

Minutes of the meeting of the
Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 11 March 2013
at Bourne Hall, Spring Street, Ewell KT17 1UF.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr David Wood (Chairman)
- * Mr Chris Frost (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Eber A Kington
- * Mrs Jan Mason
- * Mr Colin Taylor

Borough / District Members:

- * Borough Councillor Michael Arthur MBE
- * Borough Councillor Ian Booker
- * Borough Councillor Paul Arden Jones
- * Borough Councillor Julie Morris
- * Borough Councillor Jean Smith

* In attendance

5/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

There were no apologies for absence or substitutions.

6/13 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 2]

One question was received. The question and response is set out in Annex A.

It was agreed that the matter would be considered further under Item 9.

7/13 ADJOURNMENT [Item 3]

A number of members of the public attended, and four informal questions were put to the meeting. Answers were provided to the questions at the meeting.

8/13 PETITIONS [Item 4]

There was one petition received for this meeting. Details of the petition and the response from the Officers is set out in Annex B.

Dr Rahman spoke on behalf of the petitioners indicating that a crossing would be of benefit to everyone in the area as well as those attending the Islamic Centre. Parked cars in the vicinity of the Centre make it difficult to get a clear view of on-coming traffic which sometimes travels at considerable speed. The Centre is used by people of all ages. Installation of a crossing would improve road safety and also act to slow traffic. Officers indicated that people should

be encouraged to use the existing crossings at either end of the road and the local member indicated that he did not feel that this area would be a priority for a crossing from the limited resources that are available. The Committee noted the response and asked that highway officers meet with the petitioners to discuss the matter further.

9/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 5]

Confirmed as a correct record.

10/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 6]

There were no declarations of interest.

11/13 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

9 questions were received. The questions and responses are set out in Annex C. The following supplementary question and answer was given at the meeting:

Question 1 – Mrs Mason queried when the pilot scheme with SGI began and when the evaluation will be provided. As no officers from the service were present a written reply will be provided.

Question 2 – Members did not feel that it was acceptable that an answer could not be provided within the timescale. The Chairman agreed to raise this with the officers concerned.

Question 4 – Mr Taylor queried whether permits would be issued for the bays in the future. It was noted that a consultation with residents in this area had indicated that they would not be prepared to pay for permits and so none would be issued at the current time.

Question 5 – The Highway Engineer reported that since the reply had been prepared he had been made aware that the work is currently out to tender and that work should start on site in the next 2 months. The developer would be pleased to erect cycle dismount signs as soon as the work commences.

Question 7 – Mr Taylor requested that consideration be given to installing bollards.

12/13 DATA OVERVIEW OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS WITHIN THE BOROUGH OF EPSOM AND EWELL [Item 8]

It was reported that the main area for improvement within the Borough is with those children who are receiving free school meals or have previous low attainment levels.

The Committee was pleased that Epsom & Ewell schools were in general performing at above the County and national standards and requested that a press release be issued to publicise this.

Members requested information outside the meeting on the range of performance amongst schools and it was agreed that this would be provided.

Noted the report and congratulated local schools on their performance.

13/13 EPSOM AND EWELL PARKING / WAITING RESTRICTIONS (PHASE 7) REVIEW [Item 9]

Noted that the layout of the bays in Church Street would be changed slightly as they are currently the wrong size, but they will remain in their current position.

Noted the following amendments to the Statement of Reasons: Drawings 63 & 64 "Beaconsfield Place" should read "Beaconsfield Road"; Drawing 32 – "Castle Parade" to be replaced by "Ewell By-pass"; Drawing 49 - text should include reference to East Street; Drawing 31 – text should make reference to bus stop clearways; Drawing 55 – second sentence of text should be deleted; Drawing 67 should be added under St Margarets Drive.

In relation to map13 the proposals in Chadacre Road and local concern that this could impact on Waverley Road were discussed. Recent suggestions had been put forward too late for inclusion and it was proposed that the parking officer should be asked to carry out a site visit and bring proposals to the Chairman and Local member for consideration. On a vote it was agreed 4 votes FOR to 1 AGAINST that the proposals in the report should be advertised for residents comments but that exceptionally all residents in both roads should be informed of the proposals by letter to ensure that they are able to respond to the consultation on the proposals if they wish.

