

Minutes of the meeting of the
Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 23 September 2013
at Bourne Hall.

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:

- * Cllr Michael Arthur
- * Cllr Neil Dallen
- * Cllr Julie Morris
- * Cllr Humphrey Reynolds
- Cllr Jean Smith

* In attendance

40/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Tina Mountain and Borough Councillor Jean Smith. Cllr Ian Booker substituted for her.

41/13 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 2]

11 questions were received, the questions and answers are set out in Annex A. Questions relating to Abelea Green were discussed under item 9.

The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 6 – If the footways are not part of Operation Horizon what plans are there for improving the surfaces? Officers replied that there is a small central budget for footways, but that this is only able to fund work on 5-10 schemes per year across the County. These schemes are for well used footways in a poor condition. Schemes not covered by this would be a matter for prioritisation by the Local Committee from local budgets. The questioner clarified that the section of footway of concern is between Ewell Village and the Ewell by-pass.

Question 7 – Is there an opportunity under a future review for residents that want reserved spaces to have them if there is not a majority in favour in the road? Officers replied that it would not be possible to allocate individual bays, but if there were a group of residents in one part of the road who wanted residents parking then this could be considered. The Chairman reported that he had recently met with the Head of Highways with a view to making parking

reviews quicker and had received assurances that the process would be reviewed with the aim of reducing the time between the start of a review to restrictions being in place to 6 months.

Question 11 – Would it be possible to have a sign saying “No through Road”? Officers responded that the street nameplate showing the “T” symbol as is already present on one side of the road is the preferred option, but if this is not successful then other options can be considered. It is currently unclear whether vehicles are accessing the road in error or are looking for a parking space.

42/13 ADJOURNMENT [Item 3]

A number of members of the public attended. 4 informal questions were received and answers were provided.

43/13 UPDATE ON PARKING PROPOSALS IN ST MARGARET DRIVE AND ACCESS TO ST JOSEPH'S SCHOOL [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager, Stephen Clavey, Senior Engineer (Parking)

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:

There were 5 written public questions in relation to this item. The questions and responses are set out in Annex A to minute 41/13. The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 9: The questioner felt that there had been a lot of misinformation circulating and asked that now the situation is clear and the school has amended its travel plan that the situation be resolved quickly. The Area Highways Team Manager responded, that as stated on the agenda, work is on-going within the County Council to consider a response, however it is likely that some issues will be beyond its remit and will need to be resolved locally.

Question 10: Will the Borough Council be able to look at the air quality in this area? The Borough Councillors at the meeting undertook to raise the matter with the Borough Council.

Question 11: The questioner indicated that he had concerns for the safety of the school children and felt that a sign should be erected to indicate that the road is private. The Area Highways Team Manager replied that it is a matter for the owners of the private road to decide whether it is appropriate to erect a sign. However, from his observations he indicated that the traffic and parking issues at St Joseph's School were not dissimilar to those at other schools in Surrey and as such if the road were adopted highway, he would not recommend the erection of warning signs. There is currently no history of accidents at the site which would indicate the need for specialist signage.

Question 14: The questioner felt that there was an absence of documentation in relation to St Josephs School and that expansion had taken place without

consultation. He asked that the school travel plan be properly monitored and implemented.

As there was no indication of any further public questions or statements, the Chairman moved to the debate.

Member Discussion – key points:

Members were keen to make a decision to clarify the situation and asked why the matter was being deferred rather than withdrawn. The Area Highways Team Manager indicated that this was a matter of procedure as a scheme may be required in the future, but there was no intention to take forward the parking scheme currently.

Resolved:

That the proposal to relax parking restrictions in part of the Abelea Green area be not advertised with the other parking proposals and be deferred indefinitely, until such time as the matter is resolved.

44/13 PETITIONS [Item 4]

One petition was received. The petition and officer response is set out in Annex B.

The petitioner was unable to be present due to the recent birth of her baby, but it was understood that she was happy with the proposed actions. The Committee thanked her for the hard work she had put in to promoting the petition and sent their congratulations on the birth of her baby.

Members questioned why it is not possible to introduce a 20mph speed limit without traffic calming. The Area Highways Team Manager indicated that the introduction of a 20mph zone within an area signed at access points requires traffic calming to be introduced. In addition Department for Transport guidance indicates that 20mph speed limit signs, without traffic calming, can only be erected when the average traffic speed is already close to 20mph.

