

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 7.00 pm on 15 September 2014  
at Council Chamber, Epsom Town Hall.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Mr Eber A Kington (Chairman)
- \* Mr John Beckett (Vice-Chairman)
- Mrs Stella Lallement
- \* Mrs Jan Mason
- \* Mrs Tina Mountain

**Borough / District Members:**

- \* Cllr Paul Ardern-Jones
- \* Cllr Michael Arthur
- \* Cllr Neil Dallen
- \* Cllr Colin Taylor
- \* Cllr Mike Teasdale

\* In attendance

---

**17/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Stella Lallement.

**18/14 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 2]**

There were no public questions or statements.

**19/14 ADJOURNMENT [Item 3]**

Seventeen members of the public were present. Four informal questions were asked and answers were provided at the meeting. Three of these were in relation to Item 9.

**20/14 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

There were no petitions.

**21/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 5]**

Confirmed as a correct record.

**22/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 6]**

There were no declarations of interest.

**23/14 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]**

Three questions were received, the questions and answers are set out in Annex A.

The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 2: The Committee asked to see the results of the review of the road plating policy when they are available.

Question 3: Members asked why the scheme was likely to take another 4 months to implement. Officers responded that this was due to the requirement for statutory advertisement and the need to wait for comments and to programme the work. Every effort will be made to try to and complete the work as quickly as possible within these constraints.

## **24/14 CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE - EARLY HELP [Item 8]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Jenny Smith, Development Manager, Services for Young People

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** None

**Member discussion – key points**

Noted the following amendments to Annexe A: Paragraph 4 - the Youth Centres are located at “The Focus” and “The Edge”; second bullet point to read “The Watersedge estate – Ruxley Ward.

The Development Manager reported some changes arising from changes agreed to the Cabinet report since this report was published. The changes give further delegated powers to the Local Committee and its Youth Task Group to have more say on the allocation of centre based resources in the Borough and to scrutinise delivery. In addition the budget for support for minority groups will not be held centrally as these needs will be met through the local Individual Prevention Grants.

Local Prevention work should continue to be delivered outside of youth centres, but the Youth Task Group will be able to ensure that the two are better linked and work more closely together.

The final budget has not yet been agreed and will be directed to areas of greatest need. There has recently been a significant reduction in the number of young people who are NEET in Epsom & Ewell. However, this is unlikely to result in a similar reduction in the proportion of funding available because similar reductions in the numbers of young people who are NEET have been achieved county wide.

A member queried the high number of Youth Restorative Interventions for the Stamford area and whether there are any particular reasons for this. This information was not available at the meeting, but it was agreed that it would be sent to the members concerned and members of the Youth Task Group after the meeting.

**Resolved:** That the Local Committee agreed to:

- (i) Approve the local specification as set out in Annex A to the report as amended, to be considered by providers, focusing on the identified needs of Epsom and Ewell and the geographical neighbourhoods prioritised by the Youth Task Group.
- (ii) Note that approval is subject to approval of the Services for Young People model by Cabinet on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2014.

Reasons: To support the Council's policies of creating opportunities for young people and providing early help for children, young people and their families.

**25/14 EPSOM AND EWELL PARKING / WAITING RESTRICTIONS (PHASE 8) REVIEW [Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Stephen Clavey, Senior Engineer

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** Three members of the public asked questions under Item 3 in relation to this item.

A resident of Wyeths Road had conducted a survey of residents and indicated that 75% of them were in favour of a residents permit zone and requested that this should be considered. It was reported that this area is already included in the proposals at Annex 2. She asked for further details of how residents could be involved to ensure that any scheme put forward met their needs. The Senior Engineer indicated that subject to agreement by the Committee that a consultant will be employed to carry out investigations of all the proposed areas. This will include a letter to every resident in the affected roads seeking their opinion on the options available. Residents who don't reply to the consultation letter are considered to be in favour of the proposals. However, they and anyone else who may be interested have a further opportunity to contribute their views when any schemes agreed by the Committee are advertised for comment prior to a final decision.

In relation to Map 47 a resident of Chelwood Close asked whether it would be possible to change the times of the curfew parking to between 12 and 2 as he felt this would be more effective in preventing shift workers from the industrial estate from parking. It appeared that other residents may have a different view on when is the most appropriate time. The Committee therefore agreed to advertise a restriction between 10.00am and 14.00pm, to allow all residents an opportunity to contribute their views during the consultation, with a view to reducing this to a lesser period when the final proposal is considered.

A resident of Greenwood Court in The Parade, Epsom requested that they be added to the Residents Permit Zone for the town centre. She is currently the only resident with a car although it would be necessary to include all residents should anyone else wish to apply. All residents would be entitled to purchase visitor permits even if they did not own a car.

