

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL  
11 March 2013**

**MEMBER QUESTIONS**

**Question 1 Mrs Jan Mason**

**Re: Surrey Fire & Rescue**

Why is the chief Fire Officer committed to spending a lot of money on a new station at Burgh Heath when even the statistics show it is not needed.?

Why is he still committed to reducing to one pump at Epsom when at the same time we have hundreds of new homes and high rise developments being built in our borough?

What are his short and long term plans for the use of the outside company SGI, which I understand specialises in search and rescue (rescue from height, water, subsurface etc) not fire fighting or road traffic collision extrication?

Who will provide the fire cover needed after 2014 when we have reduced the number of pumps covering Epsom to Horley/ West Sussex borders from 5 to 4?

I as a resident do not want Epsom to be a one pump nor do I want my fire cover to be provided by a private company with limited training.

**Officer Response:**

The Public Safety Plan 2011-2020 (PSP) outlined plans to have two fire engines during the day and one at night based at the current Epsom fire station. The second phase of the PSP indicated an aspiration to provide a new fire station in the Burgh Heath area, which would impact on the fire engines based at Epsom and Reigate. The recent consultation on emergency response cover locations in Epsom and Ewell and Reigate and Banstead builds upon the PSP taking into account the changes at Horley by also seeking to provide a new location in the Salfords area.

These plans are based upon emergency response cover modelling using seven years of historical incident data and in accordance with the predicted improvement to the overall first response standard for the county and for Reigate and Banstead in particular.

These plans relocate one of Epsom's appliances; they do not 'remove' it from being able to make a response into Epsom or its environs. It must continue to be recognised that response cover is provided by the most appropriate fire engine(s) based upon a sophisticated system based prediction of the nearest and quickest response available. The addition of new homes and commercial developments is happening across the county and the Service continually monitor the changing environment within Surrey, having stated very clearly its intention to become a far more flexible and nimble organisation, able to react to changing risk.

Specialist Group International Ltd are currently contracted as part of a pilot scheme for the provision of contingency crewing, which is a clear statutory requirement. To ensure that this

contract provides as much benefit as possible to the county they are also providing a number of specialist rescue functions, which form an element of the core business for the company. A review will be undertaken during the first half of the pilot and a report will be provided to the SCC Cabinet with recommendations as to the future post-pilot period provision of a contingency crewing capability.

The 'chain' of four one fire engine stations will provide the first response required. As is currently the case, once further resources are required these will be provided from other stations within Surrey and/or from neighbouring Fire and Rescue Services as appropriate.

Your views have been noted as part of the consultation process. Emergency response cover is being provided by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service fire fighters, and this proposal does not change that. As described above, the use of SGI is focused upon providing specialist rescue skills, which are the core of the company's business. Staff from SGI are also receiving exactly the same standard of training in fire and rescue operations that Surrey Fire and Rescue staff receive should they be required to provide the contingency crewing for which they have been contracted.

**Question 2 Mrs Jan Mason**  
**Re: Yo-Yo Youth Centre**

As chairman of the Youth Task Group we have concerns regarding the number of Youth Centres in our Borough. On the original plans it shows 3 centres namely Lintons Centre, The Edge and Yo-Yo. However we now find that Yo-Yo has been reduced to a satellite of Lintons Centre! Yo-Yo was to have its own youth leader and programme of activities etc. When, how and why did this occur and when will the Yo-Yo be reinstated as a full youth centre for the Borough?

**Officer Response:**

Given the nature and complexity of the question, it is not possible to provide an answer in time for submission at the Local Committee. Officers will urgently look into the issues you have raised and provide a written response within one week of the Local Committee.

**Question 3 Mrs Jan Mason**  
**Re: Horton Lane Speeding**

In October 2012 a group consisting of SCC highways officers, Surrey Police and SCC Cllr Colin Taylor and myself met on site to discuss ways in which we could reduce the speed of vehicles and motorbikes along this road. Could you please inform me as to SCC's plans and when this will be implemented?

**Officer Response:**

At the site meeting in October it was agreed that road markings would be laid as an experiment to see if it could deter the motorcyclists from speeding on the approaches to the roundabouts at Hook Road and West Park during the summer period. Research has now been carried out into the type of road markings that would be best suited to achieve the aim of deterring motorcyclists but not affecting other road users to the same degree. The type of road marking chosen have been used in Surrey before and have proved to be effective. However, only once the longer evenings and summer weekends begin will it be known if it has the desired effect on motorcyclists. SCC will continue to work with the Police on monitoring the situation.

The road markings are expected to be laid before the end of the financial year as agreed at the meeting. The works are currently programmed to be carried out week commencing the 11th March although this is dependent on the weather.

**Question 4 Mr Colin Taylor**  
**Re: 3 old CPZs in Stamford ward**

Please clarify the current status of yellow lines and marked parking bays in the former CPZs at Hookfield etc, Burnet Grove etc and Marshalls Close etc.

Can anyone park in the marked bays at any time?

**Officer Response:**

Currently, the yellow lines are enforceable, but the bays are not as no permits are being issued for these CPZs.

**Question 5 Mr Colin Taylor**  
**Re: West Hill - Christ Church Road cycle path**

What is now the expected start date for this long-awaited cycle route upgrade?

Does it include the link under the railway to West Street?

Is there provision for "cyclists dismount" signs at this point?

