



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL
7 December 2015**

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

**Question 1 – Jane Saunders
Re: Parking in Albert Road**

Question:

As well as commuters and office/shop workers using Albert Road as free car parking during the day, therefore preventing residents from being able to park, we are now in the situation of people parking in Albert Road at night to use the cinema or restaurants, rather than pay for parking. Do the Council have a plan to assist the residents in Albert Road for evening parking restrictions as well as day time restrictions? This would increase parking revenue for the Council and be a long term solution to the problems of parking in Albert Road which has caused frustration and resulted in damage to cars, mine included, which have been key scratched and reversed into.

Officer Response:

We have recently carried out a preliminary consultation to investigate the requirements for a resident permit scheme along Albert Road - the results of this consultation are available on the agenda for this meeting (Item 11):

<http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=197&MId=4176&Ver=4>

It shows that only 17% of households in Albert Road are in favour of an RPZ. We do not have any further proposals along Albert Road at this time.

**Question 2 – Mr Martin Olney
Re: Yellow Lines**

Question:

One of the residents of my ward has successfully submitted a request for yellow lines on a T junction. I have been told that this request still has to go to consultation - why? This is a safety issue and the Highway Code tell you that you must not park within 10 metres of a junction. I know that this is an advisory rule, however it seems pointless telling people not to do it if there is no penalty. Putting yellow lines on a junction seems to me something that should not be voted on by the transgressors. After all turkeys do not vote for Christmas!

Can you explain why a safety issue like this cannot be imposed?

Officer Response:

We are required by law to advertise a proposal before we can implement it.

Please follow the link below:

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1996/2489/regulation/7/made>

Even if the consultation does result in objections, the yellow lines can be implemented if their inclusion is deemed to resolve a safety issue.

**Question 3 – Mr Martin Olney
Re: Parking Wheelers Lane**

Question:

Previously I have been advised that it is unlikely that grasscrete will be laid on the green outside numbers 6 to 28 Wheelers Lane. There is already a dropped curb used by residents and tradesmen to drive across the green. It also seems to be big enough to accommodate anything up to 20 cars.

Can you tell me the cost of putting down grasscrete and what number of residents would need to contribute to the CPZ to make it self-funding?

Officer Response:

The cost of providing grasscrete over the area between 6 and 28 Wheelers Lane would be approx £40k, possibly more with design costs.

Each CPZ is assessed individually, but the support of 70% of residents in the road is needed before a scheme will be considered.

**Question 4 – James Cookson
Re: Residents Parking in Church Road**

Question:

Residents of Church Road in Epsom have signed a petition requesting SCC to implement a permit parking scheme in the road. The question that was included in the petition is below:

“We, the undersigned, petition Surrey County Council to implement a parking permit system in Church Road, Epsom (KT17).

We note that according to the agenda reports pack for the meeting on 7th December 2015, the initial consultation showed 89% of respondents in Church Road (24 out of 27 replies) believe there is a parking problem and 81% (22 out of 27 replies) are in favour of a permit scheme.

We would now urge you to take all respondents included below into account when considering implementing the scheme.”

As of 2 December the petition has 72 signatures in favour from 60 properties. The Atkins survey showed 75 properties were included in Church Road and on this basis we already show 80% support for some kind of parking permit scheme.

Residents have indicated that they did not respond to the Atkins survey because:

- Overconfidence: ‘the parking situation is so drastically bad that surely the council will push the scheme through, or all my neighbours will vote for the scheme. Therefore I don’t need to take the time to vote’
- Confusion: some residents did not properly understand which scheme is on offer and on what days, or what provisions would be available for people with off-street parking or those who don’t yet have a car but may want them in the future. Therefore in light of point a) above chose not to vote
- Access to the internet: there are a number of elderly residents in the road who do not have access to the internet and therefore realistically were not able to participate

If the committee will not proceed to advertising phase immediately could the committee please undertake further analysis to understand if zoned permit parking could be implemented in sections of the road where strong support was shown in the survey.

Officer Response:

Atkins carried out a full independent consultation with all residents in the area, based on historic requests for a permit scheme from one or two residents.

