

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 2.30 pm on 9 December 2013  
at Epsom Town 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

---

**55/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Borough Councillor Jean Smith.  
Cllr Mike Teasdale substituted for her.

**56/13 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 2]**

15 questions were received, the questions and answers are set out in Annexe A. Questions relating to Abelea Green were discussed under item 8.

The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 1: When will the issue be fixed? Officers replied that it would not be possible to make any changes to parking restrictions until the next parking review which is scheduled to begin in September 2014. It is hoped that the process will be speeded up to enable restrictions if agreed following consultation to be put in place within 6 months of this date.

Question 2: Are there additional resources available to speed up the process? Officers apologised for the delay and indicated that it was necessary to batch up a package of signs as it is more efficient to do the work in this way.

Question 3: Are lights on footpaths checked as part of the inspection regime? The Chairman agreed to put this question to the appropriate officer under Item 11.

Question 5: When the road is resurfaced how can the County Council ensure that when the lines are repainted they are the correct dimension? Officers indicated that a note of the existing lines is made before the road is resurfaced and they should be repainted to match.

### **57/13 ADJOURNMENT [Item 3]**

A number of members of the public attended. 1 informal question was received and an answer was provided.

### **58/13 ABELEA GREEN BRIEFING NOTE [Item 8]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officer attending:** Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

**Amendment to the Report:**

The Area Highways Team Manager reported that since the report had been drafted, the ownership of the school land in paragraph 2.5 of the report had been clarified. The Diocese owns the school site where the buildings are located and the County Council owns the playing fields.

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:**

There were 9 written public questions in relation to this item. The questions and responses are set out in Annex A to minute 56/13. The following supplementary questions were asked.

Question 6: Can Surrey County Council ask the school to make the revised school travel plan publicly available? The Area Highways Team Manager indicated that this is not within the remit of the Local Committee. The School has been asked to change its travel plan and how it is publicised is a matter for them.

Question 7: Can the Committee help in getting people to talk to each other? The Area Highways Team Manager indicated that this is not within the remit of the Local Committee.

Question 8: Is it an offence to leave a car unattended on a yellow line? A vehicle could be subject to civil enforcement if left unattended on the public highway for a sufficient period to indicate that it was not being used for loading or unloading.

Question 9: Can the school travel plan be published? The Area Highways Team Manager indicated that this is not within the remit of the Local Committee. The School has been asked to change its travel plan and how it is publicised is a matter for them.

Question 10: The piecemeal expansion of the School has avoided any requirement to consider traffic management. Can the appropriate policies be implemented in future? The Chairman indicated that the County Planning Committee had asked the Local Committee how traffic issues can be more effectively considered, when there are plans for school expansions. Further work will take place with the aim of starting discussions between the relevant

departments earlier in the process. However as this is a Diocesan school responsibility for planning matters fall to the Borough Council and current legislation does not allow the cumulative effects of small developments to be taken into account.

Question 11: How can the school be made to comply with the law? The Area Highways Team Manager indicated that he was not able to comment on the legal issues as legal advice is a matter for the parties involved to seek on an individual basis.

Question 12: The questioner indicated that the Diocesan website states that Canon Law doesn't over rule British Law.

Question 15: Community leaders need to be involved in order to influence the situation. How can the Committee help? The Area Highways Team Manager indicated that this is a legal matter and neither the County Council or the Local Committee are a party to the dispute. If a local councillor wishes to help they may do so as an individual.

There was no indication of any further public questions or statements. The Committee did not debate the issue and noted the report.

#### **59/13 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

No petitions were received.

#### **60/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 5]**

Confirmed as a correct record.

#### **61/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 6]**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **62/13 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]**

There were no Member questions.