In relation to Drawing 49 it was proposed that this scheme should be deleted in order to protect the business of the small shop keepers. On a vote it was agreed that the scheme should be advertised as proposed (7 FOR, 1 AGAINST, 1 ABSTENTION]

Resolved: that

- i] the recommendations detailed in Annexe 1 of the report, with the exception of drawings 1, 7, 8, 13, 15, 18, 19, 23, 24, 30, 31, 44, 46, 50, 52, 55, 58, 66 where the changes to the Annex are detailed below:
 - a] Drawing 1 that the existing yellow lines in Kingsley Drive be changed to no waiting at any time.
 - b] Drawing 7 that restrictions proposed at the junction with Riverview Road should be moved to all sides of the junction with Tealing Drive (not shown on the drawing).
 - c] Drawing 8 that the double yellow lines proposed should be deleted across the parking bays outside the houses.
 - d] Drawing 13 that in view of the concerns of local residents that all properties in Chadacre Road and Waverley Road be sent a letter to make them aware of the proposals when they are advertised.
 - e] Drawing 15 that the existing double yellow lines at the junction of Lakehurst Road and Ewell Court Avenue be extended at all corners of the junction without interfering with vehicle cross overs.

- f] Drawing 18 that these proposals be deleted.
- g] Drawing 19 that double yellow lines be added in Ruxley Lane (in front of service road) to Gatley Avenue junction and on the other side of the junction to the pedestrian crossing. Also to the service road in front of the Kingfisher Pub (island side). That the Proposed restrictions alongside 166 Ruxley Lane into Gatley Avenue and all along Ruxley Lane be deleted. Wrap round to Cox Lane and all of Cox Lane restrictions to remain as shown. That the Parking Engineer redraws these proposals and checks with the local member to ensure these proposals meet the requirements and that the Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager be authorised to agree and further minor amendments.
- h] Drawing 23 that the double yellow lines be extended both sides to properties 1a and 2b.
- i] Drawing 24 that the double yellow lines be extended to Larch Crescent and along Chessington Road to driveway of 442 (Thomas Coaches). Also add double yellow lines from the pedestrian crossing down into Chessington Close and on for 10 metres both sides of the Close.
- j] Drawing 30 that the double yellow lines at the junction be extended to no.18
- k] Drawing 31 to remove the double yellow lines from the new bus stop clearway to the south of the access to Grange Mansions.
- l] Drawing 44 Temple Road, that the double yellow lines proposed be changed to single yellow lines Mon-Sat 7am – 8pm.
- m] Drawing 46 Waterloo Road, that these proposals should be defined in the key as No waiting Mon-Sun 7.00-9.30am and 4.30-6.30pm.
- n] Drawing 50 Mill Road, that the single yellow lines proposed on the railway side of the road be replaced with a curfew parking arrangement, the times of operation to be the same as those that apply at the junction with Bridge Road.
- o] Drawing 52 Grove Road, that restrictions of a double yellow line on one side and a single yellow line on the other Mon-Fri 8am-6pm be added to the consultation.
- p] Drawing 55 Chartwell Place, that these proposals be withdrawn, with the exception of the disabled bay, and a residents parking scheme be considered in the Phase 8 parking review.
- q] Drawing 58 Woodcote Park Road, that the proposals be extended to stop at the boundary between numbers 6 and 8 and advertised on the same basis as the restrictions on Hylands Close.
- r] Drawing 66 that double yellow lines on the bend in Thorndon Gardens (approximate number 15/20 to 28/29) be added to the proposals.

