

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 23 June 2014
at Bourne Hall, Spring Street, Ewell KT17 1UF.

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 Paul Ardern-Jones
- * Cllr Michael Arthur
- * Cllr Neil Dallen
- * Cllr Colin Taylor
- * Cllr Mike Teasdale

* In attendance

1/14 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE LOCAL COMMITTEE FOR 2014/15 [Item 1]

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

2/14 APPOINTMENT OF BOROUGH COUNCIL MEMBERS [Item 2]

Resolved:

That, Borough Council members be co-opted as substitutes for the municipal year 2014/15.

The Local Committee noted that at the Epsom & Ewell Borough Council's first meeting of this municipal year, 5 Borough Councillors and 5 substitutes were appointed to serve on the Local Committee for the municipal year 2014-2015, the substitute members being appointed subject to the decision above:

Appointed Members [5]

Cllr Paul Ardern-Jones [Stamford]
Cllr Michael Arthur [Ewell]
Cllr Neil Dallen [Town]
Cllr Colin Taylor [Stamford]
Cllr Mike Teasdale [Stoneleigh]

Substitutes [5]

Cllr Ian Booker [Town]
Cllr Pamela Bradley [Stoneleigh]
Cllr Julie Morris [College]
Cllr Humphrey Reynolds [Ewell]
Cllr Jean Steer [West Ewell]

3/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 3]

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Ardern-Jones, following the Committee's decision to accept substitutes for this municipal year, Cllr Jean Steer joined the Committee as substitute.

4/14 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 4]

There were no public questions or statements.

5/14 ADJOURNMENT [Item 5]

14 members of the public were present. 3 informal questions were asked (including one asked under Item 11) and answers were provided at the meeting or will be sent in writing at a later date.

6/14 PETITIONS [Item 6]

There were no petitions.

7/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 7]

Confirmed as a correct record.

8/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 8]

There were no declarations of interest.

9/14 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 9]

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

The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 2: Members felt that Plan E was unlikely to have any significant impact on the crossing point and asked whether the work could take place sooner. The Area Highways Team Manager replied that further investigation to see if the appropriate planning permission is in place, would be required. It was agreed that if planning permission is not in place this would be sought and that the loading restrictions previously agreed that had lapsed would be included in the next parking review. The Committee were made aware that the cost of constructing the crossover would probably have to be from its budget.

Question 3: Members requested that action is taken to prevent drivers from parking on the areas of verge that have not been hardened.

Question 11: Neil Dallen stated that shop keepers had previously been informed by the County Council that shops could use the parking bays for loading and unloading and that the “no return within 2 hours” restrictions did not apply. The Area Highways Team Manager agreed to clarify the restrictions and update the Committee after the meeting.

Question 12: The Area Highways Team Manager agreed to see whether it would be possible for notifications that go to divisional members to be sent to all county members so that they can alert divisional colleagues. It would not be possible for members to be consulted before the notices are published due to the number of requests processed. The Area Highways Team Manager would provide a briefing on the process for the informal Local Committee on 16 July which would include details of key contacts.

Question 13: The Community Partnership & Committee Officer would follow up with the appropriate officers whether the information promised at the last Task Group meeting was ready to be sent to members. Noted that if the scheme is funded and proceeds the Committee will have to agree statutory notices which will have to follow the usual statutory consultation process.

Question 15: The Chairman agreed to raise at his regular liaison meetings with the Borough whether it would be possible for the Borough to clean bollards and road signs when they are carrying out other street cleaning operations in the area.

10/14 PARKING IN HIGH STREET EWELL [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager, Alan Flaherty, Engineer

Petitions, Public Questions/ Statements: A representative of a business in the village reported that he had monitored the use of the parking spaces during a working day and there had been 45 cars using the spaces between 11.30am and the end of the day, so it would appear that they are being used for the purpose for which they are intended and not for long term parking. He also felt that by using the spaces shoppers were being made better aware of other businesses in the vicinity.

A resident reported that he felt that the congestion problems are caused by the lights in Spring Street and not by the parking bays. He felt that it is important to retain the bank to maintain the economic wellbeing of the High Street and the parking spaces are key to allowing residents to make visits to the bank.

There was no indication of any further public questions or statements so the Committee moved to debate the options presented in the report.

