

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 2.00 pm on 7 December 2015
 at Epsom Town Hall, The Parade, Epsom, KT18 5BY.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr Eber A Kington (Chairman)
- * Mr John Beckett (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mrs Jan Mason
- * Mrs Tina Mountain
- * Mr Karan Persand

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Michael Arthur MBE
- * Cllr Liz Frost
- Cllr Vince Romagnuolo
- * Cllr Clive Smitheram
- Cllr Tella Wormington

* In attendance

43/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Vince Romagnuolo and Tella Wormington. Tony Axelrod substituted for Tella Wormington.

44/15 CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS [Item 2]

It has been agreed to fund two projects using the Community Safety fund of £3337. £1000 for the Prevent workshop for Senior Leaders in schools and £800 for a music tutor at the Edge youth centre targeted at the cohort of young people who are involved with anti-social behaviour.

A response from John Furey, the Cabinet Member for Highways, had been received in regard to the Committees concerns about the delays in completing the implementation of Phase 8 waiting restrictions. His reply focussed on Keir's problems with finding new contractors for sign installation which have hopefully now been resolved.

The Chairman has met with Leader of the Council David Hodge to express the Committees concerns over the proposed further cut of 25% to our local highway budget.

It was confirmed that the Project Horizon roads within the Plan E area which were deferred, pending the completion of that major scheme would be resurfaced as planned from the Project Horizon budget and would not require funding from the Plan E scheme funding as had been rumoured.

45/15 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 3]

10 questions and some late additional representations had been received, the questions and answers are set out in Annex A. The following additional points were made:

Question 2: Mr Olney asked what the criteria are for assessing whether there is a safety issue requiring yellow lines. The parking engineer replied that based on requests received from a variety of sources sites are assessed to see if the issue constitutes a safety problem.

Question 4: Mr Thompson representing Mr Cookson expressed his concern at the way in which the Atkins survey had been carried out and asked why those not replying had not been reminded. Residents had been able to get a response from most houses in a matter of days. The officer replied that residents had a month to respond and resources were not available to remind those not replying. Atkins analysis had been based on the responses received.

Question 6: Mr Taylor felt that the Committee should decide whether it is more important to follow the procedure or to secure the funding. Officers responded that it was important to do both.

Question 7: Mr Taylor suggested that residents had not responded to the survey as they had consultation fatigue due to the length of time taken to look at these issues.

Question 8: Mr Taylor asked if residents be informed of the current situation. The parking engineer confirmed that a further consultation would be required and if a request from residents is received this can be included in the next parking review.

Question 10: Mr Gusterson felt that there were special circumstances in relation to his road in that most properties had adequate off street parking, whilst a group of 5 properties have no parking available and are unable to change their front gardens as they are in a conservation area. All five properties (100%) have requested a Residents Parking Zone (RPZ). The parking engineer responded that any RPZ needs to be self-financing and the area would have to be assessed in more detail.

46/15 ADJOURNMENT [Item 4]

38 members of the public were present. 10 informal questions were asked and answers were provided at the meeting.

47/15 PETITIONS [Item 5]

One petition was received.

Declarations of interest: None

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:

Mr Tufo presented his petition and asked whether there was an update on whether any funding for the Kiln Lane link would be available and when the feasibility study of the one way scheme for Temple Road/Hook Road would be completed. The officer replied that the Kiln Lane link is still in the LEP programme but they have not yet requested a business case to be submitted. It is hoped that the conclusions of the one way feasibility study will be brought to the next meeting of the Committee in February.

Member Discussion – key points

None

Resolved to:

- (i) confirm to the petitioners that both Surrey County Council and Epsom & Ewell Borough Council continue to support the proposed Kiln Lane Link scheme and seek funding opportunities for the scheme;
- (ii) make the Cabinet Member aware of the petition, in acknowledgement that while Surrey County Council's Local Committee for Epsom & Ewell supports the Kiln Lane Link scheme, the scheme is being promoted by Surrey County Council's Cabinet as part of Surrey County Council's Major Schemes programme.

Reasons: to respond to the petition

48/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 6]

The minutes were confirmed as a correct record.

49/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 7]

The Chairman indicated that he had a personal non pecuniary interest in Item 10 as the owner of a property in Chantilly Way. He vacated the Chair for items 8 to 10 and took no part in the discussion of Item 10. The Vice-Chairman took the Chair for these items.

50/15 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 8]

Three questions were received, the questions and answers are set out in Annexe B. The following additional points were made:

Question 2: Cllr Smitheram indicated that he may bring further questions as the process continues and asked whether there would be any communication with residents prior to the submission of the planning application. Officers present were unsure whether there is routine consultation with residents, but agreed to put the councillor in touch with the appropriate officer.

Question 3: Mrs Mason reported that she hadn't seen any cleaning taking place. The Highways Area Team Manager replied that her area is due to be visited in the New Year and cleaned gulleys will be marked with paint so that those visited can be identified.

**51/15 GROSVENOR ROAD, LANGLEY VALE VILLAGE [FOR INFORMATION]
[Item 9]**

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager; Alan Flaherty, Engineer.