- s] That the Parking Engineer be asked to look at including waiting restrictions outside West Ewell Infant School in Ruxley Lane and if appropriate these be added to the proposals
 - t] That the yellow line put down in error outside 13 Arundel Avenue and then removed be added to the proposals for consultation.
 - u] That the removal of the existing yellow line around the garage and drive of 32 Marshalls Close be added to the proposals.
- ii] that the County Council's intention to make an order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 be advertised and, if no objections are maintained, the order be made;
 - iii] that if objections are received the Parking Strategy and Implementation Group Manager is authorised to try and resolve them.
 - iv] that if objections cannot be resolved, they are reported to a future meeting of the Local Committee for consideration and decision.

Reasons: It is expected that the implementation of the proposals will both increase the safe passage of vehicles and also ease the parking situation within the mainly residential areas.

14/13 TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT IN STATION APPROACH, EPSOM [Item 10]

The Area Highways Team Manager reported that the consultation with local residents in the vicinity of Station Approach and station users had identified three areas of concern:

- Pedestrians were concerned at the proposal to remove the pedestrian crossing by the station entrance;
- There was too much space identified for hackney carriages; and
- There was insufficient space for pick up and drop off of passengers using private vehicles.

It was noted that the loading bays on the north side of Station Approach will be for off peak use only and at other times can be used for pick up and drop off and could be appropriately signed to allow stopping for either 5 or 10 minutes with no return within one hour or as agreed by Committee, in the peak period between 6.30 and 10.00 am and 4.30 and 8.00 pm. The second proposal would also allow for a pick up and drop off bay in one of the areas previously identified for hackney carriages.

It was noted that it had not been possible in the time from the end of the consultation period to look at the retention of the pedestrian crossing and possible alternatives. From a technical point of view it would be possible to retain the existing crossing, but this would reduce the space available for other users and require further consideration by the Working Group which would delay the implementation of any agreed scheme.

It was suggested that all Members of the Committee should be invited to attend working group meetings if they wished. On a vote this was defeated by 2 voted FOR to 3 AGAINST

It was proposed that Option 2 should be agreed but on a vote this was defeated by 4 voted FOR to 5 AGAINST it was therefore

Resolved: (5 voted FOR to 4 AGAINST)

That the results of the consultation be referred back to the Working Group to consider what amendments to the suggested layout should be incorporated and for the Working Group to report back to Committee in June 2013.

Reasons: in order to give more time to consider the results of the consultation and in particular the request for the retention of the existing crossing by the station entrance.

15/13 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 11]

Resolved: That

the Area Team Manager be authorised, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to decide Divisional Programmes for next Financial Year, in the event that individual Divisional Members have not indicated their priorities by 31 March 2013.

Reason: To ensure that next Financial Year's Divisional programmes can be finalised in good time to facilitate timely delivery of those programmes.

16/13 FLEXIBLE FORWARD PLAN [Item 12]

Noted the flexible forward plan and agreed to cancel the informal meeting scheduled for 24 April.

17/13 LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING [Item 13]

Mr Kington indicated that he wished to reduce the amount allocated to the installation of a Borough notice board by 50% and there would be no reference to the County Council on the board. It was suggested that the County Council should not be funding Borough initiatives, but on a vote this was agreed by 3 votes FOR to 1 AGAINST. It was agreed that the 50% saved would be awarded to the Mead Infant School footpath.

Resolved:

- i] That the items recommended for funding from the Local Committee's 2012/13 Member Allocation funding, as set out in section 2 of the report and summarised below be agreed:

Organisation	Project Title	Amount
Relate Mid Surrey	Young Peoples Counselling at Epsom and Ewell High School	£1,468
Ruxley Church, Ruxley Lane, Ewell, Surrey	Ruxley Church & Community Centre (Fixtures And Fittings)	£2,000
Epsom & Ewell	Hogsmill Local Nature Reserve	£1,600

