

Minutes of the meeting of the
Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 22 June 2015
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 Michael Arthur MBE
- * Cllr Liz Frost
- * Cllr Vince Romagnuolo
- * Cllr Clive Smitheram
- * Cllr Tella Wormington

* In attendance

12/15 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE LOCAL COMMITTEE FOR 2015/16 [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.

13/15 APPOINTMENT OF BOROUGH COUNCIL MEMBERS [Item 2]

Resolved:

That, Borough Council members be co-opted as substitutes for the municipal year 2015/16.

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 2015-2016, the substitute members being appointed subject to the decision above:

Appointed Members [5]

Cllr Michael Arthur MBE [Ewell]
Cllr Liz Frost [Woodcote]
Cllr Vince Romagnuolo [Court]
Cllr Clive Smitheram [West Ewell]
Cllr Tella Wormington [Town]

Substitutes [5]

Cllr Tony Axelrod [Town]
Cllr Rekha Bansil [Woodcote]
Cllr Steve Bridger [Stamford]
Cllr Kate Chinn [Court]
Cllr Humphrey Reynolds [Ewell]

Reasons: Standing Order 40(f) requires the Committee at its first meeting in the municipal year to agree whether it wishes Borough Council members to be permitted to have substitutes.

14/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 3]

There were no apologies or substitutions.

15/15 CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS [Item 4]

Borough colleagues were reminded to complete a declaration of interest form if they had not already done so, or to check their current declaration.

The County Council has very recently issued a list of Social Care, Community Support and Health Contacts in Epsom & Ewell for distribution to relevant individuals and community outlets. Copies were available to members for distribution in their area.

A leaflet on available funding sources for community and charity groups will be available shortly and copies will be sent to Borough Members of the Local Committee for distribution to local groups in their wards.

16/15 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 5]

Two questions were received, the questions and answers are set out in Annex A. Mr Osgathorp was unable to be present at the meeting, the response to the question was noted. Further discussion of this and question 2 was deferred until consideration of Item 13.

17/15 ADJOURNMENT [Item 6]

29 members of the public were present. 5 informal questions were asked (including three under Item 7 and 1 under item 13) and answers were provided at the meeting.

18/15 PETITIONS [Item 7]

Two petitions were received, the petitions and answers are set out in Annex B.

Declarations of Interest: None

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

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: Three members of the public asked questions under Item 3 in relation to this item.

Petition 1: The petitioner, Mr Tufo presented his petition. He indicated that he felt that there was no need for a study to be carried out as the traffic problems could be solved by the construction of the Kiln Lane link. Residents had previously been advised that traffic calming would be installed, there are frequent accidents which do not appear to be presented in the data included in the response to the petition.

A resident queried where the information had come from that indicated that the traffic had flowed better during the recent gas works and referred to the number of accidents in the area.

Officers responded that the accident data is supplied by the police and is publicly available on the Crash Map website. Incidents are generally only recorded if there is personal injury as there is no requirement to report damage only incidents to the police, more recent incidents are not included as there is a delay in publication whilst information is processed and verified. As the number of personal injury accidents has been low officers would recommend that limited resources are directed at areas with a higher incidence of accidents.

Whilst the Kiln Lane link may alleviate the problems there is no guarantee that it will be built in the foreseeable future. It was noted that the local highways team receive a high volume of correspondence and during the gas works received a number of requests for the one way system to be continued permanently. The feasibility study is aiming to look at whether this would be a good idea from a technical point of view and would recommend what changes would need to be made to ensure that there is no deterioration in safety in the area. If the feasibility study concludes that a one way system is appropriate, the Committee would need to agree to proceed and there would be a period of formal statutory public consultation before a final decision could be made.

Petition 2: The petitioner, Mr Tufo presented his petition. He indicated that residents had previously petitioned for traffic calming which had been agreed, but that all that had resulted was a series of staggered parking bays. It is difficult for residents to safely leave their driveways between parked cars and there are regular near misses. In addition when vehicles are not in the bays traffic is not slowed. Residents would like chicanes as in Manor Green Road, particularly as there are a number of facilities in the area, including a school and a church where users are vulnerable.

Three residents supported the request for traffic calming and indicated that they had witnessed vehicles driving at speed in the area resulting in accidents or near misses. One queried whether a one way system if agreed would lead to increases in traffic speeds and accidents.

