

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
ELMBRIDGE LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 4.00 pm on 4 December 2017
 at Council Chamber, Elmbridge Civic Centre, High Street, Esher, KT10 9SD.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr John O'Reilly (Chairman)
- * Dr Peter Szanto (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Mike Bennison
- * Mr Nick Darby
- * Rachael I. Lake
- * Mrs Mary Lewis
- * Mr Tim Oliver
- * Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
- Mr Tony Samuels

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr David J Archer
- * Cllr Andrew Davis
- * Cllr Barry Fairbank
- Cllr Roy Green
- * Cllr Peter Harman
- * Cllr Malcolm Howard
- * Cllr Andy Muddyman
- Cllr Mrs Mary Sheldon
- * Cllr Graham Woolgar

* In attendance

42/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Borough Councillors, Roy Green and Mary Sheldon, Cllr Andrew Burley substituted for Cllr Sheldon, and County Councillor Tony Samuels.

43/17 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 2]

The Chairman reported that possible changes to the Council's Constitution on matters delegated to the Local Committee are being considered by the Local Committee Chairmen's Group.

He highlighted that South Western Railways are currently consulting on changes to their timetables. If these are agreed there would be no direct services to and from London in the evening to Hersham, Esher, Walton and Weybridge which would be a reduction in service for local residents.

ITEM 6

44/17 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 3]

Three public questions were received. The questions and responses were published in the supplementary papers for the Committee. Consideration of these was deferred to Item 8 as they all related to that report.

45/17 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 4]

The minutes were confirmed as a correct record.

46/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 5]

Mrs Mary Lewis declared a personal interest in item 8 as a resident in the area.

47/17 PETITIONS [Item 6]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager (NE)

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: Four petitions were received. An update to the officer response in relation to Hare Lane is attached in the supplementary papers for the Committee to reflect the petitioners intention that the area to be considered should be between the Swan public house and the railway bridge.

Petition 1 - Mr Dorudi indicated that he was representing the residents of Bowes Road who would like to see a traffic survey to determine speed and traffic volume. The existing traffic calming has had little effect on the speed of traffic in the road and with around 800 residential units being built in the area in the next 12 months, the road which was only designed for residential use will suffer from increased traffic volumes. There are many families in this area and the road is dangerous.

Petition 2 – Mr Matic Langford indicated that the whole street would like to find a way in which the street can retain its tree lined appearance and requested some flexibility in the guidelines used by the highways department. Residents are happy to pay for the new trees.

Petition 3 – Mrs Bresson-Joseph asked the Committee to address the issues which makes the crossing, used by many local children, dangerous. Many cars jump the red light and she didn't feel that the response to the petition addressed the particular issue of children using the crossing.

Petition 4 – Lucy Wright indicated that the area which the petition seeks to address is primarily residential and there is only a narrow footpath along approximately 380 of the 400m in question, which is on the opposite side of the road to the properties. More children would be able to walk to school if the route was safer. She didn't accept that a reduction in the speed limit would impact on adjoining roads as there would be no time saved by taking an alternative route.

There was no indication of any further public questions or statements so the Committee moved to debate the options.

Member Discussion – key points

Petition 1 - Members acknowledged that it is a very busy road particularly at peak times and the roundabout at the end appears to be quite dangerous, but there does not seem to be an obvious solution. The Area Highways Manager indicated that there had been no casualties in this area in the last three years and as traffic calming measures are already in place, other areas would be a higher priority for any investment. The response was noted.

Petition 2 – The local county councillor supported the petition. This road is similar to many others in the area. Pedestrian usage is limited so there didn't seem to be a need for a wide footway allowing people to pass each other as this would not be a regular issue and they would be happy to wait for others to come through. Other members agreed that whilst it was good to have a standard to work to there could perhaps be more flexibility to have a slightly different standard on those footways that are lightly trafficked as long as there is sufficient access for a single disabled vehicle. The Area Highways Manager indicated that there was no objection to the principle of trees in the public highway. However, attitudes and standards have changed since many of the existing trees were planted. The number of vehicles parked and using the road has increased substantially, regulations to allow access for the disabled have come into force and residents are more likely to submit insurance claims alleging damage to property as a result of tree encroachment. It is also difficult for trees to thrive when planted in a hard surface, particularly if replanted in an existing tree pit. Creating a new tree pit is difficult due to driveways and conflict with utility services. He agreed to discuss the current guidelines with members of the Committee informally.

