

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 2.00 pm on 7 December 2015  
at Epsom Town Hall, The Parade, Epsom, KT18 5BY.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

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

**Borough / District Members:**

- \* Cllr Michael Arthur MBE
- \* Cllr Liz Frost
- Cllr Vince Romagnuolo
- \* Cllr Clive Smitheram
- Cllr Tella Wormington

\* In attendance

---

**43/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Vince Romagnuolo and Tella Wormington.  
Tony Axelrod substituted for Tella Wormington.

**44/15 CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS [Item 2]**

It has been agreed to fund two projects using the Community Safety fund of £3337. £1000 for the Prevent workshop for Senior Leaders in schools and £800 for a music tutor at the Edge youth centre targeted at the cohort of young people who are involved with anti-social behaviour.

A response from John Furey, the Cabinet Member for Highways, had been received in regard to the Committees concerns about the delays in completing the implementation of Phase 8 waiting restrictions. His reply focussed on Keir's problems with finding new contractors for sign installation which have hopefully now been resolved.

The Chairman has met with Leader of the Council David Hodge to express the Committees concerns over the proposed further cut of 25% to our local highway budget.

It was confirmed that the Project Horizon roads within the Plan E area which were deferred, pending the completion of that major scheme would be resurfaced as planned from the Project Horizon budget and would not require funding from the Plan E scheme funding as had been rumoured.

#### **45/15 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 3]**

10 questions and some late additional representations had been received, the questions and answers are set out in Annex A. The following additional points were made:

Question 2: Mr Olney asked what the criteria are for assessing whether there is a safety issue requiring yellow lines. The parking engineer replied that based on requests received from a variety of sources sites are assessed to see if the issue constitutes a safety problem.

Question 4: Mr Thompson representing Mr Cookson expressed his concern at the way in which the Atkins survey had been carried out and asked why those not replying had not been reminded. Residents had been able to get a response from most houses in a matter of days. The officer replied that residents had a month to respond and resources were not available to remind those not replying. Atkins analysis had been based on the responses received.

Question 6: Mr Taylor felt that the Committee should decide whether it is more important to follow the procedure or to secure the funding. Officers responded that it was important to do both.

Question 7: Mr Taylor suggested that residents had not responded to the survey as they had consultation fatigue due to the length of time taken to look at these issues.

Question 8: Mr Taylor asked if residents be informed of the current situation. The parking engineer confirmed that a further consultation would be required and if a request from residents is received this can be included in the next parking review.

Question 10: Mr Gusterson felt that there were special circumstances in relation to his road in that most properties had adequate off street parking, whilst a group of 5 properties have no parking available and are unable to change their front gardens as they are in a conservation area. All five properties (100%) have requested a Residents Parking Zone (RPZ). The parking engineer responded that any RPZ needs to be self-financing and the area would have to be assessed in more detail.

#### **46/15 ADJOURNMENT [Item 4]**

38 members of the public were present. 10 informal questions were asked and answers were provided at the meeting.

#### **47/15 PETITIONS [Item 5]**

One petition was received.

**Declarations of interest:** None

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

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:**

Mr Tufo presented his petition and asked whether there was an update on whether any funding for the Kiln Lane link would be available and when the feasibility study of the one way scheme for Temple Road/Hook Road would be completed. The officer replied that the Kiln Lane link is still in the LEP programme but they have not yet requested a business case to be submitted. It is hoped that the conclusions of the one way feasibility study will be brought to the next meeting of the Committee in February.

**Member Discussion – key points**

None

**Resolved to:**

- (i) confirm to the petitioners that both Surrey County Council and Epsom & Ewell Borough Council continue to support the proposed Kiln Lane Link scheme and seek funding opportunities for the scheme;
- (ii) make the Cabinet Member aware of the petition, in acknowledgement that while Surrey County Council's Local Committee for Epsom & Ewell supports the Kiln Lane Link scheme, the scheme is being promoted by Surrey County Council's Cabinet as part of Surrey County Council's Major Schemes programme.

Reasons: to respond to the petition

**48/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 6]**

The minutes were confirmed as a correct record.

**49/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 7]**

The Chairman indicated that he had a personal non pecuniary interest in Item 10 as the owner of a property in Chantilly Way. He vacated the Chair for items 8 to 10 and took no part in the discussion of Item 10. The Vice-Chairman took the Chair for these items.

**50/15 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 8]**

Three questions were received, the questions and answers are set out in Annexe B. The following additional points were made:

Question 2: Cllr Smitheram indicated that he may bring further questions as the process continues and asked whether there would be any communication with residents prior to the submission of the planning application. Officers present were unsure whether there is routine consultation with residents, but agreed to put the councillor in touch with the appropriate officer.

Question 3: Mrs Mason reported that she hadn't seen any cleaning taking place. The Highways Area Team Manager replied that her area is due to be visited in the New Year and cleaned gulleys will be marked with paint so that those visited can be identified.