Officers replied that a one way system can lead to increases in traffic speed but mitigating measures would be included in any proposed scheme to ensure that safety is not compromised.

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

Member discussion – key points

Petition 1: In response to members questions the Area Highways Team Manager indicated that around £5,000 had been spent on the feasibility study so far. He could not confirm how long the work would take, it is pencilled in for completion this financial year, but the officer doing the work is due to go on maternity leave in the summer and it is not yet known what cover arrangements will be put in place. Members queried whether the study could be redefined to look at alternative solutions, he indicated that once the model is established other scenarios can be tested, traffic calming solutions could be considered in the current study for an additional sum.

Petition 2: It was suggested that consideration could be given to reducing the speed limit to 20mph. Officers responded that this is not effective without engineering measures to reduce speeds, road humps are the most effective, but cause problems for emergency services, road cushions are the next best option followed by chicanes. These options could be evaluated by means of a road safety study which would cost in the order of £5,000.

Resolved:

- (i) (on a vote 2 AGAINST to 7 FOR) That, the feasibility study to consider whether a one way system in Hook Road and Temple Road would be appropriate should continue as previously agreed.
- (ii) (on a unanimous vote) That a report be brought to the next meeting of the Committee setting out how options for traffic calming in Temple Road and the surrounding area could be brought forward.

Reasons: To gather data to see whether a one way scheme would be appropriate in this area and to consider possible options for the road layout should the scheme progress.

19/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 8]

The minutes were confirmed as a correct record.

20/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 9]

There were no declarations of interest.

21/15 EPSOM AND EWELL PAY AND DISPLAY PROPOSALS [Item 13]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Stephen Clavey, Senior Parking Engineer; Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: One member of the public asked a question under Item 5 in relation to this item, a further question under item 5 was taken into consideration although the questioner was not present. A further member of the public also asked a question under Item 6.

Noted the following corrections to the report “Bankside” should read “Emerald House” “Prospect Place” should read “Providence Place”

Mr Olney stated that he represents the residents of Wheelers Lane and the majority do not want a Residents Parking Zone (RPZ) or pay and display. Around 10% would be prepared to pay for a permit to allow them to park close to their property during the day and he was therefore suggesting that an area for these residents could be created on the green area. The other questioner was also against the implementation of an RPZ and was also against the hardening of the green area.

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

Member discussion – key points

Whilst hardening of the green area would be possible, officers would not recommend this option as it would take away space for parking on the road and it would be necessary to divert the pavement. It was also likely to be quite costly for very little additional benefit.

In relation to the Clayton Road proposal members asked whether it would be possible to time any implementation to coincide with the implementation of any new RPZ to prevent vehicles being displaced to residential roads. Officers could not guarantee this would be possible, but would aim to implement the two schemes as close as possible to each other.

Resolved:

- (i) (On a vote, members unanimously voted AGAINST the introduction of pay and display in Wheelers Lane and FOR its introduction in Clayton Road) To introduce new parking restrictions including pay and display parking bays in Clayton Road, if possible to coincide with the introduction of any agreed Residents' Parking Zones in the area, but that the proposals for Wheelers Lane be not progressed;
- (ii) That the County Council's intention to make an order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 be advertised and, if no objections are maintained the order be made;
- (iii) That if objections are received the Parking Strategy and Implementation Group Manager is authorised to try and resolve them, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and the Divisional Member and decide whether or not they should be acceded to and therefore whether the order should be made, with or without modifications.

Reasons: It is expected that the implementation of the proposals will both increase the safe passage of vehicles, improve the convenience of parking in these locations and also ease the parking situation within these areas.

22/15 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 10]

Eight questions were received, the questions and answers are set out in Annex C. The following supplementary questions were asked.

Question 2: A request was made to publish the steps and timescales on the Local Committee website following the meeting of the Committees Parking Task Group and this was agreed.

Question 3: It was noted that business permits are not currently available and therefore the double yellow lines cannot be converted to parking bays as they are required by the undertakers. Officers agreed to see if there was any other location where an additional bay could be introduced.

Question 4: It was not possible to give a more specific time for these works as the programme will not be drawn up until the autumn.

Question 6: The member asked to be updated on the result of the inspection.

Question 7: The member requested a loading ban to prevent parking in the area by blue badge holders. Officers agreed to consult residents in the area.

