

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Elmbridge LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 4.00 pm on 14 September 2015
at Council Chamber, Elmbridge Civic Centre, High Street, Esher, KT10 9SD.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mrs Margaret Hicks (Chairman)
- * Mr Mike Bennison (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Ramon Gray
- * Mr Peter Hickman
- * Rachael I. Lake
- * Mrs Mary Lewis
- Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
- * Mr Tony Samuels
- * Mr Stuart Selleck

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Nigel Cooper
- * Cllr Andrew Davis
- * Cllr Chris Elmer
- Cllr Brian Fairclough
- * Cllr Neil J Luxton
- * Cllr Dorothy Mitchell
- * Cllr T G Oliver
- Cllr John O'Reilly
- Cllr Peter Szanto

* In attendance

35/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Ernest Mallett, Cllr Brian Fairclough, Cllr John O'Reilly and Cllr Peter Szanto.

36/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 8th June were approved subject to the following amendment: 'Mrs Nockles, a petitioner, made a statement at this point' to be added in immediately before the paragraph starting 'To help resolve...' in section 27/15.

37/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

38/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

The Chairman updated the Local Committee on the applications from organisations in Elmbridge borough which had been received by the SCC Community Improvements Fund. The decisions on the successful applications will be known in October. She encouraged other organisations to bid for similar funding in the future.

39/15 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 5]

The updates on the Local Committee Decision tracker were noted.

40/15 PETITIONS [Item 6]

Three petitions had been received.

Details of the petitions are attached at Annex A.

Request to change traffic flow in Faulkners Road

1. Jan Roberts, a resident of Faulkners Road, spoke on behalf of the petition to change the traffic flow in Faulkners Road. She explained that there had been an increase in the amount of traffic, often travelling at dangerous speeds turning into Faulkners Road, often unnecessarily due to the incorrect guidance of SATNAVs, and that the narrow road with cars parked on both sides increased the potential for accidents.

She added that an one way system along Faulkners Road from Burwood Road had been proposed but this would not have helped prevent the volume of traffic, but that creating a no left turn from Burwood Road and a no right turn from Queens Road would not hinder residents, but would stop the road being used as a 'cut through'.

She said the road was used by a lot of families to access the green, the playground and the church hall so the road needed to be made safer for everyone.

Request for controlled parking with residents permits in Faulkners Road

2. Cyatana Curham, a resident of Faulkners Road, spoke on behalf of the petition explaining that a large number of people who live, work, shop and use the amenities in the area, park in Faulkners Road, some all day and some cars are not moved for weeks. She proposed some solutions to resolve the problem.

Residents' parking from the Queens Road end up to the old St Johns Ambulance building from 7.00 am to 11.00 am and thereafter parking restricted to 2 hours.

Beyond the St John's Ambulance building no restrictions at all with the removal of the yellow marking outside the nursery school.

Cyatana explained the second problem is parking on both sides of this narrow road and on the kerb, which had prevented the refuse lorry from collecting refuse and restricted access to the cottages. She

proposed the introduction of double yellow lines on the cottages side up to the St John's Ambulance building.

Thirdly the petitioners would like a ban on commercial vehicles parking anywhere in Faulkners Road.

The Chairman explained responses to both petitions would be provided at the next meeting, at which point the discussion on the items would be opened up to the whole Committee. She added that she is meeting with the local ward councillors to discuss the second stage of the works in the Burwood Road area.

As the 3rd petition related to Item 9, it was taken with that Item.

41/15 PETITION RESPONSE: REQUEST FOR PEDESTRIAN CROSSING ON HURST ROAD (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 6a]

Frank Apicella, the Highways Senior Engineer, introduced the report. He explained it was for the Local Committee to decide whether to fund a feasibility study for the crossing, but he emphasised that there was no guarantee that a crossing would be feasible in the location and it was also reliant on funding being available.

The SCC Councillor, Stuart Selleck, spoke on behalf of the Divisional Member, Ernest Mallett, who had given his apologies for this meeting, offering to allocate £5,000 to fund a feasibility study. Ernest had acknowledged it could be a waste of money as it was possible there would be no funding available for any construction, but crossings are crucial for safety. Cllr Nigel Cooper expressed his support for the suggestion made on behalf of Ernest Mallett. Members expressed concern that the crossing had not been funded as part of the school expansion.

In response to questions from the petitioner, Matt Ralph, it was explained that whether or not all highway works needed to be completed before the school opened, depended on what conditions had been imposed when the planning application had been agreed.

The amendment to the recommendation was proposed by the Chairman, Margaret Hicks, and seconded by both Stuart Selleck and Rachael I Lake. 12 Members of the Committee voted in favour of funding a feasibility study.

The Local Committee resolved to:

- (i) Fund** a feasibility study for a zebra or pelican crossing on the A3050 Hurst Road, West Molesey, outside the new Hurst Park Primary School, in view of an anticipated reduction in the number of pedestrians needing to cross the road at this location, **subject to the decision at Item 13, whereby normal practice would be for it to be funded from the local Member's share of the highways budget.**

Reason: to identify whether a crossing in this location would be feasible, should funding for the crossing become available and its implementation be agreed.

42/15 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Four written public questions were received. The questions and responses are attached at Annex B.

1. After considering the response to his question Ken Huddart (Claygate Parish Council) stated that an onstreet survey had been carried out in Claygate and the views were that excessive controls should be avoided and there were concerns about the car park charges. He added that it was thought that the 4 fold increase in the charge for the first 30 minutes would increase on-street parking.

The Chairman said that the issues would be looked into when Claygate was considered in year 2 of the Parking Strategy.

SCC Cllr Peter Hickman expressed the view that the philosophy of parking charges should be considered early in the review. Cllr Dorothy Mitchell reminded the Local Committee that the car parks are the responsibility of Elmbridge Borough Council, which had reviewed their charges and considered them fair and low compared to some areas.

