

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL  
23 June 2014**

**MEMBER QUESTIONS**

**Question 1 Cllr Colin Taylor  
Re: Station Approach**

The loading bay outside Epsom station and the Travelodge has signs intended to allow up to 10 minutes parking for passenger drop-off & pick-up at peak travel times and goods unloading at other times. However it also has double yellow lines indicating no parking at any time.

Although these lines are slowly wearing out, they are discouraging the intended use, pushing both passenger drop-off & pick-up and goods unloading onto the crossing point, the taxi rank and the bus stop.

Can they be removed?

The pedestrian crossing outside Epsom station has two sets of push buttons and indicator lights on each of four posts. In each case, both of these sets face towards the line of the crossing, one directly above the other. The only logical reason for having two sets of indicators and buttons would seem to be in order to have them visible and accessible from two different directions.

Has someone made a mistake?

**Officer Response:**

The double yellow lines are a legacy of the Station Development Works when the lay-by was constructed but the Traffic Regulation Orders had not been finalised. The pre development double yellow lines TRO were re-laid to keep the lay-by clear from waiting vehicles except for deliveries. Following the completion of the Station Development, the allocation of road space was agreed by Local Committee in order to maximise the use of Station Approach for all users.

The double yellow lines are no longer the appropriate road marking. We will arrange for the fading lines to be completely removed from the lay-by and the correct parking bay road marking installed.

The traffic signal controlled crossing outside the station is a Puffin Crossing. Prior to the introduction of Puffin facilities, pedestrian heads at crossings, showing a red / green man, were located on the far side of the crossing. With Puffin facilities nearside pedestrian displays are used and pedestrians are presented with a steady red or green signal, with no flashing amber phase. When pedestrians look at a nearside Puffin pedestrian display they are also looking in the direction of approaching traffic.

When pedestrian flows are high, standard height Pedestrian Demand Units (push button units) can be masked by waiting pedestrians. High level repeaters can be installed using the red/green display repeaters with a minimum 1.70 metres clearance to the underside of the unit.

**Question 2 Cllr Colin Taylor  
Re: Waterloo Road Crossover**

Traffic is held up in Epsom High Street by goods vehicles unloading outside shops. To avoid this, "Plan E" repeats a long-standing borough council policy of providing high street shops with rear access. Accordingly, a few years ago a Local Committee review of yellow lines etc included a proposal to extend the current limits on loading and unloading to the North side of the two-way part of High Street.

The Ebbisham Centre was developed as a joint venture between EEBC, SCC and a commercial developer. One of the conditions of its Planning Permission was the provision of rear access to High Street shops. This was provided as agreed via an entrance from Waterloo Road, but when the developer applied for consent for the necessary cross-over, this was refused. As a result, although the rear access is used by EEBC and others for refuse collection, goods deliveries for many shops are still unloaded in High Street. Without the cross-over the footway in Waterloo Road has been damaged and by the time of the yellow line review the then Highways Manager had been planning to install bollards to block its use. This was deferred – along with the proposed loading and unloading ban in High Street – to enable a solution in line with Plan E to be arranged.

What is the current state of progress?

When can unnecessary unloading in Epsom High Street be prevented?

**Officer Response:**

The developing proposals for Plan E could result in significant changes to the road layout in Waterloo Road. Therefore significant works to repair or to improve the vehicles crossover have been put on hold pending the outcome of the Plan E scheme. The Plan E major scheme is currently the subject of traffic modelling to determine the benefits and impacts of the proposed scheme in terms of traffic congestion. This is critical to the development of the business case necessary to bid for funding to the Capital to Coast Regional Transport Body / Local Enterprise Partnership. As the traffic modelling phase draws to its conclusions over the next few weeks, this will enable the outline design for the different elements of Plan E to be finalised - including any changes in Waterloo Road.

There was a plan in place to amend the loading restrictions on the High Street but this was subject to the dropped kerb being put in on Waterloo Road. There was an 18 month period for this to be achieved before having to re-advertise - as this period has elapsed, the proposal would have to be re-advertised.

**Question 3 Cllr Colin Taylor  
Re: Manor Green Road**

From copies of recent correspondence, I understood that it was no longer SCC Highways policy to use advisory white lines. I was therefore surprised when a long one appeared recently opposite the shops in Manor Green Road.

After an initial wariness, delivery vans and shoppers have now resumed parking there.

A couple of years ago part of grass verge, which had been turned to mud, was "hardened" as an experiment. There is still a muddy pothole at one end, but otherwise it is a success. Further shops have now been completed and await tenants, so damage to the verges by delivery vans and shoppers looks set to worsen.