#### **63/13 EPSOM AND EWELL PARKING REVIEW - PHASE 7: CONSIDERATION OF FORMAL OBJECTIONS [Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officer attending:** Stephen Clavey, Senior Engineer (Parking)

**Petitions, Public Questions Statements:** There was no public participation during this item.

#### **Member discussion – key points**

Noted that the restrictions agreed in Phase 6 for Ewell House Grove had not been implemented as the signs had been erected and then stolen and it had not been possible to complete the yellow line due to a parked car.

In relation to Bellfield Road, the Divisional Member County Councillor Jan Mason, requested that the proposals do not proceed and indicated that a letter would be sent to all residents and a meeting held in 2014 with a view to putting forward further proposals in the next review.

In relation to East Street the Committee voted by 5 votes FOR to 2 AGAINST for retaining the existing single yellow line at the East Street/Dirdene Gardens junction and not increasing the restriction to a double yellow line.

Noted that the proposals for Ruxley Lane/ Cox Lane/ Gatley Avenue related to drawing 17 as well as drawing 19.

The following requests were made for consideration in the next parking review: 18-20 The Rise, Grove Road (Residents Parking Zone) and Green lanes (odd numbers).

The Committee thanked all those involved for their work in establishing the first verge parking ban area in Surrey.

Noted, that it was hoped that following the detailed design work, orders could be placed in January for the implementation of the agreed restrictions for implementation by end of March 2014.

**Resolved that:**

- (i) the recommendations detailed in Annex A of the report subject to the following amendments:

Bellfield Road – Do not proceed, further proposals to be submitted to Phase 8 review;

East Street – Remove a section of the proposed double yellow lines from the eastern boundary of No.182 to the western boundary of No.184 and retain the existing single yellow line at the East Street/Dirdene Gardens junction. The area in front of the shops to be considered for short term parking restrictions, if possible in a lay by in the next parking review;

Temple Road – proceed as advertised (delete remainder of recommendation);

Vernon Close – after Vernon Close, insert “on both sides of the road”.

- (ii) that the County Council makes amendments to existing traffic regulation orders and introduces new traffic regulation orders as necessary for the recommended parking controls to be implemented.
- (iii) The recommended parking controls are implemented

**64/13 LOCAL COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS TO A PARKING TASK GROUP  
[Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officer attending:** Stephen Clavey, Senior Engineer (Parking)

**Petitions, Public Questions Statements:** There was no public participation during this item.

### **Member discussion – key points**

Noted, that the first meeting for the task group should take place in January.

#### **Resolved:**

- (i) That the following members, including named substitutes, be appointed to the on street parking task group:

County Councillors – Eber Kington, John Beckett substitute Stella Lallement

Borough Councillors – Jean Smith, Julie Morris substitute Michael Arthur

- (ii) That the terms of reference as set out in the report be agreed.

### **65/13 PROGRESS REPORT ON THE STREET LIGHTING CONTRACT IN EPSOM AND EWELL [Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officer attending:** Paul Wheadon, Commercial and Performance Team Manager

**Petitions, Public Questions Statements:** There was no public participation during this item.

### **Member discussion – key points**

Noted, that the column to which the street light is attached which is above the railway bridge in Waterloo Road will be shortened.

A member queried the replacement of lights for which she had paid for recently to improve the lighting at a junction. The Commercial and Performance Team Manager replied that schemes had been designed to give a uniformity of lamp in a particular area and the team were not always aware of particular reasons for a particular layout. However he confirmed that the new design does meet the lighting standards for that type of road.

Noted that there are two lights on the corner of Waterloo Road which have not been lit since the Epsom Station redevelopment had been completed. It is understood that there is no power to these lights and it is Skanska's responsibility to resolve the issue with the developer.

Commercial and Performance Team Manager agreed to investigate whether it would be possible for the Christmas lights in Epsom, Ewell and Stoneleigh to be switched on in each location with a single switch.

Noted that teams scouting for lighting faults should be walking down footpaths to check the lights and not just driving round the area.

Noted that the lower level lights in residential areas are dimmed by 50% from 11 pm and the high level lights on main roads are dimmed by 25%.