2. Mark Sugden asked as a supplementary question what was going to happen in November 2015 as EBC had given one year's notice on both the Dittons and Claygate Children's Centres in November 2014, expressing the consternation of the local residents as there appears to be no sign of any end result.

The Chairman explained that the Committee really did not have any further information, no decision had been made and that the communities would know as soon as possible.

3. Chris Evans, (Chairman of Beechwood RA) asked whether the Local Committee had seen the briefing note he had sent with his question. As an error had been made and officers had not considered the contents of the note before preparing their response, the question was deferred to the following meeting.

Question 4 was linked to Item 12 so was taken at that Item.

43/15 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 8]

No Member questions were received.

44/15 CHANGES TO THE COMMUNITY YOUTH WORK SERVICE IN ELMBRIDGE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 9]

Jeremy Crouch, Community Youth Work Service Practice Lead, introduced the report. The main direction for SCC Services for Young People is to support as many young people as possible into employability. To achieve this aim the service needs to place its resources (youth workers) where there are the most young people who are NEET. In Elmbridge this means extending the reach of the work and delivering in new places.

The proposals went out to public consultation from 29 June to 21 August 2015. 3 public consultation events were held and an online consultation was available. The service listened to the feedback and made some adjustments.

Jeremy explained that where less youth work was being proposed this would be a phased approach and places would not be left without any provision. For example in Claygate a long transition, with a staged approach, was planned to mitigate against any lack of support.

Nick Bragger, Senior Practitioner, explained how the areas of highest need were identified including the data that was used.

At this point Mark Sugden, the Chairman of Claygate Parish Council, was invited to present his petition, detailed in Annex A. He explained that he had visited the youth club, which currently open 3 evenings per week, a number of times recently and it was always busy, providing an important facility for local young people.

He added that Elmbridge actually had received an increase of 5% in its budget and yet Claygate was being decimated with a reduction of 9 to nil hours of SCC paid for youth worker provision with a 'hope' to work with the VCFS to provide 1 evening per week. Local residents had expressed extreme concern through the consultation that the young people of Claygate were being neglected in favour of young people elsewhere in the borough and that there was the potential for an increase in ASB. Mark read out the comments of a two young people and closed by urging the Committee to review the proposal in order to provide a fairer more reasonable provision for Claygate.

The Local Committee Members' comments included:

- Agreement with basing the resource allocation on evidence
- Concern that the 'hub & spoke' system was new and hadn't been tested
- Request for details of the current youth provision from youth centres in Elmbridge
- Details of how youth work has been successfully provided by voluntary groups in other areas of the borough

Two Claygate ward councillors were allowed share their concern.

In response to questions Jeremy Crouch confirmed he would circulate the current provision, reassured the new proposals would be monitored and that they would consider different organisations coming together to provide youth work. He also explained that any group delivering youth work linked to SCC, must remain neutral and cannot be seen to be advancing their cause. In addition SCC would support the transition to provision by other groups, so hopefully there would not be any loss in provision by the time the transition was complete.

Mike Bennison, the SCC Cllr whose division includes Claygate, asked why Claygate should lose out when in fact there was an increase in budget. He suggested that crime costs money and this could lead to an increase in crime.

He suggested that transport is offered so the young people can visit other youth clubs and referred to how the travellers were mixing with the community. He said the proposals were too woolly and wanted a guarantee that 3 youth officers would remain in Claygate until the transition was complete.

Jeremy Crouch assured the Local Committee that the service would keep the communities informed, would be attending the youth task group and would look into the transport provision. However the service's responsibility is with those most in need.

5 SCC Councillors, a majority, voted in favour of the recommendation.

The Local Committee resolved to agree:

- (i) The below proposals set out in 3.1 as formal guidance for the Community Youth Work Service.

Reason: These changes are designed to: enable the Community Youth Work Service (CYWS) to better support the Council's strategic goal of employability for young people; implement a County Council Cabinet steer to allocate more of our resources to the areas of greatest need; and respond positively to an overall funding reduction of 11% for Community Youth Work across Surrey.

**45/15 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT FROM SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE (SERVICE MONITORING & ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN)
[Item 10]**

Emily Pentland, the YSS Team Manager, Elmbridge introduced the report, which was to update the Local Committee on how the Services for Young People had supported young people to be employable during 2014/15.

She explained how although the number of NEETs had increased since 2014 the trend since 2013 generally was downwards. The Optin programme which aimed to get young people ready for work had helped many young people into work, college or other purposeful activity. Together with the Family Support Programme the team had run the Sliding Doors Programme which teaches young people how to protect themselves from Child Sexual Exploitation. She continued that for young people with significant additional needs they joined forces with Walton Charity to run the Protected Work Placements Scheme and through a short case study demonstrated how it runs and how it can benefit such young people.

Emily informed the Committee about the Streets Apart Project, which was unique to Elmbridge, and how the joint approach has had a positive effect on young people.

Moving on to the Centre Based Youth Work, she explained how 100 more hours of youth work had been delivered in 2014/15 at Molesey Youth Centre and that Walton now had a permanent youth worker and the attendance had increased.

Local Committee Members' comments and questions included:

- That requests for anger management sessions had been received

- As the Surrey economy is growing it seemed strange that the number of NEETs had increased from 2014 to 2015

Officers explained that some group anger management sessions are already being run, that anger management could be an option with 121 work and if it concerns a young person who the service are already dealing with then it would become part of their package. As regards the NEET figures, it is partly the way they are counted, but it is only a snapshot and generally young people are NEET for a shorter time, and the service are working more with those who are long term NEET.

The Local Committee agreed

- i) To note How Services for Young People has supported young people to be employable during 2014/15, as set out in the appendix to this report.

