

Minutes of the meeting of the
Elmbridge LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 3.00 pm on 8 March 2021
at Virtual.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Dr Peter Szanto (Chairman)
- * Rachael I. Lake (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Mike Bennison
- Mr Nick Darby
- * Mrs Mary Lewis
- * Mr Tim Oliver
- * Mr John O'Reilly
- * Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
- * Mr Tony Samuels

Borough / District Members:

- Cllr David J Archer
- * Cllr Steve Bax
- * Cllr Barry Fairbank
- * Cllr Peter Harman
- * Cllr Caroline James
- * Cllr Mary Marshall
- * Cllr Christine Richardson
- * Cllr Mrs Mary Sheldon
- * Cllr Graham Woolgar

* In attendance

1/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Nick Darby and Borough Cllr David Archer.

2/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 2]

There were no declaration of interest at this point on the agenda.

3/21 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman thanked the members of the public joining the meeting.

He paid tribute to Borough Cllr Andrew Davis who had recently passed away and had been a valued member of the Committee previously. He also mentioned Alan Hopkins a former Leader of Elmbridge Borough Council who had also died. Condolences were passed to their families.

It was reported that the 19/20 Parking Review had been completed and it is hoped that the implementation can begin in April. The outcome of the next

review which had been expected at this meeting would now be brought to the June Committee to allow more time to review requests when more normal parking patterns are restored.

He highlighted the additional highway funding which had been allocated to the Committee which was very welcome.

He thanked the Committee for the collaborative way of working over the last 4 years on the occasion of his last formal meeting as Chairman and wished the Local Committee good luck for the future.

4/21 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 4]

Two public questions were received. Neither questioner attended the meeting.

Question 1

The Area Highways Manager outlined the background to the question. He indicated that it would not be possible to transfer the area of land in question to private ownership as there was no guarantee that it would not be required for highway purposes in future. It was unclear whether the questioner would be prepared to continue with his offer to fund the conversion to a landscaped area on this basis. Members indicated that they felt that this lay-by is used by the local community and that it also provides a useful space for vehicles to stop and make deliveries on a stretch of road where it is otherwise difficult to stop without creating an obstruction. Agreeing to this proposal could also set a precedent for other requests.

Question 2:

The Chairman reported that Nick Darby had also expressed concern at the works being carried out by Thames Water in his division and hoped that representations could be made at a senior level. He mentioned the introduction of lane rental charging which would hopefully help to minimise the time when roads are disrupted although this would only apply to 7% of the network. Residents are frustrated by works being undertaken by utility companies which appear to be taking longer than necessary and causing significant disruption. Thames Water also seem to be reluctant to proactively carry out any kind of work and it was felt that there needed to be a change in the relationship, as their poor performance reflects on the County Council. Tim Oliver agreed to take this forward as the Leader of the Council. It was suggested that an update should be provided on the process for issuing permits and the lane rental charging when new member join the Committee.

On a vote in relation to Question 1 it was:

Resolved: [by 13 votes FOR to 2 AGAINST]

That the Committee is not prepared to carry out feasibility work into the proposal outlined in the question to convert the lay-by to a landscaped area at this time and did not supported the proposal.

Reasons: The area is used for parking and deliveries and should be retained for that use.

[Tony Samuels joined the meeting after the consideration of Question 1 and left at 3.50pm]

5/21 PETITIONS [Item 5]

Declarations of Interest: Tim Oliver declared an interest as a resident of a road close to the site of the proposed crossing

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:

The petitioner was unable to be present at the meeting and was represented by Allison Galaun who presented the petition on her behalf. She indicated that the petition has a considerably number of signatures as well as written support from a number of relevant organisations and individuals. The A244 is a very busy road with cars travelling at high speed, it is becoming increasingly dangerous to cross and there is no safe crossing point for the many users of this area. Arbrook and Esher commons are well used green spaces and the addition of a crossing can only benefit the local community.

Member discussion –key points

The Area Highways Manager outlined that the scheme can be prioritised for the previous design work in this area to be updated if the Committee is in agreement. However, for the work to be undertaken in the coming financial year another scheme would need to be deferred to provide capacity for the work. Any scheme deferred could be taken forward in the following year.

The Chairman who is the divisional member indicated his support for the installation of a crossing as are the ward members of the Borough Council. Many members indicated their support for the project and their wish that it can be taken forward without delay. It was hoped that this may also help to reduce some of the traffic speeds. It is also a chance to link these areas together to allow greater use by all.

The Area Highways Manager indicated that the total cost of the project would be in the region of between £125-£150K. To complete the project the design would need to be refreshed and the Borough Council would need to give agreement to using land on the commons to provide a corralling/approach area adjacent to the crossing. This is not expected to be an issue, but it was unlikely that work would begin until late 2021/22 or early 2022/2023. As part of the design work traffic survey data will be undertaken, if it is found that the speed limit is being exceeded significantly consideration may need to be given to traffic calming measures.

