

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL  
10 March 2014**

**MEMBER QUESTIONS**

**Question 1 Cllr Julie Morris**

**Re: Junction of Randolph Road and Burgh Heath Road**

There have been several "near misses" reported by residents at the junction of Randolph Road and Burgh Heath Road, culminating in a Road Traffic Accident during week commencing 13.1.14. Residents feel that there is insufficient attention paid to the mini-roundabout at the Burgh Heath Road/Downs Road junction from vehicles travelling toward Burgh Heath Road from Church Street and that sightlines when egressing from Randolph Road are poor because of parking on the junction of Randolph Road and Burgh Heath Road. Can both these junctions please be reviewed for possible improvements to aid road safety.

**Officer Response:**

Randolph Road is a side road off Burgh Heath Road. There are warning signs to indicate there is a side road ahead on Burgh Heath Road either side of Randolph Road. The give way road markings on Randolph Road are advanced to accommodate a parking area to the right when exiting Randolph Road. There is unobstructed vision to the left of the junction.

To improve the sight lines to the right of the junction, the parking area would have to be removed with the loss of possibly 4 car parking spaces. This is likely to be very unpopular with local residents.

There are no reported personal injury accidents at the junction. We will monitor the junction but do not intend to take any action at this time.

**Question 2 Cllr Neil Dallen**

**Re: Town Centre Highway Issues**

1. A number of cars jump the lights at West Street coming from the Rosebank direction. A large number of these are pulling out from the old Oddbins area and cannot see the lights. Can an additional set be placed so that they can be seen coming out of this area? Can anything else be done to stop the dangerous jumping of lights (eg an enforcement camera)?
2. Since the last request for Residents Parking in Horsley Close and Hazon Way area was refused two changes have affected the area. Firstly the implementation of residents parking elsewhere and secondly the occupation of Jubilee House, the flats at the station. A number of residents have asked if residents parking be reconsidered for this area. If so, what action needs to be taken?
3. There are a large number of kerbs that are displaced in Hazon Way and the road surface has got to the stage where the concrete base has holes and cracks. What is planned to be done to make the road and pavement safe in this area?
4. Is there any plan with dates for the cycle way in East Street?

## Officer Response:

1. We are in discussion with SCC's Traffic Systems Department to look at ways of improving the safety at this junction. We are aware of red light violation in Rosebank which is often caused by vehicles taking up a position approaching the traffic signals that does not trigger the detectors and therefore no demand is registered. After a while vehicles move off thinking the traffic signals are not working properly. Although this only happens occasionally, we will be looking at ways of correcting this or adding other detectors in the new financial year. Cars exiting the old Oddbins parking area can see the traffic signal aspects, even with their hoods around the individual lenses. If they are exiting the oddbins access on a red light they are doing so knowingly and illegally. SCC would not provide a separate signal head for the Oddbins access as it is unnecessary. It would not be possible to introduce a separate phase in the signal timings to accommodate the access exit as this would cause greater delays to the traffic on West Street. Enforcement cameras can only be installed where they meet strict criteria in order to reduce collisions. There have been no 'killed or serious' incidents at the junction so a safety camera would not be considered appropriate.
2. The last parking review (Phase 7) included proposals to extend the existing double yellow lines into Horsley Close and implement a 'No Loading At Any Time' restriction at the junction. The whole area - Hazon Way, Horsely Close, Gosfield Road, etc, is also subject to a change of restriction from Monday to Saturday to Monday to Sunday operation. This should relieve the pressure that residents are feeling from the problems of unsocial parking in the area.

We have studied the area before with a view to implementing a residents permit zone, but there would appear to be adequate parking for residents on private driveways - the implementation of any such scheme would effectively make the area into a private road and would not be viable as residents permit schemes are supposed to be self financing. With such a small number of residents likely to require permits, the scheme would become almost redundant.

Below are the results of an informal consultation carried out as part of the previous, Phase 6 - the results show that at the time 41.7% of those who replied to the consultation were in favour from a 47.7% response.

### EPSOM AND EWELL - ANALYSIS OF INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS

Correspondence				Do you support the idea of a permit scheme in your area?			
Scheme area	Letters sent	Responses	Response rate (%)	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes (%)
Adelphi Road	48	14	29.2	12	2	0	85.7
Beaconsfield Road	84	50	59.5	35	12	3	70.0
Chalk Lane	15	11	73.3	11	0	0	100.0
Clayton Road	4	3	75.0	3	0	0	100.0
Hawthorne Place	142	60	42.3	34	20	2	56.7
Hazon Way	176	84	47.7	35	46	3	41.7
Kingston Road	15	13	86.7	13	0	0	100.0
Ladbroke Road	37	29	78.4	20	8	1	69.0
Lintons Lane	249	132	53.0	72	53	5	54.5
Rosebank	82	41	50.0	23	14	1	56.1
Sheraton Drive	20	15	75.0	12	3	0	80.0
The Kingsway	328	222	67.7	54	160	5	24.3
Town Centre	125	70	56.0	61	9	0	87.1
Whealers Lane	41	30	73.2	11	19	0	36.7
Wyeths Road	51	37	72.5	20	17	0	54.1

The proposals outlined in the first paragraph have been ordered and will be installed during March.