Member discussion – key points

The Area Highways Team Manager clarified that during the 18 month experimental period, the first 6 months is usually used to gather opinions,

following that the Committee will have a year to either make the order permanent or agree to remove it. If no decision is made within 18 months, the situation will revert to that which was there previously, before the order was made.

Members reported that the road was uneven where the work had taken place to remove the mini roundabout. It was noted that the road is due to be resurfaced shortly and these defects will be removed at that time.

Some members were concerned that it could be difficult to enforce a 30 minute parking restriction and others felt that the parking bays should be removed to allow the free flow of traffic, in particular buses, at all times to help to improve the air quality in the area. However, others felt that it was important not to do anything which may damage traders.

Noted that the no waiting restrictions proposed had been agreed with the traders and are proposed to start at 3.00pm when the traffic increases as pupils leave schools in the area.

Resolved: [by 7 votes FOR to 2 AGAINST]

To implement Option B in the report on an experimental basis, including waiting restrictions during peak hours and time limited parking off-peak, as detailed in Table 1 and authorise the Area Team Manager to modify the experimental Traffic Regulation order to facilitate this alternative scheme.

Reasons for decision: With effective enforcement, this should result in reduced congestion during peak hours whilst providing short term parking for customers and businesses in the High Street in the off-peak period and therefore meet the key objective of improving air quality in Ewell Village.

11/14 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager, Alan Flaherty, Engineer

Petitions, Public Questions/ Statements: A local resident queried the success of the new drain installed in the vicinity of Ashmore Insurance to drain the pavement as it appeared to be too high. The Area Highways Manager agreed to review the work.

There was no indication of any further public questions or statements so the Committee moved to debate the report.

Member discussion – key points

Noted in paragraph 1.3 “2013-14” should read “2014-15”

Members were keen to progress the proposed work to the traffic signals at the Spring Street junction in Ewell as soon as possible. The Area Highways Manager advised that it would be advisable to wait for drainage and resurfacing work to be completed to avoid the sensors being damaged. Members felt that if the work was inexpensive it should be done despite the

risks and the Chairman asked to be put in touch with the relevant officer in traffic signals.

It was noted that initial tests on the skid resistant surfacing in Ruxley Lane had indicated that it was not performing satisfactorily although it was not dangerous. This is a new type of surfacing which has the potential to be longer lasting and better value for money than the conventional anti skid surface and therefore the test would be repeated to see if the performance improves. If not, redress will be sought from the contractor. The Area Highways Team Manager undertook to check on progress and report back to the divisional member.

Noted the recent issues associated with the proposed surfacing of Willows Path. The divisional member indicated that she would be considering alternative solutions possibly funded from her members allocation.

In relation to the proposed safety improvements at the Tesco store on Ruxley Lane there was a query on how delivery lorries will safely get in and out of the site. The Area Highways Manager indicated that the situation will be kept under review and officers will work with Tesco to ensure an effective solution.

Noted, that Ardrossan Gardens and Stoneleigh Park Road will be included in the 2014/15 Operation Horizon Programme. The work has been delayed for further assessment but should be completed in this financial year.

The divisional member queried whether Nightingale Drive and Jasmin Road which are marked as complete in the programme had been surfaced. Officers agreed to check.

Officers agreed to investigate an area of Christ Church Mount where the road crosses a bridge that drains the common and where flooding has occurred to see who is responsible for the drainage channel if the divisional member supplies further details of the issue.

The divisional member was unhappy with the proposal for footway work in Chessington Road as she felt that some of this footway was in good condition having been surfaced fairly recently and that there were more heavily used footpaths in her division that are in a worse condition. She queried how the condition is assessed and priorities decided on. The Area Highways Manager indicated that this is a centrally funded programme and is technically driven. He agreed to put the member in touch with the appropriate team to discuss whether modifications to the scheme would be possible.

Resolved: To:

- (i) continue to keep the two pedestrian crossing improvement schemes at the Spread Eagle and at the junction of South Street with Ashley Avenue on hold pending the outcome of the Plan E Major Scheme bid;
- (ii) authorise the Area Team Manager to advertise Traffic Regulation Orders for a No-Entry and waiting restrictions near the entrance to the new Tesco store in Ruxley Lane, and to consider any objections in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Divisional

Member;

- (iii) authorise the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.
- (iv) consider the strategy for allocation of the Committee's 2015/16 highways budget at its September meeting and agree the programme of works in December 2014.

