

Minutes of the meeting of the
Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 20 June 2016
at Ewell Court House, Lakehurst Road, Ewell KT19 0EB.

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 Kate Chinn
- * Cllr Liz Frost
- Cllr Clive Smitheram
- * Cllr Mike Teasdale
- * Cllr Tella Wormington

* In attendance

14/16 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE LOCAL COMMITTEE FOR 2016/17 [Item 1]

The appointment by Council of Eber Kington as Chairman and John Beckett as Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee for the current municipal year was noted.

15/16 APPOINTMENT OF BOROUGH COUNCIL MEMBERS [Item 2]

Resolved:

To co-opt substitutes for Borough Council members for the municipal year 2016/17.

The Local Committee noted that at the Epsom & Ewell Borough Council's first meeting of this municipal year, 5 Borough Councillors and 5 substitutes were appointed to serve on the Local Committee for the municipal year 2016-2017. David McNulty, Chief Executive, has now confirmed these appointments, the substitute members being appointed subject to the decision above:

Appointed Members [5]

Cllr Kate Chinn	[Court]
Cllr Liz Frost	[Woodcote]
Cllr Clive Smitheram	[West Ewell]
Cllr Mike Teasdale	[Stoneleigh]
Cllr Tella Wormington	[Town]

Substitutes [5]

Cllr Michael Arthur	[Ewell]
Cllr Tony Axelrod	[Town]
Cllr Rekha Bansil	[Woodcote]
Cllr Steve Bridger	[Stamford]
Cllr Vince Romagnuolo	[Court]

Reasons: Standing Order 40(f) requires the Committee at its first meeting in the municipal year to agree whether it wishes Borough Council members to be permitted to have substitutes.

16/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 3]

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Smitheram, Cllr Bansil substituted for him.

17/16 CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS [Item 4]

The Chairman reported that the Committees community safety funding last year was just £3,707, but for the first time the Local Committee retained the funds and distributed it via a local bidding process which resulted in four awards –two for educational training, one to the Youth Service and one to an EEBC/Police initiative. This year the total Surrey-wide funding has been reduced and a suggestion was made that it be automatically pooled for local Community Safety Partnerships to bid to fund the delivery of local projects meeting local needs or to meet the costs of statutory Domestic Homicide Reviews. At a meeting of all Local Committee Chairmen the Chairman opposed that move proposing to retain the ability of Local Committee to determine its use, which was agreed. However the local fund available will still be reduced - to £3,000.

SCC is currently looking at an induction/training programme for both County and Borough Members of the Local Committee after the 2017 SCC Election. Some members were involved in training in 2013, other newer Members may have had none. Members were asked to contact Nicola Morris with any thoughts on what training would make/have made their work on the Local Committee easier or more productive.

18/16 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 5]

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

Question 1: Cllr Dallen questioned the reply as currently taxis drop off at the station and then u turn to join the queue. There is minimal traffic that exits from the car park opposite, the only other 'leg' on green. Pedestrian lights are at red. There does not appear to have been any near misses or accidents due to this. He requested officers to reconsider the decision. Officers remained concerned that pedestrians cross even though there lights are on red and would not be expecting taxis to turn. Officers were awaiting further comments from the traffic signals team and the police road safety team and they would share the comments with Cllr Dallen when they are received. It

was noted that a road safety audit may be necessary to evaluate potential safety issues.

Question 2: Cllr Olney asked for information on the cost of installing pay and display parking across the conservation area and whether this would be more cost effective than a residents parking zone. The Parking team would be asked to provide this information after the meeting.

Annex A

Nine Members of the public were present. Six questions were asked, answers were provided at the meeting or will be provided after the meeting.

19/16 ADJOURNMENT [Item 6]

Nine members of the public were present. Six informal questions were asked and answers were provided at the meeting or a written response will be sent.

20/16 PETITIONS [Item 7]

One petition was received.

Declarations of interest: None

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

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:

The petitioner, set out the reasons for her petition. Cuddington Avenue in Stoneleigh is used by parents taking children to both the Mead Infant School and Auriol Junior School. Many vehicles travel in excess of the current 30mph speed limit and safety is a great concern to the local community as there is nothing to slow down vehicles on the long straight road. Parents have witnessed a number of incidents where children have narrowly escaped injury and a child has recently been injured. She was supportive of the proposal to ask the schools to undertake more road safety education, but felt that this was not sufficient. Many parents are forced to use cars to take their children to school and in the morning additional commuter vehicles use this road in an attempt to avoid congestion elsewhere. The existing yellow lines, operational at peak times make it easier for vehicles to speed and many parents still park on the yellow lines obscuring sight lines.

