

Minutes of the meeting of the
Tandridge LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 10.15 am on 25 September 2015
at Nutfield Memorial Hall, High Street, Nutfield, Surrey, RH1 4HE.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr Nick Skellett CBE (Chairman)
- * Mr Michael Sydney (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr David Hodge CBE
- * Mrs Sally Ann B Marks
- * Mr John Orrick
- * Mrs Helena Windsor

* In attendance

13/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

No apologies received.

14/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the previous meeting held on the 26 June 2015 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

15/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None received.

16/15 PETITIONS [Item 4]

No petitions received.

17/15 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

Eight formal public questions were received.

Question 1

The question asked for information on the different agencies and their responsibilities towards parking matters was submitted by David Cooley, Tandridge District Councillor and Chairman of Warlingham Parish Council.

Mrs Marks felt that although the information was useful, what would be helpful if the information could be made clearer and in a format that Councillors and Parishes could forward on to residents to provide clear guidance around parking enforcement. The Committee agreed this would be helpful and asked that it could be produced and distributed.

Question 2

On behalf of Horne Parish Council, Parish Councillors David Brown and Tracey Osgood asked if BOAT 329 could be declassified as a bridleway. The Chairman advised that the response set out the various legal options for the request. They thanked the Committee for the response but would still like to try to take forward and pursue. Divisional Member Mr Sydney sympathised with the Parish and was supportive in their request. Mrs Windsor advised that as this leads into her Division she has contacted the satnav companies through their websites to advise that this route is not suitable for vehicular access. The Highways Manager offered to take their request forward.

Question 3

On behalf of Nutfield Parish Council David Cullen asked if a 20mph would be considered for parts of the Parish. Mr Cullen advised he was happy with the response but asked if a petition from the local school would be helpful in this request. The Principle Engineer advised that this would not be necessary to look into the request.

Question 4

On behalf of Nutfield Parish Council David Cullen asked if anything could be done to rectify undulation and poor drainage on Kings Mead. Could the Parish Council take some action to rectify the issue. The Area Highways Officer advised that they would not recommend that the Parish Council carried out the works and offered that Highways worked with the Parish. Divisional Member Mrs Windsor advised that she would be happy to some of her allocation to help with the work.

Mr Hodge suggested that residents should write to our MP Sam Gyimah to lobby and ask what he could do for a fairer funding system from central government. This includes fairer funding for education and for car tax money which is not proportionate to the amount paid by Surrey residents. Mr Hodge advised that it cost the County £800,000 to put notices in papers for traffic regulation orders and questioned in the day of internet and social media if this was a good use of money.

Question 5

Simon Morrow asked for an update on the current status of the parking proposals in Glebe and Elm road in Warlingham. Mr Morrow indicated that residents may now be in favour of a parking scheme. The Chairman advised that each parking review starts a fresh.

Question 6

Mr John Hill raised a question over the concerns that the resurfacing on Westhall Road in Warlingham had been carried out twice. Mr Hill thanked the Committee for their response. The Highways Officer advised that the highways teams do work closely to try and prevent work being carried out twice, however due to contractual issues this did not happen in this case. Due to the contract with the contractor should work have to be completed again it is at their cost.

Question 7

Mr Coxall was unable to attend the meeting but has been provided with a written response to his question on parking matters outside Boulthurst Way, Oxted. Mr Skellett the Divisional Member advised that he will be talking with residents and will be highlighting in the next parking review.

Question 8

A questioner raised concerns with the maintenance of the garage area on Ockleys Mead, South Godstone and young people playing in the area. They felt that the drains are an issue and regularly become blocked. The Highways Officer advised that as no one from Property Services was in attendance at the meeting that she would pass the concerns on to the officer to address.

Annex 1

18/15 MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 6]

Two Member questions were submitted and no questions were asked informally at the meeting.

Mr Sydney raised a question regarding highway matters in the Lingfield Division. Mr Sydney was happy with the response provided.

Mr Skellett asked for an update on Operation Horizon in his Division, and thanked Officers for the response provided.

19/15 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 7]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: Sarah Woodworth, Community Partnership and Committee Officer

Petition, Public Questions, Statements: None

The Community Partnership and Committee Officer informed the Committee that this item would be a new standing item on the Local Committee agenda. This would be a public document that would track actions agreed by the committee which would not be captured in recommendations of reports. For example actions arising from petitions or public questions.

Members Discussion- Key Points

- The Chairman highlighted to the Committee, following the Cabinet Members decision the Committee's request of an exception to the

policy to change the speed limit outside Limpsfeld Infant C of E School in Limpsfield to a 30mph has been agreed. Also, that it has been confirmed that the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement has confirmed this week that there will no longer be a need to go to out to consultation for Hurst Green Children's centre. The Chairman thanked Mrs Kemeny and the Cabinet for this decision.

- Mrs Marks felt that both of these decisions were excellent news and showed that as the Committee were united in hope, working together whilst recognising the financial difficulties.

20/15 MEMBERS ALLOCATIONS SUMMARY (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Sandra Brown, Community Partnership Team Leader-East

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Members Discussion – Key Points

- Members agreed to note the report.
- Mrs Marks stated that she had received a number of positive comments from local residents on the new community kitchen facility at the United Reform Church in Caterham.
- The Chairman thanked the Officers in the Community Partnership team for their support and responses to Member and public queries on Member Allocations.

