

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 7.00 pm on 19 September 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 Kate Chinn
- \* Cllr Liz Frost
- \* Cllr Clive Smitheram
- \* Cllr Mike Teasdale
- \* Cllr Tella Wormington

\* In attendance

---

**31/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Karan Persand.

**32/16 CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS [Item 2]**

The Chairman reported that sections of the meeting would be broadcast on the social media app Periscope as a way of making the meetings more accessible to residents.

He reminded members that Adult Social Care has recently published a leaflet of key contacts for the Borough and that copies could be obtained from the Community Partnership & Committee Officer on request.

**33/16 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 3]**

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

Question 1: The questioner reported that he had subsequently sent some photos showing the road being blocked by large vehicles attempting to pass parked cars in this narrow road. On some occasions the refuse vehicle also has trouble getting through.

Question 3: Cllr Arthur reported that currently around 100 trees a year are planted by the Borough Council and asked what will happen in future to avoid the loss of trees in this leafy Borough. Officers replied that the Borough

Council can continue to plant trees if they have funding available or if funding from other sources can be identified, but the County Council will not have a budget for tree planting.

**34/16 ADJOURNMENT [Item 4]**

Twelve members of the public were present. Two informal questions were asked (one was deferred to item 9) and answers were provided at the meeting.

**35/16 PETITIONS [Item 5]**

There were no petitions.

**36/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 6]**

The minutes were confirmed as a correct record.

**37/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 7]**

There were no declarations of interest.

**38/16 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 8]**

One question was received. The questions and answers are set out in Annex B. The following additional points were made:

Cllr Mason expressed her disappointment at the quality of communication with local members, who she felt had not been kept fully up to date on what is happening in order for them to pass information to local residents. She asked how residents without computers can access the information, requested a rough timeline, not specific dates and to see all letters sent to residents as some residents appeared not to have not received them. Cllr Smitheram also raised a recent incident in relation to the demolition process and asked what plan is in place to facilitate the movement of HGVs. An officer would be asked to contacted Cllr Mason after the meeting to discuss the matter further.

**39/16 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** Cllr Dallen queried whether it would be appropriate to change the previous decision of the Committee regarding the cycle scheme in Waterloo Road before the completion on the Plan E work. He requested that a Task Group should be set up to look at the options available.

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

## **Member Discussion – key points**

Members asked whether if the Committee agreed to defer the proposed schemes, they would be included in the programme of work for next year. The Area Highways Team Manager responded that this would be a decision for the Local Committee when they consider the priorities for future years, within the budget available.

Members were informed of the work of the highways works communication team, who are working to improve communications on highway work both with members and local residents/businesses. The Area Highways Team Manager agreed to find out whether Borough members could also be informed if works are delayed.

Noted that the final phase 9 parking proposals have now been agreed and details will be published shortly on the SCC website. It is hoped that the signs and lines will be in place by the end of October.

A member asked whether the community enhancement budget could be spent on cleaning illuminated bollards which are becoming increasingly dirty. The Chairman responded that £5,000 is available for each division and that a divisional member could ask for bollards to be cleaned in an area if this is a high priority for them.

In relation to paragraph 2.35 and the s106 agreement for funding of “cycle, pedestrian and public transport facilities in Waterloo Road” members asked whether the developer could be asked to extend the deadline for the return of this funding to allow the final decision to be made once the Plan E work is completed. Members felt that nothing had changed since the last discussion and alternative options should be considered. The Area Highways Manager reported that the traffic modelling work for Plan E has now been completed so that a reduction in traffic congestion at the Spread Eagle can be demonstrated. Members acknowledged that the current informal double queuing in Waterloo Road can make it difficult and dangerous for cyclists

### **Resolved: to**

- (i) Defer construction of the Stoneleigh Park Road to Bradford Drive Cycle Link, and the Scotts Farm Road Cycle Link, to 2017-18;
- (ii) Authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s), to prioritise schemes as necessary to ensure the remainder of this Financial Year's budgets are fully invested in the road network in Epsom and Ewell;
- (iii) Note that 5 year programmes for structures and drainage are being developed and that members are invited to make suggestions of priority works for these programmes to the relevant officers by 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016;
- (iv) Approve the strategy for allocation of next Financial Year's budgets as detailed in Table 4;
- (v) [on a vote by 6 vote FOR to 2 AGAINST] Ask officers to seek an extension from the developer to the time limit on the use of the s106 funding and to set up a Task Group comprising two Borough and two

County councillors to discuss the options for the use of the funding, within the agreed purpose, and make recommendations to the Committee. Membership to be agreed after the meeting and notified to the Community Partnership & Committee Officer;

- (vi) Approve a new Bus Stop Clearway in Church Street, Epsom, as detailed in Annex G;
- (vii) Approve a new Bus Stand Clearway in Station Approach, Epsom, as detailed in Annex H;
- (viii) 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: The recommendations are intended to facilitate delivery of the 2016-17 Highways programmes funded by the Local Committee and to facilitate development of Committee's 2017-18 Highways programmes, while at the same time ensuring that the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Members are fully and appropriately involved in any detailed considerations.