Other residents asked whether the presence of officers during the assessment visit would deter speeding and why a decision had been made by the schools to place the school crossing patrol in Vale Road which has traffic calming measures instead of on Cuddington Avenue. There was also concern for elderly residents crossing the road and a suggestion that school warning signs could be improved.

The area highway manager responded that the multi agency team of officers who assessed the site have many years of experience in evaluating road safety issues and are familiar with the area. The police did not feel that there was a speed issue in the area. It was noted that the police did not attend the

site visit in uniform and road users would not have been aware of their presence.

It was suggested that the residents may want to consider setting up a community speed watch to gather evidence on whether there is a speeding issue and it was agreed that details of this would be supplied. There is also a School Speed Watch scheme.

Member Discussion – key points

Members, whilst sympathetic, highlighted that similar issues exist at many schools in the Borough and across the County and limited budgets mean that funding has to be directed to those high priority sites where there is a history of accidents.

To slow vehicles it would be necessary to install either road humps or chicanes which are expensive and not always popular with residents.

Resolved:

- (i) That the Mead Infant School and Auriol Junior Schools will be requested to undertake a range of road safety education and training activities. The schools will be supported by the county council's Sustainable School Travel Team to maintain these and to update their School Travel Plan which relates to the encouragement of sustainable travel to and from school.
- (ii) That the Sustainable School Travel Team be asked to provide information on school and community speed watch schemes to the school and petitioner.
- (iii) That the Mead Infant School and Auriol Junior School be asked to review whether the school crossing patrol is sited in the most appropriate location.
- (iv) That officers be asked to check the existing signage in the area to determine whether any improvements can be made.

Reasons: A successful increase in walking and cycling modes of travel to school would contribute to fewer car journeys and less motor vehicle congestion. The recommended school travel plan and road safety education improvements would also help to improve road safety and reduce reliance on the car for the school journey.

21/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 8]

The minutes were confirmed as a correct record.

22/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 9]

There were no declarations of interest.

23/16 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 10]

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

Question 1: The Committee confirmed that it wished this proposal to be added to the list of schemes for consideration in the Phase 10 parking review.

Question 2: Members were concerned at the delay in starting the work and that issues had not been resolved earlier. There was also concern over whether the work could now be completed to meet funding requirements. The Chairman was asked to write to request regular updates. It was noted that the matter would be considered at the July informal meeting of the Committee.

Annex B

24/16 DATA OVERVIEW OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS WITHIN EPSOM AND EWELL [SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN] [Item 11]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers attending: Kerry Randle, Ne Area Education Officer; Bindi Sarl, Babcock 4S

Public Questions/Statements:

None

Member Discussion – key points

Noted on page 20 of the report that, since the report had been prepared, recent Ofsted inspections now meant that 96% of schools in Epsom & Ewell and 93% in Surrey are now good or outstanding.

Members queried why, although the results were still good, there had been a slight decrease in attainment in 2015 at Key stage 4. Officers responded that there will always be slight differences in the cohort of pupils from year to year and looking at progress is probably a better measure.

Noted that as a result of new legislation local authority support to schools will be replaced by school to school support. A transition process is in place to move to the new arrangements, which is a model which has already been in use for some support.

At members request, the Area Education Officer undertook to supply a short paragraph of text highlighting the achievements in the Borough which members could include in their regular newsletters if they wished.

Members thanked both the head teachers and staff in schools and the local education team for the support they have provided to ensure the success of schools in the Borough.

Noted the report.

25/16 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT FROM SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE [SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN] [Item 12]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers attending: Richard Leary, Youth Support Service Team Manager
Epsom & Ewell

Public Questions/Statements:

None

Member Discussion – key points

Members noted that Epsom & Ewell had the lowest rate of young people who were NEET in Surrey but asked what numbers 1.2% represented. The team manager agreed to provide the figures after the meeting.

Members asked whether more resources would be made available as part of the early help offer. It was reported that this is a response to the Ofsted inspection and some more resources have been made available, but it would be necessary to see whether these would be sufficient to meet the demand.

Members queried why more work seems to be taking place in the Town rather than in Ruxley. The officer replied that this was as a result of previous staffing problems at the Edge and that the report showed the position last year. The situation has now improved.

Councillor Frost asked whether young people from the Ebbisham Estate, where there have been some issues, are attending the Focus youth centre. The area team manager agreed to find out and report back.