A member queried whether it is appropriate for the speed indicator sign to show a sad face when the speed limit is not being exceeded. It was reported that the speed indicator sign has been installed by the school to provide reassurance and may not be required on technical grounds. The 30mph speed limit is not a target speed and it is felt that showing a sad face at a lower speed may encourage motorists to drive more carefully.

The Chairman reported that he had received a petition requesting two time limited parking spaces in front of the mini store in 27 Church Road. Unfortunately, the petition had been submitted too late to be considered at this meeting, however members were informed that a proposal to implement parking bays with a 20 minute limit in the area were being advertised as part of the current parking proposals. It was understood that the petitioner was concerned at the time being taken to implement the proposals. A response to the petition would be provided at the next meeting.

45/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 5]

Confirmed as a correct record.

Noted in relation to the following:

33/13 – that the existing traffic regulation order in Station Approach is for double yellow lines. In view of the fact that the work agreed by the Committee will be starting on 30 September it was not felt appropriate to paint double yellow lines that would have to be removed later.

34/13 – that the Chairman had discussed his concerns in relation to the lateness of the report with the Head of Highways.

35/13 – that the briefing note on youth work had been recently circulated.

37/3 – that Neil and Lucie Dallen had been put forward by the Borough Council to serve on the Youth Task Group. Neil Dallen had been elected as Vice-Chairman at a recent meeting of the Task Group.

46/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 6]

There were no declarations of interest.

47/13 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Two questions were received. The questions and answers are set out in Annex C.

48/13 SURREY FIRE & RESCUE SERVICE ANNUAL REPORT 2012-13 [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: Eddie Roberts, East Area Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion – Key points

Members queried why there was no data included in the report on response times. The Area Manager responded that this was the first time the data had been reported in this format and that consideration could be given to including other data in future years. The Committee requested that data on response times and incident type be added to future reports for this area.

A member asked whether the increase in the Boroughs population was being taken into account in future planning. It was noted that planning assumptions have been updated to be based on the latest census data. New build properties will be subject to current building regulations that specify the most modern fire protection systems.

Noted that the fire service is working with Epsom Hospital to reduce the number of false alarms and the situation will be kept under review.

The Committee recognised the achievements of the Borough team within Epsom & Ewell Borough and supported their commitment to improve initiatives to reduce risk and make The Borough safer through the delivery of the Borough/Station plan.

Noted the targets and initiatives set out in the report and support the Service in the delivery of the Borough Plan.

49/13 RESIDENT PERMIT SCHEMES AND PARKING UPDATE [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: Stephen Clavey, Senior Engineer (Parking)

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: See 41/13. There was no public participation during this item.

Member discussion – key points

Noted, that an additional resident in Chalk Lane had requested that they be included in the residents permit zone for that area.

Noted in paragraph 2.11 that “Hawthorne Road” should read “Hawthorne Place”.

Members requested clarification as to why a limit of 120 visitors permits per year, had been set by Cabinet, as this was proving a problem particularly for elderly residents who don't own a car and who receive regular visits from family members. Officers agreed to investigate further.

The addition of further properties to zones outside of the town centre where there is still capacity was felt to be permissible.

There was a discussion over the issue of availability of spaces within the town centre and the most appropriate way of allocating the remaining unused spaces. Some of the recently built flats within the town centre have been built since the original scheme was agreed. However, in some cases planning permission was granted on appeal despite concerns over the adequacy of parking, on the basis that these properties are within reach of public transport and cars should be able to be accommodated within the development. Potential purchasers should have been made aware of the local parking situation by the developers. However, it was suggested that the Borough Council should be approached to see whether it would be possible to allocate spare capacity in Borough car parks to local residents.

The Senior Engineer indicated that any changes agreed would be advertised separately from the current parking proposals and it was hoped that the changes could be in place by Christmas.

A number of proposals were put forward and votes taken:

That there should be no changes to any of the schemes. FOR 0, AGAINST 8.
Not agreed

That the remaining permits for the town centre zone should be allocated on a first come first served basis. FOR 2, AGAINST 5. Not agreed.