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

### **Member discussion – key points**

In relation to Map 43, members queried the application of the loading restrictions proposed for the High Street as it seems that not all of the shops currently have rear access to allow deliveries. The senior engineer indicated that it would not be difficult to put in a delivery bay in the High Street for these shops so if agreed they would have to park in the rear access and walk goods round. Members also queried whether vehicles using the rear access should be continuing on across Derby Square and exiting using the road to the rear of the car park as was originally planned as this is not currently possible due to obstacles in the way. Officers indicated that further investigation would be required on the feasibility and safety of large vehicles crossing a pedestrian area. If this was not thought to be appropriate vehicles entering from Waterloo Road should reverse into the access road so that they can exit safely.

The Senior Engineer reported that there are currently 91 properties eligible for permits in the town centre residents permit zone. 59 permits have been issued and there are approximately 70 spaces available. Members debated whether it was possible to add additional properties and on a vote it was agreed to add Greenwood Court and Chelsea Court as these residents had bought their properties before the permit scheme was implemented and could previously have parked in the road. Residents of the Old Court House should have been made aware that a permit scheme would be introduced, when the property was built and that the property would not be included in the scheme.

Residents of Chartwell Place had requested a one way system. It would not be possible to consider this as part of this parking review, but could be investigated by the Area Highways Team.

**Resolved:** That the Local Committee agreed

- (i) The recommendations detailed in Annex 1 and 2, subject to the following amendments and additions:
  - Francis Close – add additional double yellow lines to the T junction at the top end of the Close;
  - Howard Avenue junction with Aragon Avenue – add in double yellow line junction protection to improve sight lines;
  - Castle Avenue junction with Ewell by-pass – add in double yellow lines around bend in Castle Avenue to improve sight lines;
  - Plan 22 – remove small area of proposed double yellow line on curve of Ruxley Lane slip road;
  - Plan 25 – ensure that yellow lines are a minimum of 15m on both sides at the junction in Heatherside Road;
  - Plans 56 and 57 – remove proposal to revoke restrictions in Woodcote Side from the consultation;
  - Plan 63 – remove from consultation;
  - Plan 35 – Add to Sefton Road, extend single yellow lines on both sides up to the Longmead carpark on the left and to Hollymoor on the right.
  - Time restrictions of 9.00-10.00 and 15.00-16.00 Monday – Friday;
  - Plan 45 – extend double yellow lines on the railway side of the road to start about one car length before the exit from Jewsons;
  - Plan 47 – advertise time restrictions of 10.00 till 14.00 to allow residents

views on the most appropriate time period to be taken into account;  
Parking bays in Waterloo Road – add a no return in 1 hour instead of the current 2 hours;  
Town Centre RPZ – extend to residents of Chelsea Court and Greenwood Court but not the Old Court House [by 4 votes FOR to 3 AGAINST]  
Plan 31 – amend times for No loading to match the no waiting restrictions;  
Plan 32 – Extend proposed double yellow lines in The Kingsway to existing;  
Plan 60 – add Miles Road to the map, include Court Lane in the consultation, extend Church Road to the junction with Pitt Road and College Road and add St Martin's Close  
Annexe 2 – Lintons Lane – add Leith Road, Portland Place, Stones Road and the remainder of Victoria Place;  
Annexe 2 – Beaconsfield gardens – to consider dual use bays adjacent to the railway embankment.

- (ii) That the preliminary consultation being progressed in relation to the RPZ proposals in Annex 2, are funded from the 2013/14 parking account surplus;
- (iii) That the County Council's intention to make an order under the Road Traffic Regulation act 1984 be advertised and, if no objections are maintained, the order be made;
- (iv) That if objections are received the Parking Strategy and Implementation Group Manager is authorised to try and resolve them, in consultation with the Chairman / Vice Chairman of this committee and the county councillor for the division and to decide whether or not they should be acceded to and therefore whether the order should be made, with or without modifications.

Reasons: The implementation of the proposals will both increase the safe passage of vehicles and also ease the parking situation within the mainly residential areas.

## **26/14 EPSOM AND EWELL LOCAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY AND FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Steven Howard, Transport Strategy Project Manager;  
Caroline Tuttle, Transport Planner

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** None

**Member discussion - key points**

Tina Mountain indicated that she was unable to support the Strategy as a whole as she is opposed to the implementation of Plan E to return South Street to two way traffic. Cllr Taylor also indicated that he felt that the implementation of Plan E did not fulfil the reasons for which it was originally proposed.

In the section relating to rail provision, members suggested that if the campaign to include Epsom Station in Zone 6 is successful there could be a need for additional parking in the town centre as more people would be encouraged to use this station instead of driving to those stations currently within Zone 6.

Noted, that councillors are in correspondence with Network Rail, with a view to providing step free access to Stoneleigh Station, following a campaign locally. If provided this may increase usage of this station.

A number of corrections to the text of the Plan were identified which officers agreed to incorporate into the final document

**Resolved:** That the Local Committee agreed to: [Tina Mountain and Cllr Taylor voted against]

Approve the Epsom & Ewell Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme as set out in Annex 1 of the report with the amendments proposed at the meeting and its suggested objectives.