Reasons for recommendation: To facilitate delivery of the 2014/15 Highways programmes funded by the Local Committee, while at the same time ensuring that the Chairman, Vice-chairman and relevant Divisional Members are fully and appropriately involved in any detailed considerations.

12/14 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT FROM SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Jeremy Crouch, Lead Youth Officer East Surrey, Richard Leary, YSS Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/ Statements: None.

Member discussion – key points

Members queried why the number of young people who are unknown had not reduced significantly. The YSS Team Manager reported that the numbers are very small and it is therefore difficult to make a big improvement. There is a team who track young people from year 11 to their next choice by contacting them directly and also through education providers. However, there is always a small number who leave the area or don't want to engage and it is more difficult to track those in private education.

Noted, that the agreed performance shown is that which was submitted by the provider as part of their bid. The managing agent is being asked to address areas where they are underperforming, but some of this can be attributed to problems with under reporting, staff shortages and the relocation of one of the centres.

Noted, that it had proved difficult to fill the youth centre manager role at the Edge Youth Centre with a suitable candidate, which may be in part due to the cost of housing in the area relative to other areas of the Country. It was suggested that perhaps a housing association could be asked to consider offering a property in the area for rent.

Noted, that officers are considering potential venues in the Longmead area for a Youth Centre to replace the Yo-Yo. In the meantime workers are being recruited to work in this area linked to the Focus Youth Centre.

The Committee noted the progress Services for Young People has made during 2013/14 to increase participation for young people in education, training or employment, as set out in the report.

13/14 CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: LOCAL RE-COMMISSIONING FOR 2015 - 2020 [Item 13]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Jeremy Crouch, Lead Youth Officer East Surrey, Richard Leary, YSS Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/ Statements: None.

Member discussion – key points

It is hoped that by changing the way services are commissioned that it may be possible to secure additional funding from other sources and also to provide income from trading services.

Noted, that as the Committee had not previously been able to participate in the commissioning process as a result of a conflict of interest arising from the Borough Council bidding for services, they would receive appropriate training and support if there was to be a role for them in the process this time.

Resolved:

- (i) to support increased delegation of decision-making to include the current Centre Based Youth Work so that it can be re-commissioned alongside the current Local Prevention Framework;
- (ii) that, if possible, local priorities for the newly delegated commissions within Services for Young People will be decided by the Epsom & Ewell Local Committee, informed by the work of the constituted Youth Task Group and after appropriate training for members.

14/14 LOCAL COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS TO LOCAL GROUPS, THE YOUTH AND ON STREET THE PARKING TASK GROUPS [Item 14]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: None

Petitions, Public Questions/ Statements: None.

Member discussion – key points

None

Resolved to:

- (i) make the following appointments from the Local Committee for 2014/15 municipal year:

- a) Community Safety Partnership - John Beckett
- b) Youth Task Group - County Councillors Jan Mason and Tina Mountain and Borough Councillors Neil Dallen and Lucie Dallen.
- c) On Street Parking Task Group - County Councillors Eber Kington, John Beckett, substitute Stella Lallement, Borough Councillors Neil Dallen, Colin Taylor, substitute Michael Arthur
- d) Major Schemes (Epsom & Ewell) Task Group – County Councillors Stella Lallement, Jan Mason and Tina Mountain, Borough Councillors – Michael Arthur, Neil Dallen and John Beckett

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

15/14 COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING [Item 15]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: None

Petitions, Public Questions/ Statements: None.

Member discussion – key points

None

Resolved:

That the Local Committee wishes to transfer its budget of £3,294 to the Epsom and Ewell Community Safety Partnership and to delegate authority to the Community Partnership Manager to oversee expenditure of this budget.

16/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item]

Monday 15 September 2014, 7.00pm Epsom Town Hall

Meeting ended at: 9.50 pm

Chairman

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL
23 June 2014**

MEMBER QUESTIONS

**Question 1 Cllr Colin Taylor
Re: Station Approach**

The loading bay outside Epsom station and the Travelodge has signs intended to allow up to 10 minutes parking for passenger drop-off & pick-up at peak travel times and goods unloading at other times. However it also has double yellow lines indicating no parking at any time.

Although these lines are slowly wearing out, they are discouraging the intended use, pushing both passenger drop-off & pick-up and goods unloading onto the crossing point, the taxi rank and the bus stop.

Can they be removed?