**51/15 GROSVENOR ROAD, LANGLEY VALE VILLAGE [FOR INFORMATION]  
[Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager; Alan Flaherty, Engineer.

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

**Member discussion – key points**

Teresa Cass who raised the issues at Langley Vale in a public question at the last meeting was unable to be present, but it was reported that she was happy with the report and the that the mistakes made had been identified. She asked to be kept updated on any further developments.

The local member indicated that she had observed the new layout in operation and felt that it had improved the junction. Village gateway signs and a planter will be installed shortly. There had been no further comments from the racehorse trainers in the area.

Noted the report.

**52/15 SPEED LIMIT CHANGE IN CHANTILLY WAY, EPSOM [EXECUTIVE  
FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** Eber Kington declared a personal non-pecuniary interest as the owner of a property on Chantilly Way. This item was Chaired by the Vice-Chairman and Mr Kington took no part in the discussion or decision.

**Officers attending:** Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager; Chris Cannon, Surrey Police

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

**Member discussion – key points**

Noted that the compass point on the drawing at annex 1 is incorrect and should be reversed.

Mrs Mason set out her opposition to the proposal. She indicated that she felt that this is a busy road, near a school with lots of traffic movements and that raising the speed limit will encourage vehicles to go faster still.

The Area Highways Team Manager reported that the speed limit policy is based on the use of signs and on the perception of drivers of the road environment.

Chris Cannon reported that long term speed enforcement is ineffective if the majority of drivers feel that it is safe to exceed the current limit. Across the County there are 759 sites where speed limits are monitored and enforced, but only 6 officers carrying out this work.

Members generally felt that the use of a 30mph sign as drivers approach the bend was likely to be a good way of reminding drivers to slow down, but asked if a review could be carried out after the change is made to ensure that speeds have not increased. The Area Highways Team Manager indicated that it will be a permanent traffic order, but that a review would be possible.

**Resolved** (Jan Mason voted AGAINST and Eber Kington ABSTEINED) to:

- (i) authorise the advertising of the Traffic Regulation order for the change in speed limit on a section of Chantilly Way from 30mph to 40mph as outlined in the report;
- (ii) authorise the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, to advertise the appropriate legal notices relating to the speed limit change, to consider any objections, and if appropriate to confirm the changes.
- (iii) review the changes after they have been implemented for 6 months to ensure that they are effective.

Reasons: The change of speed limit from 30mph to 40mph would allow a greater emphasis to be given to the commencement of the 30mph speed limit by using gateway signing and relocation of the existing warning signs and chevron boards in advance of the bend.

Vehicles are already exceeding the 30mph speed limit and a 40mph speed limit is deemed to more appropriate for the general layout of the road.

#### **53/15 EPSOM AND EWELL PARKING REVIEW (PHASE 9) [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:**

6 residents asked questions in addition to those in Item 4. The following points were made:

Several of surveys/petitions of residents had been carried out in various roads since the report was published. These showed a large majority of residents in these roads are in favour of a residents parking zone (RPZ) and requested that this information is taken into account by the Committee. Some residents felt that there was a level of apathy amongst residents, as they had been consulted a number of times about a RPZ and very little progress had been made, which may account for the low response rate to the initial survey.

A resident of Woodcote side indicated that he was unhappy with the recent survey carried out by residents and felt that those who had not replied to the Atkins survey had not done so because they were happy with the current situation. He felt that the views of those against an RPZ were not being taken into account.

A resident queried how roads where there are houses mixed with very large properties with multiple occupiers who may have off street parking are dealt with. The officers replied that these have to be looked at in more detail and a RPZ could be considered for a block of individual properties if it was considered to be viable.

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

A statement was circulated by the parking team in response to the recent surveys and petitions submitted by local residents. A copy is attached at annex C.

Mrs Mountain expressed her disappointment that a number of the RPZs considered in her area had not been recommended to proceed in the current review due to the low response rate to the resident survey even though more than 50% of those responding were in favour. She was concerned that implementing a RPZ in other roads in the area would increase the pressure in these roads and that leaving consideration to the next review may mean that these roads have to meet the requirement for 70% of properties to be in favour, as a result of recent changes to the process. She questioned why those in favour are being disadvantaged by those not responding. In reply it was stated that as a RPZ would require residents to pay for a permit to park a vehicle in the road it was felt to be unreasonable to impose this on residents unless there is a clear majority of all properties in favour.

A member asked how people without internet access had been able to respond to the survey and whether there was information on the responses per household. The officer replied that the letter had provided details of internet access at local libraries and also given the number of the county council contact centre who would take residents through the survey whilst they were on the phone and recorded their responses. He confirmed that there were multiple responses from some properties and that petitions had been received from some roads during the consultation period. There had also been the opportunity to raise any additional questions at the time if residents were unclear on what was being proposed.