3. The kerbs in Hazon Way are largely dislodged, which is not unusual for a concrete road, given that the kerbs are not embedded into the carriageway. Some sections of the carriageway surface looks unsightly, but it is structurally sound.

Repairs to the kerbs in Hazon Way have been added to the list of reinstatement works for the community gang, and these repairs should be carried out next month. The carriageway would need to be resurfaced when funds become available. In the meantime we will continue to report and repair defects, as necessary.

4. A set of plans have been supplied to Cllr Dallen. Unfortunately, we do not have a date set for the S278 works yet. In terms of the process, the design is approved but we are awaiting a number of pre-start items to be concluded. These include transferring a strip of land from EEBC to SCC, agreeing details of the S278 Agreement, making temporary TROs, the traffic signal works contract to be processed, and various other pre contract documents to be finalised. I would anticipate construction will begin in 2/3 months.

**Question 3 Cllr Jan Mason**  
**Re: Town Centre Highway Issues**

I and many residents are concerned that the consultation carried out in 2013 by Surrey Fire and Rescue (SFRS) on the proposal to remove one of the two pumps from Epsom and relocate it to the Burgh heath area fell short of what we would expect from such an important issue. The removal impacts on the response times in areas such as Ashted, and wards in the northern part of our Borough. Yet to my knowledge there was no public meeting in Ashted for the first consultation and indeed I understand that little notice was given for the meeting regarding the change of site from Burgh Heath to Banstead. There was only one public meeting in Reigate & Banstead and one focus group meeting and one public meeting (held on Valentines night!) 2013 in Epsom & Ewell. Although the majority of residents in the Borough opposed the proposal (68%) including the Borough Council these views were ignored and the decision was taken to continue with the plans. This is in contrast to the recent consultation for proposals in Spelthorne where 13 meetings took place including one with Elmbridge Borough Council.

Can SFRS please explain why Mole valley was not included in the public meetings and why only one public meeting in Epsom and Ewell took place at quite short notice on an evening when many people go out (Valentines Night). Please can they also supply the data for expected arrival times in Mole Valley when the plans are implemented as we know that arrival times for the northern wards in Epsom & Ewell for a second pump will fall outside the Surrey time limit of 10 minutes.

**Officer Response:**

**Response times in Mole Valley**

One of the outcomes of the Public Safety Plan was to implement a response standard which would give members of the public a clearer understanding of the emergency response standard that they can expect from the Fire and Rescue Service in Surrey. This response standard is measured from the moment that the appropriate resource is assigned to the incident to when it reaches the location that it was sent to. Our intention is to provide an

appropriate and more balanced level of emergency cover which is supported by a new mobilising system that enables the service to identify the fire engines that can respond to the incident quickest. This has required changes in the disposition of fire engines and it was for that reason that we undertook the recent consultation in Banstead and in relation to Burgh Heath in 2013.

At present Epsom has two fire engines, with one of the them being identified as being required to move into the Banstead area. This was identified as being an area that needed to have its fire cover improved when West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service removed its fire engine at Horley which then required Surrey to look at reconfiguring its fire engines in that part of the county and which was not part of the original Public Safety Plan. This was consulted on last year and sought to create a series of single fire engine fire stations in Epsom, Burgh Heath (Banstead), Reigate and Salfords by splitting the two fire engines located at both Epsom and Reigate fire stations.

During the recent round of consultations a presentation was given to members of the public at Bourne Hall. A copy of the presentation can be found on Surrey County Councils website.

It can be seen from slide 13 that even under the current configuration with two fire engines at Epsom parts of North Epsom and Ewell fall outside of the response standard. However, slide 14 shows that there are some improvements in the Nonsuch ward where areas that were previously not within the response standard of 1 fire engine in 10 minutes now fall within it because of the movement of a fire engine into Banstead.

Movements of fire engines may have an effect on neighbouring boroughs and districts and as such the neighbouring boroughs were asked for their views as part of the consultation process. The effect of the changes on the response standards in Mole Valley are as follows; the average response time of the first fire engine is increased by 1 second while the impact on the second fire engine is to increase the time by 10 seconds. Importantly this change sees a temporal improvement in the Surrey response standard for 1 fire engine in 10 minutes (80% of occasions) from 7 minutes 28 seconds down to 7 minutes 19 seconds whilst at the same time delivering an improvement in the overall percentage from 80.8% to 82.6%.

Surrey Fire and Rescue Service will continue to ensure that it delivers a high quality service to the residents of Surrey and the response standard is just one way by which it can ensure that it delivers sustained improvements for the people of Surrey.

### **Extent of consultation (Mole Valley)**

During the option development, the impact on response times was identified to be around areas in Epsom and Ewell and Reigate and Banstead, which is why the original consultation (December 2012 – March 2013) focused on these two boroughs. However, SFRS was aware that neighbouring areas might also be interested in the plans, which is why the Mole Valley MP, District Council Leader and Community Safety Portfolio Holder were invited to respond and to encourage local residents to take part in the consultation. The Tandridge District Council Leader and Community Safety Portfolio Holder were also written to.

Further, the consultation was promoted through Surrey-wide channels (Surrey Matters website and social media, Libraries social media, central SCC media briefs), to all SCC Members and all Local Committees (through Democratic Services and Community Partnership Teams) and the External Equalities Advisory Board. Public meetings, as well as the on-line survey, were open to anyone who took an interest in the plans, including residents from Mole Valley or the remainder of Surrey.

All stakeholders that had been contacted in the consultation early 2013 were contacted again for the Banstead consultation (December 2013 – January 2014). This included the Local Committees and Council Leaders of Mole Valley and Tandridge.

### **Timing / numbers of public meetings in Epsom and Ewell and comparison against Spelthorne**

The original proposal to create a chain of single fire engine fire stations running through the boroughs of Epsom & Ewell (E&E) and Reigate & Banstead (R&B) was consulted on from December 2012 to March 2013 (12 weeks).

As listed in the consultation report (Annex 2 of the Cabinet report)<sup>1</sup>, amongst other engagement activities, there were three meetings arranged by SFRS where members of the public were invited to attend:

1. Meeting in Reigate, 15 January 2013
2. Meeting in Epsom, 22 January 2013
3. Meeting in Ewell (as requested by Epsom & Ewell Borough Council), 14 February 2013

The meeting in Ewell was arranged at the request of Epsom & Ewell Borough Council (E&E BC) at relatively short notice towards the end of the consultation period. Ensuring that a suitable venue was available and all relevant SFRS officers and the SCC Portfolio Holder could attend in order to present the option and respond to questions meant that 14 February 2013 was the only feasible date before the end of the consultation period (4 March 2013).

The event was promoted through:

- Poster campaign at 102 outlets in E&E and R&B including libraries, town centres, GPs, Community Centres, Churches, Schools, Post Offices, Borough Council offices, E&E Town Hall notice-board and Bourne Hall
- Media release issued by SCC media team and media briefed by E&E BC team
- Twitter feeds to R&B Borough Council followers, E&E BC followers and SCC followers
- Event advertised on SCC Website and E&E and R&B BC's
- Members updated again via SCC 'Communicate' and 'Issues Monitor' bulletins. Item also appeared in E&E BC Members briefing.

The comments made during these meetings were incorporated with all other feedback received during consultation to create overall results. These showed that 58% of survey respondents from E&E opposed the plan (60% including formal responses and email feedback). The consultation report was part of the evidence that SCC Cabinet considered when making the decision to approve the proposal in March 2013.

The original decision included the planned redeployment of a fire engine from Epsom to the Burgh Heath area. Subsequently, SFRS looked to widen the search area for a new fire station to three miles outside of Burgh Heath. The relatively minor operational impact of widening the search area by three miles<sup>2</sup> and the need to mitigate the removal of the Purley engine in summer 2014<sup>3</sup> meant that SFRS held a 6 week consultation, between December 2013 and January 2014. It was made clear in the consultation material that the original decision to relocate an engine from Epsom to the north of Reigate and Banstead was not being revisited and the scope of the consultation reflected this.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=120&MId=2695&Ver=4>, Item 13

<sup>2</sup> As outlined in the response times table in the consultation material

<sup>3</sup> See Cabinet Paper for more detail: <http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/mgIssueHistoryHome.aspx?IId=8776>

In the 6 weeks, amongst other engagement activities, SFRS arranged one meeting in Ewell and invited members of the public to attend. The event was promoted through:

- Posters sent to over 200 outlets in E&E and R&B (churches, schools, libraries, Citizen Advice Bureaux, the Hubs in Redhill and Epsom, community centres)
- News about the consultation including the event on the SCC website, SCC social media and through a press release (featured in Local Guardian and Get Surrey)
- Direct invites to 11 Councillors
- The event details were sent to 130 care home managers, as part of the questionnaire
- The event details were sent to 200 groups and individuals, as part of the online survey
- 171 people completed the online survey at the time of the public meeting; 130 people responded to the public meeting invite, with 62% of respondents declining to attend.

From August to October 2013, SFRS conducted a 13 week public consultation on planned changes to the emergency cover in Spelthorne Borough. The consultation, amongst other engagement activities (see Annex 1, Cabinet report)<sup>4</sup>, included three meetings arranged by SFRS with members of the public invited to attend:

1. Meeting in Ashford, 17 September 2013
2. Meeting in Staines, 25 September 2013
3. Meeting in Sunbury (as requested by Lower Sunbury Residents Association), 10 October 2013

Hence, both had public consultations that lasted 12 / 13 weeks, each included three meetings arranged by SFRS for members of the public to attend.

As a public service provider, SFRS are always keen to hear the views of the public and partners on their proposed changes to their service. This is why, for all consultations, SFRS follow internal and external guidance on consultation and engagement and take care to promote their consultations as widely, inclusively and efficiently as possible, while being comprehensive and responsive in the consultation approach. Surrey County Council's Cabinet accepted the consultations to be of sufficient quality to be part of the overall evidence base that informed their decision.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListDocumentPage?DocId=120&Mid=3244&Ver=4>, Item 10