What is the purpose of the white line?

Can the verge hardening be extended before the pothole gets deeper and the adjacent grass verge is turned to mud?

**Officer Response:**

The white line alongside the road hump is intended to guide drivers away from the edges of the road hump, where there is a narrow gap between the hump and the kerb for drainage purposes and not to prevent parking.

As a matter of principal we should not be encouraging drivers to park on the footway. It is unlawful to drive onto the footway; vehicles parked on the footway are obstructive to pedestrians. We would consider verge hardening at sites where this can be achieved without risk of obstruction to pedestrian movement, and where we can maintain a clear distinction between the area intended for pedestrians, and the area intended for vehicles. This has been achieved for the existing hardened area opposite the shops in Manor Green Road as it was possible to leave a grass strip between the hardened area and the footway. There is no scope to extend the hardened area, as the verge isn't wide enough to provide separation between vehicles and pedestrians. In this case we would look to introduce measures to prevent drivers from parking on the verge.

**Question 4 Cllr Colin Taylor  
Re: Agenda item 11**

**Annex B** Table 1 "Project Horizon" lists Eastway D1238, entire length, length 115 metres, programmed for September to December.

I think this is a list for long-term repairs – is this correct?

Table 3 "Surface Treatment" also lists Eastway D1238, entire length, length 150 metres, programmed for July/August.

Is this correct?

It seems odd to do surface treatment in July/August and then carry out long-term repairs to the same road in September to December.

The length quoted is different. Maybe it isn't the same road or the same part of the road. Please clarify.

**Officer response:**

Eastway is on the Operation Horizon programme for resurfacing. It had indeed also inadvertently been added to the Surface Treatment programme and will be removed.

**Question 5 Cllr Colin Taylor  
Re: Agenda item 11 West Hill roundabout**

Table 6 includes West Hill, roundabout and 25m into approach, with the status "not needed". There is no roundabout in West Hill.

However there is a roundabout at the intersection of Meadway with West Hill Avenue, which has previously been confused with West Hill.

When West Hill Avenue was resurfaced a couple of years ago, the roundabout was omitted, because it was not explicitly mentioned in the paperwork.

Similarly, the "Project Horizon" plans to repair Meadway also omit this roundabout. Ironically, as it gets both sets of traffic, the roundabout is in greater need of repair than either road. Potholes form regularly, sometimes more than twice a year in the same places. There is a big one there now.

Can this roundabout be inspected and the apparent decision not to repair it be reviewed?

**Officer Response:**

This was inspected in January and was deemed to be in a good condition and did not need to be resurfaced at the time. Although the roundabout serves two roads, it mainly handles local traffic. The defect in question has since been inspected and reported to the reactive team for action, but there is no need for a resurfacing scheme.

**Question 6 Cllr Colin Taylor**

**Re: Lower Hill Road**

The footway on the West side of Lower Hill Road has just been resurfaced and no doubt residents are delighted with the quality of the work.

However it is disappointing to find that the repair of the carriageway, which I thought was scheduled for the current year, has disappeared from the list. This road has so many potholes that it is wasteful to keep repairing them. I thought it was top priority for repair.

When is it scheduled for attention?

**Officer Response**

The carriageway scheme is not on the local programme because it is on the "Project Horizon" programme for the 2015-18 period. No firm dates have yet been set for these schemes.

**Question 7 Cllr Colin Taylor**

**Re: Oyster cards**

From Sunday 6 July, Oyster cards will be needed for travel on bus routes 166, 293, 406, 418, 467 and 470. This will present problems for local residents who wish to use these buses but do not travel into London where Oyster cards are readily available.

I understand that Oyster cards can be bought at West Ewell station and also at one of the newsagents in Epsom.

Would it be possible for the Local Committee to issue a definitive list showing all sources for obtaining and topping up an Oyster card?

**Officer Response**

TfL have published a list of all Oyster Ticket outlets. There are 61 in Surrey in total and 12 in Epsom & Ewell. The full list will be sent to members and those in the Borough highlighted on the Local Committees webpage.

In addition to these outlets passengers can use their contactless payment card instead of an Oyster card (credit or debit cards which have the contactless symbol). )))  
This gives the same benefits as having an Oyster and by this summer TfL have confirmed that virtually everyone in London and the South East who has a credit or debit card will have at least one contactless payment card enabled.

Passengers can also set up an account online and top up as they go or enable an auto top up facility to ensure they never run out of credit.