46/15 ELMBRIDGE YOUTH TASK GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 11]

Cheryl Poole, the Community Partnership & Committee Officer, introduced the report.

She explained that since 2011 the Youth task group's role had been to make recommendations to the local committee on youth related matters, mainly on local prevention work and more recently on Community Youth work. However, the work on the Streets Apart report had highlighted the benefits of joined up support for young people, which had led to work to develop a joint youth strategy by SCC and EBC.

As the local committee youth task group was already well established with an equal number of both borough and county councillors it seemed logical to seek to extend its remit.

It remains a non decision making group, which will monitor the youth work of the county and partners and provide advice and local knowledge so helping with the success of the strategy.

The Local Committee resolved to agree:

- (i) The terms of reference for the Youth Task Group attached in Annex A

Reason: the new terms of reference widen the remit of the task group to allow it to additionally oversee the implementation of the new Joint Youth Strategy.

47/15 RYDENS RD CONSULTATION RESPONSES (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 12]

Annex 4 to this item was tabled at the meeting. It is attached as Annex C to the minutes.

Frank Apicella introduced the report explaining officers were alerted by Members to concerns about Rydens Road raised by residents. A feasibility study was carried out and a location found, but due to a disabled resident's home fronting the site and the type of vehicle he required this refuge location would have raised safety issues. As a result a public consultation was carried out to gauge the level of support for the proposed scheme. The result was no particularly strong feeling for or against.

Borough Cllr Chris Elmer said he had not received any requests for this crossing and thanked officers for the analysis, but felt that there was a lack of statistical evidence on which to base a decision. SCC Cllr Rachael I Lake expressed concern that residents who were in favour of the crossing had not expressed their views as strongly as those against. She added it was a safety issue and that it would take all her share of the Local Committee highways budget and some of the share of the Walton South & Oatlands County Councillor Tony Samuels, so she would have to justify to the residents in her division as to why her share had been spent in another division. Tony Samuels said he was not convinced the crossing would be used and that the evidence didn't indicate that it was a high enough priority.

At this point the Chairman allowed the resident, Mick Flannigan, who had submitted a written question on the issue, to speak. The question and response are attached as Annex B. He asked where the evidence was that it is a struggle to cross the road and said this is contrary to both his experience and observations. Ward Cllr Christine Elmer was also allowed to speak and added that from all the comments and emails she had received, those against much outweighed those in favour.

Other Committee Member comments included

- how it was difficult to find out whether an island was really needed as officers based it on statistics, but people's perception of danger was different
- pedestrian refuges narrow the road making it dangerous for cyclists.
- on balance there was no evidence for it.

Tony Samuels proposed and Stuart Selleck seconded the amendment to the recommendation to not continue with the introduction of the island. 13 Members voted for the amendment and there was one abstention.

The Local Committee resolved:

- (i) **Not to continue** with the initiative to introduce a pedestrian refuge island by way of closure of the Meadowside junction based upon the consultation responses received.

Reason: the Local Committee believed that on balance there was not sufficient evidence for the refuge island to be currently considered a priority.

48/15 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 13]

Nick Healey, the Area Team Manager (NE), introduced the report. He explained that the budgets for next year, 2016-17, had not been confirmed yet, so officers had to make the assumption that there would be a £1m

reduction in the local highways revenue budget. Full council had already agreed £0.5 m cut to the capital budget over 4 years. The officer was recommending continuing with the same strategy as in 2015-16 so the priorities already identified could be delivered over the 2 year programme agreed in February 2015.

Committee Member, Stuart Selleck, suggested that the Local Committee write to put pressure on the leader regarding the budgets.

Nick Healey added that a £1m cut across Surrey would make a difference of £100,000 to this Local Committee and with the current recommendation the day to day maintenance aspect of the highways work would receive the greatest impact.

SCC Cllr Mike Bennison expressed his concern about the constant reductions in the local committee budgets.

Nick Healey ended by saying the impact of the reduction on the divisional shares of the budget was tiny with a projected reduction from £41,061 in 2015-16 to £39,333 in 2016-17.

The Local Committee resolved to:

- (i) Authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and the relevant Divisional Member(s), to prioritise schemes as necessary to ensure the remainder of this Financial Year's budgets are fully invested in the road network in Elmbridge (paragraph 2.5 refers);
- (ii) Approve the strategy for allocation of next Financial Year's budgets as detailed in Table 4 (paragraphs 2.19 to 2.27 refer);
- (iii) Authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and the relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

Reason: The recommendation is intended to facilitate delivery of the 2015-16 Highways programmes funded by the Local Committee and to facilitate development of Committee's 2016-17 Highways programmes, while at the same time ensuring that the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Members are fully and appropriately involved in any detailed considerations.

49/15 MEMBERS' ALLOCATIONS (SERVICE MONITORING & ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 14]

The Local Committee noted

- (i) The amounts that have been spent from the Members' Allocation budget, as set out in Annex1 of this report.

Meeting ended at: 6.20 pm

Chairman

TABLED DOCUMENT



SURREY

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 14 September 2015

AGENDA ITEM 6

PETITIONS

1. To receive a petition with 14 signatures from a resident, Mrs Janis Roberts, requesting Surrey County Council to change the traffic flow in Faulkners Road. The petition states:

A lot of traffic including cars, commercial vans and heavy goods vehicles turn left from the Burwood Road and right from the Queens Road using Faulkners Road as a short cut, often travelling at high speed. The road is in most parts narrow and residential.

If Faulkners Road were to become a one way system the problem of speeding would be exacerbated and encourage even more large vehicles to use the road as a cut through from the Burwood Road.

Proposal to resolve this problem:

No left turn from the Burwood Road into Faulkners Road and no right turn from the Queens Road into Faulkners Road.

.....