Noted the report.

## **66/13 PROPOSED NEW CYCLE ROUTE IN WATERLOO ROAD [Item 12]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officer attending:** Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

**Petitions, Public Questions Statements:** There was no public participation during this item.

### **Member discussion – key points**

Noted, that there had been 3 slight casualties in the vicinity of the planned scheme, but that the scheme was not being proposed on this reason.

The Committee remained concerned that the proposal would increase congestion in Waterloo Road, but accepted that this was largely caused by the operation of the lights at the Spread Eagle junction. If the major scheme associated with Plan E goes ahead the junction will be narrowed which will allow pedestrians to cross more quickly and therefore allow more vehicles to cross the junction. In the meantime it was suggested that changes to the phasing should be considered.

Noted that Transport for London who commission the 418 service for Epsom Coaches had been consulted on the proposals.

It was reported that the Section 106 funding for the scheme did not need to be used until 2018 and so it would be possible to take more time to consider the options.

### **Resolved that:**

A decision on whether to proceed with the proposed new cycle route in Waterloo Road be deferred and a Task Group established with the following membership to consider options:

Julie Morris, Michael Arthur, Neil Dallen, Tina Mountain, the Chairman or Vice-Chairman, if necessary, and other interested parties including the cycle forum and bus operators.

## **67/13 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 13]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officer attending:** Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

**Petitions, Public Questions Statements:** There was no public participation during this item.

### **Member discussion – key points**

Noted that not all the possible schemes listed for Ewell Village would be implemented, but a package of appropriate schemes would be drawn up.

### **Resolved:**

- (i) To reallocate £35,000 from this Financial year's pooled Capital Allocation to capital maintenance of footways, and to authorise the Area Team Manager to decide which footway repair schemes to take forwards in consultation with the Chairman, vice-Chairman and relevant Divisional Members. That Epsom Town Centre footways be added to the list of possible schemes for consideration;
- (ii) The 2014-15 programme of Integrated Transport Schemes as set out in paragraph 2.17 of the report, with the Tattenham Corner Road flooding scheme and the schemes relating to the Ewell Village AQMA as being the highest priorities;
- (iii) To authorise the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, to decide Divisional Programmes for next Financial Year, in the event that individual Divisional Members have not indicated their priorities by 15 January 2014;
- (iv) To authorise the Area Team manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant Divisional Members(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

#### **68/13 UPDATE ON WINTER MAINTENANCE ARRANGEMENTS [Item 14]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officer attending:** Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

**Petitions, Public Questions Statements:** There was no public participation during this item.

#### **Member discussion – key points**

Noted that if after the four year initial funding period for a grit bin purchased by a councillor or local community group, there is no further funding agreed it will be removed.

The Borough Council was thanked for its help with gritting pavements in the area.

Noted the report.

#### **69/13 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS [Item 15]**

Noted.

Meeting ended at: 5.35 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL  
9 December 2013**

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS**

**Question 1 – Philip Pavey  
Re: Parking Dirdene Gardens**

**Question:**

Before the Committee decided on a residents' parking scheme in Hawthorne Place and Providence Place in Epsom earlier this year did they commission a risk assessment concerning the displacement of daytime parking to adjacent roads, and specifically Dirdene Gardens?

If not why not?

If yes, what was the predicted effect on Dirdene Gardens and has the actual resultant nuisance parking been less, the same or more than was predicted?

Does the Committee accept that the knock-on effect of its scheme has caused the problem experienced by residents in Dirdene Gardens and how does it intend expeditiously to remedy the situation it has caused?

**Officer Response:**

When the County Council is planning on introducing new parking controls the Committee considers the impact they will have on the surrounding area, the main one usually being the displacement of cars that used to park in a location that is going to become restricted. This does not include a written risk assessment for each location, but one of the reasons that we try and make people, who may be affected by the new restrictions, aware of them is so that they can provide us with as much information as possible to help with the final decision on whether or not to go ahead with a particular proposal.