Question 8: Any suspected misuse of a blue badge should be reported to the County Council contact centre for investigation.

23/15 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

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

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

Members expressed concern that £27,000 of last year's budget had not been spent and had not been carried forward. The Area Highways Team Manager reported that local officers felt that they had spent all of the allocated budget and that this may be due to a delay in processing payments. He would investigate further and challenge the loss of this sum if it was found to be due to delayed payments. He would report back to the September meeting.

Noted, in relation to the feasibility study at the Cheam Road junction with Ewell Bypass, that officers had recently met with officers from the traffic signals team and have suggested some improvements.

Resolved:

To 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.

Reasons: to facilitate the delivery of the 2015-16 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.

24/15 EPSOM PLAN E HIGHWAYS IMPROVEMENTS - PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT ANALYSIS [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Steve Howard, Project Manager, Transport Policy; Caroline Tuttle, Transport Planner

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

The local member was concerned that residents concerns had been ignored and that a number of roads in the area would become rat runs when the scheme is implemented. The local member also suggested that some shopkeepers on South Street are also concerned that loading restrictions, which may be required, will damage their businesses. Officers responded that over 2,500 comments had been received as a result of the public exhibition and engagement and that these are being analysed to see what changes can be incorporated into the detailed design to address some of the concerns expressed. Noted that the Cabinet member had given an undertaking to consider the roads that could be potential rat runs, the local member requested that they be looked at in the winter when traffic levels are higher. The Officer explained how the team had made several visits to local businesses to explain the plans and elicit their views. Officers would be engaging further with businesses to ensure that any concerns are considered. The Committees Task Group would be kept informed of the detailed design process and any other issues arising.

The Committee noted the results of the public engagement event on the Plan E improvements proposals and that an additional £0.675m has been awarded from the (C2C LEP) Local Growth fund to increase the overall funding to £3.375m

25/15 LOCAL COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS TO LOCAL GROUPS AND TASK GROUPS [Item 14]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nicola Morris, Community Partnership & Committee Officer

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

It was agreed that the Community Partnership and Committee Officer would circulate further information on the family, friends and community support project and the role of the champion.

Mrs Mountain expressed her view that her right to represent her residents is being impaired following her removal from the Major Schemes Task Group. The Chairman responded that the decision of the Committee is a democratic means to determine representation.

Resolved:

- (i) To make the following appointments from the Local Committee for 2015/16 municipal year:
 - a) Community Safety Partnership - John Beckett
 - b) a Family, Friends and Community Support Champion for 2015/16 – to be decided.
 - 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, Michael Arthur, substitute: Clive Smitheram
 - d) Major Schemes (Epsom & Ewell) Task Group – County Councillors Stella Lallement, Jan Mason and John Beckett, Borough Councillors – to be advised by the Borough Council.

- (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.

Reasons: To enable the Local Committee to be represented on local bodies and to appoint the Committees Task Groups.

26/15 COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION) [Item 15]

Declarations of Interest: Cllr Smitheram declared an interest as a Borough member involved in the funding of the Community Safety Partnership

Officers attending: Nicola Morris, Community Partnership & Committee Officer

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

Cllr Smitheram queried the impact that retaining the budget may have on the work of the Community Safety Partnership if this funding is allocated to another organisation. He was reassured that the money could be made available to the Partnership if a suitable project is put forward which meets the criteria, however if a project cannot be identified the Committee will seek to use it on another suitable initiative to prevent the funding from being lost.

Resolved: To retain the budget of £3,337 allocated to the Committee for community safety purposes under its control and delegate authority to the Community Partnership Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee to authorise any expenditure meeting the criteria set out in the agenda and to oversee the expenditure of this budget.

Reasons: to ensure that the funding is allocated to an appropriate community safety project.

27/15 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 16]

Monday 21 September at 7.00pm, Bourne Hall, Ewell

Meeting ended at: 9.50 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank



SURREY

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL
22 June 2015**

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

Question 1 – Mr Steve Osgathorp

Re: Parking in Wheelers Lane (Item 13 and Annex 1)

Question:

I am a local resident in Wheelers Lane and have learned of the proposed pay and display scheme being considered for Wheelers Lane.

I would like to raise a number of concerns / objections with the scheme.