2. To receive a petition with 14 signatures from a resident, Miss Cyatana Curham, requesting Surrey County Council to introduce controlled parking in Faulkners Road with residents permits. The petition states:

Proposal: Controlled parking along the narrow section of Faulkners Road from near the junction with Queens Road to the beginning of the nursery school. This would give adequate parking for the residents of Faulkners Road and Mills Road whilst leaving the wider section of the road towards the Burwood Road for non-residents. Because of the narrowness of the road double lines along the residential side of the road. A ban on commercial transit vans parking in the road.

TABLED DOCUMENT

3. To receive a petition with 466 signatures from a resident, Mr Mark Sugden, requesting Surrey County Council to stop the closure of Claygate Youth Club. The petition states:

For the first time in 28 years the children of Claygate are facing the fact that there will no longer be a youth club for them. Where else will they go? They need a safe environment to meet and to keep them off the streets. What else is there for them to do in Claygate that doesn't cost them money they cannot afford? Please help us to convince Surrey County Council that this is an important facility in our Community.

PETITION RESPONSE

The Community Youth Work Service recognises that there is disappointment from the Claygate community that the resource allocation system proposals show that Surrey County Council (SCC) staff will be withdrawn from Claygate Youth Centre subject to Elmbridge Local Committee approval. The proposals show that Claygate Youth Centre would continue to provide youth work but become what is known as a 'Community Spoke' – there are no plans to close the Youth Centre. We are exploring, with the help of the community, interested stakeholders and charities, is a joined-up approach to maintaining high quality youth work at Claygate Youth Centre.

SCC are prepared to support this transition with a minimum of one night provision by SCC staff until a suitable organisation or funder can be arranged to take this on. In fact, we are prepared that the transition will take much longer than that. Our plan, subject to approval of the changes, is that the current offer of 3 evenings per week will be staffed by SCC until Christmas 2015, reducing to 2 evenings per week until Easter 2016. We would hope that by this stage community groups and/or a suitable charity will have taken on the work, and we will support in this transition. In the unlikely event that this hasn't happened, SCC will maintain one evening a week staffed by SCC workers from Easter 2016 onwards, until such a time as suitable group/s can be found.

SCC are offering the building for free, plus training, resources, advice, support and maintenance costs to any community group or charity that is willing to fund and/or staff the Youth Centre, for as many evenings per week as they wish. There will be high levels of support offered from the Community Youth Work service in Elmbridge, in particular, the Senior Practitioner. Claygate Youth Centre and those delivering youth work will remain part of the Community Youth work Service network. This is a similar plan to other areas in the County.

It may be that one or more community groups or charities will in fact be able to offer more than the 3 nights that is currently offered to the young people in Claygate. There is a lot of potential in this plan.

TABLED DOCUMENT

SCC values Claygate Youth Centre as an essential part of the Claygate community, and acknowledges the fantastic work that has happened there over many years by SCC staff and the local community. Subject to Local Committee approval of the proposals, those SCC staff will continue to work within the Borough and will be able to play a vital role in maintaining good community links in Claygate and making the transition and Community Spoke a real success.

This page is intentionally left blank



SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 14 September 2015

AGENDA ITEM 7

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question 1: Ken Huddart (Claygate Parish Council)

Can the Surrey (Elmbridge) Local Committee comment on how the recent decision by Elmbridge Borough Council to significantly increase EBC car park charges over the next 3 years, especially in Village car parks and which is likely to drive cars to park on-street, impacts its plan to seek an holistic provision of necessary parking in both Claygate and across the borough?

Response from SCC Local Committee (Elmbridge):

The analysis produced by Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) in its report on a review of its parking charges suggested that previous increases had had little impact on use of its car parks. By implication this would suggest that EBC do not expect any future rises in charges to have any significant impact on use either. Whether this will be the case obviously remains to be seen and it is clearly another factor that the county council will have to bear in mind when carrying out its review of parking and parking provision in Claygate and other parts of Elmbridge. So, put simply, the increase in car park charges does not change the aims of the new strategic parking reviews or impact on their desired outcomes.

Question 2: Mark Sugden (Claygate Parish Council)

Can the Local Committee provide the status on the future of the Claygate and Oxshott Sure Start Children's Centre currently operating out of Claygate Centre for the Community?

Response from SCC Local Committee (Elmbridge):

As you know, a proposal for a formal consultation on the future of the Sure Start children's centres was being developed for the county council's Cabinet to consider on 26 May 2015. This work is ongoing but officers were asked to provide further information on the impact of potential closures before Cabinet met. Consequently, this affected the original timescales planned for consultation and the decision to consult did not go to Cabinet on 26 May.

Officers are still providing further information for members on the future of the Sure Start Children's Centre programme and will keep those affected informed of any developments.

Question 3: Chris Evans (Chairman Beechwood Ave RA)

Does the committee agree that the traffic and parking problems at opening and closing times at Cleves School already create significant safety concerns and inconvenience, which can only be exacerbated by the proposed expansion of the school, and hence that a radical plan to address these issues needs to be agreed before the expansion can proceed?

Response from SCC Local Committee (Elmbridge):

Oatlands Avenue is the D3868, capable of carrying vehicles of all classes and weights. The road runs from the D3865 Oatlands Chase to the A317 Queens Road. It travels parallel to the railway line with access over the railway to the A317 directly at the Weybridge end, and by way of Oatlands Chase at the Walton end, with no access from the south in-between.

The road is subject to a 30mph speed limit and is well lit by a continuous system of street lighting. Continuous footways are provided on both sides of the road, in the immediate vicinity of the school, but continue along one side of the road beyond the school towards Weybridge.

School warning signs and school amber flashing lights have been provided along Oatlands Avenue, on either side of the school effectively on both approaches. A School Keep Clear carriageway marking has also been provided immediately outside the school entrance.