The Chairman made the following points: deferring the decision until the next meeting would hold up all the restrictions proposed; not all the new information received had all the address information needed to determine which properties are in favour; residents against the proposals would not have had the opportunity to put their views at the meeting as having viewed the agenda they may have been content that nothing was being proposed in their road. He proposed that where additional information had been received recently, that these roads should be considered in the next parking review with a commitment that they would not have to meet the 70% of residents in agreement criteria which would be in place for that review. If funding and staff resources could be made available in advance of the next review then these would be considered sooner.

Several members indicated that they had had representations from residents unhappy with the way the information in recent resident petitions had been collected and felt uncomfortable agreeing to include additional roads where there had been a low response rate in the original consultation with the roads to be advertised in the current review.

**Resolved:** That the following be agreed:

- (i) Subject to the following amendments and additions, the recommendations detailed in Annex 1 and 4 as set out in the report be agreed;

Statement of Reasons: Map 3 “The Avenue” should read “Grafton Road”,  
Map 9 – make reference to the extension of the current restrictions in Ravensfield Gardens;

Map 27 – Hours of operation to be amended to Mon-Fri 8.30am-4.30pm;

Map 28 – officers to check whether Tayles Hill Drive is a private road;

Map 29 – Hours of operation for The Mount should be 8-9.30 and 2-3.30;

Map 33 – Mon-Sat 08.30-18.30 to be amended to Mon-Sat 10.00-12.00;

Map 41 – Add to pay and display restrictions. Max stay 2 hours, hourly rate £1;

Map 57 – all kiss and ride bays in Station Approach to be subject to the same restrictions;

- (ii) 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;
- (iii) 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 decides whether or not they should be acceded to and therefore whether the order should be made, with or without modifications.
- (iv) (Proposed by Mr Kington and seconded by Mrs Mason) That in the next Phase of Waiting Restrictions (Phase 10), the Local Committee considers recommending the introduction of an RPZ in the roads listed below in the light of representations received after the publication of the Atkins Report:

Albert Road

Andrew’s Close

College Road

Nearby roads in the Lintons Lane/Leith Road area not currently included

Church Road

Woodcote Side

Tintagel Close

These roads will be considered under the current system and will not be subject to the 70% resident agreement which will be in place for the next review. Should resources become available ahead of the next review the Committee may consider them earlier.

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

**54/15 EPSOM-BANSTEAD SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT PACKAGE  
[EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 14]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Neil McClure, Transport Strategy Project Manager

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

**Member discussion** - key points

Noted that the project would aim to improve current bus services rather than introduce new routes.

Noted the report.

**Resolved:** That

- (i) the establishment of the proposed joint Member Task Group and the proposed members from the Epsom & Ewell Local Committee, to support this project as outlined in Annex 1 of the report be agreed;
- (ii) approve the Terms of Reference for the above Member Task Group as set out in Annex 2 of the report as amended in paragraph 4 by the substitution of "borough" by "scheme" be agreed.

Reasons: The joint Member Task Group is needed to support the Project Board in the development of the business case bid to the LEP, and beyond this for the approval of scheme construction and delivery after award of LEP Local Growth Award funding.

**55/15 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 12]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager; Alan Flaherty, Engineer.

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

**Member discussion** - key points

Mrs Mason indicated that she may wish to replace Brumfield Road with the odd numbered side of Green Lanes in next year's programme and she would discuss this with the maintenance engineer.

Noted that Rosebery Road was no longer in the county programme for resurfacing but had been added to the list for reactive maintenance.

Members were asked to alert the Area Highways Team Manager to any roads in their area where they had concerns at their condition so that they could be added to the list of roads which can be put forward should additional resources become available.

**Resolved to:**

- (i) Approve the ITS programme for next Financial Year 2016-17 as set out in the report;
- (ii) 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 2016-17 Highways programmes funded by the Local Committee to be decided in good time to facilitate timely delivery of those programmes.

**56/15 THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY AND NOMINATIONS TO THE BOROUGH'S JOINT INFRASTRUCTURE GROUP [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 13]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

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

**Member discussion** - key points

Noted the report.

**Resolved:** To:

approve the nomination of County Councillors Eber Kington and John Beckett to sit on the Joint Infrastructure Group.

Reasons: To nominate two County Members to sit on the Joint Infrastructure Group to determine the Borough's Infrastructure Delivery Plan priorities and to make recommendations as regards the allocation of strategic CIL receipts.

**57/15 APPOINTMENT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE TASK GROUPS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 15]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Nicola Morris, Community Partnership & Committee Manager

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

**Member discussion** - key points

None

**Resolved:** That the following members be appointed to vacancies on the Local Committees Task Groups arising from the resignation of County Councillor Stella Lallement:

Major Schemes (Epsom & Ewell) Task Group – Eber Kington

On Street Parking Task Group – substitute Karan Persand

Reasons: To fill vacancies on the Committees Task Groups

**58/15 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION/ACTION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION]  
[Item 16]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Nicola Morris, Community Partnership & Committee Officer

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

**Member discussion** - key points

Noted, that a response had not yet been received from the youth service and that a reminder would be sent.