We do realise that there will be some redistribution of the vehicles that were previously parked in the now restricted roads, however it is not possible for us to anticipate exactly where this parking will be offset to - this is why we constantly monitor any proposals that we implement and carry out regular parking reviews to resolve any issues that arise due to this kind of offset parking.

If the resident wishes us to investigate the implementation of further restrictions, then we can do this as part of a further parking review. For the most part we introduce new parking controls as a reactive measure following the receipt of a request to do so. We receive a constant stream of such requests from a wide variety of people, including, but not limited to, councillors, residents, members of the emergency services and local businesses. Approximately once a year we review all the outstanding requests in a borough and present a report to the local committee for that borough, with a recommendation of which of the requests should be taken forward.

**Question 2 – Chris Frost**  
**Re: Highway Signs**

**Question:**

During the last year or so of my term of office, I asked for some new signs to be erected as follows:

HGV sign for Burgh Heath Road by Longdown Lane South

Cycle sign in Woodcote Green Road opposite Pine Hill

Schools warning signs in Dorking Road for St. Joseph's school

Sign at entrance to Madans Walk by Avenue Road to say 'Shared walkway between pedestrians and cyclists.

At the time of writing these have not yet been installed. What has caused the delay, and when will they be in place?

**Officer Response:**

The HGV sign for Burgh Heath Road is currently being designed along with many other direction signs and will be ordered shortly.

The cycle signs will form part of the phase 3 cycle signs provision which will begin in the New Year. Phases 1 and 2 have now been completed.

The school signs for Dorking Road have been placed on hold pending the outcome of the Abelea Green school issue.

These have been delayed on due to our need to prioritise the most urgent work, and also to enable a package of signs work to be assembled for reasons of economy.

The signs should be erected early in the New Year.

**Question 3 – Chris Frost**  
**Re: Street Lights**

**Question:**

Now many street lights have been replaced, what is the inspection regime for checking that lights that have not been replaced are working?

**Officer Response:**

A detailed report setting out progress with street light replacement in the Borough is at Item 11 on the agenda for this meeting.

In respect of the inspection of lights, although the Central Management System (CMS) monitors and reports faults for new lights, until all lights are replaced in an area Skanska continue to monitor for faults by driving pre-determined routes during hours of darkness to identify lights not working. The County is split into routes with different areas being checked each night. Faults are recorded and logged onto the work order system the following morning and if the fault is not already identified, a work order is raised.

During Winter months (1 Nov - 31 Mar), all roads are "scouted" twice per month and during summer months it is completed once per month.

**Question 4 – Colin Wing**  
**Re: Pedestrian Access to Epsom waste depot**

**Question:**

Is it possible to provide a pedestrian entrance to the waste depot in Blenheim Road? Although there may be good safety reasons for the policy of excluding pedestrians, it discriminates against non-car-owners and encourages unsustainable transport.

**Officer Response:**

There are some particular difficulties in allowing pedestrian access to the community recycling centre.

The main issue is safety related. Due to the layout of the site there is simply not enough space for a pedestrian access without putting people in close proximity and at risk of moving vehicles/plant whilst also carrying waste.

The second issue relates to how the pedestrian access is used. Where pedestrian access has been allowed in the past, problems have been caused by members of the public parking on Felstead Rd / Roy Richmond Way and walking their waste into the site to avoid queuing.

With an increasing amount of materials collected at the kerbside and in local recycling banks, there should be suitable alternative recycling and disposal outlets in place for the smaller items that are likely to be brought to the site by pedestrians

**Question 5 – Colin Wing**  
**Re: Dimensions of yellow lines**

**Question:**

At the September meeting we heard that the standard width of yellow lines is 50mm in conservation areas and 75mm on other 30mph roads. How is it that many of the yellow lines in Ewell Village are 100mm wide?