It was

Resolved that:

- (i) St James Close be included within the existing resident permit schemes for the Town Centre (FOR 6, AGAINST 2);
- (ii) the additional properties requesting permits in the Ladboke Road and Chalk Lane permit zones be included in the appropriate zone;
- (iii) residents of all roads within the Town Centre zone be permitted to apply for carers permits (FOR 7, AGAINST 0);
- (iv) the necessary legal process should take place to make the relevant amendments to the traffic regulation orders;
- (v) any unresolved objections, received following the advertisements, are dealt with, according to the county council's constitution, by the parking strategy and implementation team manager in consultation with the chairman/vice chairman of this committee and the relevant county councillor;
- (vi) officers be asked to investigate whether it would be possible to increase the number of visitor permits that can be brought, particularly for residents who do not own a car and to discuss with the Borough the possibility of making spaces in borough car parks available for residents' parking.

50/13 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

Mrs Mason passed on thanks from local residents for the new Hogsmill cycle footbridge at Green Lanes which is being well used.

There was concern that if the footway in Waterloo Road is widened to allow for a shared use cycle way there will not be space for two lanes of queuing traffic at the junction and that this will impact on traffic flows. There was also concern at the potential for conflict between bikes and pedestrians in this busy area. Members also raised concern that since the street lamps had been replaced in this area the light levels had diminished. The Area Highways Team Manager reported that the cycle scheme is part of the S106 agreement resulting from the Station redevelopment and it may be difficult to allocate this funding to an alternative scheme. Officers were asked to review the scheme and seek alternative solutions and to report back to the next meeting.

Noted that the proposed major scheme to implement Plan E has been identified as a top priority for future funding, but is still subject to detailed traffic modelling and design to ensure that it will have the anticipated benefits. Most members were in agreement that the schemes, which could be impacted by this work, should be deferred until there was a clearer picture of whether the major scheme would proceed and the timescales for that.

Members requested some training in understanding accident statistics and diagrams.

A detailed programme for the work taking place at Station Approach was requested by Cllr Neil Dallen and officers agreed to provide this.

The Area Highways Team Manager agreed to bring further details of the top 5 priorities identified in Annex H to the December meeting for further consideration as it will not be possible to deliver everything listed.

Resolved: That

- (i) the creation of the shared surfaces needed to allow cyclists to cycle on sections of footway in Station Approach, to facilitate delivery of a new cycle route connecting to Epsom Station be authorised;
- (ii) officers be requested to consider alternatives to a shared surface in Waterloo Road and report back to the next meeting;
- (iii) a scheme at the Spread Eagle junction to modify the alignment of the pedestrian crossing over the Ashley Road arm of the junction be not constructed at the current time;
- (iv) [On a vote by 7 votes FOR to 1 AGAINST] a scheme at the junction of South Street and Ashley Avenue to provide controlled pedestrian crossing facilities be not constructed at the current time, subject to review in June 2014 should the major scheme to implement Plan E be delayed;
- (v) the Area Team Manager, be authorised, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s), to identify and prioritise schemes as necessary to ensure the remainder of this Financial Year's budgets are fully invested in the road network in Epsom and Ewell;
- (vi) the strategy for allocation of next Financial Year's budgets as detailed in Table 4 of the report, be approved;
- (vii) the following Members of the Local Committee be nominated to a Major Schemes (Epsom and Ewell) Task Group, to oversee the development of the Plan E and Kiln Lane Link Major Schemes, and to provide a steer to the progress of these schemes: County Councillors – Stella Lallement, Jan Mason and Tina Mountain, Borough Councillors – Michael Arthur, Neil Dallen and Jean Smith;
- (viii) the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) be authorised to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

51/13 REVISION TO THE BUS STOP CLEARWAY IN STATION APPROACH, EPSOM AND THE INTRODUCTION OF BUS STOP CLEARWAYS IN LONGMEAD ROAD, EPSOM [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

Noted that the bus stop in Station Approach is designated as a bus stand.

Members queried why it was necessary for the 418 bus to operate from Station Approach. The Area Highways Team Manager indicated that the move had been partly prompted by the proposed scheme in Waterloo Road, but that the County Council could not specify where non subsidised bus services operated.

It was asked whether it would be possible to ensure that the bus stops in Longmead Road can be accessed and the buses boarded and exited from a solid surface without crossing the grass verge. Officers agreed to look into this.