Can such signs be provided at an early date to allay public safety concerns for pedestrians?

**Officer Response:**

At this time we do not have a programme start date from the Developer. However it is thought to be in the near future. The scheme includes a cycleway under the railway bridge at West Street near Station Approach. Cycle dismount signs will be part of the signing schedule for the scheme.

We can ensure that the signs are erected as soon as work commences.

**Question 6 Mr Colin Taylor**  
**Re: West Hill Avenue**

Will the Engineers responsible ever respond to the request to check the alleged sub-standard micro-asphalt surfacing?

**Officer Response:**

An engineer has visited West Hill Avenue last week to have another look at this site. There is quite a lot of residual stone still there, so a request has been made to have the whole road swept as soon as possible.

The main issue seems to be that, due to cars being parked on one side of the road, not all the road is being trafficked, therefore the surface finish tends to look uneven, which does not show the micro in the best light.

Once it has been swept we will re-inspect and decide if any remedial action is necessary.

**Question 7 Mr Colin Taylor**

**Re: Corner of Station Approach and Waterloo Road outside the Travelodge**

A local resident tells me that the old damaged guard rails are being removed (I am currently house-bound) and on enquiry she was told they will not be replaced.

She says she was assured that this has been agreed by all the relevant local councillors. As I am currently the relevant local county councillor this is not true.

I have not been consulted and if I had been I would not have agreed.

This may be related to discussions in the Town Centre street furniture working group, but I don't believe they can over-rule the local member other than by a decision of the whole Local Committee.

I am aware of the danger to cyclists of being trapped between guard rails and vehicles. I am also aware of the modern view that herding pedestrians behind railings is undesirable.

However the point here is that these railings were put there to prevent vehicles mounting the footway, which used to happen too often for safety. They have since been damaged more than once by vehicles. If they had not been there pedestrians might have been injured. The fact that (reported) accident statistics are low means the railings are doing a useful job of ensuring safety, in my view.

It would, of course, be better to have bollards, which together with the poles for the traffic signals would do a better job at keeping vehicles off the footway whilst forming a lesser hazard for cyclists and avoiding corralling pedestrians.

Maybe this is the plan, I certainly hope so.

What is intended and why have I not been consulted?

**Officer Response:**

The guardrail panels on the corner of Waterloo Road and Station Approach were removed during construction of the footway outside the travelodge many months ago. The S278 works associated with the development of the station required the developer to replace the guardrail with similar to that which was removed. However this did not match the stainless steel guardrail used extensively in Station Approach and provided as part of the Hudson House development. SCC asked for guardrail to match the new stainless steel panels but was told that due to the high cost of the stainless steel panels the developer would not be willing to supply as many panels. (A meeting is due to take place regarding the S278 works on 18th March and the possibility of providing bollards in place of guardrail can be discussed.)

In the meantime, the Street Furniture Working Group had discussed the removal of guardrail throughout the town centre. Some of the group were in favour of mass removal of guardrail while others were not so keen, and it was left to a site visit with a representative of Swail House and a Safety Auditor to determine where panels could be removed throughout the town centre. The area at the junction of Waterloo Road and Station Approach was not considered to be an area where guardrail was essential. There is no reason why vehicles should mount the footway in Station Approach. The Spread Eagle junction does not have guardrail and this does not appear to cause any problems for pedestrians.

The purpose of the guardrail at junctions is primarily to encourage pedestrians to cross at the crossing point and not cut corners on the approach to the crossing. It is not used to protect pedestrians and the current way of thinking is to remove all guardrail from junctions. This has been done in the TfL area of London and SCC is monitoring the effects of removing guardrail.

A scheme to widen the footway under the Waterloo Road rail bridge is currently being designed. The proposal will be to create a shared use footway / cycleway from Horsley Close to the station entrance which will continue through to the West Street junction to link with the West Hill shared use cycleway. The design will be subject to safety audit and it maybe that some form of barrier is required, either bollards or guardrail.

**Question 7 Mr Colin Taylor**  
**Re: Yo-Yo Centre**

I see from the notes of the Youth Work Task Group that "Yo-Yo is still classed as a satellite and therefore matched provision is outside of the contract."

With Lintons closing Yo-Yo can hardly remain as a satellite to it,

Will there be activities at Phoenix?

Will they include group activities?

Will they be open to all?

What does the Local Committee need to do to improve this situation?

**Officer Response:**

When Surrey County Council moves its operation from Lintons Youth Centre to the site at the Phoenix Club, it will act as a direct replacement and will therefore fulfil the requirements we have for delivering centre-based youth work. There will be a full range of youth work activities run from the new site at the Phoenix Club. The programme of activities is currently being worked up by the Youth & Community Worker in charge of the centre based youth work. This programme will be based on the needs of the young people and will typically include a wide range of activities designed to engage young people. The youth centre will be open to all, although some specialist interest groups and issue based work may necessitate a closed group/targeted approach, again this will be based on the needs of young people.

**Question 8 Mr Colin Taylor**  
**Re: Phase 6 Parking Restrictions**

What is now the best estimate for completing the remaining work on Phase 6 parking restrictions?

**Officer Response:**

There are three more signs to do - 2 on Ladbroke Road and one on Heathcote Road. They should be done by the Committee.

We will then be going round with an E&E representative to sign off the permit zones, before they start their enforcement.

This page is intentionally left blank