Resolution:

The Local Committee (Tandridge)

- (i) NOTED the Members' Allocation applications received and amounts spent, where indicated, as set out in Annex 1 of this report.

21/15 CHANGES TO COMMUNITY YOUTH WORK SERVICE IN TANDRIDGE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Jeremy Crouch, Practice Lead- East Surrey and Ciaran Cleasby, Senior Practitioner.

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements: None

The Practice Lead Officer presented the report, highlighting the goal of the service is employability for young people. Resources for the service are allocated in accordance with NEET (Not in Employment, Education or Training) figures and for Tandridge this is a 4% increase. Over the summer the service held a public consultation, an area of concern was around young people living in village locations. This will be addressed as the Service will

work closely with the Local Prevention Framework provider to ensure young people receive the support required.

The Officer clarified that with regards to Table 2 on page 25 of the report, that there would be only one 'Hub' (Street Youth Centre) in the two Caterham areas and this would provide for both Caterham Hill and Caterham Valley. The i-bus, which is a fitted out minibus to deliver youth work would be working with the provider YMCA East Surrey to deliver more, combining resources. The offer is District wide to allow work to be targeted locally, through the work with the Youth Task Group.

Members Discussion – Key Points

- Mr Skellett praised the service stating that although the Youth Service had been hit by cuts the team had targeted and continued to support the young people who needed the support.
- Mr Hodge queried the support in the Warlingham area. The Officer advised that 2 full time youth workers were retained and they could work in the area. As young people travel across the boundaries into the London Borough of Croydon, the service is linking with Croydon council to work together.
- Mrs Marks asked if the Duke of Edinburgh award would continue in Tandridge as some schools offer for their pupils to take part. The Officer confirmed that it will continue at the youth centre in Caterham.

Resolution

The Local Committee (Tandridge)

- i) AGREED the proposal set out in 3.1 of the report as formal guidance for the Community Youth Work Service.

22/15 YOUTH ANNUAL REPORT (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Jon Twigg, Youth Support Officer.

Petition, Public Questions, Statements: None

The Youth Support Officer presented the report and referred Members to Annex 1 to highlight some key areas in the report.

The 'Not in Employment, Education or Training' (NEET) figure on page 35 displays a rise in figures in 2014-2015 peaking in January. The spike is due to young people starting college in the September and then leaving during the first term. The Prevention Manager stated that as of the 31 August 2015, Tandridge had 32 NEETs, this is the 2nd lowest in the county.

On the same graph on page 35 the Officer highlighted that the sharp drop figures in 2013-14 are due to a change in data collection and Government guidance rules.

With regards to the Youth Support Service in Tandridge figures, the Officer stated that the figure in the report was for the whole of Surrey with regards to Tandridge only one young person this year has been sentenced to custody.

The Officer wished to thank the Local Committee for their support on the Farm Buddies project.

Members Discussion – Key Points

- Members thanked the Officer for running the Farm Buddies project as seemed to be very successful for the area.
- Mr Sydney felt that the figure for apprenticeships in Tandridge was positive and good to see.
- Mr Skellett as Chairman of the Youth Task Group wished to thank its Members- Mrs Marks, Mr Orrick, District Councillors Jill Caudle and Rose Thorn.

Resolution

The Local Committee (Tandridge):

- i. NOTED how Services for Young People has supported young people to be employable during 2014/15, as set out in the annex of the report.

23/15 WEIGHT RESTRICTION ORDER ON HOLLAND LANE WEST BRIDGE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: Zena Curry, Area (South East) Highways Manager

Petition, Public Questions, Statements: None

The Area Highways Manager presented the report, advising that this was a request from National Rail due to weight restrictions and highlighted the map provided in the supplementary papers.

Members Discussion – Key Points:

Mr Skellett, the Divisional Member felt that the recommendations were sensible. The work that National Rail would be doing on the Uckfield line would be good news and beneficial.

Resolution

The Local Committee (Tandridge)

- i. AGREED that, following works carried out by Network Rail to replace Holland Lane East Bridge, the current 3 Tonne weight and 6' 6" width restriction on Holland Lane East Bridge be revoked, and the associated traffic management removed;

- ii. AUTHORISED the advertisement of notice in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to revoke the 3 Tonne weight and 6' 6" width restriction Road Traffic Regulation Order that applies to Holland Lane East Bridge and, subject to no objections being upheld, that the order be revoked;
- iii. AUTHORISED the advertisement of a notice in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to implement an 18 Tonne weight restriction on Holland Lane West Bridge and, subject to no objections being upheld, that the order be made;
- iv. AUTHORISED delegation of authority to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and the local divisional member to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals; and
- v. AUTHORISED liaison with Network Rail to determine if additional traffic management is required to support the 18 Tonne restriction on Holland Lane West Bridge.

24/15 VARIOUS ROADS IN OUTWOOD SPEED LIMIT ASSESSMENT (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (South East) and Anita Guy, Principle Highways Engineer.

Petition, Public Questions, Statements: Ian Frow, Chairman of Outwood Parish Council, thanked Michael Sydney and Helena Windsor for their work on supporting the Parish with this request. He felt there was an inconsistency with the north of Brickfield road into Nutfield remaining as 50mph however he understood that this was due to the speed survey not complying with the policy.