Petition 3 – The local county councillor agreed that this is a dangerous road to cross. Prior to the crossing being installed there was a footbridge over the road which was safer to use but had come to the end of its life. He suggested that a rumble strip could be used to encourage vehicles to slow down or that the speed limit should be reduced. Other members agreed that this is a very busy road and that it was particularly important to ensure that the crossing is as safe as possible given that it is close to several schools and used by many children. The Area Highways Manager responded that the area approaching the crossing already has most of the safety features that would be appropriate in this type of location. There is no excuse for drivers not to be aware of either the speed limit or the existence of the crossing. In addition the lights at the crossing detect the speed of approaching vehicles and adjust the timing of the green man signal accordingly. Whatever measures are employed there will always be a minority of drivers who feel that they can ignore the red lights. The installation of a rumble strip would be a relatively cheap measure, but has the potential for noise and vibration which could affect local residents and so the distance of properties from the location would have to be considered.

Petition 4 – The local county councillor agreed that the road is dangerous and that there is an area of vegetation on private land which should be cut back to increase the width of the footway and improve visibility. It has proved difficult to find the owner of the property and he suggested that if this is not possible the county council should carry out the work and invoice the owners. Members discussed 20mph restrictions which have been put in place in areas outside Surrey, without additional traffic calming measures. The Area Highway Manager responded that unless the speeds are already close to

ITEM 6

20mph the only way to consistently change driver behaviour is to change the road in a way that forces drivers to travel more slowly. The Committee would need to decide whether this would be a priority for funding. It was noted that Claygate Parish Council has funding from the local element of the Community Infrastructure Levy and may be able to contribute some funding if this was felt to be a priority for the area. Members asked for a presentation at a future informal meeting on the impact of speed limits to improve their understanding of the issues. The Chairman proposed that no action should be taken at this time. On a vote this was DEFEATED by 5 votes FOR to 9 AGAINST. The Committee, therefore agreed to allocate funding for a speed assessment and analysis of options.

Resolved:

Nightingale Avenue – Petition 2

To note the response provided, but to ask the Area Highways Manager to consider whether there could be more flexibility in the tree planting guidelines for residential roads with low footfall and to report back to the Committee if changes are possible.

A309 Kingston by-pass pedestrian crossing – Petition 3

That the Highways Area Manager be asked to consider whether there are any further measures, such as the installation of a rumble strip at this location, which could be considered to improve safety and report back to the Committee.

Hare Lane, Claygate – Petition 4

That £5,000 be allocated from the Committee's parking surplus to fund a speed assessment in Hare Lane to inform a decision on what further work, if any, may be required in the area.

Reasons: to respond to issues raised by local residents in the form of petitions to the Committee.

48/17 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

No member questions were received.

49/17 A245 STOKE ROAD - SPEED LIMIT [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: Mrs Mary Lewis declared a personal interest as a resident in the area.

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager (NE)

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:

Three public questions had been received. The questions and responses were contained in the supplementary papers, together with an additional paper which corrected an incorrect figure in the original report and addressed

issues which had been raised following the publication of the report in relation to the validity of the data being used. This information was noted.

The Chairman indicated that he had received a number of letters from local residents opposing an increase in the speed limit to 40mph, although there were a minority who were in favour.

Mr Elbourne indicated that he was representing over 300 local residents who signed a petition in 2009 requesting the reduction of the speed limit to 30mph. He had supplied members of the Committee with background information on the issue prior to the meeting. He drew the Committee's attention to what he considered to be inaccurate, inconsistent and misleading information contained in the officer report. He stated that further historic data is available, but as this has not been used for comparison it was only possible to compare data from two sites rather than sites along the length of the road as required by the SCC speed limit policy. In addition, the recent data had been collected over a three week period, which does not comply with the SCC policy which specifies it should be collected over a one week period. For the September survey the 30mph signs had been removed from the area. He did not accept that the other areas cited in the report, where speed limits had been increased from 30 to 40 mph with a reduction in mean speeds, were comparable with this area.