In your 'Reasons for Recommendations' you state that the scheme would improve safe passage for vehicles and pedestrians. I cannot see that the scheme would make any noticeable difference to the safety as your proposal is to have pay and display facilities in exactly the same place as cars currently park.

You also state that convenience would be improved. Convenience will only improve by making the current users of the parking spaces (mainly commuters and Epsom retail shop employees) parking elsewhere i.e. further up Wheelers Lane (not discounting a CPZ scheme) and further round into Parklawn Avenue and Eastdean Avenue (also not discounting a CPZ scheme). If the current users do decide to pay to park they will be there all day as currently and therefore the convenience will not change. This would therefore prove a possible lack of improved convenience and the possible creation and worsening of an existing problem further up the roads mentioned.

In Annex 1 it refers to a minimum width for emergency vehicles as being 3.2m. At no point on the route does your proposal address this with the average width along the distance considered being less than 3m. The proposal talks about additional spaces being provided but it will actually be the same.

The vandalism of pay machines is highly likely.

In section 1.5 of your report you state how hard it is to enforce parking for enforcement officers. That is because they virtually never come up Wheelers Lane. When they do they are always able to issue tickets for contraventions. If they came more often they could issue more, or people would learn to park properly / go elsewhere.

'Cruising' would actually go up further as car users would venture further up Wheelers Lane, Eastdean and Parklawn Avenues looking for space (not discounting CPZ's).

Finally point 7.1 suggests that obstructive parking would reduce but as the bays are due to put in the same place as they are now, except for 2, this situation won't really change.

I have no desire for a CPZ in the resident's area as I should not have to pay to park outside my own house. As a growing family with children within driving age in 4-5 years times we could be looking at a £200 plus charge per year. This wouldn't even guarantee a space. The last review of CPZ's a couple of years ago was for 49 spaces to be allocated for residents from 2a to 56 Wheelers Lane and to include Lane End residents in that allocation. By my count 2 years ago there were in excess of 55 residents' cars, already highlighting a shortage of space before you start looking at visitor permits, children reaching 17 etc.

The introduction of a CPZ scheme in the remainder of Wheelers Lane, Parklawn and Eastdean Avenues will become necessary if pay and display is introduced at the lower end of Wheelers Lane as residents simply won't be able to park. Thus creating one proposed solution necessitates another problem to be solved.

My question

Rather than spend £25K in year 1 and £8K per year thereafter on a scheme that seems to me fundamentally flawed spend the money taking back the undergrowth on the Northwest side of Wheelers Lane by 2 - 3 feet (0.6 – 0.9m) and tarmac this allowing parking further over and widening access for emergency service vehicles and improving safety for pedestrians with a raised curb on the south east side. This will address the problems that you have stated are the reason for this proposal.

Officer Response:

The total width that an emergency vehicle comfortably requires is the 3.2m, but this does include wing mirrors and clearance - in this instance, the minimum width is currently able to cater for the emergency vehicles.

We are proposing that two single bays should be removed at the narrowest point and relocated elsewhere, so that the total overall width is more constant.

We are also investigating the requirements for a resident permit zone (RPZ) in the area, not a CPZ (Controlled parking zone) - we did investigate this a few years ago, but there was no requirement at the time. Since then, we have been asked to re-investigate the proposals as there seems to be a greater need.

Both the RPZ proposals and pay and display proposals are subject to consultation, and it is recommended that if the pay and display proposal goes ahead, then it would need to be in conjunction with an RPZ.

The verge which is next to the parking area, is part of the public highway and as such, in principle the road can be widened. However, there are currently no plans to widen the road and it would be for the Local Committee to decide whether this would be a priority for the limited funding available.

Question 2 – Mr Martin Olney
Re: A Solution to Residents Parking in Wheelers Lane

Question:

House numbers 4 to 24 (11 houses) have a green in front of their homes. Currently it has bollards preventing access by vehicle. There is a footpath in front of the houses allowing foot access.

My suggestion is to use grasscrete to extend the footpath to allow vehicles to be driven onto the green and parked away from the road. The kerb has already been dropped outside 2 Wheelers Lane. This house is next to the bollards blocking vehicle access to the green.

This would help solve two problems faced by the residents of this part of Wheelers Lane. Those that use their cars during the day usually cannot park anywhere near their homes. We also suffer from car vandalism. This has been going on for many years and is becoming more vicious. A resident reported that four letter words were scratched on the bonnet of her car.