Borough Council	Improvement Project	
Epsom & Ewell Borough Council	Installation Of Borough Notice Board Outside Post Office In Ewell Court	£1,001.88
Epsom And Ewell Karate Club	Club Equipment	£1,000
Langley Vale Village Hall Association	Langley Vale Village Hall Flat Roof Replacement	£7,000
The Mead Infant School	New Footpath Parallel To Cudas Close	£7,186.12
Epsom Medical Equipment Fund	Funds For An Ultrasound For Epsom General Hospital	£1,317
Peer Productions	The Domestic Abuse Project	£1,300
Epsom And Ewell Business Forum	Ewell Village Christmas Lighting	£3,990
Surrey Highways	Installation Of New Lighting Column In Green Lanes, West Ewell	£3,000
Local Authority – Epsom & Ewell Borough Council	Green Flag Poles	£400

- ii] to note the expenditure previously approved by either the Community Partnerships Manager or the Community Partnerships Team Leader under delegated powers, as set out in section 4 of the report.
- iii] to note any returned funding and/or adjustments, as set out within the report and at Appendix 1 to the report.
- IV] **TO APPROVE THE RE-ALLOCATION OF £2,000 FROM CHRIS FROST’S ALLOCATION PREVIOUSLY AWARDED TO SURREY HIGHWAYS FOR THE ANTI-SKID SURFACE AT LONGDOWN LANE TO FUND TWO GRIT BINS. ONE WILL BE PLACED IN ARUNDEL AVENUE AND THE OTHER IN QUEENSMEAD AVENUE.**
- v] that any remaining unallocated funding after all current bids have been processed should be allocated to the Mead Infant School footpath or additional green flag poles.

18/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 14]

Monday 24 June 2013, 7.00pm Ewell Court House, Ewell Court.

The Chairman wished those County Councillors standing for re-election good luck and thanked those not returning for their contribution. The Committee thanked the Chairman for his work during the past year.

Meeting ended at: 10.35 pm

Chairman



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL
11 March 2013**

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

**Question 1 – Mary & Paul Gorton
Re: Marshall Close Parking**

Question:

Ever since we moved to 32 Marshalls Close in June 2000, we have been parking outside our garage which is adjacent to our property. This is an entirely sensible place to park as it does not obstruct anybody and nobody else can park there as they would block the access to our garage. Indeed, when we bought the property, this parking space was a major selling point. The boundary of our land follows a semicircular shape in front of our garage (not quite big enough to completely contain a modern car). Therefore we park with one wheel over the boundary.

A couple of years ago, Surrey County Council painted a yellow line outside our garage along this semicircular boundary. We now understand this was to reinstate an original early 1960s yellow line which had long since disappeared. Luckily, Epsom & Ewell did not police it – until last week when we got a parking ticket for parking on our own property (with one wheel across the yellow line).

The question we want to submit to the Committee is:
'Could the yellow line outside our garage please be removed?'

Officer Response:

Revocation of an existing yellow line has to go through a similar legal process to the implementation of new restrictions.

If committee agree that your request can be included within this review, the next stage will be to formally advertise the amendments in the local press and by way of street notices - this advertising period is the time in which residents or any other interested parties, can agree with or object to any proposals put forward.

Once the advertising period has ended and any correspondents have been collated, a decision on how to progress will be made by the Parking Team Manager, as delegated authority, with the local SCC councillor for the area and Committee Chairman.

Implementation or removal can then be carried out by our contractors.

During this entire process, the 'Traffic Regulation Order' (legal document that helps to enforce yellow lines), will be amended.

The whole process does take some months to progress.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Surrey County Council
Local Committee In Epsom & Ewell
11 March 2013**

PETITION 1:

B284 Hook Road, Epsom – Provision of zebra crossing

Received from Fahim Ahmed, containing 128 Signatures from users of the Islamic centre.

A petition has been received requesting the installation of a zebra crossing in Hook Road, Epsom to facilitate crossing to and from the Epsom and Ewell Islamic Centre. There are over 600 members of the Epsom & Ewell Islamic Society who visit the centre for prayers up to five times a day. In addition to this, there are around 120 children (aged 8 and above) who use the facilities every weekend. Hook road is located in a very built up area with above average traffic as a result of being one of the main routes to the recycling centre, industrial estate and various commercial business centres on Longmead Road.