Member Discussion- Key Points

- Mrs Windsor as Divisional Member thanked the Highways team for their work on this and supported the recommendations.

Resolution

The Local Committee (Tandridge)

- i. NOTED the results of the speed limit assessments undertaken;
- ii. AGREED that, based upon the evidence, the speed limit be reduced from 50mph to 40mph in Dayseys Hill, Rookery Hill, the section Prince of Wales Road between Dayseys Hill and a point 65m north of Brickfield Road, the section of Chapel Road between Rookery Hill and Normans Road and the section of Brickfield Road between Prince of Wales Road and the existing 40mph terminal approximately 105m west of Wasp Green Lane; from 40mph to 30mph in Millers Lane, Wasp Green Lane and Bellweather Lane; and from derestricted to 30mph in Little Collins, in accordance with the current policy;

- iii. AUTHORISED the advertisement of a notice in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to implement the proposed speed limit changes, revoke any existing traffic orders necessary to implement the change, and, subject to no objections being upheld, that the orders be made.
- iv. AUTHORISED delegation of authority to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and the local divisional member to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals.

25/15 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES UPDATE 2015/16 (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 13]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (South East) and Anita Guy, Principle Highways Engineer.

Petition, Public Questions, Statements:

Local resident Peter Forbes, on behalf of Nutfield Conservation Society thanked Officers and Divisional Member Helena Windsor for the speed review for Nutfield to Redhill and raised concerns regarding Nutfield High street having a 40mph speed limit.

Member Discussion- Key Points

- Mrs Windsor stated that she was glad to see that the speed assessment for Byers lane had been ordered but questioned when the results would be available. The Officer advised that as soon as the results were available they would be discussed with her as Divisional Member, Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee.
- Mr Hodge referred to table 2.8 of the report and asked if in the future the table could show the number of complaints for Tandridge.
- Members thanked the team for the work at the A22/M25 Junction; it has really made a difference.
- Mr Sydney referred to the update on Highstreet/ Plough Road/ Dormans Road, Dormansland. The Officer advised that this would be going to Tandridge Planning in the coming weeks.
- Mrs Marks raised concerns over the division route for the Wapse's Lodge Roundabout work. Stressing that in the future the route for HGV's needs to be considered.
- Mr Orrick raised concern of HGV damage on Whyteleafe Hill which may need attention.
- Mr Skellett asked that following the fire in Westerham earlier in the week, could it be made clearer for vehicles travelling on the A25 eastbound through the Surrey stretch, that you cannot drive through Westerham and a diversion is in place. The Officer agreed that she would speak to the team to arrange for signage.
- The Chairman was please to announce that the Portfolio holder agreed to the 30mph outside Limpsfield C of E Infant school. The legal team has been instructed to apply for notices and the urgency stressed.
- Following a question to the Local Committee in December requesting a 50mph speed limit on the A25 (Moorhouse) by the Grasshopper

pub, the Officer advised that discussions were taking place with Kent to ensure the same limit across the boundary.

- The Chairman asked with regards to staff vacancies across the Highway department are we ready for winter? The Officer confirmed that Surrey was working hard to fill all positions and want to recruit the right people for the role.

Resolution

The Local Committee (Tandridge)

- i). NOTED the contents of the report

26/15 FLOODING WETSPOTS IN TANDRIDGE (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 14]

Declaration of Interest: None

Officer attending: Doug Hill, Strategic Network Resilience Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The Strategic Network Resilience Manager attended the meeting to update the Committee and residents on the work of the wet spots across Tandridge and to provide a presentation on the work following the 2013/14 floods on the Caterham Bourne.

The Officer explained that the Environment Agency is the lead agency for flooding matters and SCC is the Local Agency for surface water and ground water. The Flood and Water Services team has a capital budget to look at flooding and wet spot issues. With regards to wet spot projects in Tandridge, work will be carried out on Tandridge Lane, Crowhurst due to a collapsed culvert (planned for February 2016). Farleigh Lane, Warlingham, Outwood Lane and East Hill, Oxted.

Caterham Bourne presentation

The Officer explained that in the winter of 2013/14 the area was affected by flooding. This was due to the groundwater aquifer being full/surcharging millions of gallons of water and the culvert main river not functioning correctly.

The County has two schemes planned to reduce the flooding being repeated (one short and one long term plan). The Surrey County Council LEP scheme will address issues such as the A22 filter drains, flood storage areas, inspection of the culvert main river and identification of restrictions and clearance work in sections of the culvert. Surrey County Council has cleared a lot of the debris and the Environment Agency has cleared the ditches. The Officer showed a number of slides which showed the extent of the blockages with the debris in the culverts. This included issues with service pipes (gas, electric and a sewage pipe) restricting the amount of water that can pass through, SCC is working with the utilities to redirect/ remove the pipes.

Longer term is the Caterham Bourne Flood Alleviation Scheme in Partnership with the Environment Agency and Croydon Borough Council. This will look at catchment flood alleviation and modelling flood risk.

The Officer advised that the third flood storage unit near Bug Hill would be happening imminently.

Members Discussion – Key points

- Mrs Marks raised concerns that in Caterham Valley, at the Waitrose roundabout, some shops flood when there is a downpour of heavy rain. There is a concern that businesses will not want to come to Caterham if shops get flooded.
- With regards to the blocked culverts Mrs Marks suggested that on-going maintenance would be required if the photographs showed the build up in less than 12 years.
- Members agreed to support the work of the team and assist with informing local residents who have the culvert through their gardens on their responsibilities.

