

Minutes of the meeting of the
Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 17 June 2013
at Ewell Court House, Lakehurst Road, Ewell, Surrey, KT19 0EB.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr Eber A Kington (Chairman)
- * Mr John Beckett (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mrs Stella Lallement
- * Mrs Jan Mason
- * Mrs Tina Mountain

Borough / District Members:

- * Borough Councillor Michael Arthur MBE
Borough Councillor Neil Dallen
- * Borough Councillor Julie Morris
Borough Councillor Humphrey Reynolds
- * Borough Councillor Jean Smith

* In attendance

23/13 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE LOCAL COMMITTEE FOR 2013/2014 [Item 1]

The appointment by Council of Eber Kington as Chairman and John Beckett as Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee for the current municipal year was noted.

24/13 APPOINTMENT OF BOROUGH COUNCIL MEMBERS [Item 2]

That the Local Committee [Epsom & Ewell] **agreed**

To co-opt substitutes for Borough Council members for the municipal year 2013/14.

The Local Committee noted that at the Epsom & Ewell Borough Council's first meeting of this municipal year, 5 Borough Councillors and 5 substitutes were appointed to serve on the Local Committee for the municipal year 2013-2014, the substitute members being appointed subject to the decision above:

Appointed Members [5]

Cllr Michael Arthur	[Ewell]
Cllr Neil Dallen	[Town]
Cllr Julie Morris	[College]
Cllr Humphrey Reynolds	[Ewell]
Cllr Jean Smith	[Ewell Court]

Substitutes [5]

Cllr Paul Ardern-Jones	[Stamford]
Cllr Ian Booker	[Town]
Cllr Pamela Bradley	[Stoneleigh]
Cllr Alison Kelly	[College]
Cllr Mike Teasdale	[Stoneleigh]

25/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 3]

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dallen and Reynolds. Cllrs Booker and Teasdale substituted for them.

26/13 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]

3 questions were received, the questions and answers are set out in Annex A.

The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 1- How long it would it take before additional residents could be added to the permit zones, if this were agreed? The officer replied that due to the statutory process required this could take between 9 and 12 months.

Question 2 – There was concern that any investigation of the issues in the area may be influenced by the consultation on the current proposals and assurances were sought that the residents' views would be paramount. The Chairman replied that the Committee would receive a full report which will take into account all information received.

Question 3 – A request was made to see a copy of the report. The Chairman indicated that the report will be a public document. He also reported that he had recently received 159 letters from parents of pupils at the school.

27/13 ADJOURNMENT [Item 5]

A number of members of the public attended. 13 informal questions were received and answers were provided.

28/13 PETITIONS [Item 6]

No petitions were received.

29/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 7]

Confirmed as a correct record.

Noted under 22/12 (ii) that the Passenger Transport Group had confirmed that the bus stand is only required during the times indicated, but that they would object to the use of this area by hackney carriages outside of these times, as this could impact on the use of the bus stand at other times in the future. As provision for hackney carriages is a matter for the Borough Council the matter would be referred to them for consideration.

30/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 8]

Mrs Mason and Cllr Smith declared an interest in respect of item 11 Table 4, Tattenham Corner Road Flooding as they are members of the Epsom and Walton Downs Conservators and in item 14 Community Safety Funding as they are members of the Epsom & Ewell Community Safety Partnership.

31/13 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 9]

3 questions were received, the questions and answers are set out in Annex B. In relation to Question 1, Cllr Arthur asked whether there was any appeal mechanism. The officer replied that he was not aware of any appeal process, but would clarify the process and send further information after the meeting.

32/13 PROTECTION FOR GRASS VERGES AND ON STREET PARKING [Item 10]

Members were in favour of taking forward a ban on verge parking in areas where there is sufficient parking available and verge parking should not be necessary.

Resolved: That:

- i] the intention to introduce a verge parking ban, as outlined in the report, be formally advertised and subject to statutory consultation;
- ii] the intention to introduce revised restrictions in Chadacre and Waverley Road, as set out in the report and amended below, be formally advertised and subject to statutory consultation;

At the junction of Waverley Road with the Glade the no waiting at any time restriction be extended to 20m on both sides of the road;

That the no waiting restriction in Waverley Road between The Glade and the first roundabout be moved from the east to the west side of the road;

That the no waiting Mon-Fri 8-9am be extended till 10am;

- iii] if objections are received, the parking Strategy and Implementation Group Manager be authorised to try and resolve them;
- iv] if objections cannot be resolved, they are reported to a future meeting of the Local Committee for consideration and decision.