Resolved: that

- (i) the proposed extension of the times of the bus stop clearway restriction in Station Approach be not approved;
- (ii) a clearway is introduced in Longmead Road at the bus stop adjacent to Appleby House with the restriction no stopping except local buses 'at any time'

52/13 GOING CASHLESS ON TFL BUS SERVICES - CONSULTATION [Item 13]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: None

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

Members discussed the proposal from Transport for London and agreed to submit the comments outlined below:

Resolved: that the following comments be submitted to Transport for London in response to their consultation on proposals to stop accepting cash on London Buses services:

- There are not sufficient Oyster top up outlets in the Borough for residents;
- Ticket machines should be available locally to allow passengers to purchase tickets in advance of travel;
- There was concern for the safety of young and vulnerable people if they have lost or forgotten their oyster card and additional safeguards should be put in place;

- An alternative solution needs to be available for those without the appropriate card who need to travel particularly in emergency situations.

53/13 LOCAL COMMITTEE & MEMBERS' ALLOCATION FUNDING - UPDATE [Item 14]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: None

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

Members noted the amounts that have been spent from Members' Allocation and Local Committee capital budgets, as set out in the annexes to the report.

54/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 15]

Meeting ended at: 10.00 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL
23 September 2013**

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

**Question 1 – 6 – Colin Wing
Re: Highways Issues**

Question:

1. Can Surrey paint narrower yellow lines in conservation areas? This would save on paint as well as being less visually intrusive.
2. Does Surrey have a policy for equipping its contractors' lorries and training their drivers with a view to reducing collisions with vulnerable road users? For example, membership of the Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS).
3. Why are deliveries allowed on the east side of Waterloo Road outside peak times, even though there are no premises to which to deliver?
4. The central refuges in Epsom Road, Ewell, cause conflict between cyclists and other vehicles. The consequences of a collision could be made worse by the guardrails at the side of the road. Can these be removed?
5. Why is there no dropped kerb at the junction of Cheam Road, Ewell, with the road to the High Street car park at the side of the residential part of the Sainsbury site? This was omitted when the footway was renewed outside the Sainsbury site.
6. Will the footways of Cheam Road, Ewell be resurfaced as part of Operation Horizon, as well as the carriageway? The SW footway in particular is in a poor condition.

Officer Response:

1. Surrey County Council does generally paint narrower yellow lines in conservation areas - these are usually 50mm wide as opposed to the usual 75mm (on a 30mph road) and are a primrose colour. The narrower marking is in fact slightly more expensive than the usual yellow lines being 39p per meter as opposed to 33p per meter for the standard yellow lines - this is because the colour is not standard. The rates for implementation are the same for both, and it is this rate that usually governs the overall price.
2. Health and safety is the responsibility of the County Councils contractors. The main highways contractor provides two training courses, Drive to Survive and Driver awareness that all the operatives go on, these look at behavioural themes. Also all vehicles are tracked and monitored for speed and idling, and all drivers are aware of this. This reduces incidents and collisions.

Should a collision occur testing for drugs and alcohol is carried out, with the company having zero tolerance to this and all other safety beaches.

3. The Local Committee has agreed to consider amending the loading restrictions along Waterloo Road as part of the most recent parking review. These proposals are currently being advertised and a decision on whether they should be implemented will be made later in the year.
4. The central refuges along East Street and Epsom Road have been provided to assist pedestrians to cross the road in 2 stages when often there are few gaps in the traffic flow. It is recognised that there can be conflicts between cyclists and vehicles at these pinch points although there are no incidents of personal injury recorded due to the provision of guardrail. The guardrails used near to the pedestrian refuge islands are located mainly to stop pedestrians cutting across the road at an angle rather than lining up and crossing at right angles to the carriageway. However as part of the ongoing de-cluttering review we will be looking at removing unnecessary street furniture where it is safe to do so.
5. This appears to have been an oversight following completion of the new development. Dropped kerbs and tactile paving will be provided at the Cheam Road / junction with the car park entrance.
6. At this time Project Horizon is only looking at the programming of carriageway resurfacing.

Question 7 – Martin Olney
Re: Wheelers Lane Parking

Question:

Wheelers Lane has been adversely effected by the introduction of the borough wide CPZ on June 1st. The residence need to be able to park their cars. We would therefore like to know if the CPZ could be extended to include Wheelers lane.

Factors that led to this request:

The residents of Wheelers Lane rejected the introduction of a CPZ over three years ago. The borough wide scheme was implemented on 1st June this year. Between the vote and introduction of the CPZ at least 5 houses have changed hands – about 30% of the total. The original vote may not now reflect the local opinion. I also understand that the residents will not have the opportunity to reverse this decision for up to 18 months.

Wheelers Lane is now sandwiched between two CPZs and is the closest non restricted parking to the station. Although there is space for some 40 cars before reaching the houses on Wheelers Lane the residential area is plagued with parking problems.