Meeting ended at: 12.36 pm

Chairman

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 25 September 2015

SUBJECT: Public Question

DIVISION: ALL



David Cooley, Tandridge District Councillor and Chairman of Warlingham Parish Council asks:

As a local councillor I receive a number of comments along the lines of, when I call the Police about a parking issue they refer me to Surrey CC and when I go to Surrey CC they tell me to it is a Police matter and vice versa.

Would it be possible for the Local Committee to publish a 'who is responsible for what' list in respect of complaints and questions about parking matters?

For example – 'a multitude of workman's vehicles at a development site blocking site lines'; 'parking on shop forecourt with wheels overhanging footway'; 'I can't exit (or enter my drive)' – 'someone has parked across my dropped kerb'; 'overstaying in parking zone - park for one hour no return etc'; 'regularly parks on double yellow lines'; 'disabled bays taken by drivers not displaying blue badge'.

These are just a sample of complaints. Is it possible to say who should be contacted by residents or their representatives at which organisation?

Response:

Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) from Reigate and Banstead Borough Council carry out enforcement of on street parking in Reigate and Banstead and Tandridge. This means parking controls (most of which require a traffic regulation order), including:

- single and double yellow lines,
- formalised school keep clear markings (yellow zig-zags),
- formalised bus stops clearways,
- time limited parking bays,
- permit parking bays,
- formalised disabled bays,
- white zig-zags at pedestrian crossings.

It is important to recognise that some of the restrictions listed above may be advisory (i.e. not have a traffic regulation order behind them), and they are not legally enforceable, in which case the CEOs cannot carry out any enforcement. Enforceable controls are usually identifiable on site by the presence of an accompanying traffic sign to go with the road marking. This is particularly relevant to school keep clear markings, bus stops, and disabled bays.

In addition to the restrictions listed above, CEOs may enforce within “special enforcement areas” which are described in national legislation, and for which we do not have to make a traffic regulation order. These include offences such as:

- Parking more than 50cm from the edge of the carriageway.
- Double parking.
- Parking in front of a dropped kerb. Where parking is in front of a dropped kerb which constitutes a crossing point for pedestrians, the vehicle would instantly be liable to receive a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN). If a vehicle is parked in front of a vehicle crossover access to an off-street parking area (without consent of the resident), then the resident must contact the borough council to request that the vehicle is given a ticket. In any case, the motorist would only be liable for a ticket if their vehicle made it impossible to enter or exit the access. There is no offence for ‘blocking sightlines’.

The contact number for the Parking team at Reigate and Banstead Borough Council is 01737 276000.

Civil enforcement officers cannot issue PCNs for parking on a footway, parking on a verge, or dangerous or obstructive parking, unless there are formal parking controls at the location specifically prohibiting parking there.

The police retain powers to issue Fixed Penalty Notices to motorists parking obstructively, without the need for yellow lines. The telephone number to contact the police would be the non-emergency number 101.

To answer the specific queries in the question:

- A multitude of workman’s vehicles at a development site blocking sightlines.
 - There is no specific offence relating to blocking sightlines. The police may be able to take action if they feel it is dangerous, often this approach does work. The likely impact of building works should be considered by Surrey Highways prior to the planning being given for development. If temporary parking controls are required, they should be considered as part of that process, which would enable yellow lines to be provided and for the borough council to enforce them.
- Parking on shop forecourt with wheels overhanging footway.
 - If there are yellow lines on the carriageway, these also apply to the footway, and CEOs could enforce this offence. If there are no yellow lines, then the police could look at it if it were causing obstruction to the footway.
- I can’t exit (or enter my drive) / someone has parked across my dropped kerb.
 - The resident must contact the borough council to request that the vehicle is given a ticket. In any case, the motorist would only be liable for a ticket if their vehicle made it impossible to enter or exit the access. There is no offence for ‘blocking sightlines’.
- Overstaying in parking zone - park for one hour no return etc.
 - CEOs enforce this.
- Regularly parks on double yellow lines
 - CEOs enforce this.
- Disabled bays taken by drivers not displaying blue badge.
 - If the bay is advisory then no enforcement can take place. Most disabled bays we provide in residential areas are advisory bays. It means we can install and

ITEM 5
Question 1

remove the bays relatively quickly and inexpensively. They work well and are generally well respected. Generally we only introduce mandatory bays in town centres where non-compliance would be more likely, and where CEOs can feasibly enforce the bays. These can be identified with a sign and a marked bay.

Contact Officer: David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager, 03456 009 009

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 25 September 2015

SUBJECT: Public Question

DIVISION: LINGFIELD



Horne Parish Council would like to request that BOAT Road 329– Wilmots Lane be formally de-classified as it is not safe for members of the public, dogs or horses to walk along with motorised traffic. It is a single track road which has a 3-4 foot ditch on one side and a steep bank on the other, therefore pedestrians or equestrians are unable to safely get out of the way to allow a motorised vehicle to pass.

Response:

The northern section of Wilmots Lane is classified both as a Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT 329 Outwood) and also recorded as a 'D' class road on the council's List of Maintainable Streets. The route is used mainly for recreational purposes and has an unsealed surface, so for management purposes the County Council treat it as a BOAT, managed by the Countryside Access Team, rather than a D-road managed by the Highways Service.