Specific recommendations are made to ensure developer monies arising out of the Epsom Station development are invested according to the terms of the s106 agreement, and to facilitate the implementation of Clearways to prevent obstruction to the operation of local bus services.

#### **40/16 EPSOM-BANSTEAD SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT PACKAGE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

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

**Member Discussion** – key points

Members queried whether Epsom & Ewell Borough Council are contributing anything to the project. It was confirmed that the Borough are not making a contribution as the available funding is being directed to other projects such as the Plan E scheme.

Members asked whether anything can be done to prevent people parking on the Reigate Road cycle way as posts are currently in place to stop parking on the verge. Officers replied that it is an offence to park on an off carriageway cycle route which this will be, but there are also engineering measures which can be considered such as double height kerbs to stop vehicles accessing the area.

The Committee noted the progress to date and the results of the high level analysis of the public engagement on the proposed schemes. The project business case is due to be submitted to the C2C LEP at the end of October 2016. The final business case will be reviewed by the Member Task Group prior to this. A further report will be brought to a later Committee when the LEP funding decision is known.

**41/16 EPSOM 'PLAN E' HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION) [Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Steve Howard, Transport Policy Project Manager

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

**Member Discussion** – key points

A member asked whether the proposed changes to the parking restrictions in South Street would mean that on street parking in the evening would no longer be possible. It was confirmed that this would be the intention.

Noted that traffic lights throughout the town centre would be optimised as a result of updating the urban traffic controller as part of the work.

Noted that the current signs displaying spaces available in the town centre car parks will be renewed. The replacements will be smaller and able to display other messages as appropriate.

The County Council is working with the Borough Council on a 'way-finding' scheme which will extend Borough wide to key destinations.

The road tables proposed as part of the scheme aim to encourage vehicles entering the town to slow down and make the area more pedestrian friendly without the use of additional signal controlled crossing points.

**Resolved:**

- (i) To note the update on the proposed measures and junction layouts as indicated in this report and illustrated in Annex 1 and summarised in Annex 3,
- (ii) To approve advertising of the following notices based on the information provided in the report in association with Annexes 1 and 2 and summarised in Annex 3 and with specific reference to:

Paragraph 2.9 (iv)

Paragraph 2.17 (vii-viii)

Paragraph 2.20 (viii-ix)

Paragraph 2.25 (vi-x)

Paragraph 2.30 (viii-x)

Paragraph 2.32 (iv)

The County Council's intention is to make the required orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to be advertised and, if no objections are maintained, the order(s) be made;

- (iii) That if objections are received to the advertisement of the legal notices and traffic orders, that the Area Team Manager is authorised to resolve them in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, Divisional Members and Project Manager, to decide whether or not they should be acceded to and therefore whether the orders should be made, with or without modification or to be discussed and if appropriate agreed at the next Local Committee meeting.

Reasons: To ensure that the Local Committee is kept informed, the Local Committee is asked to note the current proposals and general arrangements as indicated within this report.

The Local Committee is asked to approve the proposals including the installation of flat top raised tables at locations as indicated in Annex 1 to signified a 'gateway to the high street area' to alter drivers perception and increase pedestrian priority and reduce traffic dominance within the town centre.

To ensure that the Plan E Highway Improvements Scheme receives the necessary approvals to start construction currently planned for Jan 2017 and once implemented contributed toward achieving the objectives of the Plan E Area Action Plan.

#### **42/16 LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING OF COMMUNITY SAFETY PROJECTS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 12]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

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

**Member Discussion** – key points

The Chairman reminded the Committee that last year the Committee had retained the Community Safety funding and had allowed both the Community Safety Partnership and other local organisations to bid for the funding at the same time, instead of letting the Community Safety Partnership bid in advance of other organisations, as suggested in the officer recommendations. He felt that this approach had been successful and proposed that last year's arrangement should be continued and the Committee were in agreement with this approach.

It was noted that a recent meeting of the Epsom & Ewell Community Safety Partnership had agreed that it should amalgamate with the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership and if this is ratified they will have an opportunity to bid for the funding.

**Resolved:** That

- (i) The delegated Community Safety budget of £3,000 per Local Committee for 2016/17 be retained by the Community Partnership Team, on behalf of the Local Committee, and that local organisations including the Community Safety Partnership are invited to submit proposals that meet

the criteria and principles for funding, as defined at paragraph 2.6 of the report.