As the whole purpose of the consultation exercise was to establish whether there was support or not for residents permit schemes, and the results are very clear, any further representations to introduce schemes should be deferred to the next parking review in order to allow time for further consultation to take place and evidence to be gathered.

Trying to include residents schemes based on new representations after such an extensive consultation would cause inappropriate delay to the rest of the current parking review.

**Question 5 – Colin Taylor
Re: West Hill sign**

Question:

Some time ago, the sign near the railway bridge over West Hill advising the number of spaces free in town centre car parks was damaged by a road traffic accident. Initially it was removed and not replaced. When I queried this it emerged that because the car park sign system came from a different budget, officers believed the highways budget could not be used to replace it. Eventually this was over-ruled and the sign was re-erected. However it has still not been connected to the necessary cabling to enable it to display the relevant information. There is a cable sticking out of the ground about 5 metres away which may be relevant. When can this useful sign be got back into action?

Officer Response:

There will be a full review of all town centre signs as part of the Plan E works so it would not be economic to carry out repairs at this time before the effectiveness of the sign has been assessed.

Question 6 – Colin Taylor
Re: Kiln Lane link

Question:

The agenda includes a petition and response concerning the Kiln Lane link. The response includes mention of the possible alternative of a direct link under the railway from Kiln Lane to Felstead Road, which officers seemed unaware of when I last asked about this topic. Given that the project was denied government funding in the past due to the cost of the scheme, which is far higher than for a direct link because of the extra cutting and the additional over-bridge for access to the trading estate, it seems all too likely that it will risk rejection again next time if it is submitted again unchanged, for the same reason. Why not also submit an alternative scheme for a direct link, with proposals to modify the borough council building in Blenheim Road and the car dealership in Kiln Lane, including re-locating the traveller site as proposed at one stage?

Officer Response:

The petition response report sets out the various factors that have been taken into account when developing the proposed Kiln Lane Link Road scheme layout and considering alternatives.

The suggestion of a possible alternative of a direct link under the railway from Kiln Lane to Felstead Road was considered in the previous Business Case (July 2001) and discounted as it was considered that it would not meet the need to:

- 1 minimise landtake from non-highway/County owned land, for example existing privately owned businesses freeholds/long leaseholds,
- 2 provide the ability to provide exchange land, where non-highway/County owned landtake would be required,
- 3 minimise disruption to existing business operations as far as possible,
- 4 provide a scheme consistent with land safeguarded in the Epsom & Ewell Local Plan and hence comply with adopted policy and,
- 5 enable proposed gradients of the road to be provided within defined design standards to enable the road to pass beneath the railway line whilst allowing acceptable headroom under the railway and allow side roads to either tie into the proposed road or provide alternative access arrangements.

Taking the above factors into consideration along with the current configuration of the existing businesses in the area, the suggested alternative alignment would involve the purchase/demolition/rebuilding of the major car dealership. This could incur significant land purchase and compensation costs to a private landowner/business, which would impact on the cost/benefit of the business case for the scheme. In addition there would be difficulties ensuring that the gradients of the road/headroom under the railway could be provided within design standards and allow side roads to either tie into the proposed road or provide alternative access arrangements.

It should also be noted that the current proposed scheme layout followed a wide ranging public consultation which resulted in support for the scheme layout and was approved by the Epsom and Ewell Local Committee on 12 July 2004.

It is anticipated that the updated business case document would make reference to the previously submitted (and Provisionally Accepted Business Case) both in terms of the fact that it previously passed through Provisional Funding and that it contained a commentary on the alternative alignments considered.

Finally it should be noted that the project was deferred for funding in the past due to the previous Government focus on investment in the 3 Regional Transport Hubs in the County; namely Guildford, Woking and Reigate-Redhill, following the 2004 Spending Review.

