

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 7.00 pm on 29 February 2016  
at Bourne Hall, Spring Street, Ewell, KT17 1UF.

**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

---

**1/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Tina Mountain.

**2/16 CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS [Item 2]**

The Chairman reported that he had approved two further bids from the Community Safety Fund. Firstly £750 towards the cost of providing training for education staff on Child Sexual Exploitation, and secondly £787 to install keypads to secure gates on the Longmead Estate as a crime safety measure.

The Chairman and Vice Chairman had met with officers to discuss over £1 million of SCC held Section 106 and PIC money that is designated to be spent in Epsom and Ewell. This is an important step forward in ensuring that these sums are fully used for the purpose described and with Member input.

At the SCC Budget Meeting on 9th February the reduction of 25% in this year's Local Highway revenue funding was confirmed. This will make a difference to officers' ability to respond to all the pressures and requests that come their way. Member Allocations have not been reduced this year and remain at £10,296.

The Local Highway Maintenance Engineer, Jefferson Nwokeoma has moved to a new job and a replacement will not be in place for 2 or 3 months. Members of the Local Committee have been told the best way to report highway maintenance issues in the interim and County Members have been

advised to notify Nick Healey of schemes or priorities for 2016/2017 previously agreed.

### **3/16 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 3]**

5 questions were received. The questions and answers are set out in Annex A. The following additional points were made:

Question 1: Cllr Steer indicated that she was still unhappy with the progress made and requested that representatives from the County and Borough Councils and the Environment Agency meet on site to decide what action can be taken. This would be investigated and a response sent to Cllr Steer together with an update on current progress.

Question 2: Cllr Partridge reported that residents feel that on average there is only 8 or 9 seconds of green time in the peak hours and not the 16 seconds suggested by TfL. Highway officers agreed to give Cllr Partridge details of the contact at TfL so that he can discuss the issue with them direct. The Committee asked the Chairman to write on behalf of the Committee in support of the residents.

Question 5: On behalf of Teresa Cass, Cllr Liz Frost asked whether it would be possible to see the speed data collected by Surrey Police. It was agreed that the contact details for the appropriate officer at Surrey Police would be sent to Teresa Cass so that she could contact them direct.

### **4/16 ADJOURNMENT [Item 4]**

23 members of the public were present. Seven informal questions were asked and answers were provided at the meeting.

### **5/16 PETITIONS [Item 5]**

One petition was received.

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

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

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** Several residents of the area were present at the meeting and outlined the dangers and incidents they had witnessed whilst taking their children to school and expressing their concern that a serious incident could happen at any time. It was suggested that the installation of yellow lines in Cuddington Avenue had led to an increase in the speed of traffic in the road and the reintroduction of some parking bays was suggested. One resident had contacted the County Council to offer her services as a school crossing patrol but had not received a reply.

The Chairman responded that he had attended the recent site visit to the area with officers and that a full report on the assessment and any proposed actions would be considered at the next meeting of the Committee in June. The County Council had agreed that a school crossing patrol could be employed, but that the cost of this would need to be met by the schools as it is not considered a priority site.

**Member Discussion – key points**

Noted the progress made so far in responding to the petition and that a full report will be made to the 20 June meeting of the Committee

**6/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 6]**

The minutes were confirmed as a correct record.

**7/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 7]**

Cllr Liz Frost indicated that she had a non pecuniary interest in Item 10 as a trustee of the Millennium Green which is adjacent to the proposed zebra crossing in Woodcote Green Road.

**8/16 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 8]**

One question was received, the question and answer is set out in Annex B.

**9/16 REQUEST FOR FUNDS FOR ON STREET PARKING ENFORCEMENT EQUIPMENT [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

**Officers attending:** Joy Stevens, EEBC Head of Customer Service; Richard Chevalier, EEBC Parking Manager

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

**Member Discussion – key points**

Members queried whether the mobile coverage was good enough in some areas of the Borough to enable the hand held devices to work. Officers responded that if the area is not suitable for data transfer then the information can be held on the devices for download later.

Members welcomed the possibility of the purchase of a scooter and asked whether this would mean that the van and car currently used could be sold. Officers replied that this could be considered when the effectiveness of the scooter has been assessed.