The question is will the Local Committee look into providing this parking facility. It would improve life for the residents. Given that we suffer from commuter parking it would provide extra parking; we would be able to load and unload our vehicles near our houses; we would be guaranteed a parking space and vandalism would diminish.

Officer Response:



The area in question is shown in the photo above. In theory it would be possible to grasscrete this area if all residents were in agreement, but it would be likely to cost in excess of £20k. Such a scheme would not be something which could be justified from the limited resources available for Integrated Transport Schemes. The local member would need to consider whether they wished to support this as a priority from within their highway allocation in a future year.

This page is intentionally left blank



**Surrey County Council
Local Committee In Epsom & Ewell
22 June 2015**

PETITION 1: Temple Road / B284 Hook Road, Epsom to object to a feasibility study into a proposed one way system

Received from Joe Tufo, containing 312 Signatures from residents.

A petition has been received to object to a proposed feasibility study for a one way system for Temple Road and Hook Road, Epsom. The petition submitted contained 312 signatures. Of these there are 166 properties on the affected roads in the area, including Lower Court Road, Chase Road and Miles Road who have objected.

Officer Response:

When the Southern Gas Networks (SGN) works in Hook Road took place last summer, a temporary Traffic Management arrangement was put in place that effectively made a one way gyratory system with Hook Road being one way Epsom bound and Temple Road one way Chessington bound. Chase Road remained two way and Pound Lane remained as an existing one way street.

There was a view expressed by many at the time, that the traffic flow into and out of Epsom was greatly improved by the arrangement and there were calls for SCC to make this a permanent traffic system. Funding was therefore approved for this year's Local Committee Highway's budget to carry out a feasibility study to assess whether this was a viable scheme.

Work commenced on gathering traffic data such as volume and speed counts. However, local residents began a petition to stop the feasibility study from progressing, and Members decided to put any further work on hold until the June Local Committee, when a firm decision would be made regarding whether to progress with the study or not.

In addition to gathering important data the feasibility study would be looking at possible options for the road layout should the scheme progress. For example the study would look at the possibility of widening the footways in Hook Road, introducing segregated cycle lanes, reducing the carriageway width to control speeds and possibly additional parking provision. The study would also look at the options at the Chase Road junctions, with possibly traffic signal control allowing pedestrian crossing facilities to be introduced at both Temple Road and Hook Road junctions. In Temple Road the road layout could be changed to incorporate traffic management and calming measures to control vehicle speed.

Pound Lane was a concern during the SGN works because of the increased use of the road by HGVs and the proximity of the school. A study would determine what road layout would be suitable for Pound Lane and what measures could be introduced to make the road safer.

Some limited data has been gathered to date which shows there has been a higher number of accidents on Hook Road. A study would look at the impact of creating traffic signals at the Hook Road / Longmead Road junction which could then combine the existing traffic signal controlled crossings. Without carrying out the feasibility study we will not be in a position to determine the best solution for the area. This gyratory system could benefit local traffic flow independently of the Kiln Lane Link Road Scheme, which even if funding were to be made available would be unlikely to be built in the near future.

The Local Committee is asked to approve the completion of the feasibility study for the Hook Road / Temple Road one-way system, and for this feasibility study to take into account existing road safety concerns in Temple Road raised by the recent petition.

The Local Committee will be able to scrutinise the feasibility study on its completion, and then take a decision on whether or not to promote a one-way system in Hook Road and Temple Road.

PETITION 2: Introduce real traffic calming measures in Temple Road

Received from Joe Tufo, containing signatures from residents of 48 properties on Temple Road.

A petition has been received requesting the introduction of real traffic calming measures in Temple Road to reduce traffic speed and improve road safety.

Officer response:

From data gathered for Temple Road, shown in the table at the appendix, the number of accidents on Temple Road, including the junction with Chase Road is 7 between 2010 and 2015. SCC has not received any information regarding any fatal accident on Temple Road.

Of those accidents, 2 involved motor cyclists, and 2 were shunt accidents at the Chase Road junction. One of the 7 accidents was serious.

Average speed is 28mph and the 85%ile speed is 33mph which would be considered normal for a road of this type.

