

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 7.00 pm on 23 September 2013
 at Bourne Hall.

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
- * Cllr Neil Dallen
- * Cllr Julie Morris
- * Cllr Humphrey Reynolds
- Cllr Jean Smith

* In attendance

40/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Tina Mountain and Borough Councillor Jean Smith. Cllr Ian Booker substituted for her.

41/13 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 2]

11 questions were received, the questions and answers are set out in Annex A. Questions relating to Abelea Green were discussed under item 9.

The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 6 – If the footways are not part of Operation Horizon what plans are there for improving the surfaces? Officers replied that there is a small central budget for footways, but that this is only able to fund work on 5-10 schemes per year across the County. These schemes are for well used footways in a poor condition. Schemes not covered by this would be a matter for prioritisation by the Local Committee from local budgets. The questioner clarified that the section of footway of concern is between Ewell Village and the Ewell by-pass.

Question 7 – Is there an opportunity under a future review for residents that want reserved spaces to have them if there is not a majority in favour in the road? Officers replied that it would not be possible to allocate individual bays, but if there were a group of residents in one part of the road who wanted residents parking then this could be considered. The Chairman reported that he had recently met with the Head of Highways with a view to making parking

ITEM 5

reviews quicker and had received assurances that the process would be reviewed with the aim of reducing the time between the start of a review to restrictions being in place to 6 months.

Question 11 – Would it be possible to have a sign saying “No through Road”? Officers responded that the street nameplate showing the “T” symbol as is already present on one side of the road is the preferred option, but if this is not successful then other options can be considered. It is currently unclear whether vehicles are accessing the road in error or are looking for a parking space.

42/13 ADJOURNMENT [Item 3]

A number of members of the public attended. 4 informal questions were received and answers were provided.

43/13 UPDATE ON PARKING PROPOSALS IN ST MARGARET DRIVE AND ACCESS TO ST JOSEPH'S SCHOOL [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager, Stephen Clavey, Senior Engineer (Parking)

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:

There were 5 written public questions in relation to this item. The questions and responses are set out in Annex A to minute 41/13. The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 9: The questioner felt that there had been a lot of misinformation circulating and asked that now the situation is clear and the school has amended its travel plan that the situation be resolved quickly. The Area Highways Team Manager responded, that as stated on the agenda, work is on-going within the County Council to consider a response, however it is likely that some issues will be beyond its remit and will need to be resolved locally.

Question 10: Will the Borough Council be able to look at the air quality in this area? The Borough Councillors at the meeting undertook to raise the matter with the Borough Council.

Question 11: The questioner indicated that he had concerns for the safety of the school children and felt that a sign should be erected to indicate that the road is private. The Area Highways Team Manager replied that it is a matter for the owners of the private road to decide whether it is appropriate to erect a sign. However, from his observations he indicated that the traffic and parking issues at St Joseph's School were not dissimilar to those at other schools in Surrey and as such if the road were adopted highway, he would not recommend the erection of warning signs. There is currently no history of accidents at the site which would indicate the need for specialist signage.

Question 14: The questioner felt that there was an absence of documentation in relation to St Josephs School and that expansion had taken place without

consultation. He asked that the school travel plan be properly monitored and implemented.

As there was no indication of any further public questions or statements, the Chairman moved to the debate.

Member Discussion – key points:

Members were keen to make a decision to clarify the situation and asked why the matter was being deferred rather than withdrawn. The Area Highways Team Manager indicated that this was a matter of procedure as a scheme may be required in the future, but there was no intention to take forward the parking scheme currently.

Resolved:

That the proposal to relax parking restrictions in part of the Abelea Green area be not advertised with the other parking proposals and be deferred indefinitely, until such time as the matter is resolved.

44/13 PETITIONS [Item 4]

One petition was received. The petition and officer response is set out in Annex B.

The petitioner was unable to be present due to the recent birth of her baby, but it was understood that she was happy with the proposed actions. The Committee thanked her for the hard work she had put in to promoting the petition and sent their congratulations on the birth of her baby.

Members questioned why it is not possible to introduce a 20mph speed limit without traffic calming. The Area Highways Team Manager indicated that the introduction of a 20mph zone within an area signed at access points requires traffic calming to be introduced. In addition Department for Transport guidance indicates that 20mph speed limit signs, without traffic calming, can only be erected when the average traffic speed is already close to 20mph.

A member queried whether it is appropriate for the speed indicator sign to show a sad face when the speed limit is not being exceeded. It was reported that the speed indicator sign has been installed by the school to provide reassurance and may not be required on technical grounds. The 30mph speed limit is not a target speed and it is felt that showing a sad face at a lower speed may encourage motorists to drive more carefully.

