

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Elmbridge LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 4.00 pm on 3 October 2016
 at Council Chamber, Elmbridge Civic Centre, High Street, Esher, KT10 9SD.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mrs Margaret Hicks (Chairman)
- * Mr Mike Bennison (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Ramon Gray
- * Mr Peter Hickman
- * Rachael I. Lake
- * Mrs Mary Lewis
- * Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
- * Mr Tony Samuels
- * Mr Stuart Selleck

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Andrew Davis
- * Cllr Roy Green
- * Cllr Peter Harman
- * Cllr Malcolm Howard
- * Cllr Andy Muddyman
- * Cllr T G Oliver
- * Cllr Mrs Mary Sheldon
- * Cllr Graham Woolgar

* In attendance

32/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Mary Lewis, Mr Tony Samuels and Cllr Peter Harman.

33/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 27th June 2016 were agreed as an accurate record.

34/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Declarations of a personal interest were received from Mr Stuart Selleck and Mr Peter Hickman both in relation to Item 11, which makes reference to roads where they live.

35/16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

ITEM 2

The Chairman updated the Committee on the number of new primary places created for this Autumn in Elmbridge Schools and also the number of first place preferences offered.

36/16 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 5]

The updated information in the Local Committee Tracker was noted.

37/16 PETITIONS [Item 6]

Two petitions were received at this meeting. Details of the petitions and the responses are attached in Annex A.

Mr Doug Stewart represented the lead petitioner, Mr Matthew Owen-Hughes, whose petition was requesting the extension of the double yellow lines at the junction of Oatlands Avenue with Oatlands Close.

Mr Stewart explained the petitioners would like the parking arrangements at the junction changed to make it safer and give greater visibility. With the current length of the double yellow lines at the junction, parked cars are restricting the line of sight and they would like the lines to be extended by 10 metres on both roads. There have been 2 collisions in 2016 and there is a feeling that a more serious accident could happen.

Adrian Harris, the Parking Engineer, responded that the lines at this junction are already longer than the standard and as there is no irrefutable safety concern then the team would be happy to look at the request as part of the parking review in Walton next year.

The second petition, requesting for Park Rd., East Molesey to be resurfaced, was presented by Mr Michael Reynell who showed some photographs on the screen to evidence the condition of the surface of Park Rd. He added that this was a long-standing issue and the road had been listed for repair in 2015, then removed due to budget restrictions, which he understood, but requested to be given a target date for the work.

Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager, acknowledged that the road was not in a good condition, but that in fact few of the defects would be probably classed as safety defects according to the National Code of Practice, which SCC follows. NH said he would arrange an ad hoc inspection to check whether any are over 40mm deep and therefore will be classed as safety defects. NH's advice to the Committee was to wait until the Operation Horizon programme had been published before considering Park Rd. Stuart Selleck, the Divisional Member, sympathised with the residents of Park Rd., and he assured them that Park Rd. is at the top of his priority list for any spare budget. Peter Hickman asked whether the safety defect size guidance was any different for cycles, but NH confirmed that although cyclists are more vulnerable this is not recognised by the Code of Practice.

38/16 PETITION RESPONSE: ROAD SAFETY OUTSIDE SCHOOLS PROGRESS REPORT - HINCHLEY WOOD SCHOOLS [Item 6a]

The School Sustainable Travel Officer, Edward Cowley, introduced the item explaining that the report was making a number of recommendations which would improve the safety of students travelling to and from the Hinchley Wood schools. Two site visits had taken place with other agencies including the Police and SCC Highway officers, during which the behaviour of the highway users and the safety of the highway had been assessed. It was noted that the behaviour of both motorists and pedestrians was good. The options proposed have been done so in a staged way due to the costs involved.

Mr Mike Bennison proposed an additional recommendation, which was dependant on the agreement of recommendations in Item 12, so it was deferred to Item 12.

The Local Committee resolved to agree that:

- (i) The highway proposals presented within this report are added to the list of possible future highway improvements for Elmbridge. The local committee will then decide whether to allocate funding from their future annual budget for these. This will depend upon the extent of the problem and the estimated costs compared with other schemes, and the funds made available to the local committee. It may also be possible to utilise funding available for highway improvements as a result of development planning contributions.
- (ii) Hinchley Wood Primary already undertake a range of road safety education and training activities, however more work can be done with both schools on road safety education. The schools will be supported by the county council's Sustainable School Travel Team to deliver more road safety education and to update their School Travel Plans.

Reasons for decision: These proposed highway measures would help to reduce risk of collisions and improve the road environment to encourage more walking, cycling and scooting to school. The proposals would also help reduce congestion and driver frustration on Claygate Lane.