In October 2002, the Local Committee resolved to introduce a package of amended waiting restrictions in the vicinity of the school having deferred the item twice previously due to numerous objections. These measures included both at any time restrictions and limited waiting between 8.00am to 9.30am and 2.30pm to 4.00pm Monday to Friday.

This was carried out in an attempt to reduce parental parking immediately opposite the school, and at junctions, in order to increase safety during arrival and departure times. This caused many objections directly from the Church, residents of Oatlands Avenue, together with further residents of both private and public roads in the immediate area, due to the potential for reduced and displaced parking.

In March 2005, another traffic Order was agreed by the Committee cited as 'The Surrey County Council Prohibition of Stopping Outside Schools.' This order effectively made areas of School Keep Clear markings outside schools legally enforceable when previously they had been advisory and non-mandatory. The times of the order are 8.15am to 9.15am and 2.30pm to 4.00pm, Mondays to Fridays, during term times. This order involves more than just parking as it prohibits any vehicle to stop or remain at rest on the Keep Clear Marking area. Other minor changes have also been made subsequently.

TABLED DOCUMENT

A Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) has also been erected along Oatlands Avenue, on the approach from Weybridge. This is to supplement the existing signage, and additionally warn the drivers of vehicles, just prior to the bend, to the presence of the school ahead.

In 2012 a zebra crossing was constructed outside the school on Oatlands Avenue, by way of developer contribution. This made further changes outside the school, in particular to the existing layby, whilst the zig zag markings also affected parking outside the school further.

The normal procedure for any school expansion or development is that transport mitigation requirements are identified through the planning process. For any significant development the developer is required to undertake a Transport Assessment, which explores the transport impact and possible mitigating measures. This is then submitted as part of the planning process. During the planning process the final mitigation package is agreed between the developer, the Planning Authority, and the Highway Authority. The developer is then obliged, by planning condition, either to deliver the mitigation package as part of the development project, or to make a financial contribution to the mitigation package.

The Transport Development Planning team are the first point of contact for the Highway Authority for developers, and will advise on the detail following an application to determine what mitigation measures are required depending on the impact of the development.

This page is intentionally left blank

TABLED DOCUMENT



SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 14 September 2015

AGENDA ITEM 7

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question 4: Mick Flannigan (Walton resident)

It is alleged that crossing Rydens Road is "often a struggle". This is completely contrary to all my extensive experience and observations. May we therefore be told in what way this supposed difficulty or danger arises?

Response from SCC Local Committee (Elmbridge):

Whether or not a road is perceived to be dangerous or challenging to cross is in the eye of the beholder. There have been no Personal Injury Collisions involving pedestrians. On the other hand there have been calls from within the local community for a pedestrian crossing over the years.

This page is intentionally left blank



SURREY

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 14 September 2015

RYDENS ROAD CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Attached Website Consultation responses.

Please note: Very limited blacking out/redaction has been undertaken ensuring individuals responses are shown without identifying them and so safeguarding their privacy.

This page is intentionally left blank

Response	Road Name	Open-Ended Response
	See next column	Responses from the following :Rydens Road, Wolsey Drive, Denton Grove, Rydens Avenue, [REDACTED], Walton Park, Danesfield Close, Meadowside, Shaldon Way, Ambleside Avenue, Cottimore Avenue, Braycourt Avenue, Brunswick Close, King George Avenue, Church Street , York Gardens, Beecot Lane, Colne Drive,Holly Avenue , Lindley Road, Redfern Avenue, Stuart Avenue , The Furrows , [REDACTED]
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	The proposed changes are unnecessarily be complex, an inconvenience to certain residents in Meadowside, and perceived to be costly. A simple one-way system should be considered and mooted for turnings into / out from Walton Park. Thus making it easier for pedestrians and traffic to negotiate - by virtue of the fact that only one way traffic needs to be considered.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I cannot see the need for such a crossing and certainly not for the closure of Meadowside. The only problem comes from the increasing useage of Rydens Road by speeding heavy vehicles going and frying from the recycling centre at Hershams Station. This will only be exacerbated if the waste recycling plant goes ahead. I would suggest a set of pinch gates to slow the traffic down.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I personally believe Rydens Road at the area in question is not too difficult to cross as it is straight with good pedestrian visibility. Also a crossing going to what is essentially an island of land surrounded by another road seems counterproductive as pedestrians still need to cross another road (Walton Park) if they are heading in the direction of Hershams or Molesey.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I do not support this proposal. I think the position of the crossing would not be attractive to pedestrians. The design requires pedestrians to cross two roads instead of one. The east-west line of the path from triangular green leads to the wrong side of Walton Park. If pedestrians are going to Hershams Station or Cardinal Newman School they will have to cross Walton Park. The scheme therefore requires most people to cross three road. Finally the displacement of traffic from Meadowside to other roads is not a good idea. Meadow side has the best view for a right or left onto Rydens Road.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I feel that this is totally unnecessary and not well thought out. Yes we need several safe crossing places along the Rydens road but this one is not one of them. Once you have crossed Rydens Road have to then cross again to get to the other side of Walton Park as most users will be using the train or walking to Cardinal Newman School. As far as I am aware there have never been any major incidents along this stretch of the road. I feel that money would be best put toward making the access to Hershams Train Station from Walton Park a lot easier and safer for all concerned.
I would SUPPORT the scheme	[REDACTED]	To improve pedestrian safety, this scheme needs to be coupled with effective speed limit enforcement along the length of Rydens Road (cameras etc. rather than the current ineffective flashing sign).
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I cross the road [REDACTED] and rarely have to wait more than a few seconds to cross the road. Your scheme looks unreasonably complicated for the purpose. Equally, I rarely use traffic Islands [REDACTED]. I would like to see the results of your feasibility studies before you go and spend such a large sum of our money on this scheme. Please do think before you make such a huge hash of our roadways - as you so clearly have on [REDACTED]
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I don't think this work is necessary. [REDACTED]. I am not against the closure of Meadowside but object to the building of a footway across the green triangle at the end of Walton Park which would destroy this nice feature and is a waste of money. If this project goes forward, the existing footways at the end of Walton Park are more than adequate wherever the proposed traffic island would be located since there is a pavement along the Rydens Road side of the triangle.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I oppose because I do not believe that there is enough foot fall in the area for the proposed island. Closing Meadowside is a disproportionate measure to facilitate the traffic island. The green triangle at the end of Walton Park Road is very pleasant feature and I think that with a path it will lose some appeal. Paths are often bypassed by a quicker route by the pedestrians that use them meaning grass becomes worn and dirt patches appear. I suggest that an island further north possibly into the next ward would be more suitable.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	Please do not ruin our local area with a pedestrian crossing. We and our neighbours do not want this.
I would SUPPORT the scheme	[REDACTED]	I support the Scheme. However to help cyclist, please do not construct the crossing near a road drainage gully/grating, as cyclist would swerve out to avoid the drainage gully, with car drivers swerving in to avoid traffic island. From a driver, who is a cyclist this is a danger, which transport planers seem not to take into consideration.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I think it's easy to cross the road safely and I like the uninterrupted patch of green at the end of Walton Park
I would SUPPORT the scheme	[REDACTED]	Partially support the application. The junction would be significantly improved from a safety perspective simply by closing Meadowside to vehicular access. I do not see a particular need for the traffic island, as I see young children crossing Rydens Road every day with plenty of time, and visibility is very good. Having improved the safety by closing Meadowside, this crossing would be straightforward. The pathway across the green is definitely unnecessary though, there is no reason not to walk around to the entrance of Walton Park, and it would disrupt the watercourse and grass habitat.