Given the statistics traffic calming would not be justified. There are many roads in the Borough with higher numbers of accidents and many with greater speeds in excess of the speed limit. Hook Road which runs parallel to Temple Road has had 16 accidents over the same period of time (between Pound Lane and Chase Road) and is likely to be a higher priority when assessing the roads for possible funding.

Although the petition refers to 'real' traffic calming, the assumption is a request for physical traffic calming measures, usually referred to as vertical deflection (road humps, tables, cushions) rather than horizontal deflection such as chicanes and throttle points. The parking bay arrangement which has been in place for many years has tried to create a chicane effect to break up the long straight section of road but is limited in its effectiveness.

The only vertical deflection measures which satisfy the emergency services are road cushions. However, they are limited in their speed reducing effect on large wheelbase vehicles such as white vans and 4x4 vehicles.

The location of some parking bays has created problems for residents who have difficulty exiting their drives. However, due to the number of residential crossovers it is difficult to locate the parking bays where there is a sufficient sight line without losing a number of parking places.

This page is intentionally left blank

ACCIDENT DATA – TEMPLE ROAD AND HOOK ROAD, EPSOM

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Temple Road	1	2	0	0	1	0
Temple Road / Chase Rd	1	1	0	0	1	0
Hook Road / Chase Rd	2	0	3	2	0	0
Hook Road / Pound Lane	2	1	2	2	1	1

Temple Road has had a total of **7** accidents

Temple Road average speed was 28mph and 85%ile was 33mph

Northbound daily traffic flow average is 5,500 vehicles and southbound (towards Epsom) is 3,750.

Hook Road has had a total of **16** accidents. This would rise to 29 if Hook Road / Longmead Road junction was also included.

Speed and volume data for Hook Road has not yet been collected.

KILN LANE LINK UPDATE

The Kiln Lane Link scheme remains an aspiration for both Surrey County Council (SCC) and Epsom & Ewell Borough Council (EEBC). At this stage, however, it is not known if and when Government funding for this scheme could be provided.

Funding for such schemes have been devolved by Government to Local Enterprise Partnerships, which were formed by the [Department for Business, Innovation and Skills](#) to help determine local economic priorities and lead economic growth and job creation within its local area. The Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (C2C LEP) covers the Epsom & Ewell area. To fulfil this function the LEP decide which investments should be prioritised, review and approve individual business cases for those investments, and ensure effective delivery of the programme.

To address this, SCC in partnership with EEBC, have submitted an expression of interest to the C2C LEP to raise the need for this scheme. The C2C LEP have included the Kiln Lane Link scheme in their Strategic Economic Plan as a potential medium to long term aspiration depending upon a successful business case being submitted and approved. SCC are continuing to work with EEBC to prepare supporting transport and economic information for a business case to seek to secure funding for the scheme.

This page is intentionally left blank



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL
22 June 2015**

MEMBER QUESTIONS

**Question 1 Cllr Jan Mason
Re: Trip hazards from highway tree roots**

On a fairly regular basis Borough and County Councillors receive complaints about uneven pavements and trip hazards caused by the roots of highway trees.

1. Does Surrey Highways have an inspection process for root damage to footpaths, particularly in residential streets, and if so how regular are inspections?
2. What action is undertaken to resolve root damage and does it include the removal of the roots or the trees themselves?
3. What is the best way for residents and councillors to report the problem?
4. Can I have the latest data for insurance claims as a result of footway trip hazards due to root damage?

I am particularly concerned in regard to the root heave in Shawford Road, Chesterfield Road and Fulford Road.

Officer Response:

1. The Surrey Highways inspection regime is based on a hierarchical system in accordance with the level of pedestrian usage - this means that the higher category roads are inspected more frequently than those of a lower category. As such, the frequency of inspection is determined by the category of a specific footway.

Our inspectors would normally report all defects/trip hazards that meet our safety intervention levels; including tree root damage. Tree root related defects are not recorded separately.

2. There are two repair options:
 - Overlay the footway 'smoothing' any roots out and creating a small hill over the affected area.
 - Dig out the existing black, being careful not to damage the roots, and then replace the footway material, to reduce any rampage on the footway.

As one would expect, over time, the roots may grow and disturb the footway again - but our annual or more frequent scheduled inspections would identify that.

Generally, SCC will only remove a tree if there is a significant risk, i.e. the footpath is blocked or significantly obstructed with no alternative footway.