The people parking are either commuters or local workers (including Rosebery School and Epsom Hospital). Wheelers lane doesn't have a parking problem between 2100 and 0700 the next day during the week and at no time during the weekend. There appears to be no need to prevent short stay parking in the road.

The CPZ proposals offered to the residents three years ago appeared to be a sledge hammer to crack a walnut. We only need to prevent long stay parking during the week.

I have asked the locals and it appears that if a vote were taken the result would be very close. We are dealing with different factions:

- Those that need to park and move their cars during the working day
- Those that commute with their cars and so see no need for a CPZ
- Those that have an advisory disabled parking space (currently 3 people)
- Those that will not pay for parking outside their own house
- Those that think the guest parking is too expensive
- Those without a car

The first group are the only ones unreservedly for a CPZ.

My proposal would be to simply ask the residence if they want a CPZ. Those that say yes can be provided with a space in the CPZ. I think you will find that only about 20 spaces need to be provided. The rest of the road could be left with unrestricted parking for the use of the commuters and locals not wanting a CPZ. I think this will work because we have some 30 houses on only one side of the road. Four of those houses have their own drives so, as I understand it, will not be eligible for a space in the CPZ.

Officer Response:

SCC consulted with Wheelers Lane residents, with a proposal to introduce a residents permit zone in 2011 - at the same time that all of the other permit schemes within Epsom and Ewell were consulted on.

The recently introduced permit zones were introduced on the back of these consultations, so took 2 years to introduce.

The original consultation merely outlined an area, where it was deemed sensible to introduce a permit scheme and formally asked residents if they would like a permit scheme, as well as giving out a set of FAQs which informed residents about how a scheme would be introduced and under what terms and costs.

The consultation included a questionnaire, which enabled residents to decide on the best times of operation, how many permits they would require and if they support a permit scheme.

The outcome of the consultation was that the majority of residents would be against a permit scheme.

If committee agrees, residents could be consulted again as part of the next parking review - the consultation process would be much the same and the progression would be based on the feedback received from the residents.

With specific reference to the points outlined:

1. The bays are likely to be in operation during the working day and would therefore require residents to purchase permits if they need to park during these hours - the times are negotiable.
2. If the residents that commute do not need permits, then they will not need to purchase them - however they would still require permits if they are off sick from work or on annual leave, otherwise they would have to park away from the permit bays.
3. Disabled drivers will be able to park in resident permit bays for free.

4. Those that do not wish to pay for parking would have to park in an area that is not covered by any other enforceable restriction.
5. The guest parking prices are set at Cabinet level and cannot be altered - the price of two pounds per permit is the same price across the entire county.
6. Those without a car do not need to buy resident permits, but would still be eligible for visitors permits.

The location of the permit bays could be based on the location of those who require permits - this is likely to be one long bay, to keep down the amount of signing that would be required and therefore reducing the amount of street clutter required.

Question 8 – Matthew Hammond
Re: Residents Parking

Question:

Are private roads residents allowed to be included in a scheme to buy parking permits?

For discussion:

1. SCC policy is, I believe, not to adopt no through roads. Eg the new development at the end of Lintons Lane that is for 85 dwellings is currently being proposed as unadopted (eg private). If this is the future policy then private road residents need to be considered in a different way!
2. The demand in Town Centre Zone is mainly coming from the flats that are in, or near, The Parade and the borough car parks are as close as some of the spaces in the zone, eg Heathcote Road and Hereford Close. It is therefore just as convenient to resolve their problems using the borough car parks.
3. The demand from the new developments over the last few years (almost exclusively flats) is also much too great to be resolved with residents parking and this was known and stated at the planning stage.
4. There are very few non flat requests, I believe just from St James Close, and with the numbers these can be accommodated in the zone.

Officer Response:

Residents of private roads may be included in residents permit schemes if that is considered appropriate.

Reference is made to St James Close in the report to the Committee at Item 10 paragraph 2.6

Statement in support of Question 8 from Mr and Mrs Craik

Currently the only residents able to apply for permits in zone G are those that live directly on the following roads: Heathcote Road, Hereford Close, Laburnum Road and The Parade. These permits entitle residents who have driveway space for only one vehicle, to park a second vehicle anywhere within the controlled zone.

From correspondence earlier this year I was informed by Mr Steve Clavey, senior engineer, that St James Close was not included in the review as it was a private road with private off-street facilities for residents. I would therefore like to appeal against the exclusion of St James Close on the following grounds.