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

Teresa Cass who raised the issues at Langley Vale in a public question at the last meeting was unable to be present, but it was reported that she was happy with the report and the that the mistakes made had been identified. She asked to be kept updated on any further developments.

The local member indicated that she had observed the new layout in operation and felt that it had improved the junction. Village gateway signs and a planter will be installed shortly. There had been no further comments from the racehorse trainers in the area.

Noted the report.

**52/15 SPEED LIMIT CHANGE IN CHANTILLY WAY, EPSOM [EXECUTIVE
FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 10]**

Declarations of Interest: Eber Kington declared a personal non-pecuniary interest as the owner of a property on Chantilly Way. This item was Chaired by the Vice-Chairman and Mr Kington took no part in the discussion or decision.

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager; Chris Cannon, Surrey Police

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

Noted that the compass point on the drawing at annex 1 is incorrect and should be reversed.

Mrs Mason set out her opposition to the proposal. She indicated that she felt that this is a busy road, near a school with lots of traffic movements and that raising the speed limit will encourage vehicles to go faster still.

The Area Highways Team Manager reported that the speed limit policy is based on the use of signs and on the perception of drivers of the road environment.

Chris Cannon reported that long term speed enforcement is ineffective if the majority of drivers feel that it is safe to exceed the current limit. Across the County there are 759 sites where speed limits are monitored and enforced, but only 6 officers carrying out this work.

Members generally felt that the use of a 30mph sign as drivers approach the bend was likely to be a good way of reminding drivers to slow down, but asked if a review could be carried out after the change is made to ensure that speeds have not increased. The Area Highways Team Manager indicated that it will be a permanent traffic order, but that a review would be possible.

Resolved (Jan Mason voted AGAINST and Eber Kington ABSTEINED) to:

- (i) authorise the advertising of the Traffic Regulation order for the change in speed limit on a section of Chantilly Way from 30mph to 40mph as outlined in the report;
- (ii) authorise the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, to advertise the appropriate legal notices relating to the speed limit change, to consider any objections, and if appropriate to confirm the changes.
- (iii) review the changes after they have been implemented for 6 months to ensure that they are effective.

Reasons: The change of speed limit from 30mph to 40mph would allow a greater emphasis to be given to the commencement of the 30mph speed limit by using gateway signing and relocation of the existing warning signs and chevron boards in advance of the bend.

Vehicles are already exceeding the 30mph speed limit and a 40mph speed limit is deemed to more appropriate for the general layout of the road.

53/15 EPSOM AND EWELL PARKING REVIEW (PHASE 9) [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Stephen Clavey, Senior Parking Engineer

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:

6 residents asked questions in addition to those in Item 4. The following points were made:

Several of surveys/petitions of residents had been carried out in various roads since the report was published. These showed a large majority of residents in these roads are in favour of a residents parking zone (RPZ) and requested that this information is taken into account by the Committee. Some residents felt that there was a level of apathy amongst residents, as they had been consulted a number of times about a RPZ and very little progress had been made, which may account for the low response rate to the initial survey.

A resident of Woodcote side indicated that he was unhappy with the recent survey carried out by residents and felt that those who had not replied to the Atkins survey had not done so because they were happy with the current situation. He felt that the views of those against an RPZ were not being taken into account.

ITEM 6

A resident queried how roads where there are houses mixed with very large properties with multiple occupiers who may have off street parking are dealt with. The officers replied that these have to be looked at in more detail and a RPZ could be considered for a block of individual properties if it was considered to be viable.

Member discussion – key points

A statement was circulated by the parking team in response to the recent surveys and petitions submitted by local residents. A copy is attached at annex C.

Mrs Mountain expressed her disappointment that a number of the RPZs considered in her area had not been recommended to proceed in the current review due to the low response rate to the resident survey even though more than 50% of those responding were in favour. She was concerned that implementing a RPZ in other roads in the area would increase the pressure in these roads and that leaving consideration to the next review may mean that these roads have to meet the requirement for 70% of properties to be in favour, as a result of recent changes to the process. She questioned why those in favour are being disadvantaged by those not responding. In reply it was stated that as a RPZ would require residents to pay for a permit to park a vehicle in the road it was felt to be unreasonable to impose this on residents unless there is a clear majority of all properties in favour.

A member asked how people without internet access had been able to respond to the survey and whether there was information on the responses per household. The officer replied that the letter had provided details of internet access at local libraries and also given the number of the county council contact centre who would take residents through the survey whilst they were on the phone and recorded their responses. He confirmed that there were multiple responses from some properties and that petitions had been received from some roads during the consultation period. There had also been the opportunity to raise any additional questions at the time if residents were unclear on what was being proposed.

The Chairman made the following points: deferring the decision until the next meeting would hold up all the restrictions proposed; not all the new information received had all the address information needed to determine which properties are in favour; residents against the proposals would not have had the opportunity to put their views at the meeting as having viewed the agenda they may have been content that nothing was being proposed in their road. He proposed that where additional information had been received recently, that these roads should be considered in the next parking review with a commitment that they would not have to meet the 70% of residents in agreement criteria which would be in place for that review. If funding and staff resources could be made available in advance of the next review then these would be considered sooner.