3. Tree root damage, like all other defects on the highway, should be reported via the usual means – The SCC website or by contacting the contact centre via email or telephone.
4. According to our records, since the start of 2010, there has only been one claim that has specifically been identified as a pavement trip due to tree roots.
5. The trees in Shawford Road are small to medium size specimens and the majority are not causing any issues with the adjacent footpath. There will likely be an occasional root that crowns and distorts the adjacent path surface. In these situation it is common practice to carry out a footway patching repair, that is likely to also include cutting away the root causing the surface distortion and will not affect the tree.

The trees in Chesterfield Road are large trees that have been constrained from growing to their full potential size by periodic reduction in their crown size. Never the less these trees have increased in girth to occupy a significant amount of footway space in addition to the grass verge where they were originally sited. In these situations the Local Maintenance Engineer has to determine priorities. They have to determine whether the spatial benefit of having large trees on the footway justifies their retention against any risk to pedestrians. The problem in Chesterfield is twofold with surfacing distortion and trunk buttresses that encroach into the path. Both of which are potential hazards to pedestrians.

There are three options in Chesterfield:

- i, Fell the trees; grind the stumps and undertake major footway resurfacing works.
- ii, Carry out planned repairs to the defective sections. This means repairing both safety and cosmetic defects.
- iii, Continue with the status quo – periodic inspection and repair of safety defects in accordance with the SCC safety matrix.

Trees in Fulford Road are planted at the back edge of the curb in planting pits constructed into the path as there is no verge in this road. The commonest cause of trees dying in footpaths is when the path encapsulates the tree base against a curb allowing no access for water to enter the soil. This is not usually a problem where a verge is adjacent to a path.

There are numerous small to medium size specimens, one cherry in particular has become quite large. For the most part, the trees are not a problem to the footway, but where issue do occur the Maintenance Engineer has to consider the contribution that the individual tree makes. The corrective action required; and the likely effect on the tree. If carrying out a patch and a minor root has to be removed, it is unlikely the tree will be adversely affected. However in the case of a large Cherry where multiple of roots need to be removed there are two possible options, either felling the tree or ramping the path around the tree base

Question 2 Cllr Tella Wormington
Re: Residents Parking Scheme

Recently I have been approached by a lot of residents who are frustrated and upset about the apparent lack of action on consulting and implementing residents parking schemes.

In order that I can inform residents of the timescales currently being operated by Surrey Highways will the officers please provide a detailed timetable of the current RPZ Review starting with the initial request by Councillors and including the decision to investigate by the

Local Committee, the consultation periods, the final decision by Local Committee, the legal advertising and the final implementation after the painting of the lines and putting up of signs.

Officer Response:

The Local Committee agreed in September 2014 to employ Atkins to do the analysis work on the areas where Residents Parking Zones (RPZ) had been requested. After officers had discussed the full brief and arranged for them to provide the service, Atkins carried out the beat surveys during February. Their report was made available on 25 March 2015 and at the Informal Local Committee meeting on 22 April it was agreed to discuss the report at the next Parking Task Group meeting.

It was not possible to arrange a meeting of the Task Group before the Borough Council elections in early May and it would not have been appropriate to carry out public consultations during the election Purdah period.

The membership of the Parking TG needs to be agreed by the Committee at this meeting and a meeting will be scheduled for the end of June/early July. The Task Group will agree which of the schemes investigated by Atkins are appropriate to be considered for the next stage which is to determine whether residents are in favour of a scheme for their road or not. Atkins will complete the survey work, before final recommendations are brought back to the Local Committee to agree which schemes can proceed to the formal advertisement stage.

The formal advertisement of schemes will be for a minimum of 28 days, following which the feedback will have to be analysed prior to a decision, either under officer delegated powers or by Committee on which schemes should be agreed. The detailed design work will then need to be completed, the works ordered, signs and bay markings installed and the Traffic Regulation Orders made. Finally, residents will have to apply for the appropriate permit.

It was made clear by officers at the Committee meeting in September that it could possibly take up to two years to implement any agreed schemes, as has previously been the case for other RPZs, due to the extra work involved which is not required for yellow line parking schemes.