I would OPPOSE the scheme		A crossing point would be more useful near Severn Drive or the footpath by the allotments. People won't walk all the way to Walton Park to Cross the road then walk back down.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		Cross Rydens road Road safety measure that would benefit the area.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		Apart from adverse effects to adjoining roads resulting from closing the Meadowside/Rydens road junction, I suspect that pedestrians from Ambleside Avenue would continue to be more likely to cross at the end of Ambleside as now rather than deviate to the proposed crossing location.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I would oppose the scheme for two principle reasons: 1) The majority of footfall that crosses Rydens Road occurs between Rydens Park and Walton Park Lane - a significant distance from the proposed Meadowside crossing. Practically, people are not going to walk further to the proposed crossing point, particularly during rush hour when commuters are already short of time. 2) The closure of Meadowside will increase the volume of traffic on Ambleside Avenue, an already busy street. At the timing of school drop off and pick up, Ambleside Avenue has a disproportionately high level of traffic, which would be exacerbated by the proposed scheme. The increased volume of traffic would be concerning, with proposed funding to be spent on a scheme which would very quickly become obsolete. I recommend plans to develop the scheme are shelved.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		I welcome the initiative to allow pedestrians to cross Rydens Road more easily and safely and would encourage further review of initiatives to slow traffic down on the road (speed cameras, speed humps, more pedestrian crossings elsewhere on the road, etc).
I would OPPOSE the scheme		Although I agree that a crossing would be beneficial to facilitate crossing Rydens Road at Walton Park, I do not believe that, given the layout of the proposed crossing (which requires pedestrians to double back on themselves) will be used as people invariably will take the shortest route. Furthermore closing Meadowside will force more vehicles to use the already congested junction at Furrows/Ambleside which will be both dangerous and inconvenient. I am sure that there must be other options which meet the objectives as well or better, and in particular slow traffic down eg by narrowing the road in key places to reduce traffic speed.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		As indicated, I would support the scheme. I would also like other traffic calming schemes to be looked at on Rydens Road (speed cameras, road humps?) as vehicles often travel very fast on this road.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		I agree that the closure of Meadowside to allow for a pedestrian crossing is a good idea. It would prevent any accidents, giving a safe crossing to people heading for hersham station. The only concern I have is that Meadowside could become a car park for the station, for those that will not pay to park in a empty station car park.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		Totally unnecessary, causing more traffic chaos and a complete waste of tax payers money
I would OPPOSE the scheme		
I would OPPOSE the scheme		Agreed that a crossing could be helpful but disagree with the location of the crossing. The large flow of pedestrians come from Ambleside Avenue and will cross Rydens Road well before Meadowside. This would increase the flow of traffic down Ambleside Avenue which is already a very busy and fast road. A crossing would be much better placed by Hersham station which is a harder and more dangerous road to cross during peak hours.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I do not feel that a crossing is warranted, nor do I think it would be used at this location if it was built. The majority of foot traffic in the area walk down Walton Park, and then cross the road to Ambleside so I do not feel that this crossing would be used, albeit the distance between these two roads and the proposed crossing is not great. I think the cost will outweighthe benefits also
I would OPPOSE the scheme		The proposal appears to be an expensive indulgence. It fails to address the problem of Rydens Road, namely the difficulty of crossing a road where motorists simply will not stay within the speed limit. Would the new footway link be used? Most pedestrian traffic from Walton Park heads towards Ambleside Avenue. An alternative would be to provide a signal-controlled crossing towards Ambleside Avenue. This would slow and stop the traffic and allow pedestrians to cross.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I am writing to oppose the proposed pedestrian island in Rydens Road. I am at a loss as to why this idea is being pursued. There have been no casualties or fatalities to warrant this. Rydens Road is not a wide road and crossing it poses no problems. There are plenty of natural breaks in the traffic to ensure safety when crossing the road. What is the point of spending huge amounts of money when the benefits are unclear? I also think that the location of the crossing would adversely affect the junction of Ambleside Avenue and Rydens road which can be tricky to exit in a vehicle. If there are cars stopping randomly on Rydens Road I think this will impact on that junction and possibly result in more accidents.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I agree there should be a pedestrian crossing, or 2 pedestrian crossings to gain access to Walton Park on both sides across Rydens Road but closing off Meadowside will put additional pressure on surrounding roads at key times.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		This is a good idea, as crossing the road there currently can be very dangerous. I assume any parking controls currently active around Meadowside will be removed?

