

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL
23 September 2013**

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

**Question 1 – 6 – Colin Wing
Re: Highways Issues**

Question:

1. Can Surrey paint narrower yellow lines in conservation areas? This would save on paint as well as being less visually intrusive.
2. Does Surrey have a policy for equipping its contractors' lorries and training their drivers with a view to reducing collisions with vulnerable road users? For example, membership of the Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS).
3. Why are deliveries allowed on the east side of Waterloo Road outside peak times, even though there are no premises to which to deliver?
4. The central refuges in Epsom Road, Ewell, cause conflict between cyclists and other vehicles. The consequences of a collision could be made worse by the guardrails at the side of the road. Can these be removed?
5. Why is there no dropped kerb at the junction of Cheam Road, Ewell, with the road to the High Street car park at the side of the residential part of the Sainsbury site? This was omitted when the footway was renewed outside the Sainsbury site.
6. Will the footways of Cheam Road, Ewell be resurfaced as part of Operation Horizon, as well as the carriageway? The SW footway in particular is in a poor condition.

Officer Response:

1. Surrey County Council does generally paint narrower yellow lines in conservation areas - these are usually 50mm wide as opposed to the usual 75mm (on a 30mph road) and are a primrose colour. The narrower marking is in fact slightly more expensive than the usual yellow lines being 39p per meter as opposed to 33p per meter for the standard yellow lines - this is because the colour is not standard. The rates for implementation are the same for both, and it is this rate that usually governs the overall price.
2. Health and safety is the responsibility of the County Councils contractors. The main highways contractor provides two training courses, Drive to Survive and Driver awareness that all the operatives go on, these look at behavioural themes. Also all vehicles are tracked and monitored for speed and idling, and all drivers are aware of this. This reduces incidents and collisions.

Should a collision occur testing for drugs and alcohol is carried out, with the company having zero tolerance to this and all other safety beaches.

3. The Local Committee has agreed to consider amending the loading restrictions along Waterloo Road as part of the most recent parking review. These proposals are currently being advertised and a decision on whether they should be implemented will be made later in the year.
4. The central refuges along East Street and Epsom Road have been provided to assist pedestrians to cross the road in 2 stages when often there are few gaps in the traffic flow. It is recognised that there can be conflicts between cyclists and vehicles at these pinch points although there are no incidents of personal injury recorded due to the provision of guardrail. The guardrails used near to the pedestrian refuge islands are located mainly to stop pedestrians cutting across the road at an angle rather than lining up and crossing at right angles to the carriageway. However as part of the ongoing de-cluttering review we will be looking at removing unnecessary street furniture where it is safe to do so.
5. This appears to have been an oversight following completion of the new development. Dropped kerbs and tactile paving will be provided at the Cheam Road / junction with the car park entrance.
6. At this time Project Horizon is only looking at the programming of carriageway resurfacing.

**Question 7 – Martin Olney
Re: Wheelers Lane Parking**

Question:

Wheelers Lane has been adversely effected by the introduction of the borough wide CPZ on June 1st. The residence need to be able to park their cars. We would therefore like to know if the CPZ could be extended to include Wheelers lane.

Factors that led to this request:

The residents of Wheelers Lane rejected the introduction of a CPZ over three years ago. The borough wide scheme was implemented on 1st June this year. Between the vote and introduction of the CPZ at least 5 houses have changed hands – about 30% of the total. The original vote may not now reflect the local opinion. I also understand that the residents will not have the opportunity to reverse this decision for up to 18 months.

Wheelers Lane is now sandwiched between two CPZs and is the closest non restricted parking to the station. Although there is space for some 40 cars before reaching the houses on Wheelers Lane the residential area is plagued with parking problems.

The people parking are either commuters or local workers (including Rosebery School and Epsom Hospital). Wheelers lane doesn't have a parking problem between 2100 and 0700 the next day during the week and at no time during the weekend. There appears to be no need to prevent short stay parking in the road.

The CPZ proposals offered to the residents three years ago appeared to be a sledge hammer to crack a walnut. We only need to prevent long stay parking during the week.

I have asked the locals and it appears that if a vote were taken the result would be very close. We are dealing with different factions:

- Those that need to park and move their cars during the working day
- Those that commute with their cars and so see no need for a CPZ
- Those that have an advisory disabled parking space (currently 3 people)
- Those that will not pay for parking outside their own house
- Those that think the guest parking is too expensive
- Those without a car

The first group are the only ones unreservedly for a CPZ.