**Resolved:** that £14,196 of the Local Committee's share of the surplus on the on-street parking account, be released to the on-street account of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council (EEBC) to contribute towards the cost of:

- (i) 10 TC55 Handheld devices to be used by Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO's) in on-street parking enforcement
- (ii) a moped to be used by a CEO to enable them to attend parking concern locations in a more timely manner along with maintenance, insurance, equipment and uniform for a CEO to use a moped in a safe manner, subject to a business case review by officers.

Reasons:

The handheld equipment currently used has not been updated for many years. The new stock are more durable, enable real-time data to be transferred to and from the office, have a better battery life and GPS capabilities.

Investing in a moped will allow a CEO to attend ticketing and patrol requests more quickly, and assists with on-street enforcement across the borough particularly in peak times or if there is heavy traffic on the road.

The 2014/15 Local Committee surplus was £34,196. £10,000 of this has been allocated to Surrey County Council for the Parking Review 2015/2016. A similar amount is to be assigned for the next Parking Review for 2016/17. This bid is for the remaining funds of £14,196.

**10/16 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

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

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** Two members of the public asked questions in relation to this item. One queried whether the computer modelling took into account the school at Pound Lane. Mr Tufo who had previously submitted two petitions to the Committee, one in relation to opposition to the proposed one-way system in Temple Road/Hook Road and one asking for traffic calming in Temple Road asked whether a 20mph speed limit could be considered in the area, particularly in Pound Lane. He also asked for changes to the parking bays in Temple Road: shortening some of the bays so that vehicles cannot park as close to the dropped kerbs for driveways, to give better visibility to drivers exiting; and for bays to be moved to create a chicane effect to slow traffic. The Parking Engineer had been consulted and had agreed that some of the bays could be shortened in the next few months, but that redesign of the position of the bays would need to be considered in the next parking review. Whilst pleased that the bays could be shortened, Mr Tufo reported that this would still allow two vehicles to park which he felt would still be dangerous. It was agreed that he would discuss this further with Cllr Wormington, Mr Persand and the Parking Engineer.

**Member Discussion – key points**

Noted that the Stoneleigh Park Road to Bradford Drive cycle scheme has not yet been finalised and the plan at Annex F just shows the current progress. It is designed to help cycles legally cross to Bradford Drive without dismounting instead of having to go to the roundabout and back. The final scheme will come back to the Committee for approval.

Mr Persand proposed that the Hook Road/Temple Road one-way system should be further investigated with a view to implementing a one-way system. There was no seconder to his proposal.

Cllr Frost asked whether the Millennium Green Trustees had been consulted on whether they would agree to moving the bin, bench and sign to an area nearer to the proposed zebra crossing.

Members queried whether the proposed cycle link in Scotts Farm Road could be affected by any development taking place nearby, as infrastructure improvements would be required in the area. The Highways Area Manager reported that the scheme is currently awaiting agreement to the transfer of land from Epsom & Ewell High School.

Mrs Mason reported that Brumfield Road would be replaced by work of a similar value in Green Lanes (odd side).

The adverts for the current parking review had not yet been published. The Parking Engineer would be asked for a publication date which would be circulated to members of the Committee.

**Resolved:**

- (i) To approve the advertisement of the Legal Notice for a new Zebra Crossing in Church Street, Epsom, near Pitt Place, and for any objections to be considered by the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member;
- (ii) That the proposal for a permanent one-way system incorporating Hook Road, Chase Road, Temple Road and Pound Lane is not progressed further at the present time and that changes to the layout of parking bays in Temple Road be considered as part of the next parking review.
- (iii) To approve the advertisement of the Legal Notice for a new Zebra Crossing in Woodcote Green Road, near the bus stops behind Epsom Hospital, and for any objections to be considered by the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member;
- (iv) That the proposals for the Epsom Banstead Sustainable Transport Package (SPT) should be the subject of public consultation during May and June 2016, and to agree that the project consultation material should be decided by the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Epsom Banstead STP Member Task Group;
- (v) The realignment of the tactile paving on the southern side of the Grosvenor Road bellmouth to match the dropped kerb on the northern side, thus providing a finished but lesser scheme at this location;
- (vi) To 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:**

Programmes of work have been agreed with the Committee and individual Divisional Members. Committee is asked to provide the necessary

authorisation to deliver those programmes of work in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Member without the need to revert to the Committee as a whole.