**Officer Response:**

Three widths are prescribed for yellow lines. The 75mm size should be used on roads with a speed limit of 40mph or less, and 100mm on roads with a higher limit. In areas regarded as environmentally sensitive, the 50mm wide line may be used.

Historically some of the roads in Ewell may well have been 40mph or above and then the restriction amended and reduced to 30mph - thus the 100mm wide line would remain on the new 30mph road.

Also, if a contractor has laid the lines incorrectly we will not get them removed as this causes damage to the carriageway. The purpose of the lines, no matter what the width should be clear and they are still enforceable. We only remove the lines where they may be too long and do not directly relate to the Traffic Regulation Order.

Sometimes when paint is laid on the carriageway, depending on the ambient temperature, the paint remains liquid for longer and can bleed to create a wider line than is laid. And with varying surfaces bleeding can also occur, such as on concrete.

Again, we would not remove the lining if the width is incorrect as the method of removing lining is by scabbing off the top surface of the carriageway, which can then create a surface which is more permeable to water and prone to underlying damage.

**Question 6: Fred Mowbray**  
**Re: St Josephs School Travel Plan**

The Deed of Grant of Easement is the legal document which sets out rights of access over the private road to St Joseph's Church land (not to school land). A copy of the Deed has been provided to SCC and to the Committee prior to the last local committee meeting. Plan B within the document describes the land to which a grant of easement is granted (i.e. right of access). It is explicit in its description of access to the land of the church and hall only and not to the school.

The school has agreed to change its travel plan, notwithstanding its claim in Canon Law, which has no relevance in this case. If the school had a legal case in civil law it would have long since put that case forwards, properly argued and supported by counsel advice which it has failed to do, and instead for reasons best known to itself, is relying on Canon Law. This is deeply disturbing and has caused a lot of misunderstanding amongst parishioners and school communities and hostility towards residents who simply want their rights respected including the quiet enjoyment of their own homes

The school and church have shown that their communities (almost entirely non residents) will do as asked as demonstrated in petitions to this committee to relax parking in Rosebank, and more recently at Abelea Green.

How can SCC help the school and church to live up to their responsibilities as leaders in the community? The residents keep offering to meet and the school, church and kindergarten keep refusing. Will SCC please ask the school, which is in receipt of public funds from Surrey, to now properly advise their parents of the new travel plan which does not encourage access from St Margaret Drive?

The parents do listen when the school and church take the lead.

**Officer Response:**

The school has amended its travel plan so that parents are no longer encouraged to access the school via the private road. Communication with parents is a matter for the headteacher and school governors and not something that the Local Education Authority can influence. The school is voluntary aided and both the land and buildings (with the exception of the playing fields) belong to the diocese and not the County Council. Ultimately, the school cannot control the behaviour of parents when they are not on school property and it would be for the landowner to take action against any unauthorised access.

**Question 7: Eleanor Silverio**  
**Re: St Josephs School**

Please will the Local Committee ask Surrey County Council's Education Committee to become involved in persuading the school governors of St. Joseph's School to abide by legal documents such as the Deed of Grant dated 11th August 2004 to encourage parents via their newsletters not to abuse the use of the private road?

**Committee Chairman's Response:**

The use of the private access road is a matter for the owners and the Diocese to resolve between them, and is not a matter for the Local Committee to address. The function of the Children and Education Select Committee is to monitor the policies and actions of the Cabinet in regard to children's issues. It would not therefore be appropriate to ask the Committee to act as requested.

**Question 8: Glyn Davies****Re: Parking Enforcement Abelea Green**

The school run traffic at Abelea Green has inflicted an unwarranted environmental impact. The quiet enjoyment of our homes is disturbed twice a day with traffic noise and fumes.

Would the committee please ask EEBC to ensure that the parking restrictions in Abelea Green are properly enforced?