Members asked for an update on the 'Junk to Funk' sessions.

The Committee thanked all those involved in working with young people in Epsom & Ewell for their excellent work and commended the team on the format of the report.

26/16 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 13]

Declarations of interest: None

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

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points

In relation to paragraph 2.7 members were concerned at the delay in implementing the Phase 9 parking proposals. The Chairman was asked to write to senior officers expressing the Committees concern that the six month commitment given to members had not been met. Members noted that there

had previously been two parking engineers allocated to the five Boroughs and Districts in the East of the County. One of these is now working full time in Elmbridge meaning that the remaining officer is doing all the work in the other four Boroughs and Districts. Noted that the results of the consultations on the Phase 9 review will be sent to the Divisional members and the Chairmen in the next few weeks and it is hoped that work can be completed by September.

Members queried the status of roads which had previously been included in year 5 of Project Horizon for resurfacing. It was reported that these are now being re-evaluated as part of the next programme and it was possible that not all of them would be progressed. Members were concerned at the changes to the programme which have taken place without member involvement and the Chairman was asked to write to senior officers expressing these concerns. The Committee requested that an update on the roads currently scheduled for resurfacing should be included in future reports.

Members requested an update on the progress of all Local Enterprise bids and it was agreed that this would be requested for the July informal meeting.

Resolved:

That the Area Highways Manager be authorised, 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.

27/16 PAVEMENT HORIZON 5 YEAR PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 14]

Item withdrawn, due to lack of clarity on what is required. A further report would be brought to the July informal meeting.

28/16 LOCAL COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS TO LOCAL GROUPS AND TASK GROUPS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 15]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers attending: Nicola Morris, Community Partnership and Committee Officer

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

None.

Resolved:

That the following appointments from the Local Committee be made for the 2016/17 municipal year:

- a) Community Safety Partnership - John Beckett
- b) Family, Friends and Community Support Champion for 2016/17 – Clive Smitheram, Tella Wormington (deputy)
- c) Youth Task Group - County Councillors Jan Mason and Tina Mountain and Borough Councillors Neil Dallen and Lucie Dallen.
- d) On Street Parking Task Group - County Councillors Eber Kington, John Beckett, Borough Councillors Neil Dallen, Michael Arthur, substitute Clive Smitheram.
- e) Major Schemes (Epsom & Ewell) Task Group – County Councillors John Beckett, Jan Mason and Karan Persand, Borough Councillors – Michael Arthur, Neil Dallen with the third member to be advised by the Borough Council.
- f) Epsom Banstead STP Task Group – Eber Kington, John Beckett substitute Michael Arthur
- g) Borough Council Joint Infrastructure Group – Eber Kington, John Beckett

Reasons: To enable the Local Committee to be represented on local bodies and to appoint the Committees Task Groups.

**29/16 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION/ACTION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION]
[Item 16]**

Declarations of interest: None

Officers attending: Nicola Morris, Community Partnership and Committee Officer

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

None.

Noted the progress with the recorded decisions/actions.

30/16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 17]

Monday 19 September at 7.00pm at Bourne Hall, Ewell

Meeting ended at: 9.15 pm

Chairman



SURREY

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL
20 June 2016**

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

Question 1 – Cllr Neil Dallen

Re: Station Approach – access for taxis

Some time ago (years) I requested that taxis should be allowed to 'U' turn at the bottom of Station Approach. They need to do so to join the taxi rank once they have dropped passengers at the railway station entrance.

I was told that this sign is allowed in London (I have seen pictures of the sign) but needed permission from the Department of Transport for a 'new' sign if it was to be allowed in Surrey.

Was permission ever requested?

If so, what is the progress?

If not, can SCC please seek permission?

Officer Response:

The only signs that are allowed on the Public Highway must comply with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions, which is a statutory instrument. The no U turn sign used in conjunction with a supplementary plate reading 'except for taxis' is a non standard sign and therefore requires special approval from the Department for Transport (DfT).

Before requesting permission to use the sign from the DfT there has to be support for it's operation. SCCs Traffic Systems Team has considered the manoeuvre and concluded that it would be dangerous. There would need to be a separate 'All Red' stage to accommodate it. This would certainly increase delays at the junction which already suffers from long delays on Waterloo Road in the busy times. There is also an issue with how the U turn stage would be demanded.