Public consultation is needed to assist the development of the Epsom Banstead STP scheme proposals. At a later date it is expected that Committee will be asked to approve statutory consultation (legal notices for certain elements of the scheme) once the detailed design is nearing completion.

**11/16 MEMBERSHIP OF EPSOM & EWELL CYCLING PLAN TASK GROUP  
[EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

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

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

**Member Discussion –** None

**Resolved:** That Cllrs Michael Arthur and Tella Wormington be appointed to form a Task Group to oversee the development of a local cycling plan prior to its final agreement by the Local Committee.

Reasons: To assist officers with the preparation of a local cycling plan.

**12/16 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION/ACTION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION]  
[Item 12]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

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

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

**Member Discussion –** None

Noted, the progress with the recorded decisions/actions. The Chairman agreed to write to the youth service requesting an update on the action from the 21 September meeting.

**13/16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 13]**

Meeting ended at: 8.50 pm

---

**Chairman**



**SURREY**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL  
29 February 2016**

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS**

**Question 1 – Cllr Jean Steer  
Re: Green Lanes Stream**

**Question:**

For the past six years at least, I have been trying to get the bed of the stream that runs along Green Lanes in West Ewell cleared of silt and vegetation. Trees have seeded in this water course and have grown into maturity. This stream is a tributary for the Hogs Mill River and therefore needs to flow freely. Some five years ago, the Environment Agency examined the stream and concluded that at least 60% of the silt could be removed along with the overgrown vegetation. There has been a considerable amount of work done by multi-agency funding to the Hogs Mill River over the past few years, but the Green Lanes stream has not been included.

It has been established that the responsibility for the bed of the stream lies with Surrey County Council, although the banks are cut by the Borough Council. Surrey County Council has accepted that it is their responsibility but, so far, has not given any assurance about its upkeep.

The widespread flooding across the whole of this country, including Surrey, has highlighted residents' concerns that the stream could flood as it did many years ago

Will the County Council look into this situation as soon as possible and particularly whilst the heavy rainfall continues.

**Officer Response:**

The County Council is currently registered as the owner of the bed of the stream. This watercourse is designated as a main river and the land appears to have been acquired by this Council in connection with a land drainage improvement scheme in 1957. This land is no longer required for any County Council functions and it seems it should have been transferred to the Environment Agency following the Water Act 1973 and subsequent legislation. The Environment Agency has been contacted by the County Council legal department seeking its agreement to the transfer of the title to the land and a response is awaited. The Environment Agency has indicated that this may take some time, due to pressure of work within its legal team and that the matter is not considered a priority. The County Council has no plans to carry out any work in the area in the meantime.

**Question 2 – Cllr Keith Partridge  
Re: Malden Rushett Junction**

**Question:**

Will SCC's Highways Department please confirm their willingness to assist Epsom and Ewell Borough Councillors' with forward communications and negotiation with TfL, regarding the traffic light phasing at the main Malden Rushett crossroad junction? This we feel is now necessary, because EEBC residents travelling towards Malden Rushett westbound along Rushett Lane (B280), especially during the early morning rush-hour period, are having to queue for excessive periods of time before reaching the junction. This support could also include representation at any future meetings and possible site visits.

These delays are causing frustration and are having a detrimental effect on our residents reaching their normal places of work. During November 2015, it was observed that the green light phasing had been reduced from something like 16 seconds down to a paltry 9 seconds, with the adverse effect of queues often reaching back not only to the Horton Lane roundabout, but also beyond that to Christchurch church situated on Christ Church Road, a distance of at least 1.5 miles. Recent examples of the delays encountered by our residents from their starting to queue and then actually reaching the Malden Rushett traffic lights, are: -

1. 10th January Queuing for 31 minutes
2. 11th January 25 minutes
3. 12th January 23 minutes
4. 18th January 21 minutes
5. 19th January 22 minutes
6. 2nd February 20 minutes
7. 3rd February 20 minutes
8. 5th February 25 minutes
9. 8th February 30 minutes

TfL did provide a response on 24th November 2015 explaining their SCOOT system optimises the signal timings based on actual vehicle demand. But this does not seem to take into account, the queuing traffic along Rushett Lane and our local residents are finding that the delays are getting longer and becoming more and more frequent. We are collating further queuing times and also some photographs, which will hopefully help going forward. These will be made readily available, as deemed necessary.