39/16 PETITION RESPONSE: ROAD SAFETY OUTSIDE SCHOOLS REPORT - ST LAWRENCE COF E (AIDED) JUNIOR SCHOOL (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 6b]

Duncan Knox, the Road Safety Team Manager, introduced the report. Site visits to the location had taken place at which officers had observed that there was a lot of congestion, speeds were low and pedestrians did have difficulty crossing the road due to parked cars blocking the visibility. It was noted that there were no 'keep clear' signs outside the pedestrian entrance which could help improve the visibility. It was also noted that there was not one clear desire line for crossing the road hence there was no obvious place to install a crossing.

Graham Lovelace, resident and school parent governor, was representing the petitioners at the meeting and he did not agree that there was no desire line.

ITEM 2

He felt that it appeared to be the case because people were crossing just when there was a space in the traffic. He thanked officers for the recommended extension to the 'keep clear' signs and asked officers to think again about a crossing.

Members' comments included:

- The new school building should have included a drop off/pick up point within its grounds which would have helped to resolve the situation
- Clarification on the age of the data on the crashmap website

Officers confirmed the data on the crashmap website for 2015 would have been added to the site in June 2016, but did reassure the Committee that the team used the latest data provided by the Police for their work.

The Local Committee resolved to agree and note that:

- (i) St Lawrence C of E Junior School already undertakes a range of road safety education and training activities. The school will be supported by the county council's Sustainable School Travel Team to maintain these and to update their School Travel Plan.
- (ii) It is proposed that the "School Keep Clear" markings will be amended to deter parking across the pedestrian entrance to the school. This will be implemented following consultation with local residents.

40/16 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

The questions and responses are attached in Annex B.

Question 1. was received from Dominic Batstone, who was not present at the meeting.

Question 2. was received from Borough Councillor Barry Fairbank. As a supplementary Cllr Fairbank said he didn't know why the trust fund couldn't be treated as revenue and why it has taken so long to reach this conclusion. In addition he said we were constantly hearing that there was no funding available and yet when there is money available it still can't be spent.

The divisional Member, Mr Peter Hickman said the main issue was whether or not it could be spent on capital and the deeds would need to be checked. The highways officer, Nick Healey, added that the fund was from the sale of a property and therefore he thought would be classed as a capital receipt. He did apologise for the delay, but added that the fund, if permitted, was used for the resurfacing of Rectory Close then this would account for the full amount available.

The Chairman requested that the Highways officer kept the Committee informed.

41/16 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 8]

A question was received from Cllr Graham Woolgar. The question and response are attached as Annex C.

Cllr Woolgar said his issue was that once the agenda and papers with details of the parking proposals were published it only allowed 10 days before the meeting to discuss them with residents. Mr Ramon Gray said the Weybridge review had included a long consultation and he had spoken with residents as early as November 2015. He added that decisions need to be made and too many options cannot be offered. Cllr Andrew Davis said he would also like an extended consultation period, although he did acknowledge that the current process did involve more consultation than the previous one. Mr Ramon Gray said perhaps it was a case of needing to make the stages of the process clearer.

42/16 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT FROM SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 9]

Chris Beck, Elmbridge Youth Support Service (YSS) Team Manager, introduced the report and spoke about some of the highlights including:

Youth Support Service

- the new CSE (Child Sexual Exploitation) partnership project with the Family Support Programme
- Surrey County Council (SCC) has the lowest percentage of NEETs of any large authority in England
- SCC has no Looked After Children who are NEET
- Work was taking place with Walton Charity on the protected work placement programme

Community Youth Work

- This service was delivering open access youth work, targeted groups and 121 support, with an increase in 121 work.
- A new younger age group has been set up at Molesey Youth Centre
- Hersham Youth Centre remained the centre with the highest attendance in Surrey
- In Cobham there has been a successful initial phase with a youth group in partnership with St Andrews
- There has been a successful start for a group in Lower Green in partnership with Surrey Clubs for Young People

Neighbourhood Local Prevention

- Eikon was not delivering as expected
- Lifetrain and the outreach bus were not performing as they should be. They would be making up for 'lost' hours by running a 6 week pilot football project

121 Local Prevention

- Surrey Care Trust was running a successful mentoring project

ITEM 2

Year 11-12 Transition

- The U-explore project was achieving above and beyond

Members' comments included:

- There appeared to have been problems with staff training
- SCC needed to monitor work closely
- Concern about whether there were sufficient staff to run extra nights

Chris Beck responded that the service was constantly recruiting and SCC had picked up on training issues and was offering free training to all agencies.

The Local Committee resolved to note:

(i) How Services for Young People has supported young people to be employable during 2015/16, as set out in the appendix to this report.