You cannot use loop detectors so transponders would possibly have to be used but this would bring up issues with taxis that are fitted or not with the transponders. If the transponders were not working or damaged taxis would possibly still make the U turn thinking it was safe, but it would put other road users at risk. Other non-taxi vehicles, or mini cabs, may see the taxis doing it and copy, even if there are signs saying taxis only. Pedestrians who choose not to wait for the Green Man would not be expecting a vehicle to do the manoeuvre.

For these reasons it would not be supported by SCC.

Question 2 – Cllr Martin Olney
Re: Commuter parking

I have made several attempts at finding a solution to commuter parking in Wheelers Lane. There has not been a resolution to this problem and it is getting worse. Commuters now park on both sides of the road all the way up Wheelers Lane. A resident of Lewin Road recently contacted me and asked what could be done about commuter parking in his street. Parklawn and Eastdean Avenues are also over run by commuter parking. To complete the invasion of the conservation area by commuters they also park the length of Stamford Green Road.

In my previous questions I made the point that commuter parking only inconveniences the few people that remain at home during the day. There are several groups of vulnerable people in that number. However, there would not be enough support for a CPZ. The use of yellow lines would inconvenience the residents. We have no alternative other than to park on the road as few of the homes have off road space.

What is the Local Committee doing to mitigate the inconvenience, all be it to a small group of residents, of commuter parking? Is there a solution that doesn't expect local residents to pay for the privilege of parking somewhere close to their property? Is it possible to have a pay and display, or similar, scheme throughout the residential part of Stamford Green Conservation Area. Could this be constructed so that residents are exempt from parking charges that commuters pay?

Officer Response:

The only way of providing assured parking for residents is by introducing a residents' permit scheme, which does come with a cost. This still however is limited to the available on street space and if the number of residents' vehicles exceeds the amount of on street space, then there would obviously be a shortfall and some residents may still have difficulty parking.

In a residents permit scheme, residents are paying for the privilege of sole use of a particular section of the public highway, which usually anybody is entitled to park on - the costs cover administration (which includes issuance of permits), maintenance and enforcement.

A pay and display system would also require some kind of residents' permit to show that the residents are exempt - again, this would come with a similar cost.

There are no solutions whereby we can reduce the amount and type of on street parking without having to introduce some kind of restriction, whether it be yellow lines or permits.



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL
20 June 2016**

MEMBER QUESTIONS

**Question 1 Cllr Tella Wormington
Re: Parking Restrictions in Station Approach**

Controlling parking at a station will always be difficult, and there will probably never be a solution that pleases everyone. At Epsom Station we do have very little space, and there are residents who are having difficulty parking for short times at weekends and in the evenings. Often they want to buy tickets in advance, and this relieves some of the queues at peak times, thus helping the flow of passengers and enables them to catch trains.

The lack of parking controls at weekends and in the evenings results in long term parking during these times, thus preventing those who just want to call into the station for a short time to buy tickets or collect a passenger, from being able to park.

We would request a change to the parking restrictions on both sides of Station Approach so that they include Sundays and up to 10 pm in the evenings Monday to Sunday (i.e. every day).

Officer Response:

If the Committee and local members are in favour of this approach it can be added to the list of parking restrictions to be considered in the next parking review which will come to Committee in March 2017.

**Question 2 Cllr Tella Wormington
Re: Plan E timetable**

Please could we have an update on the Plan E major Highways project, in particular confirmation of the start date; decision about the taxi rank (in the High Street); and the bus stand (in Ashley Road), and when the project and communication plans will be published?

Officer Response:

Following further discussions with the Borough Council Officers and other key stakeholders, there are still some outstanding issues relating to the scheme which need to be addressed in order for the final scheme layout to be in effect 'signed off' and move into the scheme delivery phase.

These issues are to be discussed at an officer meeting being held on Tuesday 21 June and hopefully resolved there and then, but if not, then a process will be agreed to achieve agreement on the final scheme layout. The outcomes of this meeting and update on the scheme development and delivery will be reported to members at the informal Local Committee on the 13th July, with the aim of signing-off the final scheme layout. The final

scheme can then be presented to the September formal Local Committee alongside the request to advertise the Traffic Regulation Orders associated with the scheme.

This has inevitably led to delays in delivering the scheme, and any associated communication plan, as previously reported to members at the last informal meeting. We are unable to engage fully with contractors until we have clarity on the final scheme layout, and materials. The contractors are requesting a 3 month lead in time to mobilise plant and labour and given the constraints of the Christmas period works embargo commencing in mid November, it is unlikely that any substantial work will start now until Jan 17 at the earliest.