the current school traffic/parking issues will be alleviated by the restricted parking proposals for Whitehorse drive, bearing in mind that the last collection of data was on a school INSET day and prior to the use of the road and turning/parking circle by St Joseph's?

Keith & Tracey Whittington

Please confirm how you came to your conclusion in your Reasons For Recommendations statement re time limit parking.....Item 10. page 2.

'This would be a minimal restriction, which would stop all day parking, but assist the school and hopefully not cause too much disruption to residents, most of whom have off-street parking facilities'

Was a study carried out to obtain evidence of actual numbers of all day parkers, number of residents' cars per household, numbers of available parking spaces in driveways for residents, taking into account that most houses in Whitehorse Drive, Elm Grove and Dudley Grove have 4 bedrooms and mixed age groups with at least two cars?

From our experience, we know who owns the cars in Dudley Grove, the vast majority belonging to residents, rather than all day parkers, OR is this an assumption without any evidence?

Where would you propose residents who are unable to accommodate their cars in driveways park during restricted hours if such a scheme was introduced?

Officer response:

The proposals were devised by the local SCC councillor and the parking team based on site observations. We do not usually carry out traffic or parking surveys before putting forward proposals.

The object of advertising is to consider the feedback we receive during that period to allow the Committee to make an informed decision.

This page is intentionally left blank



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL
5 October 2020**

MEMBER QUESTIONS

**Question 1: Cllr Neil Dallen
Re: Electric Vehicle Charging Points**

Why are some boroughs, including Epsom and Ewell, having to wait until the end of the pilot in November 2021 before any action is being taken to consider provide electric charging points on the highway?

Officer Response:

The pilot aims to support the County Council to uphold commitments to improving air quality and addressing the climate change emergency; both of which are key priorities and require urgent action. The objectives of this Electric Vehicle (EV) pilot are aligned with the ambitions set out in the government's 'Road to Zero' strategy published in 2018 and SCC's Electric Vehicle Strategies published in 2018.

Why these locations?

The pilot is being funded by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), and so the 4 boroughs in the west of Surrey were chosen as they all have declared Air Quality Management Area's (AQMA), already have some uptake of EV users and are classified as 'Young Urban Resident Towns', so the LEP are keen to understand how and if the provision of this EV infrastructure would facilitate economic growth in these areas to examine the potential for transformative change in the EV market.

What are the expected outcomes of the pilot?

- A key outcome of the pilot, beyond the delivery of 80 EVCPs, is to understand key issues relating to on-street charging and the impacts of installing chargers such as costs, policy, public perception, profitability and types of maintenance contracts.
- Better understanding will come from first hand experience of installation, analysis of usage patterns and analysis on surrounding impacts such as AQ monitoring.
- The lessons learnt from the pilot will be used to understand the key issues relating to on-street charging and the results would help develop an implementation plan and design guideline for Surrey to be used as leverage for funding from the private sector to deliver the charging infrastructure on the public highway that meets the public need, for both EV and non-EV users to inform the roll-out of charging infrastructure across Surrey.

Phase 1 to install 80 EVCPs is due to be completed by Nov 2020 with a potential Phase 2 to run a further year until 2021.

The LEP funded pilot is part of a wider county council review to co-ordinate county-wide policies and strategies to focus on decarbonising and EV strategies across the county, in order to provide clear direction / guidance in terms of activities that borough and districts authorities should also be undertaking in their areas to address climate change.

ITEM 9

The urgency to provide this new clear direction / guidance is well recognised in order for the county council to meet its targets set out in the recently published Climate Change Strategy to reduce vehicle emissions by 46% by 2035.