33/13 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 11]

Mrs Mason and Cllr Smith declared an interest in respect of the Tattenham Corner Road Flooding Scheme as they are members of the Epsom & Walton Downs Conservators.

Noted in respect of paragraph 1.3 that it had been agreed exceptionally that overspends will not be carried forward into this Financial Year.

It was reported that there was an area in Station Approach which currently has no yellow line restrictions, resulting in all day parking and it was requested that this be rectified in advance of the final scheme for road space allocation. The Area Highways Team Manager indicated that this may be possible under an existing Traffic Regulation Order and that he would investigate further.

Members were concerned at the deterioration in the road surface at the Quadrant Junction which is not currently programmed for any work. A report on a temporary or permanent solution with costings was requested for the next meeting in September.

Noted the following amendments in Table 5: "Lower Road" to read "Lower Court Road" and "Malston Road" to read "Marston Road"

Resolved: That the Area Team Manager be authorised, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s), to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes;

34/13 PROJECT HORIZON [Item 12]

URGENT BUSINESS

The Chairman of the Committee agreed to allow this item to be considered as urgent business, on the grounds that a decision was required to be taken urgently by the Committee before its next scheduled meeting in September 2013.

Noted that only year 1 surface treatment schemes had been included in the list of roads for completeness and some of the work had already been done, but are not part of the Project Horizon programme. Surface treatment schemes for future years had not yet been agreed.

It was noted that the Horizon Programme would be delivered to gain maximum value for money through efficiencies, so schemes would be clustered together and not necessarily treated in order of need. Any changes to the programme in the early years could affect the discounts negotiated with the contractors. However, as the programme develops it may be possible to re-programme roads in later years.

Members were concerned that the report had been received late and that some changes requested at the meeting in April held to discuss Project Horizon had not been incorporated or any explanation received as to why this had not been possible.

Noted that this programme does not affect how maintenance issues are treated, so potholes will be filled if they are considered to be a safety issue as normal.

On a vote by 6 vote FOR to 3 AGAINST with 1 ABSTENTION it was

Resolved:

- i] to note the decision made by Cabinet on 26 March 2013 to allocate capital monies to Operation Horizon as detailed in the Medium Term Financial Plan;
- ii] to approve the Operation Horizon programme for Epsom & Ewell and that the 30km of road, across the defined scheme list set out in the Annex to the report, is resurfaced over the investment period;
- iii] that Surrey Highways produce an annual report in March 2014 confirming to the Local Committee, programme progress and success to date.

35/13 SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE COMMISSIONS IN EPSOM & EWELL 2012/13 [Item 13]

Further information was requested on the work taking place at the Edge Youth Centre. It was noted that there had been a vacancy for a centre manager for much of the year. That post had now been filled, but information on activities taking place at the centre had not been included in the report as it would be unfair to make a comparison with other centres. The Contract Performance Manager agreed to provide more detailed information to the member outside the meeting.

It was noted that youth centres do not work with younger children as it is not within the scope of their operation and they are not insured to do so. A higher staff to child ratio is also required which would increase costs.

Members requested a briefing note be circulated giving an overview of the different strands of youth work in Epsom & Ewell.

Noted the progress Services for Young People has made during 2012/13 to increase participation for young people in Epsom & Ewell, as set out in the appendix to the report.

36/13 COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING [Item 14]

Resolved: That the £3,226 allocated to the Local Committee for community safety purposes, be transferred to the Epsom and Ewell Community Safety partnership and authority be delegated to the Community Partnership Manager to oversee the expenditure of this budget.

37/13 LOCAL COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS TO LOCAL GROUPS AND THE YOUTH TASK GROUP [Item 15]

Resolved: That

- i] the following appointments from the Local Committee be approved:
 - a] Eber Kington on the Local Strategic Partnership for 2013-2014
 - b] Jan Mason on the Community Safety Partnership Group for 2013-2014
 - c] County Councillors Jan Mason and Tina Mountain to the Youth Task Group, to assist and advise the Local Committee in relation to youth issues and the future delivery of youth provision locally for 2013-2014. That the Borough Council be asked to provide the names of two

Borough Councillors for appointment to the Task Group and one of them be invited to be Vice-Chairman of the Task Group.

- ii] the requirement that Members appointed to outside bodies should update the Local Committee on the group/service they are appointed to/represent on a six monthly basis or as appropriate be noted.

38/13 FLEXIBLE FORWARD PLAN [Item 16]

Noted the flexible forward plan and that the venue for the September meeting should be amended to Bourne Hall.