Officer Response:

The B284 Hook Road links the A24 and the Longmead Business Park. Hook Road can be a busy road at times, heavily used by all traffic but particularly by HGVs accessing the Recycling Centre in Blenheim Road. There are existing traffic signal controlled crossings at either end of Hook Road. One is 250m north of the Islamic Centre near Pound Lane, and one is 230m south of the centre near Chase Road.

The Islamic Centre is located opposite the northern arm of Miles Road. There are double yellow lines around the junction of Hook Road and Miles Road. The remaining road space in Miles Road, although clear of waiting restrictions, has very limited parking space due to the number of vehicle crossovers (driveways) and parked cars belonging to residents, commuters or people working in the town centre. Therefore there is limited opportunity within Miles Road for visitors to the Islamic Centre to park.

Visitors approaching on foot along Hook Road are able to cross at the alternative traffic signal controlled crossings on Hook Road if they are approaching from either side of the Islamic Centre. Site observations suggest that demand to cross Hook Road outside the Islamic Centre is limited.

From an engineering point of view, there is only one location where a zebra crossing could be located outside the Islamic Centre due to the positions of vehicle crossovers to properties on Hook Road. In theory a zebra crossing could be located outside 102 Hook Road. However this is very close to the junction with Miles Road, which would put pedestrians using the zebra crossing in conflict with vehicles turning left out of Miles Road. A crossing in this location would also necessitate the removal of the existing parking bay for approximately 3 cars due to the space needed for the crossing and the associated zig zag road markings.

It is not recommended to promote a new zebra crossing at this location at the present time.

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL
11 March 2013**

MEMBER QUESTIONS

Question 1 Mrs Jan Mason

Re: Surrey Fire & Rescue

Why is the chief Fire Officer committed to spending a lot of money on a new station at Burgh Heath when even the statistics show it is not needed.?

Why is he still committed to reducing to one pump at Epsom when at the same time we have hundreds of new homes and high rise developments being built in our borough?

What are his short and long term plans for the use of the outside company SGI, which I understand specialises in search and rescue (rescue from height, water, subsurface etc) not fire fighting or road traffic collision extrication?

Who will provide the fire cover needed after 2014 when we have reduced the number of pumps covering Epsom to Horley/ West Sussex borders from 5 to 4?

I as a resident do not want Epsom to be a one pump nor do I want my fire cover to be provided by a private company with limited training.

Officer Response:

The Public Safety Plan 2011-2020 (PSP) outlined plans to have two fire engines during the day and one at night based at the current Epsom fire station. The second phase of the PSP indicated an aspiration to provide a new fire station in the Burgh Heath area, which would impact on the fire engines based at Epsom and Reigate. The recent consultation on emergency response cover locations in Epsom and Ewell and Reigate and Banstead builds upon the PSP taking into account the changes at Horley by also seeking to provide a new location in the Salfords area.

These plans are based upon emergency response cover modelling using seven years of historical incident data and in accordance with the predicted improvement to the overall first response standard for the county and for Reigate and Banstead in particular.

These plans relocate one of Epsom's appliances; they do not 'remove' it from being able to make a response into Epsom or its environs. It must continue to be recognised that response cover is provided by the most appropriate fire engine(s) based upon a sophisticated system based prediction of the nearest and quickest response available. The addition of new homes and commercial developments is happening across the county and the Service continually monitor the changing environment within Surrey, having stated very clearly its intention to become a far more flexible and nimble organisation, able to react to changing risk.

Specialist Group International Ltd are currently contracted as part of a pilot scheme for the provision of contingency crewing, which is a clear statutory requirement. To ensure that this

contract provides as much benefit as possible to the county they are also providing a number of specialist rescue functions, which form an element of the core business for the company. A review will be undertaken during the first half of the pilot and a report will be provided to the SCC Cabinet with recommendations as to the future post-pilot period provision of a contingency crewing capability.

The 'chain' of four one fire engine stations will provide the first response required. As is currently the case, once further resources are required these will be provided from other stations within Surrey and/or from neighbouring Fire and Rescue Services as appropriate.