Details regarding all ways to pay are on the TfL website [www.tfl.gov.uk/waystopay](http://www.tfl.gov.uk/waystopay)

All information about the cashless operation is also on the TfL website [www.http.consultations.tfl.gov.uk/buses/29889993](http://www.http.consultations.tfl.gov.uk/buses/29889993)

**Question 8 Cllr Colin Taylor**  
**Re: Cycle paths**

What are the expected dates for work to start on the off-road cycle paths in:

- a. Pound Lane between Lower Court Road and Eastway?
- b. Christ Church Road and West Hill?
- c. East Street?

**Officer Response**

- (a) The improvements to the footway surface are complete. Shared use cycle signs will be going up at each end within the next 3 weeks.
- (b) The developer has yet to submit Traffic Management Plans to an acceptable level in order to get a permit to begin work. Works programme may now be dependent on Malden Rushett Works (see below)
- (c) The County Council has been advised that Sainsbury's has deferred the construction of their proposed car park deck until later in the year. The work on the cycle path is dependent on the construction of the car park deck.

**Question 9 Cllr Colin Taylor**  
**Re: Malden Rushett**

What is the expected date for TfL to start work on improving the junction at Malden Rushett, which is partly funded by the development at West Park?

**Officer Response:**

Following a meeting on Thursday 19th June, SCC was informed there will now be periods of road closures during construction.

Work will commence on Rushett Lane on 22nd September 2014, with no road closure until 27th October 2014. This will be followed by a road closure from 27th Oct 2014 to the end of the year.

Work will then commence on Fair Oak Lane from beginning of January until 9th Feb without a road closure. From 9th February 2015 until 20th March 2015 the road will be closed. Details of diversion routes will be distributed when received from TfL.

The work programme will go on until completion in August 2015 although none will affect traffic flow.

**Question 10 Cllr Colin Taylor**  
**Re: Pound Lane**

Some years ago I made a request to the Local Committee for a 20mph limit in Pound Lane between Temple Road and Hook Road, outside Epsom Primary School, as originally suggested by Cllr Sheila Carlson.

Under SCC policies at that time it was thought it would probably not qualify and attention was concentrated on a road outside a school in Stoneleigh.

Since then SCC policies have been reviewed and a new version is on SCC Cabinet's agenda for 24 June, the day after our Local Committee.

Once the new policy has been ratified, can this part of Pound Lane be re-considered for a 20mph limit outside the school?

**Officer Response:**

This part of Pound Lane could be considered under the new Road Safety Outside Schools policy, which is expected to be approved by the County Council's Cabinet on 24th June. Under the new policy we would not consider the narrow question of whether to implement a 20mph limit per se, but rather would consider the wider question of safety outside the school holistically. We would then draw conclusions as to what, if any, measures would be an appropriate response to the problems identified. The range of measures considered would include education and enforcement as well as engineering. It would be up to the Local Committee to prioritise funding for the necessary feasibility study.

**Question 11 Cllr Colin Taylor**  
**Re: Time limited parking bays**

Local businesses have reported problems where their delivery vans have to be loaded in parking bays with a "no return with 2 hours" limit. Having completed one delivery they get served with a PCN when they return to collect their next load.

When these bays were first installed they were advised that the same principle applied as for yellow lines and loading or unloading was allowed unless otherwise stated. More recently they have been told that this is not the case and appeals against the PCNs have been rejected.

What options are open for solving this problem? Can loading and unloading be allowed in time limited parking bays or is the only option to request a shorter "no return" time?

**Officer Response:**

Any vehicle using these bays is restricted by the time limits and return time.

If the businesses have been advised that they can load in the same way as on yellow lines, then they have been misinformed - if this was the case then any user of the bays, including regular shop users would be able to use the loading and unloading mechanism as a way of violating the restrictions.

Shared use parking and loading/unloading can be utilised, but the signing in this particular area would become overly complicated and very difficult to understand and possibly to enforce.

A shorter return time can be utilised, but the current restrictions have taken a number of years to get to this stage with continual changes - it would be advisable to establish exactly how many businesses require constant loading and unloading in this area before proposing any changes.

**Question 12 Cllr Neil Dallen**

**Re: Temporary Diversions and changes to road layout**

Members received an email 4 days (2 working days) before a significant temporary one way system was due to be implemented the week of the Derby. Fortunately, after considerable discussion and phone calls it was postponed for a week. This is not the first time that a significant temporary change to the road layout has been proposed at the last minute without prior warning to Members. To avoid a repetition is it possible to add consultation with relevant Ward and County Members prior to these schemes being announced?