The pedestrian crossing outside Epsom station has two sets of push buttons and indicator lights on each of four posts. In each case, both of these sets face towards the line of the crossing, one directly above the other. The only logical reason for having two sets of indicators and buttons would seem to be in order to have them visible and accessible from two different directions.

Has someone made a mistake?

Officer Response:

The double yellow lines are a legacy of the Station Development Works when the lay-by was constructed but the Traffic Regulation Orders had not been finalised. The pre development double yellow lines TRO were re-laid to keep the lay-by clear from waiting vehicles except for deliveries. Following the completion of the Station Development, the allocation of road space was agreed by Local Committee in order to maximise the use of Station Approach for all users.

The double yellow lines are no longer the appropriate road marking. We will arrange for the fading lines to be completely removed from the lay-by and the correct parking bay road marking installed.

The traffic signal controlled crossing outside the station is a Puffin Crossing. Prior to the introduction of Puffin facilities, pedestrian heads at crossings, showing a red / green man, were located on the far side of the crossing. With Puffin facilities nearside pedestrian displays are used and pedestrians are presented with a steady red or green signal, with no flashing amber phase. When pedestrians look at a nearside Puffin pedestrian display they are also looking in the direction of approaching traffic.

When pedestrian flows are high, standard height Pedestrian Demand Units (push button units) can be masked by waiting pedestrians. High level repeaters can be installed using the red/green display repeaters with a minimum 1.70 metres clearance to the underside of the unit.

**Question 2 Cllr Colin Taylor
Re: Waterloo Road Crossover**

Traffic is held up in Epsom High Street by goods vehicles unloading outside shops. To avoid this, "Plan E" repeats a long-standing borough council policy of providing high street shops with rear access. Accordingly, a few years ago a Local Committee review of yellow lines etc included a proposal to extend the current limits on loading and unloading to the North side of the two-way part of High Street.

The Ebbisham Centre was developed as a joint venture between EEBC, SCC and a commercial developer. One of the conditions of its Planning Permission was the provision of rear access to High Street shops. This was provided as agreed via an entrance from Waterloo Road, but when the developer applied for consent for the necessary cross-over, this was refused. As a result, although the rear access is used by EEBC and others for refuse collection, goods deliveries for many shops are still unloaded in High Street. Without the cross-over the footway in Waterloo Road has been damaged and by the time of the yellow line review the then Highways Manager had been planning to install bollards to block its use. This was deferred – along with the proposed loading and unloading ban in High Street – to enable a solution in line with Plan E to be arranged.

What is the current state of progress?

When can unnecessary unloading in Epsom High Street be prevented?

Officer Response:

The developing proposals for Plan E could result in significant changes to the road layout in Waterloo Road. Therefore significant works to repair or to improve the vehicles crossover have been put on hold pending the outcome of the Plan E scheme. The Plan E major scheme is currently the subject of traffic modelling to determine the benefits and impacts of the proposed scheme in terms of traffic congestion. This is critical to the development of the business case necessary to bid for funding to the Capital to Coast Regional Transport Body / Local Enterprise Partnership. As the traffic modelling phase draws to its conclusions over the next few weeks, this will enable the outline design for the different elements of Plan E to be finalised - including any changes in Waterloo Road.

There was a plan in place to amend the loading restrictions on the High Street but this was subject to the dropped kerb being put in on Waterloo Road. There was an 18 month period for this to be achieved before having to re-advertise - as this period has elapsed, the proposal would have to be re-advertised.

**Question 3 Cllr Colin Taylor
Re: Manor Green Road**

From copies of recent correspondence, I understood that it was no longer SCC Highways policy to use advisory white lines. I was therefore surprised when a long one appeared recently opposite the shops in Manor Green Road.

After an initial wariness, delivery vans and shoppers have now resumed parking there.

A couple of years ago part of grass verge, which had been turned to mud, was "hardened" as an experiment. There is still a muddy pothole at one end, but otherwise it is a success. Further shops have now been completed and await tenants, so damage to the verges by delivery vans and shoppers looks set to worsen.

What is the purpose of the white line?

Can the verge hardening be extended before the pothole gets deeper and the adjacent grass verge is turned to mud?

Officer Response:

The white line alongside the road hump is intended to guide drivers away from the edges of the road hump, where there is a narrow gap between the hump and the kerb for drainage purposes and not to prevent parking.

As a matter of principal we should not be encouraging drivers to park on the footway. It is unlawful to drive onto the footway; vehicles parked on the footway are obstructive to pedestrians. We would consider verge hardening at sites where this can be achieved without risk of obstruction to pedestrian movement, and where we can maintain a clear distinction between the area intended for pedestrians, and the area intended for vehicles. This has been achieved for the existing hardened area opposite the shops in Manor Green Road as it was possible to leave a grass strip between the hardened area and the footway. There is no scope to extend the hardened area, as the verge isn't wide enough to provide separation between vehicles and pedestrians. In this case we would look to introduce measures to prevent drivers from parking on the verge.

Question 4 Cllr Colin Taylor
Re: Agenda item 11

Annex B Table 1 "Project Horizon" lists Eastway D1238, entire length, length 115 metres, programmed for September to December.

I think this is a list for long-term repairs – is this correct?

Table 3 "Surface Treatment" also lists Eastway D1238, entire length, length 150 metres, programmed for July/August.

Is this correct?

It seems odd to do surface treatment in July/August and then carry out long-term repairs to the same road in September to December.

The length quoted is different. Maybe it isn't the same road or the same part of the road. Please clarify.

Officer response:

Eastway is on the Operation Horizon programme for resurfacing. It had indeed also inadvertently been added to the Surface Treatment programme and will be removed.

Question 5 Cllr Colin Taylor
Re: Agenda item 11 West Hill roundabout

Table 6 includes West Hill, roundabout and 25m into approach, with the status "not needed". There is no roundabout in West Hill.

However there is a roundabout at the intersection of Meadway with West Hill Avenue, which has previously been confused with West Hill.

When West Hill Avenue was resurfaced a couple of years ago, the roundabout was omitted, because it was not explicitly mentioned in the paperwork.

Similarly, the "Project Horizon" plans to repair Meadway also omit this roundabout. Ironically, as it gets both sets of traffic, the roundabout is in greater need of repair than either road. Potholes form regularly, sometimes more than twice a year in the same places. There is a big one there now.

Can this roundabout be inspected and the apparent decision not to repair it be reviewed?

Officer Response:

This was inspected in January and was deemed to be in a good condition and did not need to be resurfaced at the time. Although the roundabout serves two roads, it mainly handles local traffic. The defect in question has since been inspected and reported to the reactive team for action, but there is no need for a resurfacing scheme.

Question 6 Cllr Colin Taylor

Re: Lower Hill Road

The footway on the West side of Lower Hill Road has just been resurfaced and no doubt residents are delighted with the quality of the work.

However it is disappointing to find that the repair of the carriageway, which I thought was scheduled for the current year, has disappeared from the list. This road has so many potholes that it is wasteful to keep repairing them. I thought it was top priority for repair.

When is it scheduled for attention?

Officer Response

The carriageway scheme is not on the local programme because it is on the "Project Horizon" programme for the 2015-18 period. No firm dates have yet been set for these schemes.

Question 7 Cllr Colin Taylor

Re: Oyster cards

From Sunday 6 July, Oyster cards will be needed for travel on bus routes 166, 293, 406, 418, 467 and 470. This will present problems for local residents who wish to use these buses but do not travel into London where Oyster cards are readily available.

I understand that Oyster cards can be bought at West Ewell station and also at one of the newsagents in Epsom.

Would it be possible for the Local Committee to issue a definitive list showing all sources for obtaining and topping up an Oyster card?

Officer Response

TfL have published a list of all Oyster Ticket outlets. There are 61 in Surrey in total and 12 in Epsom & Ewell. The full list will be sent to members and those in the Borough highlighted on the Local Committees webpage.

In addition to these outlets passengers can use their contactless payment card instead of an Oyster card (credit or debit cards which have the contactless symbol).)))
This gives the same benefits as having an Oyster and by this summer TfL have confirmed that virtually everyone in London and the South East who has a credit or debit card will have at least one contactless payment card enabled.

Passengers can also set up an account online and top up as they go or enable an auto top up facility to ensure they never run out of credit.

Details regarding all ways to pay are on the TfL website www.tfl.gov.uk/waystopay

All information about the cashless operation is also on the TfL website www.http.consultations.tfl.gov.uk/buses/29889993

Question 8 Cllr Colin Taylor
Re: Cycle paths

What are the expected dates for work to start on the off-road cycle paths in:

- a. Pound Lane between Lower Court Road and Eastway?
- b. Christ Church Road and West Hill?
- c. East Street?