**Question 7 – Colin Taylor
Re: Residents Parking Schemes**

Question:

The agenda includes a proposal to advertise a proposed Residents Parking schemes in Victoria Place and another in Leith Road and Lintons Lane, but not in Portland Place and Stones Road nor in the new Winter Place. The results of the expert survey by Atkins indicate that residents in Portland Place and Stones Road believe there is a parking problem and that those who have replied are overwhelmingly in favour of being included. The only issue seems to be that lots of households did not reply. This is very likely due to either having an off-road parking space or not having a car. Whilst it is only right that no RPS should be installed where the majority of residents are against it, would it not make sense to find this out by advertising a proposal to see how many are actually against it, also covering Winter Place? These three roads (plus Middle Lane) are sure to get a lot of displaced commuter parking from the RPS areas. Middle Lane residents opted to face this consequence, but residents in Portland Place and Stones Road asked to be protected from it. The report mentions that prior requests to councillors can be taken into account when deciding where to make proposals. In this case there was a lot of correspondence when I was a councillor for that area, but I no longer have access to the relevant emails.

Officer Response:

Atkins carried out their consultation so that we could determine whether or not certain areas actually required residents permit schemes, and to save on the expense of taking a proposal through to the advertising stage if it wasn't truly wanted.

All residents in the roads mentioned were given the opportunity to answer a questionnaire as part of the consultation, but there was only a minimal response rate – it cannot be assumed that residents did not answer because they either do not have a car or have space available off-street - a residents permit scheme would still directly affect them. If we were to draw this conclusion, then we would have to draw a similar conclusion to all of the other areas consulted, which would make the Atkins report redundant.

Any further representations to introduce schemes should be deferred to the next parking review in order to allow time for further consultation to take place and evidence to be gathered.

Question 8 – Colin Taylor
Re: Residents Parking Schemes

The agenda includes proposals to advertise proposed Residents Parking schemes in the Burnet Grove area and the Marshalls Close area, these being two of Epsom & Ewell's three old CPZs from before 2000. The report mentions that for several years permits have not been available for the marked parking bays in these areas. This is also true of the third CPZ in Hookfield and Lindsay Close, where no change is proposed. What is intended as the future policy for issuing permits for the marked parking bays in this CPZ? If there is no demand for permits, can the status of the marked bays be clarified?

Officer Response:

We can certainly look to amend the status of the bays in Hookfield - we haven't done this at present, but it could certainly be added to the next review, although if the requirement was to make the bays into residents permit bays, we would need at least 70% of residents to be in favour before such a change would be progressed.

Question 9 – Colin Taylor
Re: Pound Lane cycle path

The new shared cycle path in West Hill is well marked with white painted signs. However the other new one in Pound Lane still has none. Worse, there are still old white markings on its old route on the main carriageway. When I last asked about this, officers felt the sign posts were sufficient. However in practice hardly any use is being made of the new safer route. Can the usual white paint signs be added please?

Officer Response:

White thermoplastic pedestrian / cycle symbols can be added to the section of shared use cycleway in Pound Lane. This will be included on the list of outstanding road markings and should be done early in the new year.

Question 10 – Barry Gusterson
Re: Residents Parking in College Road

I am writing on behalf of the owners of properties 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 College Road, Epsom and in response to the Review (phase 9) as it impacts on our request for restricted residents parking.

Background:

1. In accordance with Appendix 2 ('Requests can relate to a specific part of the road rather than the road in general, so even though a road is listed it does not necessarily mean that all parking situations in that road have been assessed'); we are requesting residents parking for our block of 5 properties in College Road that have a special case as outlined below.
2. In accordance with Appendix 4 ('a recommendation cannot be based on a minority in favour, except where there may have been previous correspondence including petitions'). There has been a long correspondence previously about the specific and individual situation of this block of Victorian properties and the need for residents parking.

3. This section of College Road has a unique block of Victorian terraced houses, which because of their age, situation and architectural importance have restrictions on them, resulting in a ban on converting the front garden into off street parking. The residents thus rely on being able to park outside their own property.
4. The survey showed that only 10 properties in College Road out of 58 replied to the survey. This is explained by the fact that the houses between Randolph Road and Church Road are modern and have off street parking or are flats, where the owners are not resident. Opposite numbers 12 – 20 there are three large properties, a nursing home, a residents home for the elderly and a block of flats all of which have parking for residents.
5. The main problems that we have relate to the 'lack of space available for residents to park, with a significant amount of road space being used by commuters/local workers/shoppers'. There is also an issue with large delivery lorries that block the highway and have to go up on the pavement.
6. We all recognise the importance of this block of properties and do our best to maintain them and keep the gardens attractive to enhance the local environment and resolving the parking issue would be of great assistance.