43/16 ON STREET PARKING ENFORCEMENT UPDATE (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 10]

Mark Carpenter, Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) Parking officer, introduced the report explaining that Elmbridge Borough Council provided the on-street enforcement service on behalf of Surrey County Council (SCC). The EBC and SCC teams worked closely together and had a good working relationship. The Civil Enforcement Officers concentrated on the problem areas. He added that the surplus income was ringfenced for highways works and additional maintenance of parking signs and lines and replacement of on-street pay and display machines were included in the works funded and to be funded.

Ramon Gray thanked the teams for their co-operation.

The Local Committee resolved to:

(i) note the contents of the report.

44/16 MOLESEYS AND DITTONS PARKING REVIEW (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 11]

Adrian Harris, the Parking Engineer, introduced the report. He explained that the preliminary consultation had taken place in May/June 2016 from which some of the requests were received and these were considered alongside those directly received since the last review of this area. Site visits were made and meetings held with the Parking Task Group and all Ward Councillors were invited to discuss the proposals.

Residents of Challoners Close and School Road were consulted directly on whether they would like residents' permits, but the feedback was that there was no appetite for such a scheme.

County Councillor, Mr Stuart Selleck, proposed an additional recommendation, which was to amend 5 parking bays on Hampton Court

Parade to 30 minutes limited parking. County Councillor Mr Ernest Mallett seconded this proposal.

Members' comments included:

- Acknowledgement of the good work done by the officer
- Warning that some of the proposals might receive adverse comments when advertised

Borough Councillor Malcolm Howard raised an objection to the fact that the recommendations did not include the parking scheme request detailed in paragraph 2.5 and 2.6. He said 80% of the residents in the affected roads had signed the petition, the residents had not been contacted by the team and that the petition met with the aims of the changes to the parking restrictions described in the bullet points on page 69 of the report. He added the petitioners would like their petition to be reconsidered.

Members' comments with reference to the views of Cllr Malcolm Howard included:

- The officers had weighed up the options and we should have confidence in them
- These issues had been discussed previously. Let's see what the response to the advert is
- These were commuters parking. This restriction might displace them to the station car park
- We needed to ensure we considered the responses to the adverts seriously
- How was the survey conducted

The Parking Officer responded that the requested parking scheme would cause displacement and many of the houses already had off-street parking. Much of the parking was by local workers as well as commuters.

The Local Committee resolved to agree:

- (i) The county council's intention to introduce the proposals in Annex 1, **with the additional proposal to amend a section of parking bay of five spaces on Hampton Court Parade to 'Parking Monday - Saturday 8am - 6pm, 30 mins no return 2hrs'**, is formally advertised, and subject to statutory consultation
- (ii) If objections are received the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team manager is authorised to try and resolve them;
- (iii) If any objections cannot be resolved, the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of this committee and the county councillor for the division, decides whether or not they should be acceded to and therefore whether the order should be made, with or without modifications.

Reasons for decision: Changes to the highway network, the built environment and society mean that parking behaviour changes and consequently it is necessary for a Highway Authority to carry out regular

ITEM 2

reviews of waiting and parking restrictions on the highway network. The amendment is to assist businesses on Hampton Court Parade.

45/16 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 12]

Nick Healey, the Area Highways Manager, introduced the report.

Members asked questions about particular issues in relation to the general update on 2016/17 schemes.

NH spoke about the income from the parking agency agreement and how it was revenue income so could be spent on either revenue or capital projects. He explained how this income was a great opportunity to invest in transport development. At the Informal meeting held on 6th July, which borough officers had also attended, the interest in developing the highway network was demonstrated by both organisations. The focus of the Local Committee in recent years had been on funding maintenance with the budget. He added that his proposal was to use the parking agency agreement income to develop schemes and complete the feasibility studies, for which bids could be put forward to the Community Infrastructure Levy board.

County Councillor Mr Stuart Selleck questioned the £100,000 for funding cycling schemes and the funding for both Esher and Brooklands Transport Studies. He suggested that some was spent on resurfacing.

NH confirmed that the detailed cycling schemes would come back to the Local Committee for approval as would the programme for other Highways schemes. He explained that for both Esher and Brooklands money needed to be spent to understand the issues. SCC overall spent 90% of its highways budget on maintenance. His view was that it was better to spend the parking income on unlocking a bigger pot of money.

Members' comments included:

- Congestion around Brooklands and Esher did have an effect on the area functioning
- We needed feasibilities to unlock LEP funding
- Parking income should be used to reduce the number of mud baths caused by cars parked on grass verges

NH added that in relation to the highways budgets for 2017/18 the proposal was to maintain the strategy of dividing the allocation by the nine divisions as per last year. This proposal along with the proposal for the parking income offered a balance of activity of both capital schemes and maintenance.