Officer Response

- (a) The improvements to the footway surface are complete. Shared use cycle signs will be going up at each end within the next 3 weeks.
- (b) The developer has yet to submit Traffic Management Plans to an acceptable level in order to get a permit to begin work. Works programme may now be dependent on Malden Rushett Works (see below)
- (c) The County Council has been advised that Sainsbury's has deferred the construction of their proposed car park deck until later in the year. The work on the cycle path is dependent on the construction of the car park deck.

Question 9 Cllr Colin Taylor
Re: Malden Rushett

What is the expected date for TfL to start work on improving the junction at Malden Rushett, which is partly funded by the development at West Park?

Officer Response:

Following a meeting on Thursday 19th June, SCC was informed there will now be periods of road closures during construction.

Work will commence on Rushett Lane on 22nd September 2014, with no road closure until 27th October 2014. This will be followed by a road closure from 27th Oct 2014 to the end of the year.

Work will then commence on Fair Oak Lane from beginning of January until 9th Feb without a road closure. From 9th February 2015 until 20th March 2015 the road will be closed. Details of diversion routes will be distributed when received from TfL.

The work programme will go on until completion in August 2015 although none will affect traffic flow.

Question 10 Cllr Colin Taylor
Re: Pound Lane

Some years ago I made a request to the Local Committee for a 20mph limit in Pound Lane between Temple Road and Hook Road, outside Epsom Primary School, as originally suggested by Cllr Sheila Carlson.

Under SCC policies at that time it was thought it would probably not qualify and attention was concentrated on a road outside a school in Stoneleigh.

Since then SCC policies have been reviewed and a new version is on SCC Cabinet's agenda for 24 June, the day after our Local Committee.

Once the new policy has been ratified, can this part of Pound Lane be re-considered for a 20mph limit outside the school?

Officer Response:

This part of Pound Lane could be considered under the new Road Safety Outside Schools policy, which is expected to be approved by the County Council's Cabinet on 24th June. Under the new policy we would not consider the narrow question of whether to implement a 20mph limit per se, but rather would consider the wider question of safety outside the school holistically. We would then draw conclusions as to what, if any, measures would be an appropriate response to the problems identified. The range of measures considered would include education and enforcement as well as engineering. It would be up to the Local Committee to prioritise funding for the necessary feasibility study.

Question 11 Cllr Colin Taylor
Re: Time limited parking bays

Local businesses have reported problems where their delivery vans have to be loaded in parking bays with a "no return with 2 hours" limit. Having completed one delivery they get served with a PCN when they return to collect their next load.

When these bays were first installed they were advised that the same principle applied as for yellow lines and loading or unloading was allowed unless otherwise stated. More recently they have been told that this is not the case and appeals against the PCNs have been rejected.

What options are open for solving this problem? Can loading and unloading be allowed in time limited parking bays or is the only option to request a shorter "no return" time?

Officer Response:

Any vehicle using these bays is restricted by the time limits and return time.

If the businesses have been advised that they can load in the same way as on yellow lines, then they have been misinformed - if this was the case then any user of the bays, including regular shop users would be able to use the loading and unloading mechanism as a way of violating the restrictions.

Shared use parking and loading/unloading can be utilised, but the signing in this particular area would become overly complicated and very difficult to understand and possibly to enforce.

A shorter return time can be utilised, but the current restrictions have taken a number of years to get to this stage with continual changes - it would be advisable to establish exactly how many businesses require constant loading and unloading in this area before proposing any changes.

Question 12 Cllr Neil Dallen

Re: Temporary Diversions and changes to road layout

Members received an email 4 days (2 working days) before a significant temporary one way system was due to be implemented the week of the Derby. Fortunately, after considerable discussion and phone calls it was postponed for a week. This is not the first time that a significant temporary change to the road layout has been proposed at the last minute without prior warning to Members. To avoid a repetition is it possible to add consultation with relevant Ward and County Members prior to these schemes being announced?