39/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 17]

Monday 23 September 2013 at 7pm at Bourne Hall, Ewell

Meeting ended at: 10.15pm

Chairman

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL
17 June 2013**

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

**Question 1 – Chris Rauch
Re: Residents Parking Permits**

Question:

Please can The Flint House, 39 Ashley Road, Epsom be included in the Residents Parking Scheme for Ladbroke Road. I have parked in Ladbroke Road opposite our house since 2004 when we moved in. Currently, there is no parking provision on Ashley Road and very limited availability on Worple Road. I own two cars as both my wife and I work and I have one off street parking space on my drive. With the new residents parking scheme in Ladbroke Road, I will now be forced to park as far away as Downs Road (10 minute walk).

Officer Response:

The current resident permit bays / zones came in to force on 1st June 2013.

We are aware that there are likely to be a number of residents who may wish to be included within these zones, SCC will be continually monitoring the situation.

We may be able to include these residents in the zones at a future date, but this would be subject to committee approval and would have to go through a statutory legal process of advertising before final approval can be made.

The request for inclusion of the two addresses on Ashley Road are very specific, and the Ladbroke Road permit zone is likely to be able to accommodate the inclusion of two more vehicles - although this would still be subject to consultation.

There have been additional requests from residents of Chelsea Court and The Old Court House, to be included within the 'Town Centre' permit zone. These properties were developed with little or no off-street parking in an area where on-street parking is at a premium.

The scheme was mainly developed for those properties that are landlocked and have no vehicular access. The additional addresses may not be able to be accommodated within the zone, so the parking team would have to carry out an informal consultation to find out how many permits would be required and if they could or could not be accommodated within the scheme.

This would then, obviously be subject to the usual legal process for implementing / amending parking restrictions.

Question 2 – Fred Mowbray
Re: Parking Proposals St Margaret Drive

Question:

In the light of the Deed of Grant of Easement provided to the committee membership. Would the committee consider withdrawing the St Margaret Drive parking relaxation proposal?

Officer Response:

The proposals which were put forward by the Local Committee in March have not yet been subject to the formal statutory consultation process. If following the consultation period there remain unresolved objections the Committee will be asked whether to confirm or reject the proposal. Officers will also be looking for a long term solution to the issues, see response below.

Question 3 – Liz Frost
Re: Traffic Management issues at Abelea Green & St Joseph's Church and School

Question:

There are considerable concerns about the current situation with parents and children accessing St Joseph's Roman Catholic Primary School (the school). As you will be aware, this was a small school built at the end of Rosebank, a cul-de-sac accessed from West Street near the Town Centre.

Some years ago the Abelea Green estate off South Street was built. It is a development unique to the area with the houses set around the green – which is owned by the residents and managed by an estate company. After the estate was built, the school sold part of its playing fields and St Joseph's Church was built there, on the land that is adjacent to Abelea Green. One of the planning conditions was that the Abelea Green residents leased a piece of land to the church to create a private drive way from St Margaret's Drive (one of the estate roads) for access to the church, church halls and church car park. The Church's car park is adjacent to the school. Access between the two is only possible by vehicles via a gate.

Since the church was built, there has been a significant housing development at the top of Rosebank, and the school has started an expansion programme. Rosebank is now very busy at school start and finish times, and many parents access the school through St Margaret's Drive and the small private driveway to the Church.

There is currently some significant disagreement between some of the residents and directors of the land management company for the Abelea Green Estate, the Church and the school about the legality of the access to the school via Abelea Green and the driveway. This disagreement is based upon apparent contradictions or differences in interpretation between the original deed of covenant providing access to the Church and the S106 agreement relating to –

- Who may use the private drive way from St Margaret's Drive – may it only be used for access to the church, church halls and church car park or by others, e.g. those accessing the school?
- The Church's car park is adjacent to the school. Vehicular access between the two is via (locked) gates. May these be unlocked and opened routinely to

permit overflow parking etc or must they be kept locked except for emergency vehicles or exceptional circumstances on giving notice to the borough council?

Interpretation of these agreements is resulting in significant disharmony between some of the residents, the school, and the church.

The school has some large areas of land (playing fields) that could be developed as a car park / pick-up drop off area. This might alleviate congestion in Rosebank, provide a safe drop off and pick up area, and discourage some parents from using the Abelea Green access to the school.

Would the Committee please instruct SCC Highway and Education officers to look at the whole issue of the traffic management and rights of the landowners (leasehold/freehold) and the original requirements of the planning permission given to St Joseph's Roman Catholic Church, the section 106 Agreement, the SCC Travel Policy Adopted for St Joseph's Roman Catholic Primary School and other relevant documents and suggest a solution that is acceptable to all interested parties.