- (ii) Authority is delegated to the Community Partnership Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee, to authorise the expenditure of the Community Safety budget in accordance with the criteria and principles stated at paragraph 2.6 of this report.
- (iii) The Committee receives a report detailing the projects that were successful in being awarded the local community safety funding and the outcomes and impact they have achieved.

Reasons: A recent analysis of how the local committees' community safety funds were spent in 2015-16 revealed a mixed picture. While there were some notable examples of good practice, much of the funding was spent on activities that could have otherwise been delivered either through existing partnership work or by closer synergy with Surrey's established, strategic community safety projects. This report makes recommendations that are intended to secure greater oversight of the committee's expenditure and better value for money for projects that help to achieve the County's community safety priorities.

**43/16 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION/ACTION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION]  
[Item 13]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

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

**Member Discussion** – key points

None

Noted the progress with the recorded decisions/actions

**44/16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 14]**

Monday 5 December at 2.00pm in Epsom Town Hall

Meeting ended at: 9.05 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank



**SURREY**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL  
19 September 2016**

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS**

**Question 1 – Peter Kalinowski on behalf of Association of Ewell Downs Residents**

**Re: Longdown Lane North – traffic issues**

Longdown Lane North is a very busy cut through route which enables drivers to escape heavy congestion on Reigate Road and at the Drift Bridge junction.

There are three main issues as follows:

**Blind bends and overtaking**

Drivers travelling from Epsom Downs towards Reigate Road tend to accelerate down the slope and enter the blind curve at more than 30mph. Problems occur when approaching the entrance to Higher Green at speed. If vehicle in front is signaling to enter Higher Green, drivers often try to overtake this vehicle by driving on the wrong side of the road on a blind bend. Given that they are now travelling at more than 30mph there is little time or space to pull over when another vehicle traveling in the direction of Epsom Downs suddenly appears in view.

Similarly drivers travelling from Reigate Road towards Epsom Downs encounter a blind bend at the junction with Ewell Downs Road which gives rise to similar issues about overtaking on the blind bend as described above particularly as cars tend to park on this blind bend and it is necessary to pull out on the blind bend in order to proceed.

**Accidents at the junction with Higher Green**

There have been two serious accidents at the junction with Higher Green when cars leaving Higher Green have been hit at speed by cars travelling along Longdown Lane North. Fortunately there have been no fatalities but the cars involved have been write-offs. Higher Green slopes downwards away from Longdown Lane North so it is difficult for a driver on Longdown Lane North traveling at speed to be able to see clearly cars exiting Higher Green as the junction is very close to the blind curve. There is thus little time and space to avoid a collision. Similarly cars leaving Higher Green have the same problem of visibility.

In addition there is another issue due to the design of the junction Higher Green/Longdown Lane North as it is a “Y” shape ie a left-hand exit/entrance and a right-hand exit/entrance. Drivers frequently misunderstand how this junction works and assume that the left-hand is for exiting only and the right-hand is for entrance to Higher Green, despite clear marking in the road. These instances are increasing as Higher Green itself is being used as cut-through to avoid the busy junction at the Homebase roundabout and to by-pass Epsom congestion.

## HGVs getting stuck in Higher Green

The road width in Higher Green is abnormally narrow and adjacent to the high grass bank on all three sides such that large vehicles can get stuck when trying to pass a parked car. There have been several incidents when very long articulated vehicles have got stuck for up to an hour trying to extricate themselves. Higher Green can get completely blocked by parked cars due Wallace Fields Infants School and associated Nursery. Thus the school run takes place up to six times a day.

These HGVs were all in transit and not making deliveries in the immediate area. When we have spoken to the drivers of these vehicles they have stated that their SatNav has recommended driving through Higher Green to access Kiln Lane and other directions. Trees have been damaged and one had to be felled.

Would the Committee agree to make the following changes to address these issues?

1. Place new signs at the entrances to Longdown Lane North at the junction with College Road and Reigate Road stating "30mph Please Drive Carefully." This will remind drivers that there is a speed limit.
2. Install double white lines on the blind bend areas of Longdown Lane North. Alternatively make one of the two broken lines a solid white line.
3. Place a new sign at the entrance to Higher Green stating "Unsuitable for HGVs".

### Officer Response:

Longdown Lane North has a 30mph speed limit. The road does have curves but they are not blind bends and are not severe enough to require chevron boards on their approach. There is a strip of hatched road markings down the centre of the road which narrows the lane widths and deters overtaking compared to a single white warning line.

Motorists overtaking on bends is clearly poor driver behaviour but double white line road markings could not be justified as the road layout does not meet the criteria for a double white system. Sight lines from Higher Green are good in both directions.