I would OPPOSE the scheme		used this road as pedestrians, cyclists and motorists and have never found a need for a pedestrian crossing whatsoever.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I am opposed to the proposal for the following reasons. 1 I am not convinced it is necessary. 2 I am not convinced that people that do want to cross Rydens Road will use the crossing, I suspect that most will wait for a gap in the traffic and cross at the point that minimises the length of the journey.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		Unwarranted as 1) not necessary, 2) disruptive to affected residents whose roads impacted by proposed changes, 3) particularly at a time of budget cut backs, a notable proposed waste of our money, 4) no evidence that a significant number of locals have requested such, 5) Surrey C C claim that a pedestrian refuge island would be "the most appropriate solution" to an apparently unstated problems, 6) it is likely to add to the dangers on Rydens road, not reduce them, as it may encourage people to be less vigilant when crossing the road, 7) most people will not use it - they will cross the road where they presently choose to do so.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		A safe Crossing point is long overdue. A high number of children cross the road going to and from local schools and to Hersham station catch a train to school. Traffic can travel very quickly on this road despite attempts to alert drivers to the speed. While closure of the junction with Meadowside will be a minor inconvenience it is worth it for the benefits to those who need to cross safely.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		Why now, the closing of Meadowside is not an option, as it is used by many motorists to and from Ambleside School. It would make accident Black spot , as the road is too narrow, and also the pavements in Rydens road are shallow enough as it is. I have not seen anybody crossing Rydens road at any point in the whole road. The size of the Lorries, and speeding motor cyclists in the area now, would be a danger to pedestrians at that point. Other things to spend council money on, Potholes need filling to start with, and social care for the elderly springs to mind immediately.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		In my opinion this plan will help improve the residential feel of the area as well as provide better access for pedestrians crossing the road. I would support upgrading the crossing to a zebra crossing in order to slow down the average traffic speed.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		More likely to increase traffic flow into adjacent side roads and takes no note of already heavy traffic flow in area which diverts via Severn Drive / Lindley Road. SCC have NEVER replaced restriction signs at entrance to Severn Drive to limit such flows.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		I support the idea of closing off access to motorised vehicles in principle. However, the current design significantly fails people using bicycles. Level access for bicycle, tricycle and cargo bike users need to be considered. The current plans do not allow people on bicycles and other non-motorised vehicles to access Meadowside without mounting the pavement. The design is not fully in line with Elmbridge & Surrey Council's active travel strategy, by excluding safe & convenient access for cyclists.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I would SUPPORT the scheme, IF there was changes to the current plans. The problems as I see it are this;- The proposed footway, also needs a South Bound version to Walton Park to give line of sight options. A traffic island like proposed is terrible to people who cycle. It creates a fast and narrow pinchpoint and is obstructive and preventive of future cycling growth. Your existing widening is not enough for safe passage. The crossing needs to be a Zebra version.. and thus then removes this island. The closure of Meadowside would be fine if you facilitated safe segregated cycle access through this. Current plans are preventive of this method. And, cyclists do not mix with pedestrians at all no matter what you say. With current plans, you will have cyclists on the pavement at these points which is and will cause problems, danger and hate. If you can amend these problems and issues then I can see the scheme working...
I would SUPPORT the scheme		Much needed, I strongly support
I would OPPOSE the scheme		The monies would be better spent providing a safe crossing to Hersham Station, this is were the need is. This scheme can follow in another year, plus how many people cross the road at present at this location?
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I am very surprised that this proposal has been revived. It really is a senseless idea. , I have used Rydens Road on a and there has never been a need for a crossing of any kind. With local authorities being strapped for cash, it is utterly bewildering that you could even be considering such a pointless project. Never once have I seen any pedestrian encountering any difficulty in crossing Rydens Road. The view in both directions is clear and if a vehicle happens to be approaching, it is a simple matter of waiting for a moment until the way is clear to cross. There must be far more appropriate things to spend our taxpayers' money on. Creating a "refuge" in the middle of the road is actually dangerous. .
I would OPPOSE the scheme		What a truly ridiculous idea. I frequently cross Rydens Road at this location. Crossing the road is not a problem now and never has been. I cannot believe anyone would consider this plan as anything other than a total waste on money. Nobody wants this!
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I believe this suggestion would be a waste of money and also make the road more dangerous rather than safer. Rydens Road is a narrow road and even with the closure of one end of Meadowside it would still further narrow the road. With the number of large vehicles using the road, it would end up being harder to navigate and thus more dangerous. And of course notwithstanding what the residents of Meadowside may have to say about the closure of one end of their road. , I cross Rydens road and have no difficulty making it across safely. You should reject this scheme and spend valuable council money elsewhere where it's really needed.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I have never had any problem crossing the road. .Who is suggesting this change? If traffic needs to be calmed this is not the solution.

I would OPPOSE
the scheme

[REDACTED]

there is no problem with crossing Rydens Road even in the rush hour. You can see traffic easily and can always cross within a few minutes, without danger. What a waste of public money !

I would OPPOSE the scheme	██████████	Completely unnecessary on a clear open stretch of road, easy to cross without wasting money on this proposal !,
I would SUPPORT the scheme	██████████	Vehicles regularly drive too quickly at this stretch of Rydens Road. As a parent I would support any traffic calming measures in the area.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	██████████	I do not feel that a pedestrian crossing in this location is a good idea and oppose this suggestion. I think that the junction of Rydens Road and Ambleside Avenue would be even more dangerous which the extra traffic that would be generated from people wanting to access Rydens Road from The Furrows, Rydens Ave and Meadowside. I have watched pedestrians cross the Rydens Road and to cross where the crossing is proposed is dangerous - right in the middle of two junctions from Walton Park. I think that anyone crossing the road and stopping at the half way point would be a "sitting duck" for the traffic coming down the road. I have never witnessed people having difficulty crossing this road and I think the closure of Meadowside is an extremely bad idea.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	██████████	This is a scheme eases one issue and creates others. The next simplest exit on to Rydens Road for residents would be the junction at Ambleside Ave, which is busy, dangerous and difficult. More traffic would be forced here adding to the problem. The commuter parking on Meadowside ██████████. Reducing direct access to our homes is unfair and unthinkable. This may effect property values negatively too. I cross Rydens Road at this location ██████████ and never find it problematic. Very rarely do I see pedestrians crossing here anyway, other than the commuters who have parked on Meadowside to avoid parking charges. Giving them a crossing would only encourage them further! This would negatively impact our lives and those of residents in the adjacent roads and we would be angry and saddened if it went ahead.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	██████████	<p data-bbox="76 720 135 850" style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 17</p> <p data-bbox="542 711 2365 1302">There is absolutely no justification for this scheme. You have not intimated the cost of it, but local people are speculating that it could be anything up to £100,000. What an outrageous waste of public money. I have been involved in extensive discussions with many local residents and not one of them has a good word to say about your proposal. I therefore don't understand who is "suggesting" it. The person concerned needs to step forward and be identified; and to explain exactly why he/she finds the crossing of Rydens Road to be "challenging". It simply ISN'T. The road is wide open and gives a clear view for a long distance in each direction. If a car or a lorry is approaching, all that is required is to wait for a second or two and then it is easy to cross in complete safety. Why on earth has public money been spent on a feasibility study?? All you have to do is to stand at Meadowside and monitor pedestrians crossing Rydens Road at busy times. The evidence of your own eyes would soon tell you that there is absolutely no need for a crossing. Indeed, a "refuge" island would create far MORE danger. Inviting people (including young school children) to go half-way across and stand on an island in the middle of the road is madness. With traffic passing close by on either side, it would only take a stumble or an error of judgement or a moment's lack of concentration to cause an almighty tragedy. Far safer to wait on the pavement for a second or two, until it is safe to cross. The intended closure of Meadowside would make no sense and would cause incredible inconvenience to house owners. I frankly cannot understand why you say that the previous consultation was "inconclusive". Nobody around here, to my knowledge, has ever requested a crossing. Quite the reverse: people are 100% against it. The proposal has been dubbed the "Krazy Crossing". ██████████ "furious" and extremely distressed about this latest consultation. I think the alleged support for the scheme must be a figment of your imagination. SCC originally sent its contractor along to begin work ages ago, without proper notice or consultation. When residents objected, the contractor in charge of the work commented "I would never put a crossing here in a million years". Precisely!!! There are dozens and dozens of highways problems that you could spend our money on, but please don't invent unnecessary projects. This one seems to us to be a solution in search of a problem. There just ISN't any problem, so please consign this project to the bin once and for all. It's nothing short of disgraceful that the public has been put to all the anxiety and trouble of repeatedly fighting off this proposal. It beggars belief that SCC is still trying to flog it, after having previously been told in no uncertain terms that it's a farcical waste of money. Why was a "feasibility study" conducted? Why have detailed plans been drawn up? What a waste of time and money. The so-called "desire line" for the crossing is from Ambleside Avenue into Walton Park. The position of the planned crossing is well away from that line, so what's the point? People simply aren't going to walk 40 yards out of their way and then back to Walton Park.</p>

<p>I would OPPOSE the scheme</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>I'm not sure who has suggested we need a pedestrian crossing in Rydens Road but over many years I have never in all that time had any difficulty crossing the road. Traffic has increased over those years as it has throughout the borough and local residents are frustrated by the number of lorries that thunder down the road on their way to the Weylands Waste Plant but it is not difficult to cross the road. [REDACTED] As you have identified the main crossing point is from the corner of Ambleside Ave to Walton Park as this is the route to Hersham Station. No-one wanting to cross the road is going to walk beyond this point to do so. The proposal is therefore a complete waste of taxpayers money. There has already been one consultation on this proposal which you say proved inconclusive. I do question therefore why you are continuing to pursue this when it is no more than 'suggested'. There are no local strong feelings about the need for a crossing indeed local residents are becoming increasingly frustrated that the Council are not listening to them. The works required to install this crossing are pretty major and will undoubtedly cost a very large sum of taxpayers money. Money that should be spent on repairing our roads not satisfying the whim of a Councillor. Surrey County Council have already got egg on their face from the cycle lane fiasco in Terrace Road which has been a disgusting waste of money. This proposal is just further evidence that our Surrey County Councillors are completely out of touch and does nothing to instil any confidence in their ability to serve the needs of the residents.</p>
<p>I would OPPOSE the scheme</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>I feel the money would be better spent on traffic calming to slow cars and restrict HGV's, thus benefiting the whole of Rydens Road.</p>
<p>I would OPPOSE the scheme</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>I feel the money would be better spent on Traffic Calming to slow cars and restrict HGV's, thus benefiting the whole of Rydens Road.</p>
<p>I would OPPOSE the scheme</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Surely a more feasible implementation would be to construct a traffic calming project to control Heavy Goods Vehicles that BLIGHT the use of Rydens Road. To place a Pedestrian Island in the suggested area would cause a very dangerous situation indeed. Perhaps you could spend public money on emplacing a weight restriction on the Rydens Road and also constructing a more speed control operation on the whole length of Rydens Road</p>