Members agreed that whilst this scheme would be added to the 2021-22 work programme it would need to compete with existing projects for prioritisation and there was no guarantee that it would proceed in this year. Further discussion on prioritisation would take place at a later date.

Resolved to:

- (i) Promote the requested Pegasus crossing scheme as part of Committee's 2021-22 programme of feasibility / design work;
- (ii) Delegate authority to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and affected Divisional Members to consider whether a scheme that is already part of Committee's 2021-22 programme of work should be deferred;
- (iii) Agree that an application for CIL be made to Elmbridge Borough Council's Local CIL Board for Esher for £40k in the 2021 application round.
- (iv) Authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the requested scheme.

Reasons: To take forward this project in response to the petition.

6/21 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 6]

Confirmed as a correct record.

7/21 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

There were no questions submitted.

8/21 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE ITEM - FOR DECISION] [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: Rachael I Lake declared an interest as a resident of a property adjacent to Baker Street and Cllr James as a resident of Thames Ditton High Street

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion –key points

The Area Highways Manager outlined the key points of the report and in particular the additional funding now allocated to the Committee. For construction in the 2021/22 year there is a need to move forward with schemes which are already well advanced to ensure that the funding available can be utilised. For future years the Committee can have a greater role in deciding which schemes should be prioritised. He proposed that the ITS funding should be used to top up CIL funding to enable schemes to proceed.

In relation to the Baker Street Active Travel scheme the Area Highways Manager apologised for not being able to publish the results of the consultation before the meeting. The response had been good. Everyone adjoining Baker Street both residents and businesses had been consulted with letters sent to over 500 addresses. There were 261 responses (54%) of those 66% were in favour and 32% were not in favour of making the scheme permanent. Of the residents 156 were in favour and 72 were opposed. Businesses were more divided 7 were in favour and 11 were opposed. He

emphasised that the scheme does not remove any parking from the area. The detailed comments would be circulated to Committee members for consideration with seven days to respond with any additional concerns. Any received would then be considered in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and divisional member and a decision made as to whether the concerns are significant enough to delay the advertisement of the traffic regulation order for further consideration by the Committee at the next meeting. The recommendations were amended accordingly. The people who commented on the scheme either or before installation during installation are not included in this analysis and this consultation was carried out in February once people had had an opportunity to experience the scheme. It is not possible to maintain the current temporary restrictions in the long term so a decision is required either to make permanent or to remove it. The divisional member indicated that both he and the majority of ward members are in favour of making the scheme permanent and that every effort had been made to make the community aware of the consultation.

In relation to recommendation (v) the divisional member queried whether this would just move the issue further down the road and whether there are additional measures could be considered. The Area Highways Manager indicated that this recommendation had been put forward by officers at Elmbridge Borough Council who are responsible for dealing with fly tipping.

The Committee agreed to consider the prioritisation of schemes and the method for scoring schemes in future years at its informal meeting on 14 April.

Resolved: to:

- (i) Delegate authority to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Members to decide a programme of schemes for next Financial Year 2021-22 in which to invest the additional ITS funding;
- (ii) Authorise the advertisement of a permanent traffic regulation order to convert the temporary Active Travel scheme currently deployed in Baker Street, Weybridge, into a permanent scheme, and to delegate authority to the Area Highway Manager to consider any objections in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member, subject to Committee members having seven days to review the detailed consultation response and send any comments to the Area Highways Manager. Any comments would be discussed with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and divisional member before making a decision as to whether to proceed with the advertisement;
- (iii) Agree to consulting the business community in Bridge Road, East Molesey, with a proposal for trial a specific weekend only pedestrian zone, and to agree to fund the trial in summer 2021 should the business community be supportive and should COVID-19 restrictions allow;
- (iv) Agree to consulting the business community in Thames Ditton High Street, with a proposal for a trial of a new pedestrian area at the Lime Tree on weekends during summer 2021, and to agree to fund the trial should the business community be supportive and should COVID-19 restrictions allow;

- (v) Authorise the advertisement of an amendment to the prohibition of traffic order that is currently in force in Pointers Road, Cobham, to move the starting point of the order approximately 90m to the southeast to a point just northwest of the entrance to Chatley Farm, to authorise the installation of a new gate at this location to prevent unauthorised access, and to delegate authority to the Area Highway Manager to consider any objections in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member;
- (vi) Authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

Reasons:

A programme of schemes needs to be developed to invest Committee's share of the new allocation for ITS schemes in the next Financial Year 2021-22.

Committee is asked to agree next steps for the proposed Active Travel schemes in Baker Street, Bridge Road and Thames Ditton High Street.

An amendment to the prohibition of traffic order in Pointers Road, Cobham, would be beneficial to mitigate the problem with fly tipping in this location.

9/21 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER [FOR DECISION] [Item 9]

The Committee agreed to remove closed items from the tracker.

10/21 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 10]

Noted the forward plan.

11/21 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 11]

Monday 7 June 2021 at 4pm tbc

Meeting ended at: 4.50 pm

Chairman