The Chairman reported that he had received a petition requesting two time limited parking spaces in front of the mini store in 27 Church Road. Unfortunately, the petition had been submitted too late to be considered at this meeting, however members were informed that a proposal to implement parking bays with a 20 minute limit in the area were being advertised as part of the current parking proposals. It was understood that the petitioner was concerned at the time being taken to implement the proposals. A response to the petition would be provided at the next meeting.

ITEM 5

45/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 5]

Confirmed as a correct record.

Noted in relation to the following:

33/13 – that the existing traffic regulation order in Station Approach is for double yellow lines. In view of the fact that the work agreed by the Committee will be starting on 30 September it was not felt appropriate to paint double yellow lines that would have to be removed later.

34/13 – that the Chairman had discussed his concerns in relation to the lateness of the report with the Head of Highways.

35/13 – that the briefing note on youth work had been recently circulated.

37/3 – that Neil and Lucie Dallen had been put forward by the Borough Council to serve on the Youth Task Group. Neil Dallen had been elected as Vice-Chairman at a recent meeting of the Task Group.

46/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 6]

There were no declarations of interest.

47/13 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Two questions were received. The questions and answers are set out in Annex C.

48/13 SURREY FIRE & RESCUE SERVICE ANNUAL REPORT 2012-13 [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: Eddie Roberts, East Area Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion – Key points

Members queried why there was no data included in the report on response times. The Area Manager responded that this was the first time the data had been reported in this format and that consideration could be given to including other data in future years. The Committee requested that data on response times and incident type be added to future reports for this area.

A member asked whether the increase in the Boroughs population was being taken into account in future planning. It was noted that planning assumptions have been updated to be based on the latest census data. New build properties will be subject to current building regulations that specify the most modern fire protection systems.

Noted that the fire service is working with Epsom Hospital to reduce the number of false alarms and the situation will be kept under review.

The Committee recognised the achievements of the Borough team within Epsom & Ewell Borough and supported their commitment to improve initiatives to reduce risk and make The Borough safer through the delivery of the Borough/Station plan.

Noted the targets and initiatives set out in the report and support the Service in the delivery of the Borough Plan.

49/13 RESIDENT PERMIT SCHEMES AND PARKING UPDATE [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: Stephen Clavey, Senior Engineer (Parking)

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: See 41/13. There was no public participation during this item.

Member discussion – key points

Noted, that an additional resident in Chalk Lane had requested that they be included in the residents permit zone for that area.

Noted in paragraph 2.11 that “Hawthorne Road” should read “Hawthorne Place”.

Members requested clarification as to why a limit of 120 visitors permits per year, had been set by Cabinet, as this was proving a problem particularly for elderly residents who don't own a car and who receive regular visits from family members. Officers agreed to investigate further.

The addition of further properties to zones outside of the town centre where there is still capacity was felt to be permissible.

There was a discussion over the issue of availability of spaces within the town centre and the most appropriate way of allocating the remaining unused spaces. Some of the recently built flats within the town centre have been built since the original scheme was agreed. However, in some cases planning permission was granted on appeal despite concerns over the adequacy of parking, on the basis that these properties are within reach of public transport and cars should be able to be accommodated within the development. Potential purchasers should have been made aware of the local parking situation by the developers. However, it was suggested that the Borough Council should be approached to see whether it would be possible to allocate spare capacity in Borough car parks to local residents.

The Senior Engineer indicated that any changes agreed would be advertised separately from the current parking proposals and it was hoped that the changes could be in place by Christmas.

A number of proposals were put forward and votes taken:

That there should be no changes to any of the schemes. FOR 0, AGAINST 8. Not agreed

ITEM 5

That the remaining permits for the town centre zone should be allocated on a first come first served basis. FOR 2, AGAINST 5. Not agreed.

It was

Resolved that:

- (i) St James Close be included within the existing resident permit schemes for the Town Centre (FOR 6, AGAINST 2);
- (ii) the additional properties requesting permits in the Ladboke Road and Chalk Lane permit zones be included in the appropriate zone;
- (iii) residents of all roads within the Town Centre zone be permitted to apply for carers permits (FOR 7, AGAINST 0);
- (iv) the necessary legal process should take place to make the relevant amendments to the traffic regulation orders;
- (v) any unresolved objections, received following the advertisements, are dealt with, according to the county council's constitution, by the parking strategy and implementation team manager in consultation with the chairman/vice chairman of this committee and the relevant county councillor;
- (vi) officers be asked to investigate whether it would be possible to increase the number of visitor permits that can be brought, particularly for residents who do not own a car and to discuss with the Borough the possibility of making spaces in borough car parks available for residents' parking.