**Committee Chairman's Response:**

The Borough Parking Manager has been made aware of the concerns expressed and personally visited the area. However, I am advised that no complaints have been received in relation to parking violations in the area and no enforcement issues have been observed during patrols. The area will continue to be monitored by Parking Attendants.

**Question 9: Peter Barlow****Re: St Josephs School Travel Plan**

St Josephs school has agreed to change its travel plan, but there is no evidence of any change and the clutter and congestion blocking access to and from the estate continues.

Now that the school has changed its travel plan and as it is obvious that parents will listen to the church and school, will SCC now ask the school to publish its travel plan to all of the parents and to manage and monitor its implementation?

**Officer Response**

The school has amended its travel plan so that parents are no longer encouraged to access the school via the private road. Communication with parents is a matter for the headteacher and school governors and not something that the Local Education Authority can influence. The school is voluntary aided and both the land and buildings (with the exception of the playing fields) belong to the diocese and not the County Council. Ultimately, the school cannot control the behaviour of parents when they are not on school property and it would be for the landowner to take action against any unauthorised access.

**Question 10: Eugene Niemira****Re: St Josephs School Expansion**

Has St Joseph's School expansion followed the Surrey County Council Travel plans good practice guide and the SCC Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance January 2012 when it underwent expansion?

**Officer Response:**

The expansion of St Joseph's School has comprised of a number of discrete developments. Each individual development was small enough that it did not trigger a review of access arrangements or the travel plan. As Planning Law currently stands, each application must be considered strictly on its own merits; the cumulative effect of multiple developments at the same site cannot be anticipated; nor can the cumulative impact of small developments be taken into account retrospectively.

**Question 11: Neil Carpenter  
Re: Briefing Note**

Whilst I thank Mr Healy and the Committee for their time on the matter relating to the private access road between St Margaret Drive and St Joseph's Church only, I am concerned by misinformation given undue credence in Mr Healy's briefing note.

Does this committee take its guidance from Canon-Law or Civil Law in this Country? Canon Law like Sharia Law is totally irrelevant to determining what is right or wrong in this Country does this committee not agree? Please confirm.

If the briefing note is a proper briefing note it should qualify the information provided in paragraph 1.8 of the briefing note to state that Canon Law does not override Civil law in this Country.

The briefing note also excludes any reference to the section 106 agreement that is in place regarding the use of the car park at the separate site of the Church with its own land registry reference and the separate site of the school with its own land registry reference BOTH SEPARATE SITES IN ENGLISH LAW. The briefing note should refer to the section 106 annex which states that "the School will need to use the Church car park except on very rare occasions." The annex stipulates the 14 days notice period to be given to the Council for the School to use the Church car park as over flow parking accessed from the School side in Rosebank by use of the mechanical gates.

Please will Mr Healy confirm that his briefing note will be updated for the points mentioned above so that the briefing note as a public document has correct information in it and is not misleading?

**Officer Response:**

Canon law is cited by the Governors of St Joseph's School in their dispute with the owners of the private road. It is not for the Local Committee or County Council to comment on whether or not canon law is relevant in this case or to provide legal advice on a private dispute. The agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act is under the jurisdiction of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council as Local Planning Authority. Surrey County Council was not a signatory to this agreement.

**Question 12: Chris Grice**  
**Re: Briefing Note**

I refer to the notes to the committee by Mr Healey.

Please explain the relevance of Canon Law in this issue with the private road in Abelea Green?

**Officer Response:**

Canon law is cited by the Governors of St Joseph's School in their dispute with the owners of the private road. It is not for the Local Committee to comment on whether or not canon law is relevant in this case.

**Question 13: Teresa Cass**  
**Re: Langley Vale**

I would like to bring to the attention of the Local Committee the following three problems with Rosebery Road in Langley Vale.

- 1 **The poor state of the road surface of Rosebery Road from the junction of Langley Vale Road to the junction of Harding Road** - Numerous pot holes have been filled on several occasions however the whole road is subsiding, large cracks are appearing and further pot holes are forming. I believe major work needs to be undertaken.
- 2 **Dangerous pavements** - The pavement on both sides, from the junction of Langley Vale Road to the junction of Harding Road, is also in a very bad state. It is extremely uneven in places, tree roots have lifted sections and cable/utility repairs have left very uneven patches. Many people are now walking in the road because they believe that is safer than the pavement, especially at night.
- 3 **Speeding cars** - I know that this was discussed a few months ago following the petition regarding a blanket 20mph in the village, however there are residents living in the bottom half of Rosebery Road who are very concerned with the speed of the traffic. They are requesting a VAS to be installed to educate drivers as to their speed. Would you please consider installing VAS signs in the road, either as flashing warnings or 'smiley faces'?

I ask that the Local Committee instructs officers to investigate these issues and gives priority to addressing them before there is a serious accident.

**Officer Response:**

- 1 There are four main strands to our strategy for carriageway maintenance:
  - 1) Major reconstruction. Under Operation Horizon Surrey County Council will reconstruct approximately 10% of its road network over a 5 year period. The reconstructed roads are being designed for a ten year life without significant defect. This is the most expensive treatment, and is reserved for roads that are most deteriorated.
  - 2) Surface Treatment. If a road can be treated with either surfacing dressing or micro asphalt (both chip and tar treatments) before it starts to deteriorate

quickly, it is possible to add between 5 to 10 years to its life for approximately one tenth the cost of reconstructing the same road.

- 3) Local Structural Repair. This is a treatment that repairs the worst sections of a road with large patches. Local Structural Repair is often followed by a Surface Treatment.
- 4) Safety Defect Repair. Every road is inspected as a matter of routine and all defects considered to be safety defects are repaired within predetermined timescales. If residents report potholes, these are inspected and those deemed to be safety defects are repaired within the same predetermined timescales.

Surrey County Council is obliged to prioritise its resources. Therefore although Rosebery Road is deteriorating it has not currently been identified as a priority for significant intervention at the present time. It will continue to be inspected for safety defects as a matter of routine, and any reported potholes would be inspected. Rosebery Road has been added to the Local Committee's list for consideration; at the present time it would be for the Local Committee to decide whether to prioritise the road for treatment.

2 There are three main strands to our strategy for footway maintenance:

- 1) Major reconstruction. This Financial Year Surrey County Council will reconstruct eight footways in Surrey. This is the most expensive treatment, and is reserved for footways that are most deteriorated. This would include replacement of slabs with asphalt wherever appropriate.
- 2) Surface Treatment. If a footway can be treated with a slurry seal before it starts to deteriorate quickly, it is possible to add between 5 to 10 years to its life for approximately one tenth the cost of reconstructing the same footway. Slurry seals are also used to refresh the slip resistance of a footway surface.
- 3) Safety Defect Repair. Every footway is inspected as a matter of routine and all defects considered to be safety defects are repaired within predetermined timescales. If residents report defects, these are inspected and those deemed to be safety defects are repaired within the same predetermined timescales.

Surrey County Council is obliged to prioritise its resources. Therefore although the footways in Rosebery Road are deteriorating they have not currently been identified as a priority for significant intervention at the present time. They will continue to be inspected for safety defects as a matter of routine, and any reported defects would also be inspected. The footways in Rosebery Road have been added to the Local Committee's list for consideration; at the present time it would be for the Local Committee to decide whether to prioritise the road for treatment.

3 Following the petition received from residents of Langley Vale, it was agreed to erect gateway signing at the entrance to the village. It was also agreed to reduce the threshold speed of the Speed Indicating Device in Beaconsfield Road. This work will be undertaken shortly.

It would not be appropriate to provide additional measures until the initial signs are installed and motorist behaviour monitored. The vehicles who are exceeding

the speed limit at the far end of Rosebery Road are most likely local residents who are aware of the speed limit on the roads in Langley Vale. The use of VAS is more appropriate on roads where motorists are unfamiliar with the road layout and speed limit.

**Question 14: Jill Chapman**

**Re: St Josephs School**

The school traffic chaos at St Margaret Drive has arisen due to the unplanned St Joseph's school expansion

This committee has been asked to help resolve this issue by one of our ward councillors

SCC and EEBC have a residual responsibility to uphold the property rights of residents which is threatened by actions encouraged by the Church and School

The Deed of Grant is for a defined plot of land, not for the organisation which owns the land to extend its area beyond the defined plan and assume rights including parking on a private road that it does not have in civil law.

Will this committee please make it clear to the school that they should actively encourage their parents via the school and church newsletters to stop using St. Margaret Drive as an access route to the school as stated in the school travel plan and to respect the property rights of others and allow the residents to have a peaceful enjoyment in their homes?

**Committee Chairman's Response:**

The Local Committee responded to the several requests for action by asking for a Report and advice from SCC as to appropriate action. We have been advised that the school's Travel Plan has been amended, and further advised that the dispute over the access road is a private matter to be resolved between the owners of Abelea Green and the Diocese and that it is not a matter for the County Council to address. In the light of this it would not be appropriate for the Local Committee to make any statement in regard to the highways issues that are subject to dispute.

**Question 15: Beth Legge**

**Re: St Josephs School**

This matter is before this committee because of the piecemeal applications by St Joseph's school for its expansion, including this latest application to relax parking at Abelea Green which was deferred indefinitely at the last committee.

The difficulties started in 2010 when the church applied to widen the access road and build car parking on the green, without even advising the residents, the freehold owners of the land. Hardly an act to foster good community relations.

Many of the residents have done everything possible to help the church and school only to be let down as more information emerges, the latest being the claim in Canon Law and ignoring Plan B in the Deed of Grant.

The distress caused to residents has to be brought to an end as does the waste of officers' and councillors' time and we need your help and remain willing to meet the school and church and independent kindergarten.

The school and church enjoy privileged positions of influence in the community. I trust SCC can help them in their obligations arising there from, such as with implementation of the revised travel plan.

At a minimum it seems to me the church and school have an obligation to provide proper and complete information to all parties.

It is in my view, entirely misleading to suggest rights of access to the school citing Canon Law. This is fostering misunderstanding and disharmony and at times unwarranted hostility towards residents who only wish to have the quiet enjoyment of their homes and their property rights respected, whilst the school, church and independent kindergarten continue ignoring every offer to meet residents to find a solution.

The church's influence over the school board is set out in Mr Healey's report to the committee. This surely does not mean that a school in receipt of tax payers money can simply ignore the law of the land and surely there is an obligation to follow guidance as well?

The power and reach of the church and school is extensive and we ask Surrey County Council how they can assist in getting the school and church to put out proper information based in Civil Law and to desist from continuing to assert "possible" rights under Canon Law.

The Deed of Grant of Easement is lodged at Land Registry and governs the use of the private road and is governed by the laws of the land, not by Canon Law.

Our otherwise delightful peaceful oasis of Abelea Green is subjected to school traffic chaos arising out of the piecemeal applications to expand the school, denying not only the residents but also officers the opportunity to properly consider a school expansion of this size.

A good starting point would be clear concise newsletters to the church, school and independent kindergarten communities asking to respect the resident's rights of quiet enjoyment and property rights.

What help can SCC Highways, or Education, or Early Learning or Community Affairs or other SCC departments do to help us in this distressing situation?

**Officer Response:**

The school has amended its travel plan so that parents are no longer encouraged to access the school via the private road. Communication with parents is a matter for the headteacher and school governors and not something that the Local Education Authority can influence. The school is voluntary aided and both the land and buildings (with the exception of the playing fields) belong to the diocese and not the County Council. Ultimately, the school cannot control the behaviour of parents when they are not on school property and it would be for the landowner to take action against any unauthorised access.