Several members indicated that they had had representations from residents unhappy with the way the information in recent resident petitions had been collected and felt uncomfortable agreeing to include additional roads where there had been a low response rate in the original consultation with the roads to be advertised in the current review.

Resolved: That the following be agreed:

- (i) Subject to the following amendments and additions, the recommendations detailed in Annex 1 and 4 as set out in the report be agreed;

Statement of Reasons: Map 3 “The Avenue” should read “Grafton Road”, Map 9 – make reference to the extension of the current restrictions in Ravensfield Gardens;

Map 27 – Hours of operation to be amended to Mon-Fri 8.30am-4.30pm;

Map 28 – officers to check whether Tayles Hill Drive is a private road;

Map 29 – Hours of operation for The Mount should be 8-9.30 and 2-3.30;

Map 33 – Mon-Sat 08.30-18.30 to be amended to Mon-Sat 10.00-12.00;

Map 41 – Add to pay and display restrictions. Max stay 2 hours, hourly rate £1;

Map 57 – all kiss and ride bays in Station Approach to be subject to the same restrictions;

- (ii) That the County Council’s intention to make an order under the Road Traffic Regulation act 1984 be advertised and, if no objections are maintained, the order be made;
- (iii) That if objections are received the Parking Strategy and Implementation Group Manager is authorised to try and resolve them, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of this committee and the county councillor for the division, and decides whether or not they should be acceded to and therefore whether the order should be made, with or without modifications.
- (iv) (Proposed by Mr Kington and seconded by Mrs Mason) That in the next Phase of Waiting Restrictions (Phase 10), the Local Committee considers recommending the introduction of an RPZ in the roads listed below in the light of representations received after the publication of the Atkins Report:

Albert Road

Andrew’s Close

College Road

Nearby roads in the Lintons Lane/Leith Road area not currently included

Church Road

Woodcote Side

Tintagel Close

These roads will be considered under the current system and will not be subject to the 70% resident agreement which will be in place for the next review. Should resources become available ahead of the next review the Committee may consider them earlier.

Reasons: It is expected that the implementation of the proposals will both increase the safe passage of vehicles and also ease the parking situation within the mainly residential areas.

**54/15 EPSOM-BANSTEAD SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT PACKAGE
[EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 14]**

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Neil McClure, Transport Strategy Project Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion - key points

Noted that the project would aim to improve current bus services rather than introduce new routes.

Noted the report.

Resolved: That

- (i) the establishment of the proposed joint Member Task Group and the proposed members from the Epsom & Ewell Local Committee, to support this project as outlined in Annex 1 of the report be agreed;
- (ii) approve the Terms of Reference for the above Member Task Group as set out in Annex 2 of the report as amended in paragraph 4 by the substitution of "borough" by "scheme" be agreed.

Reasons: The joint Member Task Group is needed to support the Project Board in the development of the business case bid to the LEP, and beyond this for the approval of scheme construction and delivery after award of LEP Local Growth Award funding.

55/15 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager; Alan Flaherty, Engineer.

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion - key points

Mrs Mason indicated that she may wish to replace Brumfield Road with the odd numbered side of Green Lanes in next year's programme and she would discuss this with the maintenance engineer.

Noted that Rosebery Road was no longer in the county programme for resurfacing but had been added to the list for reactive maintenance.

Members were asked to alert the Area Highways Team Manager to any roads in their area where they had concerns at their condition so that they could be added to the list of roads which can be put forward should additional resources become available.

Resolved to:

- (i) Approve the ITS programme for next Financial Year 2016-17 as set out in the report;
- (ii) 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: Recommendations are made to enable the 2016-17 Highways programmes funded by the Local Committee to be decided in good time to facilitate timely delivery of those programmes.

56/15 THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY AND NOMINATIONS TO THE BOROUGH'S JOINT INFRASTRUCTURE GROUP [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 13]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion - key points

Noted the report.

Resolved: To:

approve the nomination of County Councillors Eber Kington and John Beckett to sit on the Joint Infrastructure Group.

Reasons: To nominate two County Members to sit on the Joint Infrastructure Group to determine the Borough's Infrastructure Delivery Plan priorities and to make recommendations as regards the allocation of strategic CIL receipts.

57/15 APPOINTMENT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE TASK GROUPS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 15]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nicola Morris, Community Partnership & Committee Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion - key points

None

Resolved: That the following members be appointed to vacancies on the Local Committees Task Groups arising from the resignation of County Councillor Stella Lallement:

Major Schemes (Epsom & Ewell) Task Group – Eber Kington

ITEM 6

On Street Parking Task Group – substitute Karan Persand

Reasons: To fill vacancies on the Committees Task Groups

**58/15 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION/ACTION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION]
[Item 16]**

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nicola Morris, Community Partnership & Committee Officer

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion - key points

Noted, that a response had not yet been received from the youth service and that a reminder would be sent.

59/15 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 17]

Noted that the next meeting would take place on Monday 29 February 2016 at 7pm, Bourne Hall, Spring Street, Ewell.

Meeting ended at: 4.55 pm

Chairman