Your views have been noted as part of the consultation process. Emergency response cover is being provided by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service fire fighters, and this proposal does not change that. As described above, the use of SGI is focused upon providing specialist rescue skills, which are the core of the company's business. Staff from SGI are also receiving exactly the same standard of training in fire and rescue operations that Surrey Fire and Rescue staff receive should they be required to provide the contingency crewing for which they have been contracted.

Question 2 Mrs Jan Mason
Re: Yo-Yo Youth Centre

As chairman of the Youth Task Group we have concerns regarding the number of Youth Centres in our Borough. On the original plans it shows 3 centres namely Lintons Centre, The Edge and Yo-Yo. However we now find that Yo-Yo has been reduced to a satellite of Lintons Centre! Yo-Yo was to have its own youth leader and programme of activities etc. When, how and why did this occur and when will the Yo-Yo be reinstated as a full youth centre for the Borough?

Officer Response:

Given the nature and complexity of the question, it is not possible to provide an answer in time for submission at the Local Committee. Officers will urgently look into the issues you have raised and provide a written response within one week of the Local Committee.

Question 3 Mrs Jan Mason
Re: Horton Lane Speeding

In October 2012 a group consisting of SCC highways officers, Surrey Police and SCC Cllr Colin Taylor and myself met on site to discuss ways in which we could reduce the speed of vehicles and motorbikes along this road. Could you please inform me as to SCC's plans and when this will be implemented?

Officer Response:

At the site meeting in October it was agreed that road markings would be laid as an experiment to see if it could deter the motorcyclists from speeding on the approaches to the roundabouts at Hook Road and West Park during the summer period. Research has now been carried out into the type of road markings that would be best suited to achieve the aim of deterring motorcyclists but not affecting other road users to the same degree. The type of road marking chosen have been used in Surrey before and have proved to be effective. However, only once the longer evenings and summer weekends begin will it be known if it has the desired effect on motorcyclists. SCC will continue to work with the Police on monitoring the situation.

The road markings are expected to be laid before the end of the financial year as agreed at the meeting. The works are currently programmed to be carried out week commencing the 11th March although this is dependent on the weather.

Question 4 Mr Colin Taylor
Re: 3 old CPZs in Stamford ward

Please clarify the current status of yellow lines and marked parking bays in the former CPZs at Hookfield etc, Burnet Grove etc and Marshalls Close etc.

Can anyone park in the marked bays at any time?

Officer Response:

Currently, the yellow lines are enforceable, but the bays are not as no permits are being issued for these CPZs.

Question 5 Mr Colin Taylor
Re: West Hill - Christ Church Road cycle path

What is now the expected start date for this long-awaited cycle route upgrade?

Does it include the link under the railway to West Street?

Is there provision for "cyclists dismount" signs at this point?

Can such signs be provided at an early date to allay public safety concerns for pedestrians?

Officer Response:

At this time we do not have a programme start date from the Developer. However it is thought to be in the near future. The scheme includes a cycleway under the railway bridge at West Street near Station Approach. Cycle dismount signs will be part of the signing schedule for the scheme.

We can ensure that the signs are erected as soon as work commences.

Question 6 Mr Colin Taylor
Re: West Hill Avenue

Will the Engineers responsible ever respond to the request to check the alleged sub-standard micro-asphalt surfacing?

Officer Response:

An engineer has visited West Hill Avenue last week to have another look at this site. There is quite a lot of residual stone still there, so a request has been made to have the whole road swept as soon as possible.

The main issue seems to be that, due to cars being parked on one side of the road, not all the road is being trafficked, therefore the surface finish tends to look uneven, which does not show the micro in the best light.

Once it has been swept we will re-inspect and decide if any remedial action is necessary.

Question 7 Mr Colin Taylor

Re: Corner of Station Approach and Waterloo Road outside the Travelodge

A local resident tells me that the old damaged guard rails are being removed (I am currently house-bound) and on enquiry she was told they will not be replaced.

She says she was assured that this has been agreed by all the relevant local councillors. As I am currently the relevant local county councillor this is not true.

