



SURREY

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL
22 June 2015**

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

Question 1 – Mr Steve Osgathorp

Re: Parking in Wheelers Lane (Item 13 and Annex 1)

Question:

I am a local resident in Wheelers Lane and have learned of the proposed pay and display scheme being considered for Wheelers Lane.

I would like to raise a number of concerns / objections with the scheme.

In your 'Reasons for Recommendations' you state that the scheme would improve safe passage for vehicles and pedestrians. I cannot see that the scheme would make any noticeable difference to the safety as your proposal is to have pay and display facilities in exactly the same place as cars currently park.

You also state that convenience would be improved. Convenience will only improve by making the current users of the parking spaces (mainly commuters and Epsom retail shop employees) parking elsewhere i.e. further up Wheelers Lane (not discounting a CPZ scheme) and further round into Parklawn Avenue and Eastdean Avenue (also not discounting a CPZ scheme). If the current users do decide to pay to park they will be there all day as currently and therefore the convenience will not change. This would therefore prove a possible lack of improved convenience and the possible creation and worsening of an existing problem further up the roads mentioned.

In Annex 1 it refers to a minimum width for emergency vehicles as being 3.2m. At no point on the route does your proposal address this with the average width along the distance considered being less than 3m. The proposal talks about additional spaces being provided but it will actually be the same.

The vandalism of pay machines is highly likely.

In section 1.5 of your report you state how hard it is to enforce parking for enforcement officers. That is because they virtually never come up Wheelers Lane. When they do they are always able to issue tickets for contraventions. If they came more often they could issue more, or people would learn to park properly / go elsewhere.

'Cruising' would actually go up further as car users would venture further up Wheelers Lane, Eastdean and Parklawn Avenues looking for space (not discounting CPZ's).

Finally point 7.1 suggests that obstructive parking would reduce but as the bays are due to put in the same place as they are now, except for 2, this situation won't really change.

I have no desire for a CPZ in the resident's area as I should not have to pay to park outside my own house. As a growing family with children within driving age in 4-5 years times we could be looking at a £200 plus charge per year. This wouldn't even guarantee a space. The last review of CPZ's a couple of years ago was for 49 spaces to be allocated for residents from 2a to 56 Wheelers Lane and to include Lane End residents in that allocation. By my count 2 years ago there were in excess of 55 residents' cars, already highlighting a shortage of space before you start looking at visitor permits, children reaching 17 etc.

The introduction of a CPZ scheme in the remainder of Wheelers Lane, Parklawn and Eastdean Avenues will become necessary if pay and display is introduced at the lower end of Wheelers Lane as residents simply won't be able to park. Thus creating one proposed solution necessitates another problem to be solved.

My question

Rather than spend £25K in year 1 and £8K per year thereafter on a scheme that seems to me fundamentally flawed spend the money taking back the undergrowth on the Northwest side of Wheelers Lane by 2 - 3 feet (0.6 – 0.9m) and tarmac this allowing parking further over and widening access for emergency service vehicles and improving safety for pedestrians with a raised curb on the south east side. This will address the problems that you have stated are the reason for this proposal.

Officer Response:

The total width that an emergency vehicle comfortably requires is the 3.2m, but this does include wing mirrors and clearance - in this instance, the minimum width is currently able to cater for the emergency vehicles.

We are proposing that two single bays should be removed at the narrowest point and relocated elsewhere, so that the total overall width is more constant.

We are also investigating the requirements for a resident permit zone (RPZ) in the area, not a CPZ (Controlled parking zone) - we did investigate this a few years ago, but there was no requirement at the time. Since then, we have been asked to re-investigate the proposals as there seems to be a greater need.

Both the RPZ proposals and pay and display proposals are subject to consultation, and it is recommended that if the pay and display proposal goes ahead, then it would need to be in conjunction with an RPZ.

The verge which is next to the parking area, is part of the public highway and as such, in principle the road can be widened. However, there are currently no plans to widen the road and it would be for the Local Committee to decide whether this would be a priority for the limited funding available.

Question 2 – Mr Martin Olney
Re: A Solution to Residents Parking in Wheelers Lane

Question:

House numbers 4 to 24 (11 houses) have a green in front of their homes. Currently it has bollards preventing access by vehicle. There is a footpath in front of the houses allowing foot access.

My suggestion is to use grasscrete to extend the footpath to allow vehicles to be driven onto the green and parked away from the road. The kerb has already been dropped outside 2 Wheelers Lane. This house is next to the bollards blocking vehicle access to the green.

This would help solve two problems faced by the residents of this part of Wheelers Lane. Those that use their cars during the day usually cannot park anywhere near their homes. We also suffer from car vandalism. This has been going on for many years and is becoming more vicious. A resident reported that four letter words were scratched on the bonnet of her car.

The question is will the Local Committee look into providing this parking facility. It would improve life for the residents. Given that we suffer from commuter parking it would provide extra parking; we would be able to load and unload our vehicles near our houses; we would be guaranteed a parking space and vandalism would diminish.

Officer Response:



The area in question is shown in the photo above. In theory it would be possible to grasscrete this area if all residents were in agreement, but it would be likely to cost in excess of £20k. Such a scheme would not be something which could be justified from the limited resources available for Integrated Transport Schemes. The local member would need to consider whether they wished to support this as a priority from within their highway allocation in a future year.

This page is intentionally left blank