My proposal would be to simply ask the residence if they want a CPZ. Those that say yes can be provided with a space in the CPZ. I think you will find that only about 20 spaces need to be provided. The rest of the road could be left with unrestricted parking for the use of the commuters and locals not wanting a CPZ. I think this will work because we have some 30 houses on only one side of the road. Four of those houses have their own drives so, as I understand it, will not be eligible for a space in the CPZ.

Officer Response:

SCC consulted with Wheelers Lane residents, with a proposal to introduce a residents permit zone in 2011 - at the same time that all of the other permit schemes within Epsom and Ewell were consulted on.

The recently introduced permit zones were introduced on the back of these consultations, so took 2 years to introduce.

The original consultation merely outlined an area, where it was deemed sensible to introduce a permit scheme and formally asked residents if they would like a permit scheme, as well as giving out a set of FAQs which informed residents about how a scheme would be introduced and under what terms and costs.

The consultation included a questionnaire, which enabled residents to decide on the best times of operation, how many permits they would require and if they support a permit scheme.

The outcome of the consultation was that the majority of residents would be against a permit scheme.

If committee agrees, residents could be consulted again as part of the next parking review - the consultation process would be much the same and the progression would be based on the feedback received from the residents.

With specific reference to the points outlined:

1. The bays are likely to be in operation during the working day and would therefore require residents to purchase permits if they need to park during these hours - the times are negotiable.
2. If the residents that commute do not need permits, then they will not need to purchase them - however they would still require permits if they are off sick from work or on annual leave, otherwise they would have to park away from the permit bays.
3. Disabled drivers will be able to park in resident permit bays for free.

4. Those that do not wish to pay for parking would have to park in an area that is not covered by any other enforceable restriction.
5. The guest parking prices are set at Cabinet level and cannot be altered - the price of two pounds per permit is the same price across the entire county.
6. Those without a car do not need to buy resident permits, but would still be eligible for visitors permits.

The location of the permit bays could be based on the location of those who require permits - this is likely to be one long bay, to keep down the amount of signing that would be required and therefore reducing the amount of street clutter required.

Question 8 – Matthew Hammond
Re: Residents Parking

Question:

Are private roads residents allowed to be included in a scheme to buy parking permits?

For discussion:

1. SCC policy is, I believe, not to adopt no through roads. Eg the new development at the end of Lintons Lane that is for 85 dwellings is currently being proposed as unadopted (eg private). If this is the future policy then private road residents need to be considered in a different way!
2. The demand in Town Centre Zone is mainly coming from the flats that are in, or near, The Parade and the borough car parks are as close as some of the spaces in the zone, eg Heathcote Road and Hereford Close. It is therefore just as convenient to resolve their problems using the borough car parks.
3. The demand from the new developments over the last few years (almost exclusively flats) is also much too great to be resolved with residents parking and this was known and stated at the planning stage.
4. There are very few non flat requests, I believe just from St James Close, and with the numbers these can be accommodated in the zone.

Officer Response:

Residents of private roads may be included in residents permit schemes if that is considered appropriate.

Reference is made to St James Close in the report to the Committee at Item 10 paragraph 2.6

Statement in support of Question 8 from Mr and Mrs Craik

Currently the only residents able to apply for permits in zone G are those that live directly on the following roads: Heathcote Road, Hereford Close, Laburnum Road and The Parade. These permits entitle residents who have driveway space for only one vehicle, to park a second vehicle anywhere within the controlled zone.

From correspondence earlier this year I was informed by Mr Steve Clavey, senior engineer, that St James Close was not included in the review as it was a private road with private off-street facilities for residents. I would therefore like to appeal against the exclusion of St James Close on the following grounds.

1. The only access to St James Close is directly from Heathcote Road, which sets our location apart from the other surrounding roads that have not been included in the zone G scheme.
2. The close is a parking area that provides one parking bay per household. This is directly accessed from Heathcote road and is, therefore, not dissimilar to the 'private' driveways of other Heathcote Road residents who are nonetheless eligible to apply for a zone G parking permit.
3. The residents of St James Close, who rely on the zone as their only access, are inherently part of the local community. Whilst we support the general idea of the scheme in protecting the parking rights of local residents it is currently unfairly excluding the few local residents of St James Close. This is in contradiction with the Officer Report to Local Committee 25/01/2011 (phase 6 of the Epsom and Ewell Parking Review) where it is stated that 'the proposals are designed to help overcome the negative affects of the long term parking by non-residents' and 'aid residents ability to park.'
4. Since the scheme is clearly under-subscribed currently, the inclusion of St James Close to me would seem logical given the above points and the small number of properties it would entitle.