**59/15 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 17]**

Noted that the next meeting would take place on Monday 29 February 2016 at 7pm, Bourne Hall, Spring Street, Ewell.

Meeting ended at: 4.55 pm

---

**Chairman**



**SURREY**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL  
7 December 2015**

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS**

**Question 1 – Jane Saunders  
Re: Parking in Albert Road**

**Question:**

As well as commuters and office/shop workers using Albert Road as free car parking during the day, therefore preventing residents from being able to park, we are now in the situation of people parking in Albert Road at night to use the cinema or restaurants, rather than pay for parking. Do the Council have a plan to assist the residents in Albert Road for evening parking restrictions as well as day time restrictions? This would increase parking revenue for the Council and be a long term solution to the problems of parking in Albert Road which has caused frustration and resulted in damage to cars, mine included, which have been key scratched and reversed into.

**Officer Response:**

We have recently carried out a preliminary consultation to investigate the requirements for a resident permit scheme along Albert Road - the results of this consultation are available on the agenda for this meeting (Item 11):

<http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=197&MId=4176&Ver=4>

It shows that only 17% of households in Albert Road are in favour of an RPZ. We do not have any further proposals along Albert Road at this time.

**Question 2 – Mr Martin Olney  
Re: Yellow Lines**

**Question:**

One of the residents of my ward has successfully submitted a request for yellow lines on a T junction. I have been told that this request still has to go to consultation - why? This is a safety issue and the Highway Code tell you that you must not park within 10 metres of a junction. I know that this is an advisory rule, however it seems pointless telling people not to do it if there is no penalty. Putting yellow lines on a junction seems to me something that should not be voted on by the transgressors. After all turkeys do not vote for Christmas!

Can you explain why a safety issue like this cannot be imposed?

**Officer Response:**

We are required by law to advertise a proposal before we can implement it.

Please follow the link below:

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1996/2489/regulation/7/made>

Even if the consultation does result in objections, the yellow lines can be implemented if their inclusion is deemed to resolve a safety issue.

**Question 3 – Mr Martin Olney**  
**Re: Parking Wheelers Lane**

**Question:**

Previously I have been advised that it is unlikely that grasscrete will be laid on the green outside numbers 6 to 28 Wheelers Lane. There is already a dropped curb used by residents and tradesmen to drive across the green. It also seems to be big enough to accommodate anything up to 20 cars.

Can you tell me the cost of putting down grasscrete and what number of residents would need to contribute to the CPZ to make it self-funding?

**Officer Response:**

The cost of providing grasscrete over the area between 6 and 28 Wheelers Lane would be approx £40k, possibly more with design costs.

Each CPZ is assessed individually, but the support of 70% of residents in the road is needed before a scheme will be considered.

**Question 4 – James Cookson**  
**Re: Residents Parking in Church Road**

**Question:**

Residents of Church Road in Epsom have signed a petition requesting SCC to implement a permit parking scheme in the road. The question that was included in the petition is below:

*“We, the undersigned, petition Surrey County Council to implement a parking permit system in Church Road, Epsom (KT17).”*

*We note that according to the agenda reports pack for the meeting on 7th December 2015, the initial consultation showed 89% of respondents in Church Road (24 out of 27 replies) believe there is a parking problem and 81% (22 out of 27 replies) are in favour of a permit scheme.*

*We would now urge you to take all respondents included below into account when considering implementing the scheme.”*

As of 2 December the petition has 72 signatures in favour from 60 properties. The Atkins survey showed 75 properties were included in Church Road and on this basis we already show 80% support for some kind of parking permit scheme.

Residents have indicated that they did not respond to the Atkins survey because:

- Overconfidence: 'the parking situation is so drastically bad that surely the council will push the scheme through, or all my neighbours will vote for the scheme. Therefore I don't need to take the time to vote'
- Confusion: some residents did not properly understand which scheme is on offer and on what days, or what provisions would be available for people with off-street parking or those who don't yet have a car but may want them in the future. Therefore in light of point a) above chose not to vote
- Access to the internet: there are a number of elderly residents in the road who do not have access to the internet and therefore realistically were not able to participate

If the committee will not proceed to advertising phase immediately could the committee please undertake further analysis to understand if zoned permit parking could be implemented in sections of the road where strong support was shown in the survey.

**Officer Response:**

Atkins carried out a full independent consultation with all residents in the area, based on historic requests for a permit scheme from one or two residents.

As the whole purpose of the consultation exercise was to establish whether there was support or not for residents permit schemes, and the results are very clear, any further representations to introduce schemes should be deferred to the next parking review in order to allow time for further consultation to take place and evidence to be gathered.