I have not been consulted and if I had been I would not have agreed.

This may be related to discussions in the Town Centre street furniture working group, but I don't believe they can over-rule the local member other than by a decision of the whole Local Committee.

I am aware of the danger to cyclists of being trapped between guard rails and vehicles. I am also aware of the modern view that herding pedestrians behind railings is undesirable.

However the point here is that these railings were put there to prevent vehicles mounting the footway, which used to happen too often for safety. They have since been damaged more than once by vehicles. If they had not been there pedestrians might have been injured. The fact that (reported) accident statistics are low means the railings are doing a useful job of ensuring safety, in my view.

It would, of course, be better to have bollards, which together with the poles for the traffic signals would do a better job at keeping vehicles off the footway whilst forming a lesser hazard for cyclists and avoiding corralling pedestrians.

Maybe this is the plan, I certainly hope so.

What is intended and why have I not been consulted?

Officer Response:

The guardrail panels on the corner of Waterloo Road and Station Approach were removed during construction of the footway outside the travelodge many months ago. The S278 works associated with the development of the station required the developer to replace the guardrail with similar to that which was removed. However this did not match the stainless steel guardrail used extensively in Station Approach and provided as part of the Hudson House development. SCC asked for guardrail to match the new stainless steel panels but was told that due to the high cost of the stainless steel panels the developer would not be willing to supply as many panels. (A meeting is due to take place regarding the S278 works on 18th March and the possibility of providing bollards in place of guardrail can be discussed.)

In the meantime, the Street Furniture Working Group had discussed the removal of guardrail throughout the town centre. Some of the group were in favour of mass removal of guardrail while others were not so keen, and it was left to a site visit with a representative of Swail House and a Safety Auditor to determine where panels could be removed throughout the town centre. The area at the junction of Waterloo Road and Station Approach was not considered to be an area where guardrail was essential. There is no reason why vehicles should mount the footway in Station Approach. The Spread Eagle junction does not have guardrail and this does not appear to cause any problems for pedestrians.

The purpose of the guardrail at junctions is primarily to encourage pedestrians to cross at the crossing point and not cut corners on the approach to the crossing. It is not used to protect pedestrians and the current way of thinking is to remove all guardrail from junctions. This has been done in the TfL area of London and SCC is monitoring the effects of removing guardrail.

A scheme to widen the footway under the Waterloo Road rail bridge is currently being designed. The proposal will be to create a shared use footway / cycleway from Horsley Close to the station entrance which will continue through to the West Street junction to link with the West Hill shared use cycleway. The design will be subject to safety audit and it maybe that some form of barrier is required, either bollards or guardrail.

Question 7 Mr Colin Taylor
Re: Yo-Yo Centre

I see from the notes of the Youth Work Task Group that "Yo-Yo is still classed as a satellite and therefore matched provision is outside of the contract."

With Lintons closing Yo-Yo can hardly remain as a satellite to it,

Will there be activities at Phoenix?

Will they include group activities?

Will they be open to all?

What does the Local Committee need to do to improve this situation?

Officer Response:

When Surrey County Council moves its operation from Lintons Youth Centre to the site at the Phoenix Club, it will act as a direct replacement and will therefore fulfil the requirements we have for delivering centre-based youth work. There will be a full range of youth work activities run from the new site at the Phoenix Club. The programme of activities is currently being worked up by the Youth & Community Worker in charge of the centre based youth work. This programme will be based on the needs of the young people and will typically include a wide range of activities designed to engage young people. The youth centre will be open to all, although some specialist interest groups and issue based work may necessitate a closed group/targeted approach, again this will be based on the needs of young people.

Question 8 Mr Colin Taylor
Re: Phase 6 Parking Restrictions

What is now the best estimate for completing the remaining work on Phase 6 parking restrictions?

Officer Response:

There are three more signs to do - 2 on Ladbroke Road and one on Heathcote Road. They should be done by the Committee.

We will then be going round with an E&E representative to sign off the permit zones, before they start their enforcement.

This page is intentionally left blank