Officer Response:

Surrey County Council's Local Committee for Epsom and Ewell is aware of this highly complex situation. There is no easy answer to the problems described as there are numerous different parties involved. Each interested party will have different priorities, which may well be in conflict with each other. It is quite possible there is no available solution that is acceptable to all parties. Notwithstanding their complex nature this Committee considers a resolution of the problems to be a priority. Therefore this Committee requests that officers research the problems fully, identify possible options, together with their advantages and disadvantages, and present these options to a future meeting of the Committee. The research and identification of options will involve several different teams within the Council. Reference will be made to representations already received, but (if not already done so) local residents, organisations and the users of the local facilities will be invited to set out the issues as they see them along with their preferred outcomes so that the differing priorities are considered within the Report. Therefore it may take some time before officers are able to report back to Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL
17 June 2013**

MEMBER QUESTIONS

Question 1 Cllr Michael Arthur

Re: Newly introduced CPZ

Can the parking team give urgent consideration to allow the issue of a resident's parking permit to the owner (PH) of a house in Providence Place which is in multiple occupation by five students (HMO)?

PH, who is partially disabled, requires to attend by car to the property frequently for statutory purposes such as Landlord's Gas Safety Certificates, Fire Extinguisher service; Electrical Inspection, Carpet fitters and general maintenance especially between now and September when students return.

Epsom & Ewell as agents for SCC say they cannot issue a permit to a non-resident and have to follow the rules as set down. Although it has been indicated to me that there may be a review in 3 months, this request is urgent now.

Given that the Epsom is a university town and also has other higher education establishments in the borough, none of which have specific student accommodation, student housing relies upon individual housing to help meet this need, some of which is now located in CPZ's. The situation now arisen may not have been foreseen in setting rules for the scheme.

Officer Response:

Under the current residents schemes for Epsom and Ewell the only person who can apply for a residents parking permit is "a person whose usual place of abode is at a house the postal address of which is specified and described in Column 2 of the table forming the First Schedule and which house includes a bathroom and a kitchen for the sole use of the said house". Therefore if the owner of the property does not live at the address they can't apply for a residents permit.

Residents are also the only people that can apply for the residents' visitor permits. An owner who does not live at the property can not apply for visitors permits under the current traffic regulation orders for Epsom and Ewell.

The above two points apply not only in all the permit schemes in Epsom & Ewell, but also in all the permit schemes in Surrey and as far as I am aware, elsewhere in the country.

When permit schemes and other parking controls are introduced, they do not always suit everyone, but they are introduced to provide the most benefit for the largest number of people. There may be people that they disadvantage, and who feel they have a special case, but it would not be practical, nor necessarily reasonable, to amend the traffic regulation order to accommodate them.

Question 2 Cllr Michael Arthur
Re: Kiln Lane Junction with East Street

Now that the planning application for the Superstore new Car Deck has been granted can I anticipate that the junction re-surfacing will soon be undertaken?

Officers will recall my raising this earlier in that the approaches to the junction were re-surfaced, but not the junction itself. The area is very bad and particularly hazardous for cyclists”

Officer Response:

The recently approved planning application requires the completion of cycle routes along East Street before the approved decking can be used and it is anticipated that Sainsburys will complete these works themselves under a section 278 Agreement.

The improvements to the Kiln Lane Junction, which will entail the resurfacing of the whole junction are connected to a previous agreement and are dependent on other factors.

Question 3 Cllr Michael Arthur
Re: 20mph zones

Does Surrey Highways have a policy on the introduction of 20 MPH zones?

I believe that there are areas within the borough that would benefit from such zoning.

Before I spend time on research and consultation I would like to know about this policy (if any). I will accept a short reply for now with any details being submitted later.

Officer Response:

The County Council does have a policy on 20mph zones which is available on the County Council website.

<http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roads-and-transport-policies-plans-and-consultations/roads-and-transport-policies-and-plans/traffic-policy-and-good-practice/speed-limit-policies-and-good-practice/20mph-zones-and-20mph-limits>

It is also worth noting that the Cabinet Member has asked officers to review a number of the county council's road safety policies and activities to ensure that the council remains up to date with best practice. Central government issued new guidance on setting speed limits in January, and the Cabinet Member wants to be sure that everything is being done to ensure that problems caused by anti-social driving and speeding are tackled. The review of road safety will include the council's road safety education offer and the enforcement provided in partnership with Surrey Police. Consultation with councillors and local committees will form an important part of the review.

Therefore the existing policy may change over the next few months although this is likely to be a refinement rather than a major change.