Trying to include residents schemes based on new representations after such an extensive consultation would cause inappropriate delay to the rest of the current parking review.

**Question 5 – Colin Taylor  
Re: West Hill sign**

**Question:**

Some time ago, the sign near the railway bridge over West Hill advising the number of spaces free in town centre car parks was damaged by a road traffic accident. Initially it was removed and not replaced. When I queried this it emerged that because the car park sign system came from a different budget, officers believed the highways budget could not be used to replace it. Eventually this was over-ruled and the sign was re-erected. However it has still not been connected to the necessary cabling to enable it to display the relevant information. There is a cable sticking out of the ground about 5 metres away which may be relevant. When can this useful sign be got back into action?

**Officer Response:**

There will be a full review of all town centre signs as part of the Plan E works so it would not be economic to carry out repairs at this time before the effectiveness of the sign has been assessed.

**Question 6 – Colin Taylor**  
**Re: Kiln Lane link**

**Question:**

The agenda includes a petition and response concerning the Kiln Lane link. The response includes mention of the possible alternative of a direct link under the railway from Kiln Lane to Felstead Road, which officers seemed unaware of when I last asked about this topic. Given that the project was denied government funding in the past due to the cost of the scheme, which is far higher than for a direct link because of the extra cutting and the additional over-bridge for access to the trading estate, it seems all too likely that it will risk rejection again next time if it is submitted again unchanged, for the same reason. Why not also submit an alternative scheme for a direct link, with proposals to modify the borough council building in Blenheim Road and the car dealership in Kiln Lane, including re-locating the traveller site as proposed at one stage?

**Officer Response:**

The petition response report sets out the various factors that have been taken into account when developing the proposed Kiln Lane Link Road scheme layout and considering alternatives.

The suggestion of a possible alternative of a direct link under the railway from Kiln Lane to Felstead Road was considered in the previous Business Case (July 2001) and discounted as it was considered that it would not meet the need to:

- 1 minimise landtake from non-highway/County owned land, for example existing privately owned businesses freeholds/long leaseholds,
- 2 provide the ability to provide exchange land, where non-highway/County owned landtake would be required,
- 3 minimise disruption to existing business operations as far as possible,
- 4 provide a scheme consistent with land safeguarded in the Epsom & Ewell Local Plan and hence comply with adopted policy and,
- 5 enable proposed gradients of the road to be provided within defined design standards to enable the road to pass beneath the railway line whilst allowing acceptable headroom under the railway and allow side roads to either tie into the proposed road or provide alternative access arrangements.

Taking the above factors into consideration along with the current configuration of the existing businesses in the area, the suggested alternative alignment would involve the purchase/demolition/rebuilding of the major car dealership. This could incur significant land purchase and compensation costs to a private landowner/business, which would impact on the cost/benefit of the business case for the scheme. In addition there would be difficulties ensuring that the gradients of the road/headroom under the railway could be provided within design standards and allow side roads to either tie into the proposed road or provide alternative access arrangements.

It should also be noted that the current proposed scheme layout followed a wide ranging public consultation which resulted in support for the scheme layout and was approved by the Epsom and Ewell Local Committee on 12 July 2004.

It is anticipated that the updated business case document would make reference to the previously submitted (and Provisionally Accepted Business Case) both in terms of the fact that it previously passed through Provisional Funding and that it contained a commentary on the alternative alignments considered.

Finally it should be noted that the project was deferred for funding in the past due to the previous Government focus on investment in the 3 Regional Transport Hubs in the County; namely Guildford, Woking and Reigate-Redhill, following the 2004 Spending Review.

**Question 7 – Colin Taylor**  
**Re: Residents Parking Schemes**

**Question:**

The agenda includes a proposal to advertise a proposed Residents Parking schemes in Victoria Place and another in Leith Road and Lintons Lane, but not in Portland Place and Stones Road nor in the new Winter Place. The results of the expert survey by Atkins indicate that residents in Portland Place and Stones Road believe there is a parking problem and that those who have replied are overwhelmingly in favour of being included. The only issue seems to be that lots of households did not reply. This is very likely due to either having an off-road parking space or not having a car. Whilst it is only right that no RPS should be installed where the majority of residents are against it, would it not make sense to find this out by advertising a proposal to see how many are actually against it, also covering Winter Place? These three roads (plus Middle Lane) are sure to get a lot of displaced commuter parking from the RPS areas. Middle Lane residents opted to face this consequence, but residents in Portland Place and Stones Road asked to be protected from it. The report mentions that prior requests to councillors can be taken into account when deciding where to make proposals. In this case there was a lot of correspondence when I was a councillor for that area, but I no longer have access to the relevant emails.

**Officer Response:**

Atkins carried out their consultation so that we could determine whether or not certain areas actually required residents permit schemes, and to save on the expense of taking a proposal through to the advertising stage if it wasn't truly wanted.

All residents in the roads mentioned were given the opportunity to answer a questionnaire as part of the consultation, but there was only a minimal response rate – it cannot be assumed that residents did not answer because they either do not have a car or have space available off-street - a residents permit scheme would still directly affect them. If we were to draw this conclusion, then we would have to draw a similar conclusion to all of the other areas consulted, which would make the Atkins report redundant.

Any further representations to introduce schemes should be deferred to the next parking review in order to allow time for further consultation to take place and evidence to be gathered.

**Question 8 – Colin Taylor**  
**Re: Residents Parking Schemes**

The agenda includes proposals to advertise proposed Residents Parking schemes in the Burnet Grove area and the Marshalls Close area, these being two of Epsom & Ewell's three old CPZs from before 2000. The report mentions that for several years permits have not been available for the marked parking bays in these areas. This is also true of the third CPZ in Hookfield and Lindsay Close, where no change is proposed. What is intended as the future policy for issuing permits for the marked parking bays in this CPZ? If there is no demand for permits, can the status of the marked bays be clarified?

**Officer Response:**

We can certainly look to amend the status of the bays in Hookfield - we haven't done this at present, but it could certainly be added to the next review, although if the requirement was to make the bays in to residents permit bays, we would need at least 70% of residents to be in favour before such a change would be progressed.

**Question 9 – Colin Taylor**  
**Re: Pound Lane cycle path**

The new shared cycle path in West Hill is well marked with white painted signs. However the other new one in Pound Lane still has none. Worse, there are still old white markings on its old route on the main carriageway. When I last asked about this, officers felt the sign posts were sufficient. However in practice hardly any use is being made of the new safer route. Can the usual white paint signs be added please?

**Officer Response:**

White thermoplastic pedestrian / cycle symbols can be added to the section of shared use cycleway in Pound Lane. This will be included on the list of outstanding road markings and should be done early in the new year.

**Question 10 – Barry Gusterson**  
**Re: Residents Parking in College Road**

I am writing on behalf of the owners of properties 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 College Road, Epsom and in response to the Review (phase 9) as it impacts on our request for restricted residents parking.

Background:

1. In accordance with Appendix 2 ('Requests can relate to a specific part of the road rather than the road in general, so even though a road is listed it does not necessarily mean that all parking situations in that road have been assessed'); we are requesting residents parking for our block of 5 properties in College Road that have a special case as outlined below.
2. In accordance with Appendix 4 ('a recommendation cannot be based on a minority in favour, except where there may have been previous correspondence including petitions'). There has been a long correspondence previously about the specific and individual situation of this block of Victorian properties and the need for residents parking.

3. This section of College Road has a unique block of Victorian terraced houses, which because of their age, situation and architectural importance have restrictions on them, resulting in a ban on converting the front garden into off street parking. The residents thus rely on being able to park outside their own property.
4. The survey showed that only 10 properties in College Road out of 58 replied to the survey. This is explained by the fact that the houses between Randolph Road and Church Road are modern and have off street parking or are flats, where the owners are not resident. Opposite numbers 12 – 20 there are three large properties, a nursing home, a residents home for the elderly and a block of flats all of which have parking for residents.
5. The main problems that we have relate to the 'lack of space available for residents to park, with a significant amount of road space being used by commuters/local workers/shoppers'. There is also an issue with large delivery lorries that block the highway and have to go up on the pavement.
6. We all recognise the importance of this block of properties and do our best to maintain them and keep the gardens attractive to enhance the local environment and resolving the parking issue would be of great assistance.

We are thus asking the Local Committee, on the basis of previous correspondence and the information above, whether they would consider including the stretch of College Road from nos. 12 to 20 inclusive in a Residents Parking Scheme to give residents only parking in this part of College Road.

#### **Officer Response:**

Atkins carried out a full independent consultation with all residents in the area, based on historic requests for a permit scheme from one or two residents.

As the whole purpose of the consultation exercise was to establish whether there was support or not for residents permit schemes, and the results are very clear, any further representations to introduce schemes should be deferred to the next parking review in order to allow time for further consultation to take place and evidence to be gathered.

Trying to include residents schemes based on new representations after such an extensive consultation would cause inappropriate delay to the rest of the current parking review.

#### **Additional representations received in relation to Residents Parking Schemes which were outside the deadline for questions and petitions.**

##### **Sally Wray – Andrew's Close**

Petition, with a total of 32 signatures supporting the introduction of residents' only parking restrictions from residents accounting for 26 of the properties on Andrew's Close and 1 property on the corner of College Road and Andrew's Close (the front door to this property is on Andrew's Close). 72% of occupied properties are in support.