He felt that the installation of 30mph repeater signs, as used on many other roads, would help drivers to comply with the speed limit and asked the Committee to request that the limit is regularly enforced by Surrey Police. Residents have contacted the police asking to establish a Community Speed Watch in the area but are still awaiting training. He suggested that speeds could be reduced by means of simple measures including the reactivation of the two vehicle activated (VAS) signs to operate at 30mph and the widening of traffic islands.

There was no indication of any further public questions or statements so the Committee moved to debate the options.

Member Discussion – key points

The Area Highways Manager responded that evidence shows that signs are only one factor in determining a driver's choice of speed. Stoke Road appears to be semi-rural in nature and many drivers would interpret this as a road with a 40mph limit. Setting a limit at a level that drivers expect increases the level of compliance. He apologised for the one figure in the report which was incorrect and had been amended in the additional information published subsequently. The information provided is now correct and compliant with the requirements of the speed limit policy. He also reported that a representative of Surrey police had been invited to the meeting, but was unable to attend due to a prior commitment. 30mph repeater signs must not be installed in an area where there is a system of street lights as there is in Stoke Road. A 30mph sign can be used in conjunction with a speed camera sign, but these must be in enforcement areas. He invited anyone who felt that 30mph repeater signs had been used in other road in the County to notify him, to enable any mistake to be investigated and rectified. He believed that the original petition and the wish of residents is to make the road safer, but changing the limit alone has not achieved this and so one of the two options

ITEM 6

outlined in the report must be taken forward to comply with the policy, both options are equally valid.

Members commented that they would like to see a Community Speed Watch established in the area, as this helps the police to target their resources, and improved enforcement by Surrey Police. The Chairman agreed to raise the matter with the Police.

Some members commented that they felt uncomfortable with the data being presented and were not persuaded that this demonstrated that the limit should be increased. If measures are implemented to try and improve compliance future monitoring should take place over a one week period to allow comparison with previous data.

The Area Highways Manager agreed that the VAS signs could be reactivated at 30mph and other measures such as the width of traffic islands considered. If the Committee agreed to allocate £5,000 the previous study could be revisited and other measures considered in consultation with local members. If appropriate a bid for funding from the Community Infrastructure Levy could be considered to fund a long term solution.

Resolved:

- (i) That £5,000 be set aside from the original CIL contribution and the parking surplus to investigate measures to reduce traffic speeds and report possible options back to Committee for review; and
- (ii) Should viable measures be identified, to identify appropriate funding and implement such measures and monitor the effects on vehicle speeds in line with Surrey's policy 'Setting Local Speed Limits'.

Reasons: Recommendations have been made based on Surrey's policy 'Setting Local Speed Limits', in consultation with Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team.

50/17 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager (NE)

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member comments – key points

Members were disappointed that the condition of the worst roads in the Borough will not be addressed in the coming year even if they are not considered to be unsafe.

Resolved:

- (i) To prioritise St Mary's Road, Surbiton, for resurfacing in 2018-19, using the £38,636 that was allocated for a maintenance scheme by Committee in September 2017 from the 2018-19 capital budget;

- (ii) To authorise the advertisement of a traffic regulation order to permit buses, delivery vehicles and emergency services' vehicles to pass through a "gateway" that has been included in the detailed design for the next phase of the Burwood Road junction with Pleasant Place scheme, to provide a turning opportunity for these vehicles;
- (iii) To approve seven new ITS projects, as set out in the report, to be funded from the parking surplus allocations that are not yet fully committed;
- (iv) To approve the advertisement of a traffic regulation order for a new U-turn ban in Hampton Court Way between Embercourt Road and the Ember River bridge, in both directions, and that if there are no significant objections to the traffic regulation order, that the order is made to enable the new ban to come into force as soon as possible;
- (v) To approve nineteen new bus stop clearways as detailed in the report and Annexes G and H;
- (vi) To 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 2018-19 Highways programmes funded by the Local Committee to be decided in good time to facilitate timely delivery of those programmes.

Further recommendations have been made, to facilitate implementation of the next phase of the Burwood Road junction with Pleasant Place UTS scheme, to enable a new U-turn ban to be introduced to mitigate a pattern of casualties, and to facilitate the introduction of a number of bus stop clearways.