Reasons: To support the County Council's priorities to promote sustainable economic growth and secure investment in infrastructure and to reduce the negative impact of traffic.

## **27/14 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** None

**Member discussion** - key points

Noted in Table 5, row 2 location should read " Hook Road/Temple Road, Epsom" and in row 5 location should read "Scotts Close".

**Resolved:** That the Local Committee agreed to:

- (i) Promote the modification to the parking bays in High Street, Ewell, ahead of this year's annual review of parking and waiting restrictions;
- (ii) Authorise the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s), to promote reserve schemes to ensure the remainder of this Financial Year's budgets are fully invested in the road network in Epsom and Ewell;
- (iii) Authorise the implementation of a Bus Stop Clear in Ruxley Lane opposite its junction with Pams Way;
- (iv) Approve the strategy for allocation of next Financial Year's budgets as detailed in Table 4 of the report;
- (v) Authorise the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

Reasons: To facilitate delivery of the 2014-15 Highways programmes funded by the Local Committee and to facilitate development of Committee's 2014-15 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.

**28/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]**

Monday 8 December at 2.00pm, Epsom Town Hall

Meeting ended at: 10.25 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL  
15 September 2014**

**MEMBER QUESTIONS**

**Question 1 Cllr Michael Arthur  
Re: Chessington Road Rail Bridge, Ewell**

Local residents have raised concerns about the “strength” of the road bridge over the railway especially that larger lorries seem to now be using it.

With this increased usage, how often is it inspected to ensure its integrity?

**Officer Response:**

The B2200/1 Ewell West Station Bridge is owned and maintained by Network Rail. Network Rail carried out an assessment of the strength of the bridge in May 1998. The bridge passed the load assessment at full capacity of 40 tonnes vehicles. Network Rail would request a weight restriction if the load assessment were determined to be below current standards.

We have no details of when Network Rail last inspected this bridge. However, as with local authority bridges, Network Rail have a programme of cyclic inspections of their bridges. Although this information has been requested, unfortunately, it has not been available in time for this reply. Once received it will be passed to members.

There is no recent traffic count data available to determine any increase in HGV usage of Chessington Road.

**Question 2 Cllr Michael Arthur  
Re: East Street Temporary Lights**

I refer to the road opening by Thames Water on East Street outside Lintons Lane. For five days (at time of writing 12 noon on 9 September) there has been long delays of traffic on the busy A24. The drivers problems have been compounded by lack of activity on site, whilst this may be due to waiting for a special part, could not the relatively small opening have been plated over to restore working without temporary traffic lights.

**Officer Response:**

The works in question were carried out by Thames Water under an Immediate Emergency Permit. The New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 allows for works promoters to undertake works without prior consultation and approval with the Highway Authority.

In this instance Thames Water advised us on Friday the 5th of September of the works by submitting a Permit application. On Monday the 8th of September messages were left with Thames to contact Surrey regarding the works. The information received was that the site would be clear on Tuesday the 9th At this time Conditions were added imposing extended hours working (07:00 to 19:00) to expedite the works and manual control of the signals during peak hours (06:30 - 09:30 and 15:30 to 19:00) to assist with traffic flows. We received notification that these works had stopped at 15:01 on Wednesday the 10th of September

A review was undertaken on Monday the 8th to confirm the requirement for temporary traffic signals given the degree of traffic disruption being caused. The available carriageway width adjacent to the works site did not meet the national standards to permit two way traffic hence the use of lights was appropriate.

The use of road plates to cover excavations whilst works are not in progress is used with caution. Unless used appropriately, the right type in the right place secured in the right manner, consequence can be significant. In this instance given the indication that the works would be completed sooner and with the mitigation applied as Permit Conditions, plating was not considered appropriate.

The Street Works Team within Surrey Highways has however noted the Thames Water East Street scenario especially the levels of traffic congestion with a view to reviewing the policy on when and where road plating would be appropriate.

**Question 3 Cllr Jan Mason**

**Re: Road Safety Improvements at Tesco store Ruxley Lane**

At the June meeting of the Committee, it was agreed to advertise a Traffic Regulation Orders for a No-Entry and waiting restrictions near the entrance to the new Tesco store in Ruxley Lane in order to improve road safety in this area. With the return of children to schools in this very busy area, please can I have an update on when this work will be carried out?

**Officer Response:**

Since the last committee meeting, detailed design drawings have been produced and a meeting has taken place with Tesco to discuss the issues regarding access to the car park.

Tesco have been very co-operative and a design has now been agreed which will see the entrance to their car park widened slightly. The service road will be kept free of parked cars with double yellow line waiting restrictions and will be resurfaced. Additional dropped kerbs and tactile paving will be provided and Tesco have put in place restrictions on all their vehicle movements which will only access the store car park from the Gatley Avenue side of Ruxley Lane. They have also agreed that any delivery vehicles and refuse collection vehicle manoeuvres can only be carried out with additional staff in attendance to ensure the public are safe from reversing vehicles. Construction is likely to take place in the new year.