**Question 3 Cllr Tella Wormington
Re: Church Road Residents Parking scheme**

Residents feel that there is not enough parking in the evening in Zone E and have requested an additional parking space on Hawthorn place just after the Church road junction outside Trueloves funeral services (this is currently double yellow lines)

Officer Response:

Double yellow lines were specifically introduced here to allow funerary vehicles to park in this location as they are exempt from the double yellow line restrictions - to introduce one more bay in the road would prevent the funeral parlour from being able to use this facility.

The single yellow line restriction only operates from 9am to 5pm, to allow any additional overnight parking in the area. There is also a parking bay near the funeral parlour which is restricted during the day, but again in the evening, allows residents to park here.

**Question 4 Cllr Tella Wormington
Re: West Street Road Surface**

West Street road surface is in considerable disrepair, (as it has been since the Dalmeny Way development when repair work was not enforced) and residents are concerned about road safety particularly for cyclists and motorcycle users because of the unevenness of the surface. Can resurfacing work for scheduled for this road?

Officer Response:

West Street, between High Street and Wheelers Lane, and also Rosebank, are both due to be resurfaced as part of the Operation Horizon programme. They are scheduled for resurfacing in either 2016-17 or 2017-18. In the meantime we will inspect these roads for Safety Defects and arrange repairs as appropriate.

**Question 5 Cllr Tella Wormington
Re: West Street pavement camber**

Near the junction of West Street with the B280, there is a considerable camber on the pavement, which is making use of this pavement precarious for wheelchair and mobility scooter users. Could remedial work for this part of the pavement be considered?

Officer Response:



The camber can be improved by reducing the height of the footway surface so that it is aligns with the existing kerb height albeit with a slight gradient to maintain water run-off. This can be delivered during the current financial year.

**Question 6 Cllr Tella Wormington
Re: Lintons Lane Development - Lintons Lane and Victoria Place road repair work**

The condition of Lintons Lane and Victoria Place roads has suffered significantly from the heavy goods and works traffic related to the Lintons Lane development. As this development is nearing completion, can you confirm that the developer will complete repair work to these roads before development is completed and if so, when this is scheduled?

Officer Response:

An officer from Transport Development Planning will inspect the condition of the road and we will take appropriate action if it can be proved that the damage has been done by the developer. Victoria Place is due to be resurfaced as part of the Operation Horizon programme. It is scheduled for resurfacing in either 2016-17 or 2017-18. The Local Committee has funding that may be allocated for resurfacing Lintons Lane, if the Local Committee considered the resurfacing of this road to be a high enough priority. The Local Committees funds for Highways works are fully committed for the current Financial Year

2015-16. This means the earliest that the Local Committee could allocate funding for resurfacing Lintons Lane would be 2016-17. In the meantime we will inspect these roads for Safety Defects and if they are not the responsibility of the developer, arrange repairs as appropriate.

Question 7 Cllr Tella Wormington
Re: Hook Road Parking

Hook Road No loading on double yellow lines around the Islamic centre: Parking around the Islamic centre in Hook road is causing issues. Could no loading be implemented on the double yellow lines in the immediate vicinity of the centre?

Officer Response:

This sounds like an enforcement issue. Obviously, vehicles should not be parked on a double yellow line for any significant period of time anyway. If this restriction is not being adhered to, it is unlikely that a loading restriction will work any better, unless the issue is with disabled drivers. Epsom and Ewell Borough Council carry out the enforcement on behalf of Surrey County Council - they should therefore be contacted regarding any enforcement issues.

It should be remembered that drivers can allow passengers to board and alight on double yellow lines and vehicles can load and unload - a loading restriction may also cause problems with residents requiring deliveries themselves.

Question 8 Cllr Tella Wormington
Re: Blue Badge use enforcement

Residents have raised concerns about the number of on street parking places being used by Blue badge holders. Rather than restrict blue badge parking, could you provide an update on what enforcement of Blue Badge holders is currently being carried out and if additional enforcement could be implemented?

Officer Response:

Blue badge holders are entitled to park on a yellow line (unless it has a loading restriction), for anywhere up to three hours - they can also park in unlimited or time limited parking bays for as long as they like. If a blue badge is registered to a vehicle and properly displayed in the windscreen it very difficult to carry out any kind of enforcement.

If the blue badge is being misused, then this would need to be investigated separately and reported to the blue badge team at Surrey CC - blue badges can be revoked if it is felt that they are being misused.

This page is intentionally left blank