51/17 FUTURE OF PARKING REVIEWS IN ELMBRIDGE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Adrian Harris, Parking Engineer

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member comments – key points

Members discussed the options available. Some were in favour of a condensed two year programme with a change of the grouping of areas as this would allow for a fuller local consultation similar to that which has happened under the current process. However others were concerned that this meant that urgent issues in a particular area could not be addressed quickly if this area was later in the programme for review of a review had recently been completed. The Parking Engineer responded that an annual review would be less detailed and there would be less consultation possible with the community. In addition it may not be possible to look at larger more detailed parking schemes.

ITEM 6

Members felt that the public often don't understand the complexities of the process and requested advice on what to tell residents what to expect in terms of the timescales for an issue to be addressed. There could also be parking issues that needed to be addressed as a result of new development. The Parking Engineer commented that there is guidance on the process on the SCC website although this relates more to Residents Parking Zones than yellow lines. Parking issues associated with new developments should be addressed as part of the planning agreement as a result of any restrictions requested through the transportation planning process. On a vote 8 members voted for an annual review and 7 for a two year review. It was therefore

Resolved:

That the parking review process from June 2018 should continue to be carried out by a dedicated engineer, but that the whole Borough should be considered in each review which would take place annually.

Reasons: The existing three year review cycle is drawing to a close and the future direction of parking reviews needs to be decided.

52/17 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE ANNUAL REPORT 2016-17 [SERVICE MONITORING - FOR INFORMATION] [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Kevin Noble, Assistant Group Commander Surrey Fire & Rescue Service

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member comments – key points

The officer highlighted the increase in the number of properties with smoke alarms. A member asked whether the alarms are checked on visits to make sure that they are still operational as the detectors deteriorate with age. It was noted that new alarms no longer require batteries to be checked and can be fitted for free by the service.

He updated members on the progress of the Respect the Water Campaign which had been supported by the Committee through an allocation from their community safety budget. Throw lines have been purchased and are being put in pubs along the river with staff being given training in how to use them. The next stage is to install boards along the river with safety advice and an emergency number to call. Callers will then be given a code to unlock a case containing the throw line. The boards will also have a location number which will help emergency services to locate the incident. There will be nine sites in Elmbridge in the first year. It was suggested that county councillors may like to support this project with any funding remaining in their member allocation or that a bid could be made for Community Infrastructure Funding.

The Committee recognised the achievements of the Borough teams within Elmbridge Borough and supported their commitment to improve initiatives to reduce risk and make Elmbridge Borough safer through the delivery of the Borough/Station plan and noted the initiatives set within the Elmbridge

Borough plan for 2016/17 and supported the Fire and Rescue Service in the delivery of this plan.

53/17 RIVER THAMES SCHEME [ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN - FOR INFORMATION] [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Tina Donaldson, Environment Agency, Ben Skipp, SCC River Thames Local Authority Programme Manager.

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member comments – key points

Noted that the final outline design and detailed modelling will be available next year. The scheme is designed not to make the situation worse for anyone elsewhere and consultations have taken place with the tidal Thames team. Members were concerned that the benefits at Molesey are minimal and if the model is flawed they could be made worse. There was no land available in this area to create an additional channel, but the Environment Agency will also work with communities to help them to put measures in place to help in the event of a flood. Members were invited to register on the Environment Agency website to receive regular newsletters with updates and flood alerts. Work is currently taking place on a business case to submit to the treasury.

Members asked whether the team work with Surrey Fire & Rescue to improve river safety. Much work on safety has been done along the Jubilee river, but officers agreed to take back this suggestion to the design team to ensure that it is not overlooked when the work is carried out.

It was noted that there is still a substantial funding gap, much work has been put into addressing this. The development of the scheme means that there can be more certainty around the final costs.

Members thanked the officers for the informative presentation.

54/17 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER [FOR DECISION] [Item 13]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nicola Morris, Partnership Committee Officer

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member comments – key points

None

Resolved: That those items marked as closed on the decision tracker should be removed from the tracker.

Reasons: To keep the tracker up to date.

ITEM 6

55/17 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 14]

Monday 5 March at 4pm in Elmbridge Civic Centre.

Meeting ended at: 6.50 pm

Chairman