**Officer Response:**

SCC wrote to TfL last year raising concerns about the timings on the traffic signals being unfavourable to Rushett Lane traffic, following the improvement to the junction.

TfL responded on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2015 with the following reply

**“In managing London’s traffic signals, we seek to safely balance the needs of motorists, pedestrians and cyclists within a heavily used network with significant competing demands.**

**The signals in question are operating on a dynamic traffic control system called SCOOT that optimises signal timings based on actual vehicle demand. During peak periods there are significant queues on all approaches to the**

**junction with the A243 queuing back to the M25 junction 9 in the AM peak, and Bridge Road Roundabout during the PM peak. Whilst we recognise that there also significant queues on Rushett Lane during the AM peak and Fair Oak Lane during the PM peak, we have tried to balance the needs of all users of the junction and feel that the current signal timings in operation represent the best balance for everybody. We will continue to monitor the junction to ensure that this remains the case.”**

SCC have written again to TfL asking for the timings to be reviewed following the information supplied by Cllr Partridge.

TfL have replied with the following statement

**“During the AM peak Rushett Lane receives an average of 16 seconds green time. This has been the case since November 2015. The SCOOT system detects vehicle flow on all approaches to the junction and adjusts green time according to demand. Since SCOOT has been implemented queues on certain approaches to the junction have changed in order to create a fair balance between all vehicles in the network.”**

**Question 3 – Cllr Martin Olney  
Re: Residents Parking Zones (RPZ)**

**Question:**

At the last meeting of the Local Committee many people express concern about the way in which the introduction of a RPZ was considered. The introduction of a 70% majority was a great concern. It appears to be a money saving measure given the other factors that are taken into consideration. Can we have a definitive statement on what criteria are used to select the participants in a vote for a RPZ?

As an illustration of my concerns I will use a request that I recently made. I asked for grasscrete to be put on the green outside numbers 4 to 24 Wheelers lane – 11 homes which form a crescent around the proposed CPZ. The idea was to serve the small group of people that stay at home during the day and use their cars. This would include home workers, retired people and families with young children. There is already a dropped kerb that serves no 2 Wheelers lane next to the green.

My understanding is that the whole of Wheelers Lane would be canvassed for their opinion of this change. That would be a total of 42 homes. Last time a RPZ was looked at Lane End was also included. This is a single track cul-de-sac off Wheelers Lane with 9 homes, all with off street parking.

I would like clarification on why the following groups would be included in the consultation:

- Those homes outside the crescent formed by the proposed RPZ;
- Homes with off street parking and/or garages;
- Those that do not meet the criteria for which the RPZ was required

I would also like to understand what the cost effectiveness criteria are. In my example the RPZ would have been for a small group of people that stay at home during the day. The roads are used by commuters, those employed locally and shoppers to park their cars. Therefore if the local residents move their cars there is

very little likelihood of finding a parking space anywhere near their homes on their return.

**Officer Response:**

There is no criteria used to select participants in a RPZ - usually the residents concerned would let us know that they wish us to look at installing a scheme and the location of the residents would determine the extents of a proposal.

The 70% criteria enables us to better manage peoples expectations and is a County wide requirement agreed by the Cabinet member to ensure consistency.

A residents permit scheme should not be introduced unless there is a majority in favour - we have set this at 70% as it makes it a clear majority with no room for questioning the outcome.

Previously it was often the case that 1 or 2 residents would request a scheme and a lot of officer time and the committee's budgets was spent on carrying out preliminary consultations, only to find that a majority of residents in the area were not in favour of a scheme.

We are now asking residents to speak to their neighbours and gain 70% in favour before we start, so that we set off on the right foot and actually look at implementing something that is required – this removes the need for us to carry out any preliminary consultations and in turn means that any schemes agreed by the Committee can be implemented more quickly.

When a RPZ was previously considered in Wheelers Lane, there was mass objection to the scheme and it was dropped. No further proposals will be considered unless the residents views have changed and the current criteria for imposing such a scheme can be met.