**Officer Response:**

Temporary road closures, one-way systems, etc for major works are brought into force by the making of a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO). Divisional Members are informed of TTROs at the point when they are first advertised. This is normally 2 to 3 weeks in advance of the works commencing. Before any TTRO is authorised, the County Council's Streetworks team check to ensure the proposed works do not clash with any other works, or indeed any major public event such as the Derby. It is unfortunate that in this case Members did not receive the normal 2 to 3 weeks' notice and the Streetworks team did not anticipate any negative impact on the Derby of the proposed temporary traffic management. However due to local concerns raised by Members, it was decided to ask the works promoter to delay the start of their works until after the Derby.

**Question 13 Cllr Neil Dallen**

**Re: South Street Improvements**

We, through the Coast to Capital LEP (Local Enterprise Partnership), have put in a submission for government funding for making South Street two way. This is part of Plan E, an approved planning document from a number of years ago. Currently work is being done to provide up to date figures on traffic flow for the model so that we can measure accurately the impact and improvement of any change. We are soon to hear from government whether our submission has been successful. If we are successful the money can only be used for this purpose. If the scheme is no longer of benefit to Epsom due to changed traffic flow / movement over the past few years we lose the money.

I believe that it is therefore important that we all understand that

- a) We can only use the money for making South Street two way as stated in the approved Planning Policy - Plan E.
- b) If the model shows that it no longer a beneficial change for Epsom we would not want it to proceed and would refuse the funding.
- c) To enable sensible and informed decisions to be made it is important to have all the facts and figures.

When are the facts and figures going to be made available and what is the process following their availability?

**Officer Response:**

South Street 2 way forms part of the Epsom Plan E Expression of Interest bid to the Coast to Capital LEP. If this expression of interest is successful (which is anticipated will be known by July 2014) a business case is required to be prepared and submitted before the end of 2014 to secure funding for the scheme. It is anticipated that the Coast to Capital LEP would indicate whether the scheme can be funded in 2015/16 or whether it would need to be considered in a future funding year.

The business case needs to show overall benefits to journey times and delays to show a benefit cost ratio greater than 2 to demonstrate value for money and secure Government funding. The journey times and delays are assessed through a nationally and government accepted computer traffic model that is robustly validated against existing vehicle movements. These vehicle movements have been updated through a recent series of extensive traffic surveys undertaken over a wide geographical area.

This survey information is currently being incorporated into the computer traffic model which is expected to be complete in July 2014 following which the Plan E highway options (including South Street) will be tested in August 2014 and incorporated in the business case submission to the Coast to Capital LEP.

A joint County and Borough Member task group has been established through the Local Committee to enable informed discussion on the development of Plan E. This group has to date met twice (on 26 March 2014 and 25 April 2014) and received information on the results of the traffic surveys. The next meeting is currently being planned to receive a presentation of the computer traffic model with further meetings held to consider the outputs of the option testing.

Surrey County Council and Epsom & Ewell Borough Council officers are working closely with the Member Task Group to ensure that a clear and robust business case is produced that sets out the case for the Epsom Plan E scheme as set out in the EEBC Local Plan.

**Question 14 Cllr Neil Dallen  
Re: Development off Rosebank**

The development off Rosebank on the old Rosebery School site creating Dalmeny Way caused considerable damage to both the road, kerbs, verge and pathways. I am still getting complaints and comments from residents about the state of the area. Has the developer now completed reinstatement to the satisfaction of Surrey County Council? If not what action is being taken to enforce satisfactory reinstatement?

**Officer Response:**

At the present time we cannot insist that developers reinstate any damage done to the road network in the vicinity of their development. We are currently reviewing whether an opportunity exists to do so, and if so how this could be achieved from an operational point of view. However, it would seem that much of the damage referred to has occurred since the development was completed. Rosebank is scheduled to be resurfaced in the near future.

**Question 15 Cllr Jan Mason  
Re: Bollards and Lighting**

When travelling around the Borough, I have noticed that many of the bollards are dirty, not working or damaged and that some of the lights on the pedestrian islands particularly on

East Street have not been working for some time. Who is responsible for the maintenance of these and when will the necessary cleaning and repairs be carried out.

**Officer Response:**

The County Council inspects illuminated bollards on a routine basis, and also receives ad hoc reports from residents. There is a limited central budget available for repairs to illuminated bollards, and this is prioritised to the most safety critical sites. The Local Committee has previously allocated some of its own funds to refurbish illuminated bollards in lower priority locations and could do so again next Financial Year 2015-16 if this was considered a high priority. Officers are reviewing any outstanding requests for repairs.

Subject to appropriate traffic management the community highways gang could be asked to clean the bollards if members wish.

This page is intentionally left blank