50/13 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

Mrs Mason passed on thanks from local residents for the new Hogsmill cycle footbridge at Green Lanes which is being well used.

There was concern that if the footway in Waterloo Road is widened to allow for a shared use cycle way there will not be space for two lanes of queuing traffic at the junction and that this will impact on traffic flows. There was also concern at the potential for conflict between bikes and pedestrians in this busy area. Members also raised concern that since the street lamps had been replaced in this area the light levels had diminished. The Area Highways Team Manager reported that the cycle scheme is part of the S106 agreement resulting from the Station redevelopment and it may be difficult to allocate this funding to an alternative scheme. Officers were asked to review the scheme and seek alternative solutions and to report back to the next meeting.

Noted that the proposed major scheme to implement Plan E has been identified as a top priority for future funding, but is still subject to detailed traffic modelling and design to ensure that it will have the anticipated benefits. Most members were in agreement that the schemes, which could be impacted by this work, should be deferred until there was a clearer picture of whether the major scheme would proceed and the timescales for that.

Members requested some training in understanding accident statistics and diagrams.

A detailed programme for the work taking place at Station Approach was requested by Cllr Neil Dallen and officers agreed to provide this.

The Area Highways Team Manager agreed to bring further details of the top 5 priorities identified in Annex H to the December meeting for further consideration as it will not be possible to deliver everything listed.

Resolved: That

- (i) the creation of the shared surfaces needed to allow cyclists to cycle on sections of footway in Station Approach, to facilitate delivery of a new cycle route connecting to Epsom Station be authorised;
- (ii) officers be requested to consider alternatives to a shared surface in Waterloo Road and report back to the next meeting;
- (iii) a scheme at the Spread Eagle junction to modify the alignment of the pedestrian crossing over the Ashley Road arm of the junction be not constructed at the current time;
- (iv) [On a vote by 7 votes FOR to 1 AGAINST] a scheme at the junction of South Street and Ashley Avenue to provide controlled pedestrian crossing facilities be not constructed at the current time, subject to review in June 2014 should the major scheme to implement Plan E be delayed;
- (v) the Area Team Manager, be authorised, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s), to identify and prioritise schemes as necessary to ensure the remainder of this Financial Year's budgets are fully invested in the road network in Epsom and Ewell;
- (vi) the strategy for allocation of next Financial Year's budgets as detailed in Table 4 of the report, be approved;
- (vii) the following Members of the Local Committee be nominated to a Major Schemes (Epsom and Ewell) Task Group, to oversee the development of the Plan E and Kiln Lane Link Major Schemes, and to provide a steer to the progress of these schemes: County Councillors – Stella Lallement, Jan Mason and Tina Mountain, Borough Councillors – Michael Arthur, Neil Dallen and Jean Smith;
- (viii) the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) be authorised to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

51/13 REVISION TO THE BUS STOP CLEARWAY IN STATION APPROACH, EPSOM AND THE INTRODUCTION OF BUS STOP CLEARWAYS IN LONGMEAD ROAD, EPSOM [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

Noted that the bus stop in Station Approach is designated as a bus stand.

Members queried why it was necessary for the 418 bus to operate from Station Approach. The Area Highways Team Manager indicated that the move had been partly prompted by the proposed scheme in Waterloo Road, but that the County Council could not specify where non subsidised bus services operated.

It was asked whether it would be possible to ensure that the bus stops in Longmead Road can be accessed and the buses boarded and exited from a solid surface without crossing the grass verge. Officers agreed to look into this.

Resolved: that

- (i) the proposed extension of the times of the bus stop clearway restriction in Station Approach be not approved;
- (ii) a clearway is introduced in Longmead Road at the bus stop adjacent to Appleby House with the restriction no stopping except local buses 'at any time'

52/13 GOING CASHLESS ON TFL BUS SERVICES - CONSULTATION [Item 13]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: None

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

Members discussed the proposal from Transport for London and agreed to submit the comments outlined below:

Resolved: that the following comments be submitted to Transport for London in response to their consultation on proposals to stop accepting cash on London Buses services:

- There are not sufficient Oyster top up outlets in the Borough for residents;
- Ticket machines should be available locally to allow passengers to purchase tickets in advance of travel;
- There was concern for the safety of young and vulnerable people if they have lost or forgotten their oyster card and additional safeguards should be put in place;

- An alternative solution needs to be available for those without the appropriate card who need to travel particularly in emergency situations.

53/13 LOCAL COMMITTEE & MEMBERS' ALLOCATION FUNDING - UPDATE [Item 14]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: None

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

Members noted the amounts that have been spent from Members' Allocation and Local Committee capital budgets, as set out in the annexes to the report.

54/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 15]

Meeting ended at: 10.00 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank