



SURREY

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL
27 November 2017**

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

**Question 1 – Cllr Martin Olney
Re: SCC Highways Budget**

It has been alleged that the SCC Highways Budget has remained roughly the same this year as it was last year. Can you confirm that the published figures suggest a 37% reduction this year over the previous year? Can you also confirm that the Epsom & Ewell Local Committee Highway Budget was £355k in 2106/2017 and this year is £77K? Can you tell me how many projects are being considered for funding by Horizon that are in the Epsom West District?

Officer Response:

The overall revenue and capital budgets for the Council's Highways service for 2016-17 and for 2017-18 are as follows:

Revenue	
2016-17	£51,925,000
2017-18	£52,766,000
Capital	
2016-17	£58,133,000
2017-18	£49,286,000

Full details of the Council's financial plans (including previous financial plans) are available here: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/your-council/council-tax-and-finance/medium-term-financial-plan>.

The total revenue and capital budgets delegated to the Epsom & Ewell Local Committee in 2016-17 were £355,433, and in the current Financial Year 2017-18 are £77,273.

The lists of schemes to be considered for funding under the Horizon programme are published here: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-maintenance-and-cleaning/horizon-highway-maintenance-investment-programme>.

**Question 2 – Cllr Martin Olney
Re: Yellow lines - Wheelers Lane**

I made an attempt last year to have the yellow lines in Wheelers Lane re-painted. I was told that this was not done on an ad hoc basis, but was scheduled maintenance. The state of the lines is now so poor that commuters can legitimately assert that there aren't any. I also get the lines swept on a regular basis to remove leaves. Unfortunately this also removes even more of the yellow lines. Can you tell me if and when Wheelers Lane will get the yellow lines re-painted?

ITEM 3

Officer Response:

The refreshment works have been ordered for Wheelers Lane - we have made contact with the lining contractor, so hopefully they will be repainted before the end of November. It is however, weather dependent.

Question 3 – Sally Yates

Re: Disabled parking bay – Chartwell Place

Could the Council confirm that the disabled parking bay in Chartwell Place in Epsom is:

a) for the use of any blue badge holder

And that it can only be used by non-blue badge holders under the following two exceptions

b) if a non-blue badge holder, only if the blue badge holder is in the car with them or

c) if a non-blue badge holder, if they are picking up or dropping off the blue badge holder

Officer response:

This is an advisory Disabled Bay, but still allows any driver to park in it without condition. These are put in as a 'polite notice' to advise drivers that there is a disabled person in the vicinity who requires parking near to their property as an aid to gaining access to and from said property.

These are only installed following receipt of documents, such as the V5 form and disable blue badge form, as proof of the requirement for such a bay.

Installing these types of bays is the first step towards assisting a disabled resident, however if it is abused, SCC can make the bay into a mandatory (enforceable bay) as part of a parking review - this requires an amendment to the traffic regulation order. By making a bay mandatory, it would only be blue badge holders who could use the bay, as long as they display their blue badge in the window.

Question 4 – Annie Thackray

Re: Parking restrictions – Chartwell Place

In relation to the proposed parking restrictions to be introduced on Chartwell Place, Epsom:

1. Can the Committee confirm that the specific issue of parking restrictions in Chartwell Place was raised at the March meeting as stated in writing by David Hodge, CEO of SCC (letter dated 8.11.17: "I can confirm that the entire parking review was taken to the two committees both in March and June") and by Steve Clavey, Senior Engineer (email dated 20.9.17: "The proposals were considered at both the March and June committees")?
2. Following a resident survey, 92% of immediate residents who responded oppose the parking restrictions in Chartwell Place in addition to the 147 parents and residents who formally objected to the introduction of 8-hour parking restrictions.

In light of these objections, will the committee be re-visiting the time period allocated to the restrictions?

3. In line with other local infant schools (e.g. St Martin's CofE Infants, Epsom Primary and most recently Cuddington County First School) will the timing of the parking restrictions be adjusted or a 30-minute parking period be permitted, to facilitate the safe drop off and collection of the young pupils that attend St Christopher's School?
4. Would the Committee explain where they propose the nearest parking place will be situated for parents to drop off and collect their 2 and a half year to 7 old children under the existing proposals which envisage 8-hour restrictions which overlap with drop off and several pick-up times?
5. What responsibility does the Committee have to ensuring that a local school, which has been operating in the heart of the Borough for 80 years and existed prior to the creation of Chartwell Place, is able to protect the ability of its parents to safely collect and drop off such young children?
6. Can the Committee explain why EEBC has elected not to involve the School at any stage of the limited discussion or consultation that has been carried on this matter?

Officer response:

1. The parking review was considered at two meetings in both March and June, with the Chartwell Place proposals being brought to the June committee.
2. The feedback from the notice of intent was considered by the Divisional member/ Vice Chairman and officers and adjudicated by the Chairman of the committee. A decision has been made to progress based on safety grounds. It would be for the members of the committee to decide if they wanted to reconsider parking proposals in this area in a future review.
3. In relation to the schools mentioned, there are a limited number of bays in Worple Road, which operate outside of school drop off and pick up times, however the road has a double yellow line opposite these, which still allows access to other vehicles who wish to use the road. The intended use of the parking bays in Temple Road is to serve the shops and not the school, as shop keepers were finding that they were losing footfall, because of inconsiderate parking. Likewise with the parking bays on Vale Road.
4. We have already informed the school that the yellow lines will still allow parents to board and alight their vehicles, and to guide a vulnerable person to a place of safety - what it does not allow for is parents to park for an unlimited period.
5. The issue is that we do not believe that the safety of young children is being considered - SCC and councillors have witnessed drivers mounting the footway and reversing on said footway without any consideration to pedestrians. We have also witnessed pupils being walked in the middle of the road to gain access to the school. There is a disabled resident in the area who has to push a wheelchair in the road as no access can be gained to the footway.

ITEM 3

All of these point to a real safety issues, where no consideration has been given to other users of the public highway, who may want to use the footpath as intended, or indeed use the carriageway as intended.

Current parking situations do not allow large vehicles, such as emergency vehicles, to gain access. As the Highway Authority, we have to make sure that the public highway can be used safely as intended - the current situation prevents this.

6. Epsom and Ewell Borough Council is not involved in the implementation of these proposals, they will only enforce once the lines are installed.

It must also be taken into account that this is not a consultation, but an advert of intent - this means that we will introduce the restrictions although the feedback from the advert is taken into account. However, we do have the power to overrule any feedback if we believe that it jeopardises the safety of the users of the public highway.

The minimum requirement for us to advertise, is a notice in the local paper - over and above this, we put up street notices on available lamp columns or posts and letter drop where necessary.

The school says that it did not receive a notice, but were alerted by members of their staff and in fact did respond to the advert during the advertising period, which proves that the notices do work. The advertising period was also extended by a week to accommodate the school holiday period.

Question 5 – Hugh Ricketts

Re: Epsom & St Helier Hospitals Strategy

In the light of the engagement recently undertaken by our local hospitals trust, what does the committee see as its role in the development of the strategy and what further action does it propose to take in this regard?

Chairman's response:

The Committee does not currently intend to have an active role in the process, but it will monitor the situation and take action if necessary. It supports the call to retain hospital services in Epsom and Ewell for local residents.

Question 6 – Hugh Ricketts

Re: Highway Prioritisation

How does the highways department prioritize and evaluate its work?

Officer response:

This is a very wide ranging question. The response seeks to cover the major activities that the Council's Highways Service delivers.

The Council's prioritisation policy for its major maintenance capital investment programmes is published online here:

https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0016/45052/Prioritisation-Policy-and-Criteria-v3.pdf.

Also published online are this year's capital investment programmes, together with lists of sites for consideration for future years: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-maintenance-and-cleaning/horizon-highway-maintenance-investment-programme>.

The Council also has a programme of major transport projects, for which the county council seeks funding from a number of sources including Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and the Department for Transport (DfT). Details of this programme are published here: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roads-and-transport-policies-plans-and-consultations/major-transport-projects>.

The Council also delivers considerable revenue funded programmes each year, including:

- Repair of Safety Defects (<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roads-and-transport-policies-plans-and-consultations/roads-and-transport-policies-and-plans/highway-safety-inspections-standards-and-procedures>);
- Environmental maintenance including grass cutting, tree management and hedgerow management – some of these activities are delivered on the Council's behalf by the Boroughs and Districts within Surrey;
- Streetlighting and other illuminated street furniture – repairs and paying the electricity bill;
- Drainage repairs and routine gully cleaning;
- Maintenance of signs and road markings;
- Maintenance of crash barriers – repairs and tensioning;
- Minor repairs to structures;
- Parking development, and parking enforcement (which is delivered on the Council's behalf by the Boroughs and Districts within Surrey).

Small capital and revenue budgets are delegated to the Council's eleven Local and Joint Committees that operate within the different Borough and District areas. These budgets are prioritised by the eleven Committees to target local needs.

Officers would be pleased to provide further details of any of the activities delivered by the Highways Service.

Question 7 – Nigel Collin

Re: 166 bus route

The 166 bus route is a major lifeline for several older members in the community and for local school children. The route is, we understand being put out to tender and there is a possibility that the service will be terminated due to a lack of funding. Councillor Mountain has advised that SCC has no funds available and that funding is solely a matter for Transport for London. What pressure is SCC bringing to bear to ensure that this essential service continues?

Officer response:

Service 166 is tendered and operated under the direct control of London Buses and is not under the jurisdiction of Surrey County Council. Although we do have a cross boundary service agreement with London Buses this does not include any financial obligation from Surrey County Council.

ITEM 3

We are however aware that London Buses have recently retendered service 166, without any consultation with Surrey County Council. Various options have been tendered, one of which is to terminate the service in Banstead and no longer operate through to Epsom Hospital. The County Council has arranged to meet with London Buses to discuss the tender results and the future of the service in Surrey. We are of course very supportive of the service continuing to serve Epsom Hospital as it currently does.

We are unable to guarantee the future of service 166 in Surrey at this time but would like to assure the Local Committee that we remain fully supportive of the current arrangements continuing without change.

Question 8 – Nigel Collin
Re: Epsom General Hospital

Given the London centric bias in the Epsom and St Helier Trust, as evidenced by the proposals set out in the recent consultation, what steps is SCC taking to preserve a full range of services at Epsom General Hospital which, unlike St Helier, is a Surrey hospital, and is currently having several services transferred to St Helier's Hospital.

Officer response:

SCC sent the response below to Daniel Elkeles, CEX ESHT, to their recent engagement process:

Surrey County Council supports Epsom and St Helier University Hospital NHS Trusts' need to consult with Surrey residents on the quality and sustainability of their health services to Surrey residents.

Surrey County Council is a key partner in the Epsom Health and Care Alliance which is a formal partnership between ourselves, CSH Surrey (community provider), GP Health Partners (federation of 19 practices covering 210,000 patients in the Epsom / Leatherhead area) and Epsom and St Helier University Hospital NHS Trust (acute provider). The partnership has been working for two years with local people and communities to establish new and improved ways of providing care for people aged over 65 years. The fully integrated service involving all partners is making a demonstrable improvement to the lives of local people and their carers and has resulted in fewer people needing admission to hospital as an emergency and more patients coming home from hospital sooner with ongoing care provided in their homes.

Surrey County Council are committed to working in partnership with the Trust and the Epsom Health and Care Alliance to improve the quality, sustainability and delivery of health and care services to local residents.