There are essentially three legal options that could be considered to change the use/status of a BOAT. All of which are quite complicated processes and it is unlikely that the County Council would be able to proceed with any of them, as the necessary criteria do not apply:

1. Reclassify the BOAT on the basis that it was originally added to the Definitive Map and Statement incorrectly and it should have been recorded as a bridleway or footpath - To do this the Council would have to prove that public vehicular rights do not exist over the BOAT. This particular route was reclassified to a BOAT in 1989. At that time it would have gone through a legal process where historic evidence of vehicular use would have been carefully considered. User groups, landowners, and statutory bodies, including parish councils would have also have been consulted. As this exercise was carried out relatively recently and would have been thorough, it appears that the reclassification process correctly established that vehicular rights do exist and the council has a legal duty to record the route as such. The County Council is able to Modify the Defintive Map and Statement on the discovery of evidence that the status of the route shown incorrectly, but this would be very unlikely bearing in mind the relatively recent Reclassification process. The parish council is free to supply any relevant evidence if available to this effect.

2. Extinguish (vehicular) rights on the basis that they are not necessary for public use via the Magistrates Court - Although the existing recreational vehicular use of the BOAT may be relatively infrequent, it would be difficult to prove this legal test as it appears that Wilmots Lane is essentially the same as most other BOATs across the county, in terms of its character and use. There does not appear to be any unique circumstances that would make Wilmots Lane different to other BOATs and therefore a candidate for extinguishment of rights. Whilst it is recognised that sections of it are narrow and effectively 'single track', it is not unusual and many other BOATS across the county have similar circumstances, with little evidence of accidents occurring where users meet in these situations. An application to the Magistrates Court by the County Council (as the Highway Authority) would need to show that the necessary legal criteria under s116 Highways Act 1980 apply. These are: 1. that the route is unnecessary for vehicular traffic, or 2. That it can be diverted to make it nearer or more commodious to the public. The parish council would need to provide evidence that these criteria can be shown to apply to Wilmott's Lane, for the County Council to progress the matter in this way.

3. Restrict vehicular use by a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) - Traffic Regulation Orders recognise the legal rights of classes of users, but can impose restrictions on use of rights of way, or other highways. The council has a specific policy covering the application of TROs to restrict vehicles on BOATs. The criteria for a TRO of this type specifies that it can only be applied where there are significant safety issues or where significant damage is occurring to the route. Countryside Access staff have inspected the route recently and found that on the whole, it is in a good condition and suitable for public use. To apply a TRO in this case it would be necessary for the County Council to either make an exception to its current policy or to change the policy. There is no formal application process for a TRO. The County Council considers requests against the relevant policy criteria and legislation against the situation regarding the route in question.

Contact Officer: Steve Mitchell, Countryside Access Team Manager, 020 8541 7040

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 25 September 2015
SUBJECT: Public Question
DIVISION: GODSTONE



Nutfield Parish Council ask:

20mph traffic speed restrictions outside Nutfield Church School (South Nutfield) on Mid Street and outside the Nutfield Day Nursery on Church Hill (Nutfield Village).

What criteria does Highways use to judge the merits of such a scheme and what can the Parish Council and local community do/provide to get the scheme(s) successfully implemented?

Response:

The existing speed limit is 30mph on both Mid Street (outside Nutfield Church School, South Nutfield) and Church Hill (outside the Nutfield Day Nursery).

Speed limit assessments

Speed limit assessments are progressed by the South East Area Highways Team as part of the Highways Forward Programme agreed by Tandridge Local Committee.

The council's policy 'Setting Local Speed Limits' became effective in July 2014 and includes processes for 20mph speed limits. The policy sets out the procedure for speed limit assessments and is summarised as follows:

1. The request is reviewed by the Area Highways Team, in consultation with the local divisional member. The allocation of funding for an assessment is considered.
2. Surveys are undertaken.
3. Survey results are analysed to see if the existing speeds would allow for a lowering of the speed limit by signing only (based on Department for Transport formulae).
4. If the measured speeds are too high for a lowering of the speed limit by signing only, supporting engineering measures to influence speeds will be required. Feasibility works will consider measures such as traffic calming features.
5. Consultation with Surrey Police as the enforcement authority.
6. Report on findings to Tandridge Local Committee who will consider whether to proceed with the proposed change to the speed limit.
7. Advertise the order, as legally required, respond to comments/objections, and implement the scheme.
8. Monitor speeds following implementation and report back to Tandridge Local Committee.

Further information is available at:

<http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-safety/speed-limits>

School Road Safety

The council's policy 'Road Safety Outside Schools' became effective in July 2014. The policy sets out the procedure for assessing road safety outside schools. The council's Sustainable Travel Team leads the assessment process, which includes review of the site and school travel plans and potential road safety education.

Further information is available at:

<http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-safety/school-road-safety>

Local involvement in speed management

In terms of local involvement in speed management, it is suggested that the Parish Council and local community may wish to explore the following options:

Community Speed Watch

This involves Surrey Police providing local volunteers with equipment and training to be able to monitor vehicle speeds and note the registration details of speeding vehicles. The police then issue letters to the keepers of vehicles who have been detected speeding to provide a warning against speeding at that location. Further police action may then be taken against motorists who are detected speeding several times.

Further information is available at:

<http://www.drivesmartsurrey.org.uk/>

Proposed actions

It is proposed that speed surveys at both locations are included on the Highways Forward Programme for the current financial year (2015-16). The results will be reported to the local committee chairman, vice-chairman and the local divisional member. Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team has expressed support for the speed assessment.

It is proposed that SCC's Sustainable Travel Team is advised of the issues and is asked to add Nutfield Church School to their list for future assessment under the Road Safety Outside Schools policy.

Contact Officer: Peter Shimadry, Traffic Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 25 September 2015

SUBJECT: Public Question

DIVISION: GODSTONE



Nutfield Parish Council asks:

With regards to Kings Mead, in the view of Nutfield Parish Council and following numerous comments from local residents we feel that the highways issues (major undulation and defect on the highway, poor drainage on Snicketts Path and subsidence of a drain) have become so severe that we request urgent action is taken, in this financial year, to make good both the highway and footpath.

Response:

Highways are aware of the issues in Kings Mead, Nutfield and have investigated what action could be taken to resolve them.

The carriageway in Kings Mead is inspected annually in accordance with Surrey's Highway Safety Inspections Policy. The Area Safety Team manager has confirmed that there are no outstanding safety defect works in Kings Mead, with the next inspection scheduled for February 2016.

The Tandridge Maintenance Engineer has visited site and has identified that the main subsidence in the block paving carriageway is outside 34 Kings Mead. The depression presents itself as a slope rather than a shear face as is the case with potholes in tarmac roads. The depression does not fall within the safety matrix for repair as a safety defect.

To remove the depression would require an area of block paving of about 27.5m² to be regulated and relaid. Unfortunately there is no funding available from this financial year's Local Committee allocation for works of this nature as it has already been committed to other schemes. The Maintenance Engineer has approached the Highways Asset Team to see if there is any funding that could be made available to fund the repair from their budget. If this is not possible, with the divisional Member's agreement, the repair could be prioritised for Local Structural Repair (LSR) next financial year, subject to LSR funding being made available to the Local Committee in 2016/17.

The subsidence around the gully outside 60 Kings Mead is not as severe as the section detailed above, and again cannot be classified as a safety defect. The gully was cleaned in August 2015 and no issues were found with its integrity. Again, there is no funding available to carry out a repair at this location at the present time, but this area could be included when funding is identified to rectify the main area of subsidence in Kings Mead.

ITEM 5
Question 4

There is no drainage system along Snickets Path which links Kings Mead and The Copse. There are no safety defects identified in Snickets Path but water ponds in a small area at the eastern (The Copse) end of the path. This problem could be resolved by a small area of inlay to even out the existing dip in the path. However, there is no funding available at the present time to carry out this work. It may be possible to fund this work next financial year, subject to budgets and divisional Member agreement.

Contact Officer: Anita Guy, Principal Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 25 September 2015
SUBJECT: Public Question
DIVISION: WARLINGHAM



Simon Morrow, Tandridge District Councillor asks:

Parking in Glebe and Elm Roads Warlingham is a long-standing issue, and recently proposals were put forward by the County Council to change the yellow lines in these roads to provide more parking spaces, but these were not favoured by residents. Can the Committee advise the current status of these proposals and whether it is intended to canvass the introduction of a residents' parking scheme?

Response:

As part of the 2015 Tandridge parking review, proposals were developed in Glebe Road aimed at increasing the available parking space in the road. During the statutory consultation some residents objected to these proposals and after a meeting with them and the local member, David Hodge, the parking team have decided not to proceed with these changes,

There are no plans to introduce residents parking in Glebe or Elm Roads.

Contact Officer: David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager, 03456 009 009

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 25 September 2015

SUBJECT: Public Question

DIVISION: WARLINGHAM



Regarding Westhall Road, Warlingham John Hill asks:

I have a number of questions relating to work carried out this year on Westhall Road, between its junction with Hillbury Road (near Upper Warlingham Station) and Searchwood Road.

1) What was the planning process which resulted in road markings (both median and parking restrictions) being repainted in the Spring, only for them to be covered by the "top-dressing" exercise, a matter of couple of months later?

2) Why was there a considerable delay between the completion of the "top-dressing" exercise and the start of work to re-instate the road markings?

3) Why was the approach to the two elements of this work ("top-dressing" and re-lining) different?

In the former case signs were put up prior to commencement, telling motorists not to park, thereby allowing the work to be completed without hindrance.

In the latter case this preliminary action was not taken and, therefore, the extensive parking which had resumed since the "top-dressing" exercise has impeded completion of the work. This has resulted in several visits by the team, most recently on Thursday, 17 September, late in the evening.

As of 8am Friday, 18 September there are still some half dozen car-sized lengths of line yet to be joined up.

Response:

1. Road markings on the main Surrey road network, defined as Surrey Priority Network (SPN) 1, 2 and 3 roads, are refreshed every three years as part of a cyclical maintenance programme. The SPN 1, 2 and 3 network in Tandridge, which includes Hillbury Road, formed part of the refresh programme for 2015/16. As part of the refresh, where there are road markings that extend into side roads, such as yellow line waiting restrictions, these are also refreshed for up to a distance of 30 metres.

Officers liaise with the Works Delivery Group to determine which roads are due to be resurfaced under their various works programmes, to avoid the issue that has arisen in Westhall Road. However, the surface dressing programme was not finalised at the start of the financial year and regrettably the road markings were refreshed only to be removed as part of the surface dressing scheme.

2. Road markings cannot be relaid on a newly surface dressed road for at least one week after the dressing has taken place. This information was included in the letter delivered to residents prior to commencement of the works. The weather has also delayed the reinstatement of the road markings, as they cannot be laid during wet conditions.

3. The signs put on site for the surface dressing scheme cover both the resurfacing and line marking phases of the works. These should still have been prior to the road marking being carried out, but may well have been disregarded due to the delay between completion of the resurfacing and commencement of the road marking work. The majority of the road markings were replaced over one night. Any sections that remain incomplete due to parked cars or similar will be attended to as a matter of urgency, subject to the weather.

Contact Officer: Anita Guy, Principal Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 25 September 2015
SUBJECT: Public Question
DIVISION: OXTED



Mr Chris Coxall asks:

Over the last few months the road outside our property on Boulthurst Way has become subjected to extensive commercial vehicle parking particularly during the evenings and weekends and is often used as layover when these vehicles are not being used. The photographs below are typical.



Whilst I acknowledge that there are no parking restrictions being breached (I think) my concern is that parking on this junction is far from ideal and particularly unsafe as this location is used as a crossing point for children accessing the park and children's playground. These vehicles are obscuring sight lines (as can be seen in one photo) and I fear it is only a matter of time before a serious accident occurs. You may recall that some time ago the junction was temporarily used as a bulky items rubbish collection point before the Council acknowledged the same safety issue and relocated to another site.

Is there any way appropriate road markings/restrictions or advisory notices can be introduced to prevent such large vehicles making the crossing point so dangerous to use?

Response:

Rule 243 of the Highway Code states that drivers should not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres of a junction. Failure to comply with this rule will not, in itself, cause a person to be prosecuted, but may be used in evidence in any court proceedings under the Traffic Acts.

Signs and road markings on the public highway have to comply with national legislation, as set out in the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002. There are no non-regulatory road markings or signs that could be used at the junction of Boulthurst Way and

Hazelwood Road to deter vehicles from parking at the junction. Keep Clear markings are intended to cover a junction to keep it free from queueing vehicles, so allowing vehicles to enter/exit the junction. They are not designed to prevent parking and are only advisory.

Yellow boxes serve the same purpose as Keep Clear markings but require approval from the Police before they are provided as the Police are responsible for their enforcement.

The only way to prevent parking at the junction is to introduce double yellow lines to keep it clear of parked vehicles and maintain sightlines/crossing points. This would require the making of Traffic Regulation Order and would be enforceable by Civil Enforcement Officers. It should be noted that if restrictions were to be placed at the junction, the likelihood is that the vehicles would park in another location nearby. The junction of Bouthurst Way and Hazelwood Road could be added to the list of sites for investigation as part of the next Tandridge parking review with a view to the introduction of double yellow lines.

Contact Officer: Anita Guy, Principal Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 25 September 2015

SUBJECT: Public Question

DIVISION: GODSTONE



Questioner asks:

The Godstone estate area encompassing Ockleys Mead and surround is home to a lot of young families with children ranging from 0 to 17 years. There is currently no suitable play area in the vicinity, accessing the playground on Godstone Green involves a walk along the busy A25.

Surrey County council sold off some lockup garages from a lot of 15 situated at the bottom of Evelyn Gardens opposite the Oakleigh Care Home. I purchased 3 of them over 2 years ago. Since acquiring them I've had problems arising from the local children and teens having nowhere to play and therefore using the forecourt as a football pitch or playground whenever they feel like it; in wet weather the balls are kicked against the doors leaving them battered and stained with grit marks and paint damage. Other issues are the drains and the general upkeep of the area; it looks dilapidated. Some of these garages have had their doors opened attracting fly tippers with van loads of rubbish to deposit and only to be cleared by Tandridge council when called. That has now stopped. When it rains the water cannot escape through the drains - see photos.



Please could you advise me who is responsible for clearing the drains and ensuring that the communal areas still owned by SCC are maintained in good condition – something that will help discourage vandalism?

Please will you advise me of what provisions can be made for the children and teens on the estate to enjoy their physically active games in a safe environment?

Response:

Drains and Maintenance:

Surrey County Council owns the forecourt and as such is responsible for the repair. Costs can be recharged to the garage owners/ residents.

The council is not under any obligation to repair any of the garages other than two which it owns. Whilst the doors of the garages owned by the council are old, they are currently secure and as such there are no plans to replace these.

Evelyn Gardens is on a grounds maintenance contract with periodic inspections and works being undertaken to prevent weed growth and to litter pick. The Area Facilities Officer Paul McIntyre also inspects the area periodically and would arrange for repairs within the council's responsibility, if required from time to time. There is no obligation for the council to provide lighting to the garages or carry out other improvements.

An order was placed by the helpdesk to clear the drains shown in the photographs and a contractor attended on 5 September between 3-4 pm.

We have attended in the past to clear drains. To date we have not charged any of the garage owners for this service.