1. The only access to St James Close is directly from Heathcote Road, which sets our location apart from the other surrounding roads that have not been included in the zone G scheme.
2. The close is a parking area that provides one parking bay per household. This is directly accessed from Heathcote road and is, therefore, not dissimilar to the 'private' driveways of other Heathcote Road residents who are nonetheless eligible to apply for a zone G parking permit.
3. The residents of St James Close, who rely on the zone as their only access, are inherently part of the local community. Whilst we support the general idea of the scheme in protecting the parking rights of local residents it is currently unfairly excluding the few local residents of St James Close. This is in contradiction with the Officer Report to Local Committee 25/01/2011 (phase 6 of the Epsom and Ewell Parking Review) where it is stated that 'the proposals are designed to help overcome the negative affects of the long term parking by non-residents' and 'aid residents ability to park.'
4. Since the scheme is clearly under-subscribed currently, the inclusion of St James Close to me would seem logical given the above points and the small number of properties it would entitle.

I would be very grateful if the committee could consider these points at the forthcoming review.

Question 9 – Elizabeth Legge

Re: Update on Parking Proposals on St Margaret Drive and Access to St Joseph's School

Question:

The original parking relaxation proposal to accommodate St Joseph's School drop off and pick up time was made in respect St Elizabeth Drive, not St Margaret Drive, as referred to in the Agenda for 23/9/13.

For the purpose of clarity and avoidance of doubt, please confirm that any proposals to relax parking on St Elizabeth Drive and or St Margaret Drive will not be advertised with other parking proposals agreed by the Committee, and that this will be deferred until the matter is resolved - as recommended to the Local Committee, per the Agenda 23/9/13 meeting.

Officer Response:

The recommendation is intended to refer to any current parking proposals in respect of the Abelea Green area.

Question 10 – Glyn Davies

Re: Air Quality

Question:

What is the air quality policy for Epsom and how can the school and kindergarten be assisted by the Council to understand the impact of the pollution on the environment of Abelea Green and its residents, by their wrongful encouragement of the use of St Margaret Drive as access to the school and independent kindergarten now sited at the school?

The Borough's air quality report of 2012 states that a major source of air pollution emanates from queuing slow moving cars, junctions and major highways such as the A24. This is exactly what is happening at Abelea Green where the houses are built right on the road. The St Joseph's school traffic is often backed up from the A24 junction with St Margaret Drive to the church car park, causing pollution and preventing residents from going about their daily business, even though there is no legal right of access to the school from St Margaret Drive?

How can Surrey County Council and Epsom Council assist the school and independent kindergarten in their responsibilities to design, implement and manage a proper travel plan?"

Officer Response:

It is the responsibility of the Borough Council to monitor air quality in the area and to designate Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) where they find that air quality standards are not met consistently. Where an AQMA is identified the County Council will work with the Borough Council to contribute to action plans where appropriate.

Schools play an important role in supporting the health and wellbeing of children and young people and there is much information available to support them in this role from a variety of agencies.

The County Council offers advice and guidance on the preparation and operation of travel plans for all organisations.

**Question 11 – Robert & Sue Brown
Re: Ewell House Grove**

Question:

Can a "NO THROUGH ROAD" signs to be erected at the entrance to Ewell House Grove positioned at the end of the existing double yellow lines.

Officer Response:

Although the street nameplate does have a 'no through road' symbol, it is only on one side of the road at present. The Borough Council are responsible for providing street nameplates. An additional sign on a new post showing the no through road "T" symbol can be erected at the entrance to the road but we are currently trying to declutter signs in Ewell Village and putting up more signs goes against this initiative.

Highways officers will ask the Borough Council to provide a second street nameplate containing the 'no through road' symbol.

Question 12 – Neil Carpenter

Re: Parking Restrictions St Elizabeth and St Margaret Drive

Question:

My question is with reference to the request to have the parking restrictions along St Elizabeths and St Margarets Drives relaxed during pick up and drop off times for parents of children at St Joseph's School.

As was made clear by residents at the meeting of this committee on 17 June the access road from St Margaret's Drive to St Joseph's Catholic Church is a private road owned by Abelea Green Management Company (Epsom) Limited. The Deed of Grant governing the use of this private road is quite clear that the Church has the right "To pass and repass at all times and for all reasonable purposes in connection with the use of the said church and community hall as a church and community hall and ancillary purposes (but for no other purpose whatsoever)."