Please also note that:

- Two of the properties on Andrew's Close are unoccupied – house nos 3 and 22
- There are only 38 properties on Andrew's Close (not 39 as stated in Atkins' documents – there is no number 13). Petition signatures from 23 properties represents support for the proposals from 64% of the 36 occupied properties in the street.
- One resident said she had no view for or against the proposals (house no 33) and there were 6 properties where residents were not in at the times we called (house nos 8, 9, 17, 24, 26, 28)
- Only 4 residents said they were not in favour of residents' only parking proposals

In the original parking consultation letter that was sent out to residents (dated 3 September 2015), the Council stated that responses would be considered on 'a road by road basis' and not by area. The attached petition shows that the majority of the residents of Andrews Close support the introduction of residents' only parking restrictions on their street and I therefore request that the proposal is progressed to the next stage.

My reasons for supporting the proposal are:

- damage to our car when it is parked near our house – our own car, parked outside our house, has been hit by non-residents parking/looking for parking spaces on two occasions this year alone. My husband witnessed a delivery van hit a resident's parked car. Two other residents told me that their vehicles have been hit by other vehicles whilst parked in the street.
- damage to property – last year one of our elderly neighbours had a large vehicle drive up his drive and onto his front lawn to turn round because the driver didn't have space to turn in the street
- we are often not being able to park in the street when we return from shopping or from attending medical appointments
- emergency vehicles would not have sufficient access to drive down the road when it is parked up during the day
- poor parking has meant that our refuse does not always get collected because the dustcarts have been unable to get down the street because of parked cars. This has happened on several occasions, most recently about two weeks ago.
- obstruction of pavements - commuters now park on the pavements in the street as a matter of course. The pavements are obstructed for pedestrians and frequently impassable for anyone with a pushchair or requiring wheelchair access.

### **Ed Birchall – Residents Parking in College Area**

Petition on change.org with 30 signatures on 3 December.

Resident Permit Parking for

Pikes Hill, Wyeth's Road, St Martin's Close, Grove Avenue, Church Road, Grove Road, Albert Road, Wimborne Close, Andrew's Close, Treemount Court, Tintagel Close, Cedar Close, College Road and Pitt Road

Resident's permits currently cost £50 per year for the first permit and £75 per year for any subsequent permits, and visitors' permits are £2 each. This price is set in our standard county-wide policy.

The concerns that residents have expressed are:

- The obstruction of pavements/ off street parking, and the obstruction of the highway in general for larger vehicles such as fire appliances, ambulances and refuse/delivery vehicles.
- The lack of space available for residents to park, with a significant amount of road space being used by commuters/local workers/shoppers.

This page is intentionally left blank



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL  
7 December 2015**

**MEMBER QUESTIONS**

**Question 1 John Beckett  
Re: Traffic Light Systems**

Residents in Epsom and Ewell are becoming increasingly frustrated at the apparent lack of action regarding the repair and upkeep of the traffic light systems within Epsom and Ewell. Several local Borough Councillors have approached me recently regarding the ongoing problems at the Cheam Road Junction and the A240 which is causing particular concern.

I have also been informed that the team looking after traffic light management is now only made up of 6 individuals which appears to be totally inadequate to cope with the issues that are arising and the ongoing problems that need addressing.

Can officers please investigate?

**Officer Response:**

Congestion problems have indeed been exacerbated at the busy A240 Ewell-by-Pass/A232 Cheam Road junction, since the recent carriageway resurfacing works completed as part of Surrey's 'Project Horizon' Programme. Regrettably, such resurfacing inevitably damages the detector loops buried in the carriageway surface which enable the current traffic signals controller to operate at its optimum efficiency and such damage has indeed occurred at this location.

This damage does affect the intelligence of the junction which can lead to extended queues at busy times, as has recently been experienced. Unfortunately this problem has also been compounded further by a fault with the BT line which links the junction's controller to the 'Urban Traffic Control' (UTC) Server at Surrey's offices, to operate in conjunction with the nearby signals at the junction of Cheam Road/Nonsuch Court Road. I am pleased to confirm that having been followed up by Surrey Officers, this fault was rectified by BT on Tuesday 1st December, which should help to improve the junction movements a little.

Regrettably current contractual performance issues with Surrey's specialist Traffic Signals Contractor, have delayed the re-cutting of the detector loops into the new carriageway surface. Contractual performance problems continue to be managed closely by Surrey Officers to mitigate future similar delays and I am pleased to confirm that this work is now scheduled to commence on Thursday 3rd December. Works will take place in the evening outside peak times to avoid any further disruption. With the BT line repaired and the detector loops restored the junctions should revert back to their previous performance levels (under UTC control) by Tuesday 8th December.

Furthermore, utilising funds from Local Committee, further enhancements to these junctions - also linked to the nearby pedestrian crossing near the railway bridge - are already in hand, upgrading traffic signals controllers and their mode of operation to the optimum level of

intelligence. Site refurbishments are planned for the end of January 2016, with final connections and system checks completed by February.