Safe area to play:

Surrey County Council has an internal commissioned service for Community Youth Work which started on the 1 April 2015. The service delivers targeted provision for local young people in specific areas of Tandridge. With regards to Ockleys Mead and the concerns you have raised, the Senior Practitioner has confirmed he is aware of the local issues and is meeting with residents and young people next week. This will include closely liaising with the new Local Prevention provider (Neighbourhood) YMCA East Surrey, who started their contract on the 1st September 2015 to try and move forward in this matter.

Contact Officers:

Sarah Walker, Senior Estates Surveyor, 03456 009 009

Ciaran Cleasby, Senior Practitioner, Community Youth Work Service 07773 244679

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)
DATE: 25 September 2015
SUBJECT: Member Question
DIVISION: LINGFIELD



Michael Sydney, Divisional Member for Lingfield asks with regards to Highway matters in his division.

Smallfield

The Parish has a sub-committee called Humps and Bumps. Please can Highways make contact to arrange a meeting with the Humps and Bumps members to discuss:

- Traffic calming in the Smallfield area including Redehall Road and Broadbridge Lane.
- The drainage problem in Redehall Road at the northern end.

Lingfield/Dormansland.

The two Parish Councils have requested that Haxted Road be considered for a reduction in speed from 50 to 40 to reduce the accident rate on this road. Can this be looked into?

Response:

Smallfield Traffic Calming

Highways officers would welcome meeting with the Parish Council Humps and Bumps sub-committee to discuss traffic calming in the Smallfield area and drainage in Redehall Road. Officers will contact the Parish Clerk to arrange a mutually convenient date.

Haxted Road, Lingfield/Dormansland

Haxted Road is a single carriageway, two lane road which provides a link between Lingfield and Edensbridge. It is currently subject to a 50mph speed limit along its 2½ mile length.

A review of the recorded personal injury collisions along the length of the Haxted Road over the past 3 years (2012 – 2013) and the current year (to end May 2015, the latest data available) has been carried out, the results of which are given below.

Year	Slight	Serious	Fatal	Total
2012	3	0	0	3
2013	5	0	0	5
2014	2	3	0	5
2015 (to end May)	3	0	0	3
Total	13	3	0	16

Of the 16 reported collisions, 13 were the result of loss of control, 10 of which involved only a single vehicle. Nine of the total number of collisions occurred in the vicinity of the bends by Barrow Green Farm, all involving loss of control. As part of the reporting process, the Police log their views as to contributory factors leading to a collision. In Haxted Road, 'Travelling too fast for conditions' was recorded as a contributory factor in 6 of the collisions and 'Exceeding the speed limit' in 1 collision.

Road safety in Haxted Road has been raised at the Road Safety Working Group. This group consists of road safety experts from both Surrey Police and the County Council as well as engineers from Surrey Highways and as part of its remit, considers individual sites or lengths of roads where clusters of collisions have been identified. The number of collisions in the vicinity of Barrow Green Farm was raised at the November 2013 meeting and it was agreed to carry out a SCRIM test to determine the skid resistance of the road. This was reported to the following meeting of the working group in May 2014, where it was noted that there had been no further personal injury collisions since 2103. The SCRIM test results showed that the road did not meet the investigatory levels ie. the skid resistance levels met the required standards. It was agreed to monitor the site.

Surrey County Council does not hold any speed data for Haxted Road. In March 2015, Tandridge Local Committee allocated £5,000 of their revenue budget to fund speed limit surveys, which are required to be carried out using automatic traffic count equipment over a continuous 7 day period to comply with Surrey's Speed Limit Policy. Given its length, a number of locations would need to be surveyed on Haxted Road. Haxted Road will be added to the list of roads to be assessed in Tandridge and once locations for the survey sites have been identified and agreed, the surveys will be ordered. It should be noted that speed surveys should not be carried out if the results would be affected by other factors eg. adverse weather conditions.

The results of the speed surveys will be reported to the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, who is also the divisional Member. If the measured mean speeds comply with Surrey's Speed Limit Policy, Haxted Road can be added to the list of schemes for consideration for future Local Committee funding.

Contact Officer: Anita Guy, Principal Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 25 September 2015

SUBJECT: Member Question

DIVISION: OXTED



Nicholas Skellett, Divisional Member for Oxted asks with regards to Highway matters in his division.

Oxted Division - Roads Needing Repair

According to the original Horizon programme Hurstlands and Greenhurst Lane were due to be repaired in 2014 but were then scheduled for September 2015. When will this work be done and what is the reason for the delay?

Which other roads in the Oxted Division will be repaired under the Horizon programme in the Council year 2015/2016 and will Gordons Way and Stoneleigh Road be included as originally indicated?

Response:

Hurstlands and Greenhurst Lane are programmed for 18th December, subject to weather and permits. These schemes were delayed and had to be rescheduled due to clashes with utility works in the area. These are the only outstanding Operation Horizon schemes in the Oxted division for 2015/16.

Gordons Way and Stoneleigh Road are both currently being designed, for delivery in 2016/17 (Year 4 of the Horizon programme). Additional schemes being designed and to be prioritised for delivery in either Year 4 or Year 5 of Operation Horizon are listed below:

Coldshott	Entire length
Woodhurst Lane	Woodlands Rise to Westerham Road
Tandridge Hill Lane	Gangers Hill to Oxted Road
Ridlands Rise	Ridlands Road to Tally Road

Contact Officer: Anita Guy, Principal Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

This page is intentionally left blank