The criteria for a residents permit scheme does not penalise individuals within a proposed area - if there are one or two residents with off-street parking, then they will be able to apply for any additional permits that may be required. Where this would make a difference is if the entire street had ample off-street parking and a scheme was being requested to prevent others from parking in the area, essentially making it seem like a private road.

The length of the scheme is either determined by the Engineer, finding a reasonable cut off point for the scheme or those residents who have applied and their location.

As stated previously, it is not the individual, but the whole area that is looked at to determine the RPZ requirements and anyone is able to respond to the statutory advertisement of the scheme. These views are then considered before a final decision is made on whether it would be appropriate to implement a RPZ.

A resident permit scheme must be self financing - the monies that residents pay for permits is for enforcement, maintenance and administration costs.

The cost of providing grasscrete over the area between 4 and 24 Wheelers Lane is separate from any RPZ consideration and would be approx £40k, possibly more with design costs. It is unlikely to be considered a priority for the Committees limited funding at the current time.

**Question 4 – Cllr David Reeve**

**Re: Exit from Park Avenue West at the Beggars Hill roundabout**

**Question:**

We have had several complaints from residents about the congestion in Park Avenue West trying to enter the Ewell By-Pass at the Beggars Hill roundabout.

This was discussed with the local SCC Councillors who explained about the huge reductions in Grants making changes almost impossible.

There is a solution which, apart from a survey, could be very cheap to implement.

There are traffic lights on the By-pass just to the west of this roundabout. Currently they are pedestrian activated.

They could be programmed to operate during rush hour congestion. These lights could be sequenced with the traffic lights at Stoneleigh Park Road so that cars do not have an additional stoppage.

Would the Committee support this proposal?

**Officer Response:**

There is an existing pelican crossing on Kingston Road linking the bus stops near to the Beggars Hill roundabout. The pelican is activated by pedestrian demand (push button). Changing the way in which the pelican operates may lead to motorists believing the signals are not working properly as they would show a red light to vehicles when there are no pedestrians crossing and this will lead to red light abuse.

In addition, it is not possible to link the traffic signals without providing ducting between the traffic signals at Stoneleigh Park Road and the pelican crossing which is a distance of 330m. This would be an extremely expensive operation and could not be justified for what is essentially a lack of patience for motorists exiting Park Avenue West in the peak hours. Making the exit from Park Avenue West more attractive may lead to an increase in vehicles using it as a short cut.

At present when the Kingston Road (Epsom bound) traffic at Stoneleigh Park Road is held up the traffic from Stoneleigh Park Road is given a green light but the volume is not that great that it prevents Park Avenue West traffic from exiting. Often traffic in Park Avenue West is held up due to vehicles turning left on the by pass joining a queue from the London Road junction or vehicles waiting to turn right being delayed due to the queue of traffic Kingston bound.

**Question 5 – Teresa Cass**

**Re: Grosvenor Road/ Langley Vale Road Junction**

**Question:**

I am very pleased to see that you are recommending no change to the kerb line on the southern side of the junction apart from re aligning the tactile section of the path. Although I was not at the original petition resident, highways, county councillor meeting, as far as I am aware the concerns regarding speeding were within the village, further up the roads (mainly in Beaconsfield) I do have firsthand knowledge

that some residents of Rosebery Road had contacted Cllr Mountain with regards to speeding in their road.

Following the introduction of the speed humps in Langley Vale Road, many years ago, the speed of traffic entering the village was greatly reduced and the vehicle “knocks” that had been a regular occurrence have ceased. However speeding further into the village is still an issue which these schemes, at the entrance, would really never have addressed. I believe the origin of this scheme was always about traffic within the village, not at the entrance, and therefore - To state that the “traffic entering Grosvenor Road is now entering more slowly” and that “This is the main aim of the scheme” is incorrect and should be removed from the report.

It was previously reported that most of the speeding is done by the residents; therefore surely education of that speed is needed. So how can we do that? I'm not sure putting signs to say “you are entering a village” would really work on people who live in the village and speed - they already know they live in a village! We have spoken to the police who will not allow us to speed checks due to the classification of “cul de sac” for these roads.

I have been told that flashing signs do not make a difference however surely this does educate people as to what speed they are doing and hopefully make them slow down. We do find that the gradient of Langley Vale Village means drivers do tend to accelerate hard after entering the village and therefore would not necessarily be aware of the speed they are doing.