The additional recommendation at Item 6a, proposed by County Councillor Mike Bennison and seconded by Borough Councillor Tim Oliver, which was dependent on the outcome at Item 12, was agreed.

The Local Committee resolved to:

- (i) Authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s), to prioritise schemes as necessary to ensure the remainder of this

- Financial Year's budgets are fully invested in the road network in Elmbridge (paragraph 2.3 refers);
- (ii) Approve the allocation of £100,000 income from the Parking Agency Agreement to develop Committee's Cycling Strategy, and a further £270,000 to develop Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS), as detailed in paragraph 2.9;
 - (iii) Subject to Committee approving recommendation (ii), delegate to the Cycling Task Group two tasks:
 - a. Devise a programme of projects, for approval by the full Committee, in which to invest the proposed £100,000 allocation from the parking surplus to the Cycling Strategy;
 - b. Update Committee with progress in delivering the programme of projects at its regular formal meetings (paragraph 2.10 refers);
 - (iv) Subject to Committee approving recommendation (ii), establish a new Steering Group to oversee the development and delivery of a Brooklands Transport Study (paragraph 2.12 refers);
 - (v) Approve the strategy for allocation of next Financial Year's budgets as detailed in Table 3 (paragraphs 2.35 to 2.43 refer);
 - (vi) 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
 - (vii) **Agree that £5,000 is allocated from the Parking Agency Agreement income to prepare a feasibility study for the Hinchley Wood Schools recommended measures in preparation for a CIL bid for the early 2017 CIL bidding round**

Reasons for decision: To facilitate delivery of the 2016-17 Highways programmes funded by the Local Committee and to facilitate development of Committee's 2017-18 Highways programmes, while at the same time ensuring that the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Members are fully and appropriately involved in any detailed considerations.

In addition to facilitate investment of income from the Parking Agency Agreement in various schemes in Elmbridge, including proposals recommended in the Hinchley Wood Schools Road Safety Outside Schools report.

46/16 BURWOOD RD JUNCTION WITH PLEASANT PLACE PEDESTRIAN AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 13]

County Councillor Mr Stuart Selleck left the meeting.

Peter Shimadry, Senior Traffic Engineer, introduced the report which he explained detailed the results of the consultation on the proposals to amend the road layout at the junction of Burwood Rd and Pleasant Place. The purpose of the changes to the road layout were to slow traffic and improve pedestrian facilities. The next steps were to work towards detailed design and construction informed by the consultation.

Members' comments included:

- Consultation showed plans had been well received

ITEM 2

- Question as to whether new layout would provide enough space for 2 buses
- Good to see that the plans have managed to maintain parking
- It was encouraging to see support from residents and businesses

Borough Councillor, Mary Sheldon, requested that at the next stage moving the bus shelter and/or stop be looked at and discussed with Waitrose.

Borough Councillors, Malcolm Howard and Graham Woolgar left the meeting.

Peter Shimadry confirmed that option 2 was being progressed and that reference to the concerns over the bus shelter affecting the entrance to the shopping centre were detailed in paragraph 2.8 of the report.

Borough Councillor Tim Oliver left the meeting.

The Local Committee resolved to :

- (i) note the results of the public consultation as set out in this report, particularly that there is overwhelming level of support for the proposals presented for public consultation;
- (ii) note that the preferred option is recognised and will be incorporated in the detailed design;
- (iii) note that the results and feedback will be used to inform the detailed design.

47/16 LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING OF COMMUNITY SAFETY PROJECTS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 14]

Cheryl Poole, Community Partnership and Committee Officer, introduced the report explaining that the proposal to change the administration process for the Community Safety funding had come about following an analysis of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) expenditure across the County in 2015-16.

The Local Committee resolved to:

- (i) The delegated Community Safety budget of £3,000 per Local Committee for 2016/17 is to be retained by the Community Partnership Team, on behalf of the Local Committee, and that the Community Safety Partnership is invited to submit proposals that meet the criteria and principles for funding, as defined at paragraph 2.6 of this report.
- (ii) Authority is delegated to the Community Partnership Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee, to authorise the expenditure of the Community Safety budget in accordance with the criteria and principles stated at paragraph 2.6 of this report.
- (iii) The Committee receives a report detailing the projects that were successful in being awarded the local community safety funding and the outcomes and impact they have achieved.

Reasons for decision: A recent analysis of how the local committees' community safety funds were spent in 2015-16 revealed a mixed picture.

While there were some notable examples of good practice, much of the funding was spent on activities that could have otherwise been delivered either through existing partnership work or by closer synergy with Surrey's established, strategic community safety projects. This will secure greater oversight of the committee's expenditure and better value for money for projects that help to achieve the County's community safety priorities.

Meeting ended at: 6.35 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank