



SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 27 June 2016

AGENDA ITEM 11

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question 1: Ken Huddart (Claygate Parish Councillor)

Could the Elmbridge Local Committee provide specific timing on when the Claygate on-street parking review will commence?

Response:

The parking review for Esher, Claygate, and Hinchley Wood is currently due to start with initial consultations in August / September 2016, and the report of recommendations for new parking controls is due to be presented at the local committee meeting in February 2017.

The full timetable is available on our the website at:

www.surreycc.gov.uk/parking/elmbridge

Question 2: Mark Sugden (Claygate Parish Councillor)

Could the Elmbridge Local Committee/SCC confirm what it can do to ensure that Thames Water fix water issues on Highways, such as the long standing problem in the High Street, Claygate, to enable future SCC repair of this critical stretch of road?

Reponse:

Surrey County Council has no formal authority (legislative or otherwise) to oblige a statutory undertaker to maintain their apparatus, save for circumstances when a defect gives rise to an immediate safety hazard.

Question 3: (To be taken with Item 13) Mike O’Sullivan (Chairman Wey Road & Round Oak Road Residents’ Association)

The County Parking Team’s Review Recommendations for Weybridge state that: “a significant amount of the feedback to the initial consultation was in relation to the provision and management of off-street parking within the borough”, and additionally recognises: “that the provision of inexpensive and available off-street parking is a concern within Weybridge.”

Therefore, will the Committee today please:

- formally minute its specific recognition of both comments,

TABLED DOCUMENT

ITEM 11

- ensure that Elmbridge Borough Council is formally and specifically advised of the Committee's recognition in writing, and
- formally commit to support the wishes of Weybridge residents for additional, inexpensive, long-stay, off-street car parking in the Town to address the present inadequacy, and thereafter monitor and review progress in the matter on a frequent basis until a specific resolution has been identified and implemented?

Response:

The local committee will consider the Weybridge parking review report in the course of this evening's meeting. Should there be any specific comments made as part of the discussion, they will be duly recorded in the minutes. The county council and the borough council have already shared the results of the consultation and discussed the issue of a shortage of off street parking at meetings of the parking task group. The county council and the borough council are both already committed to trying to improve the resident experience and, as this issue will not go away without some action being taken, it is only natural that such discussions will continue in future.

Question 4: David Bellchamber (Cobham resident)

Relating to Footpath 97 (Esher), a path running between High Street, Cobham and Cedar Road, Cobham, there has been a recent closure order made under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1964 to extend to 17th June 2017 an order previously operating from 18 December 2015. The existence of the public footpath here appears to be recognised, although it does not appear as such on the Surrey Interactive Map, and the continuing closure as specified is of great concern to residents given that there has been no recent activity on the site it crosses and the site now appears somewhat derelict. What assurance can the various Departments involved at Surrey County Council give that development work will proceed with alacrity and in a way that will ensure that this path can become quickly operative once again, thus enabling the elderly, young and disabled, in particular, to no longer have to use the hazardous route designated in the Order as the alternative?"

Response:

Mr Bellchamber is correct that the public right of way has been recognised by Surrey County Council and this is why it has subsequently been legally closed to the public for reasons of public safety. When the closure was first put in place it did appear that following demolition on site other works would shortly follow. This has clearly not happened. You may also be aware that the existing public right is subject to an application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to divert it to an alternative route on the site. This Order was made on 19 April 2016. Following advertising no objections were received. The Order was therefore confirmed on 1 June 2016. This new route will not be available to the public legally or physically until it has been constructed to our satisfaction. I attach the plan from the diversion order.

Following requests by local members of the public I recently asked Surrey Property Services whether the existing public footpath 97 or some other alternative could be provided across the site whilst works are currently on hold. Like Mr Bellchamber, it has been noted that this would be preferable to the alternative currently suggested. I have been informed that following the recent confirmation of the diversion order, the developer "Shanlys" are eager to commence work on site as soon as possible

TABLED DOCUMENT

ITEM 11

subject to the correct paperwork and transfers being put in place. It is likely then that work will begin soon, although no fixed date has yet been given. Therefore for reasons of safety it would make sense for the current temporary closure to remain in place in its current form.

This page is intentionally left blank