I would be very grateful if the committee could consider these points at the forthcoming review.

Question 9 – Elizabeth Legge

Re: Update on Parking Proposals on St Margaret Drive and Access to St Joseph's School

Question:

The original parking relaxation proposal to accommodate St Joseph's School drop off and pick up time was made in respect St Elizabeth Drive, not St Margaret Drive, as referred to in the Agenda for 23/9/13.

For the purpose of clarity and avoidance of doubt, please confirm that any proposals to relax parking on St Elizabeth Drive and or St Margaret Drive will not be advertised with other parking proposals agreed by the Committee, and that this will be deferred until the matter is resolved - as recommended to the Local Committee, per the Agenda 23/9/13 meeting.

Officer Response:

The recommendation is intended to refer to any current parking proposals in respect of the Abelea Green area.

Question 10 – Glyn Davies

Re: Air Quality

Question:

What is the air quality policy for Epsom and how can the school and kindergarten be assisted by the Council to understand the impact of the pollution on the environment of Abelea Green and its residents, by their wrongful encouragement of the use of St Margaret Drive as access to the school and independent kindergarten now sited at the school?

The Borough's air quality report of 2012 states that a major source of air pollution emanates from queuing slow moving cars, junctions and major highways such as the A24. This is exactly what is happening at Abelea Green where the houses are built right on the road. The St Joseph's school traffic is often backed up from the A24 junction with St Margaret Drive to the church car park, causing pollution and preventing residents from going about their daily business, even though there is no legal right of access to the school from St Margaret Drive?

How can Surrey County Council and Epsom Council assist the school and independent kindergarten in their responsibilities to design, implement and manage a proper travel plan?"

Officer Response:

It is the responsibility of the Borough Council to monitor air quality in the area and to designate Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) where they find that air quality standards are not met consistently. Where an AQMA is identified the County Council will work with the Borough Council to contribute to action plans where appropriate.

Schools play an important role in supporting the health and wellbeing of children and young people and there is much information available to support them in this role from a variety of agencies.

The County Council offers advice and guidance on the preparation and operation of travel plans for all organisations.

**Question 11 – Robert & Sue Brown
Re: Ewell House Grove**

Question:

Can a "NO THROUGH ROAD" signs to be erected at the entrance to Ewell House Grove positioned at the end of the existing double yellow lines.

Officer Response:

Although the street nameplate does have a 'no through road' symbol, it is only on one side of the road at present. The Borough Council are responsible for providing street nameplates. An additional sign on a new post showing the no through road "T" symbol can be erected at the entrance to the road but we are currently trying to declutter signs in Ewell Village and putting up more signs goes against this initiative.

Highways officers will ask the Borough Council to provide a second street nameplate containing the 'no through road' symbol.

Question 12 – Neil Carpenter

Re: Parking Restrictions St Elizabeth and St Margaret Drive

Question:

My question is with reference to the request to have the parking restrictions along St Elizabeths and St Margarets Drives relaxed during pick up and drop off times for parents of children at St Joseph's School.

As was made clear by residents at the meeting of this committee on 17 June the access road from St Margaret's Drive to St Joseph's Catholic Church is a private road owned by Abelea Green Management Company (Epsom) Limited. The Deed of Grant governing the use of this private road is quite clear that the Church has the right "To pass and repass at all times and for all reasonable purposes in connection with the use of the said church and community hall as a church and community hall and ancillary purposes (but for no other purpose whatsoever)."

There is no right to park along the private access road and no right of access to St Joseph's school. The school has acknowledged this by removing this approach to the school from its school travel plan.

As there is no access to the school from Abelea Green there is no point in considering relaxing the parking restrictions on St Elizabeth nor St Margaret Drives for parents to have to walk their children down the Dorking Road to access the school via Rosebank. To relax the parking restrictions would be an encouragement to parents to commit trespass across private land. It is very disappointing that after three months the committee has been unable to reach this conclusion. It doesn't take three months to read the legal documents and reach the conclusion that there is no right of access across the private road to the School and hence no point in considering relaxing the parking. It is all too clear to the residents that the planning application to widen the access road and the planning application to expand the school were based on a school travel plan that was wrong and a planning process that did not follow all of the required procedures. The School was aware that the travel plan was wrong, advised by a trustee of the diocesan trust that is the leasee of the private road and at the time a director of the Abelea Green management company (Epsom) Ltd and I understand the person who instigated the request to this committee to relax the parking restrictions. The evident conflict of interest was not disclosed to the residents of Abelea Green.

As these are the circumstances and the committee is set on deferring making the decision to put a stop and end to the request please will the committee confirm the reading of the attached House of Commons briefing paper on unadopted roads to be found at

<http://www.parliament.uk/Templates/BriefingPapers/Pages/BPPdfDownload.aspx?bp-id=sn00402>. In particular the last paragraph of page 3, "the owner could put up a notice indicating that the road is not for use by the public, thus demonstrating that there is no intention to dedicate it to the public". A polite, and clear notice put up by Abelea Green Management Company (Epsom) Limited stating that the private road is for access to the church only and that no parking was permitted along the private road would be following this guidance would it not, Committee?

It is important for this Committee to answer this question now because the School is a school maintained by Surrey County Council. We are all here knowing that children attending the school are trespassing across a private road that is unadopted and not

to highways standard and are therefore all responsible. This situation is not good for child safety whilst the committee defers and leaves the door open to ambiguity for an undefined period of time. Whilst this situation persists it is also not good for the School safety plan that emergency vehicles will be obstructed from passing up and down the private access road because the church allows parking all along the access road despite this being "a criminal offence.....Under section 34 of the *Road Traffic Act 1988*", as set out on page 8 of the attached house of commons guidance on unadopted roads.

The professional highways experts in attendance at this committee must, therefore, see it as their responsibility too to agree that a sign at least should be put up stating that the private road is for access to the church only and that no parking is permitted along the private road. Side stepping confirming these facts now when they are known would be letting the school children down and compromising their safety.

Closing the door on the ambiguity now would also encourage the school and church to look at solutions to their parking problem that can be found within the boundaries of their own grounds. I am aware that Abelea Green Management Company (Epsom) Limited has not only made numerous attempts to meet with the Church to discuss these options all of which have been declined but also requested a meeting with Surrey County Council Highways which as yet has not been taken up.

Officer Response:

As set out in Item 9 of the agenda for this meeting of the Local Committee, officers from a number of County Council departments are still reviewing what, if any responsibility and/or authority the County Council has in this matter, but in the meantime the Committee are being asked to defer the advertisement of any parking proposals in the vicinity of Abelea Green.

Signage on unadopted roads is a matter for the owner of the road and not something on which officers or the Committee are able to comment.

Question 13 – Eleanor Silverio

Re: Abelea Green

Question:

At the 17th June Local Committee Meeting there was discussion about the benefits of appointing a lead officer at Surrey County Council to liaise on matters at Abelea Green.

Has this now happened and who is the contact? Will this include liaison with the relevant Epsom & Ewell Borough Council officers.

Officer Response:

Due to the complexities of the issues and the number of departments involved a lead officer has not yet been identified. In the meantime any queries or requests for information should be directed to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer, Nicola Morris whose contact details can be found on the agenda for this meeting.

Once the County Council position has been established relevant Epsom & Ewell Borough Council Officers would be consulted along with any other interested parties if appropriate.

Question 14 – Fred Mobray
Re: Abelea Green

Question:

I refer to EP/12/0956 Summary Report dated 6 Feb. 2013.

This report summarises the detailed processes put into St Martins School's expansion proposal by SurreyCC.

Can this committee assure the residents of Abelea Green that the same processes will be afforded them in the case of matters at Abelea Green, including the St. Joseph's School expansion and new and expanding independent Kindergarten of St Joseph's Ltd also sited at the school?

Officer Response:

There are no current plans to expand St Joseph's School, but if this were ever to be considered the procedures followed would be as set out in the report referred to relating to St Martin's School.

Any expansion of the independent Kindergarten would require planning approval from the Borough Council and is not a matter for the County Council.

This page is intentionally left blank