With regards to staffing levels, the number of posts in the Traffic Operations team maintaining Surrey's Traffic signals has not reduced over recent years and no changes to team numbers were proposed when the Environment and Infrastructure Service went through its latest restructure this year. Whilst additional staff numbers might well assist in dealing with any problems with Traffic signals across the County, current and future pressures on all revenue budgets make it unlikely that further posts will be created, so management focus remains on refining and improving processes, managing Contractor Performance and maximising the use of the latest technology to improve signals operation and maintenance.

Looking slightly further ahead, Surrey have successfully bid for an allocation of Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Capital money as part of the 'Wider Network Benefits' project, which over the next couple of years will enable all the Traffic signal controllers along the A24, and A240 routes to be upgraded to the latest specification and optimum method of operation.

**Question 2 Cllr Clive Smitheram**  
**Re: Danetree School Expansion – parking issues**

The residents of the roads adjacent to Danetree School in West Ewell, particularly Gadesden Road, Oakhurst Road and Danetree Road currently experience a very high level of inconsiderate, antisocial, inappropriate and quite often very dangerous parking during the 'school pick up' between 2-30pm and 3-30pm Monday to Friday.

With the impending large increase in pupil numbers and more than probable vehicle journeys what measures are being put in place to address a totally unacceptable impact on the local highway infrastructure.

**Officer Response:**

The proposed expansion of the three Ewell schools has come about as a result of an approach to Surrey County Council by the governing bodies of West Ewell Infants, Ewell grove Infants and Danetree Juniors. All three schools have, at different times, expressed a keen interest in becoming all through primaries. Once SCC identified a basic need for more primary school places in Ewell this re-organisation became possible for SCC to fund through the grant it gets directly from central government for additional school places. These places have been added to all three schools.

Two public consultations have been held on this proposal and both have had a high level of parental support and equal support from the schools' governors. Surrey County Council and GLF (the multi-academy trust of which Danetree is a part) has therefore determined that the re-organisation will go ahead.

SCC is now ready to commence its planning applications to enable the council to provide the appropriate accommodation at all three schools. The planning proposals will also include measures to mitigate additional traffic as advised by Surrey Highways officers and an independent transport assessment.

The Council is aware of residents' concerns about traffic and these will be taken into consideration, as part of the planning application, by the Surrey Planning Committee when it considers this early next year.

However traffic mitigation may not wholly resolve this issue which regrettably occurs, from time to time, around many schools. Anti-social parking or the behaviour of individual drivers is a matter for the residents to take up with the schools, in the first instance, or with the local police.

**Question 3 Jan Mason**  
**Re: Gulley Clearance**

What is the routine schedule for gulley clearance in Epsom and Ewell? How does Surrey Highways deal with individual reports of localised flooding and blocked highway drains?

**Officer Response:**

Information on gully and drain maintenance and cleaning is available on the Surrey County Council website: <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-maintenance-and-cleaning/drainage-and-flooding/drain-cleaning>. This includes the gully cleaning schedule for the County. In the past the County Council had contracts in place for every publically maintainable gully in Surrey to be cleaned once a year. We are now moving to a more intelligent programme, whereby gullies that fill with silt more quickly are cleaned more frequently, and gullies that fill with silt more slowly are cleaned less frequently. This means that resources can be targeted to where they are most needed.

We welcome reports of blocked or damaged gullies, or indeed troublesome puddles, on an ad hoc basis. Depending on the timing of these reports, we may respond through the routine gully cleaning programme. We are also able to respond ahead of the routine cleaning programming with ad hoc gully cleaning and jetting. When there is physical damage to a gully or drainage system, we are also able to commission more substantial repairs. Recent examples of more substantial repairs include London Road, Ewell, near Bourne Hall, and Beaufort Way, also in Ewell.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Epsom & Ewell Local Committee  
7 December 2015**

**STATEMENT FROM THE PARKING TEAM IN RELATION TO RESIDENTS PARKING ZONES**

The recommendations shown in Annex 4 of the Epsom and Ewell parking review proposals, are based on the evidence gathered by an independent source.

All residents in the assigned areas were consulted and had the opportunity to agree with or object to implementing a residents permit scheme in these areas.

The consultation period took place from 03 September to 02 October 2015, during which period all residents were letter dropped, notified of the proposals and asked to give us their feedback.

Since the report was published some two weeks ago (from committee date), there have been numerous requests to consider changing the recommendations based on new information gathering exercises.

These new representations will not have been analysed independently by engineers or the rest of the committee, in addition those residents who are against resident permit schemes may not know about any new representations that have been made and may or may not have had the opportunity to put their opinion forward.

As the whole purpose of the consultation exercise was to establish whether there was support or not for residents permit schemes, and the results are very clear, any further representations to introduce schemes should be deferred to the next parking review in order to allow time for further consultation to take place and evidence to be gathered.

Trying to include residents schemes based on new representations after such an extensive consultation would cause inappropriate delay to the rest of the current parking review.

This page is intentionally left blank