There is no right to park along the private access road and no right of access to St Joseph's school. The school has acknowledged this by removing this approach to the school from its school travel plan.

As there is no access to the school from Abelea Green there is no point in considering relaxing the parking restrictions on St Elizabeth nor St Margaret Drives for parents to have to walk their children down the Dorking Road to access the school via Rosebank. To relax the parking restrictions would be an encouragement to parents to commit trespass across private land. It is very disappointing that after three months the committee has been unable to reach this conclusion. It doesn't take three months to read the legal documents and reach the conclusion that there is no right of access across the private road to the School and hence no point in considering relaxing the parking. It is all too clear to the residents that the planning application to widen the access road and the planning application to expand the school were based on a school travel plan that was wrong and a planning process that did not follow all of the required procedures. The School was aware that the travel plan was wrong, advised by a trustee of the diocesan trust that is the leasee of the private road and at the time a director of the Abelea Green management company (Epsom) Ltd and I understand the person who instigated the request to this committee to relax the parking restrictions. The evident conflict of interest was not disclosed to the residents of Abelea Green.

As these are the circumstances and the committee is set on deferring making the decision to put a stop and end to the request please will the committee confirm the reading of the attached House of Commons briefing paper on unadopted roads to be found at

<http://www.parliament.uk/Templates/BriefingPapers/Pages/BPPdfDownload.aspx?bp-id=sn00402>. In particular the last paragraph of page 3, "the owner could put up a notice indicating that the road is not for use by the public, thus demonstrating that there is no intention to dedicate it to the public". A polite, and clear notice put up by Abelea Green Management Company (Epsom) Limited stating that the private road is for access to the church only and that no parking was permitted along the private road would be following this guidance would it not, Committee?

It is important for this Committee to answer this question now because the School is a school maintained by Surrey County Council. We are all here knowing that children attending the school are trespassing across a private road that is unadopted and not

to highways standard and are therefore all responsible. This situation is not good for child safety whilst the committee defers and leaves the door open to ambiguity for an undefined period of time. Whilst this situation persists it is also not good for the School safety plan that emergency vehicles will be obstructed from passing up and down the private access road because the church allows parking all along the access road despite this being "a criminal offence.....Under section 34 of the *Road Traffic Act 1988*", as set out on page 8 of the attached house of commons guidance on unadopted roads.

The professional highways experts in attendance at this committee must, therefore, see it as their responsibility too to agree that a sign at least should be put up stating that the private road is for access to the church only and that no parking is permitted along the private road. Side stepping confirming these facts now when they are known would be letting the school children down and compromising their safety.

Closing the door on the ambiguity now would also encourage the school and church to look at solutions to their parking problem that can be found within the boundaries of their own grounds. I am aware that Abelea Green Management Company (Epsom) Limited has not only made numerous attempts to meet with the Church to discuss these options all of which have been declined but also requested a meeting with Surrey County Council Highways which as yet has not been taken up.

Officer Response:

As set out in Item 9 of the agenda for this meeting of the Local Committee, officers from a number of County Council departments are still reviewing what, if any responsibility and/or authority the County Council has in this matter, but in the meantime the Committee are being asked to defer the advertisement of any parking proposals in the vicinity of Abelea Green.

Signage on unadopted roads is a matter for the owner of the road and not something on which officers or the Committee are able to comment.

Question 13 – Eleanor Silverio

Re: Abelea Green

Question:

At the 17th June Local Committee Meeting there was discussion about the benefits of appointing a lead officer at Surrey County Council to liaise on matters at Abelea Green.

Has this now happened and who is the contact? Will this include liaison with the relevant Epsom & Ewell Borough Council officers.

Officer Response:

Due to the complexities of the issues and the number of departments involved a lead officer has not yet been identified. In the meantime any queries or requests for information should be directed to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer, Nicola Morris whose contact details can be found on the agenda for this meeting.

Once the County Council position has been established relevant Epsom & Ewell Borough Council Officers would be consulted along with any other interested parties if appropriate.

Question 14 – Fred Mobray
Re: Abelea Green

Question:

I refer to EP/12/0956 Summary Report dated 6 Feb. 2013.

This report summarises the detailed processes put into St Martins School's expansion proposal by SurreyCC.