We are thus asking the Local Committee, on the basis of previous correspondence and the information above, whether they would consider including the stretch of College Road from nos. 12 to 20 inclusive in a Residents Parking Scheme to give residents only parking in this part of College Road.

Officer Response:

Atkins carried out a full independent consultation with all residents in the area, based on historic requests for a permit scheme from one or two residents.

As the whole purpose of the consultation exercise was to establish whether there was support or not for residents permit schemes, and the results are very clear, any further representations to introduce schemes should be deferred to the next parking review in order to allow time for further consultation to take place and evidence to be gathered.

Trying to include residents schemes based on new representations after such an extensive consultation would cause inappropriate delay to the rest of the current parking review.

Additional representations received in relation to Residents Parking Schemes which were outside the deadline for questions and petitions.

Sally Wray – Andrew's Close

Petition, with a total of 32 signatures supporting the introduction of residents' only parking restrictions from residents accounting for 26 of the properties on Andrew's Close and 1 property on the corner of College Road and Andrew's Close (the front door to this property is on Andrew's Close). 72% of occupied properties are in support.

Please also note that:

- Two of the properties on Andrew's Close are unoccupied – house nos 3 and 22
- There are only 38 properties on Andrew's Close (not 39 as stated in Atkins' documents – there is no number 13). Petition signatures from 23 properties represents support for the proposals from 64% of the 36 occupied properties in the street.
- One resident said she had no view for or against the proposals (house no 33) and there were 6 properties where residents were not in at the times we called (house nos 8, 9, 17, 24, 26, 28)
- Only 4 residents said they were not in favour of residents' only parking proposals

In the original parking consultation letter that was sent out to residents (dated 3 September 2015), the Council stated that responses would be considered on 'a road by road basis' and not by area. The attached petition shows that the majority of the residents of Andrews Close support the introduction of residents' only parking restrictions on their street and I therefore request that the proposal is progressed to the next stage.

My reasons for supporting the proposal are:

- damage to our car when it is parked near our house – our own car, parked outside our house, has been hit by non-residents parking/looking for parking spaces on two occasions this year alone. My husband witnessed a delivery van hit a resident's parked car. Two other residents told me that their vehicles have been hit by other vehicles whilst parked in the street.
- damage to property – last year one of our elderly neighbours had a large vehicle drive up his drive and onto his front lawn to turn round because the driver didn't have space to turn in the street
- we are often not being able to park in the street when we return from shopping or from attending medical appointments
- emergency vehicles would not have sufficient access to drive down the road when it is parked up during the day
- poor parking has meant that our refuse does not always get collected because the dustcarts have been unable to get down the street because of parked cars. This has happened on several occasions, most recently about two weeks ago.
- obstruction of pavements - commuters now park on the pavements in the street as a matter of course. The pavements are obstructed for pedestrians and frequently impassable for anyone with a pushchair or requiring wheelchair access.

Ed Birchall – Residents Parking in College Area

Petition on change.org with 30 signatures on 3 December.

Resident Permit Parking for

Pikes Hill, Wyeth's Road, St Martin's Close, Grove Avenue, Church Road, Grove Road, Albert Road, Wimborne Close, Andrew's Close, Treemount Court, Tintagel Close, Cedar Close, College Road and Pitt Road

Resident's permits currently cost £50 per year for the first permit and £75 per year for any subsequent permits, and visitors' permits are £2 each. This price is set in our standard county-wide policy.

The concerns that residents have expressed are:

- The obstruction of pavements/ off street parking, and the obstruction of the highway in general for larger vehicles such as fire appliances, ambulances and refuse/delivery vehicles.
- The lack of space available for residents to park, with a significant amount of road space being used by commuters/local workers/shoppers.

This page is intentionally left blank