In view of this:

- Is there any funding left in the Langley Vale pot as this scheme was not completed fully? If yes - how much money is left?
- How much does it cost to erect a flashing speed sign?
- Can the officers please advise as to how we can get the” cul de sac” classification removed from Langley Vale

Finally - referring back to my verbal question at the September meeting are you yet able to confirm what internal procedures have been put in place to ensure that this type of situation does not happen again.

Just as an extra note – there are still occasional times when vehicles are backed in to Langley Vale Road, if Grosvenor Road is blocked, as there is no longer the curve to house the waiting vehicles.

#### **Officer Response:**

Surrey Police has attempted speed enforcement within Rosebery Road, Beaconsfield Road and Grosvenor Road but found that the level of compliance with the 30mph speed limit is very good. There is no evidence to suggest a need for traffic calming in these roads, other than residents' perceptions. These issues were explored and reported to Committee when the original petition was submitted.

The main aim of the scheme, which is now part completed, was indeed to reduce the speed of vehicles entering Grosvenor Road.

Most drivers in Rosebery Road, Beaconsfield Road and Grosvenor Road will be residents, their visitors, and parents driving their children to school. Any initiative to encourage these drivers to slow down would be most effective if promoted by the local community. Officers have observed that the local community is quite active on

social media, and this could be a useful tool in encouraging drivers to behave responsibly. Any new signs are primarily intended for visitors to Langley Vale. We would agree they are unlikely to have any impact on the behaviour of residents.

Rosebery Road, Beaconsfield Road and Grosvenor Road are all cul de sacs, by definition. If there is a disagreement with Surrey Police over the establishment of a Community Speed Watch, this should be taken up with Surrey Police. As suggested above, it is unlikely that a Community Speed Watch would find evidence of significant speeding.

The cheapest Vehicle Activated Signs cost approximately £2,500 and have been demonstrated only to have a very minimal impact of driver behaviour. Most drivers using Rosebery Road, Beaconsfield Road and Grosvenor Road will be well aware of the 30mph speed limit. A Vehicle Activated Sign would not provide these drivers with any new information.

There is a small amount of developer money remaining that would cover the cost of realigning the tactile paving on the southern side of the Grosvenor Road bellmouth. If there are any monies left over after these works, we would then discuss priorities for investing these monies with the Divisional Member.

There are no plans to extend either Rosebery Road, Beaconsfield Road or Grosvenor Road at the present time to make them into through routes leading eastwards across Epsom Downs and connecting to Tadworth. Therefore all three will remain cul de sacs for the foreseeable future.

The proposed consultation guidelines are due to be submitted to the Cabinet Member for approval, but there has not been a Cabinet Member meeting since Committee met in December so this has not happened yet.

This page is intentionally left blank



**SURREY**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL  
29 February 2016**

**MEMBER QUESTIONS**

**Question 1 Cllr Michael Arthur**

**Re: High Street Ewell Waiting restrictions from o/s Green Man to o/s No.53**

With regard to the limited time waiting restrictions introduced around last September which followed extensive consultation with local traders, business, residents and members, popular belief was that these new restrictions were experimental and subject to a review after about six months. However, Officers have just confirmed that the official road traffic order was not subject to any experimental period and is therefore substantive.

There is now strong feedback, which I would describe as 100%, that there is no requirement for Saturdays being included within the order. The need was precipitated by heavy volume of traffic associated with Monday to Friday business and school days. Those conditions do not arise on Saturdays.

My question is, given that my proposal is for a reduction in prohibited hours of no waiting, can an amendment - to remove Saturday restrictions - be incorporated into Phase 9 proposals which have yet to be formally advertised?"

**Officer Response:**

At the September 2014 Local Committee, the Area Team Manager informed Members that, contrary to the recommendation made at the June 2014 Local Committee, the modifications to parking bays could be made under an experimental order, the TRO for the parking bays would have to be a permanent order as it was not lawful to modify parking bays using an experimental order.

Therefore any changes to the existing parking bays would require an amendment to the TRO and this would have to be carried out under the next parking review which is scheduled to be considered by the Committee in March 2017. The Parking Team has informed the Local Area Team that it would not be possible to include any amendments in the Phase 9 review which will shortly be advertised.

This page is intentionally left blank