Can this committee assure the residents of Abelea Green that the same processes will be afforded them in the case of matters at Abelea Green, including the St. Joseph's School expansion and new and expanding independent Kindergarten of St Joseph's Ltd also sited at the school?

Officer Response:

There are no current plans to expand St Joseph's School, but if this were ever to be considered the procedures followed would be as set out in the report referred to relating to St Martin's School.

Any expansion of the independent Kindergarten would require planning approval from the Borough Council and is not a matter for the County Council.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Surrey County Council
Local Committee Epsom & Ewell
23rd September 2013**

PETITION :

Reduction of Speed Limit to 20mph in Langley Vale Village, Epsom Downs

Received from Miss Lucy Hamilton, containing 111 signatures from local residents.

The key concerns are:

- The volume of traffic has increased in Langley Vale due to construction of new houses.
- The amount of parking has increased due to the extra number of houses and more car ownership.
- There has been an increase in the number of deliveries to the estate, possibly due to internet shopping.
- It is suggested that vehicles speeds are higher than the 30mph speed limit.
- There is no safe crossing places near the School in Beaconsfield Road.
- Many cars park on the pavement making parents with pushchairs have to walk in the road.
- A family pet was recently killed by a driver who was doing less than 30mph and there are fears a child may be next.

Officer Response:

1. A meeting took place on 16th Sept with Miss Lucy Hamilton, County Councillor Tina Mountain, the highway engineer and the Police to discuss the issues and possible solutions to the problems raised by the petition.
2. It was felt that there are some motorists driving at an inappropriate speed near the vicinity of the school. However, speed surveys carried out by the Police did not indicate excessive speeds and there are virtually no personal injury accidents within the estate. It was felt that a slight adjustment to the SID (Speed Indicator Display) sign to indicate a sad face above 25mph would help encourage slower more appropriate speed near to the school.
3. Although parking does occur this is predominantly residential and the only way to alter this would be to introduce waiting restrictions which would not be popular with local residents.
4. It was suggested that some new gateway signing at the entrance to the village at Rosebery and Grosvenor Roads would help to make motorists feel that they were entering a different environment from Langley Vale Road. The blanket introduction of a 20mph speed limit would not be possible without some form of traffic calming measure being introduced.
5. It would be difficult to justify the high cost of introducing traffic calming given the speed and accident data. Gateway signs such as 'Langley Vale Village – please drive carefully' will be investigated to deter inappropriate speeds on the village

roads. It was felt that the use of social networking sites maybe a useful tool in engaging with the community. It was agreed that Miss Hamilton will be kept informed of progress. It was also felt that making the community aware of the antisocial driving may bring about long term changes in driver behavior.

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL
23 September 2013**

MEMBER QUESTIONS

**Question 1 Cllr Michael Arthur
Re: Item 10 of the agenda - Residents' Parking**

The table at para 2.2 does not list all the zones brought into operation on 1.06.13. Could figures be provided for those zones not listed so that these also may be included within the debate?"

Officer Response:

The report is only intended to cover additional requests for the three zones mentioned in the report. However the data in relation to the other zones as of 19 August is as follows:

Zone	Approx no of spaces	Permits issued	Location	Visitor permits
A	8	11	Kingston Road, Ewell	80
B	16	18	Adelphi Road	158
C	66	46	Rosebank	684
D	13	3	Chalk Lane	30
E	37	34	Hawthorne Place	390
F	67	48	Providence Place	453
G	69	56	Town Centre	668
H	3	1	Clayton Road	10
J	30	24	Ladbroke Road	300

**Question 2 Cllr Michael Arthur
Re: Item 11 of the agenda - Highways Update**

At para 2.14 of the report makes reference - "To make quick decisions" and to "Identify and prioritise additional schemes in consultation with Chair, Vice Chair and relevant divisional member(s)". Whilst it is appreciated that at the present time such additional schemes may not be known, although it would be helpful to have knowledge of them now, could the relevant (or nearby) Borough Council member be also included in those consultation(s)?"

Officer Response:

The Committee is being asked to authorise the Area Team Manager to make the decision on which schemes should go forward without having to wait for the next meeting of the Committee. In order to ensure that this decision is in accordance with members' wishes, that there is a consistency of approach to dealing with urgent policy and service decisions and that there is a clear role responsibility in these matters, the Area Team Manager will consult first with the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and the relevant divisional member. Since the Borough members of the Local Committee do not represent all areas of

the Borough it is suggested that it should be left to the relevant County member to consult with the local Borough members if appropriate.