Officer Response:

Temporary road closures, one-way systems, etc for major works are brought into force by the making of a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO). Divisional Members are informed of TTROs at the point when they are first advertised. This is normally 2 to 3 weeks in advance of the works commencing. Before any TTRO is authorised, the County Council's Streetworks team check to ensure the proposed works do not clash with any other works, or indeed any major public event such as the Derby. It is unfortunate that in this case Members did not receive the normal 2 to 3 weeks' notice and the Streetworks team did not anticipate any negative impact on the Derby of the proposed temporary traffic management. However due to local concerns raised by Members, it was decided to ask the works promoter to delay the start of their works until after the Derby.

Question 13 Cllr Neil Dallen

Re: South Street Improvements

We, through the Coast to Capital LEP (Local Enterprise Partnership), have put in a submission for government funding for making South Street two way. This is part of Plan E, an approved planning document from a number of years ago. Currently work is being done to provide up to date figures on traffic flow for the model so that we can measure accurately the impact and improvement of any change. We are soon to hear from government whether our submission has been successful. If we are successful the money can only be used for this purpose. If the scheme is no longer of benefit to Epsom due to changed traffic flow / movement over the past few years we lose the money.

I believe that it is therefore important that we all understand that

- a) We can only use the money for making South Street two way as stated in the approved Planning Policy - Plan E.
- b) If the model shows that it no longer a beneficial change for Epsom we would not want it to proceed and would refuse the funding.
- c) To enable sensible and informed decisions to be made it is important to have all the facts and figures.

When are the facts and figures going to be made available and what is the process following their availability?

Officer Response:

South Street 2 way forms part of the Epsom Plan E Expression of Interest bid to the Coast to Capital LEP. If this expression of interest is successful (which is anticipated will be known by July 2014) a business case is required to be prepared and submitted before the end of 2014 to secure funding for the scheme. It is anticipated that the Coast to Capital LEP would indicate whether the scheme can be funded in 2015/16 or whether it would need to be considered in a future funding year.

The business case needs to show overall benefits to journey times and delays to show a benefit cost ratio greater than 2 to demonstrate value for money and secure Government funding. The journey times and delays are assessed through a nationally and government accepted computer traffic model that is robustly validated against existing vehicle movements. These vehicle movements have been updated through a recent series of extensive traffic surveys undertaken over a wide geographical area.

This survey information is currently being incorporated into the computer traffic model which is expected to be complete in July 2014 following which the Plan E highway options (including South Street) will be tested in August 2014 and incorporated in the business case submission to the Coast to Capital LEP.

A joint County and Borough Member task group has been established through the Local Committee to enable informed discussion on the development of Plan E. This group has to date met twice (on 26 March 2014 and 25 April 2014) and received information on the results of the traffic surveys. The next meeting is currently being planned to receive a presentation of the computer traffic model with further meetings held to consider the outputs of the option testing.

Surrey County Council and Epsom & Ewell Borough Council officers are working closely with the Member Task Group to ensure that a clear and robust business case is produced that sets out the case for the Epsom Plan E scheme as set out in the EEBC Local Plan.

**Question 14 Cllr Neil Dallen
Re: Development off Rosebank**

The development off Rosebank on the old Rosebery School site creating Dalmeny Way caused considerable damage to both the road, kerbs, verge and pathways. I am still getting complaints and comments from residents about the state of the area. Has the developer now completed reinstatement to the satisfaction of Surrey County Council? If not what action is being taken to enforce satisfactory reinstatement?

Officer Response:

At the present time we cannot insist that developers reinstate any damage done to the road network in the vicinity of their development. We are currently reviewing whether an opportunity exists to do so, and if so how this could be achieved from an operational point of view. However, it would seem that much of the damage referred to has occurred since the development was completed. Rosebank is scheduled to be resurfaced in the near future.

**Question 15 Cllr Jan Mason
Re: Bollards and Lighting**

When travelling around the Borough, I have noticed that many of the bollards are dirty, not working or damaged and that some of the lights on the pedestrian islands particularly on

East Street have not been working for some time. Who is responsible for the maintenance of these and when will the necessary cleaning and repairs be carried out.

Officer Response:

The County Council inspects illuminated bollards on a routine basis, and also receives ad hoc reports from residents. There is a limited central budget available for repairs to illuminated bollards, and this is prioritised to the most safety critical sites. The Local Committee has previously allocated some of its own funds to refurbish illuminated bollards in lower priority locations and could do so again next Financial Year 2015-16 if this was considered a high priority. Officers are reviewing any outstanding requests for repairs.

Subject to appropriate traffic management the community highways gang could be asked to clean the bollards if members wish.

This page is intentionally left blank