Longdown Lane North is currently on the Speed Management Plan. This is a joint initiative with Surrey Police to target roads with speed and accident problems. There are many roads currently on the plan and Surrey Police do carry out regular enforcement by prioritising roads with the greatest need. The latest data shows average speeds of 33mph northbound, and 34mph southbound.

Observations indicate that Longdown Lane North is not excessively used as a short cut. Very rarely does traffic form queues at the Longdown Lane North / Longdown Lane South / College Road junction.

Higher Green is a public highway and therefore vehicles whether big or small are allowed to use it. There is a form available on Surrey's website that can be used to inform SCC of inappropriate use of a road by vehicles. The link is shown below.

<http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/cycling-and-driving/large-goods-vehicles/report-a-lorry-incident>

With regard to the specific requests, 30mph signs can only be used at terminal points where there is a change in speed limit. (all roads with a street lighting system have a 30mph speed limit unless otherwise indicated) So given that all approaches to the

College Road / Longdown lane North and South are within a 30mph speed limit restriction it would not be possible to introduce a 30mph sign. Similarly the speed limit on Reigate Road at the junction with Longdown Lane North is 30mph so we can not introduce a 30mph sign at the entrance to Longdown Lane North.

Longdown Lane North does not meet the criteria for introducing a double white line system. Double white lines are used where there is severe limited visibility such as hump back bridges.

We receive many requests from residents all over the Borough asking for 'unsuitable for HGVs' signs. There would have to be exceptional circumstances for the use of this type of sign, and there are many legitimate reasons why HGVs should be able to use Higher Green and Wallace Fields, such as for home deliveries or house moving.

**Question 2 – Cllr Michael Arthur  
Re: Kiln Lane Junction Resurfacing**

I was disappointed to learn that phase five of Project Horizon had, in effect, been cancelled and the expectations of works anticipated for that year will not be undertaken. Instead, a new five year programme is being established with fresh submissions all on a level playing field which will at some point be programme scheduled.

I believe within the original year five programme was the resurfacing of the whole of East Street plus part of Epsom Road which would embrace the very badly worn junctions at Kiln Lane and High Street East.

For cyclists, the above junctions are very hazardous requiring great care indeed they are bumpy for bus and car passengers too.

Can any hope be offered that the promised resurfacing of East Street may soon be done?"

**Officer Response:**

This section of road is currently subject to assessment using the agreed prioritisation criteria, along with other roads across the County. It is not possible to say at this point whether it will be resurfaced. It is anticipated that the programme of roads for inclusion in the next phase of the Project Horizon programme will be published in October.

**Question 3 – Cllr Michael Arthur  
Re: Highway Trees**

Epsom & Ewell Borough Council are set to hand over the street tree contract to Surrey from 1/4/17. Part of that work is the planting of replacement street trees.

Epsom & Ewell has enjoyed good liaison over the years with the Tree Advisory Board ensuring that street trees are regularly planted to ensure the future continuance of a pleasant leafy suburban environment.

The future for this aspect looks very much in jeopardy with high unit cost of replacement planting.

Could a meeting be set up between SCC officers and Epsom Tree Advisory Board to establish a positive way forward for this important service?

**Officer Response:**

Surrey County Council has no specific budget to plant new trees. If funding for new tree planting were to be identified, Officers would be pleased to assess suggested sites and arrange for new trees to be planted.

The Borough Council may also continue to plant trees on the Public Highway after the agency agreement has ended, subject to gaining permission from the County Council. The opportunities and process for the Borough Council to plant trees on the Public Highway are detailed on our website here: <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/planting-trees-on-the-highway>.

Officers are aware that the Borough Council has a relationship with the Epsom and Ewell Tree Advisory Board (E&ETAB). There is no intention for the County Council to form any kind of formal relationship with the E&ETAB, or to give the E&ETAB any special status. Rather the intention is to treat the E&ETAB with due respect as would be afforded to any other regular customer.



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL  
19 September 2016**

**MEMBER QUESTIONS**

**Question 1 Cllr Jan Mason and Cllr Clive Smitheram  
Re: Expansion of Danetree School**

Over the past few months we have been inundated with complaints and queries from residents regarding the new build at Danetree School. There have been several developments on site including the installation of a generator which was installed yards from residents' homes and working 24/7. At no time has SCC kept me or the Ward Cllrs briefed on these developments. The residents have complained that they also have not been consulted regarding the parking issues resulting from this school doubling its pupil numbers to 900, and a recent letter sent to residents referred to "Cleve School". They now have lost all faith in SCC and its so called consultation process.

In order that local Members can monitor the works can you please provide Councillor Clive Smitheram and I with the following information:

- The Planning Conditions (permitted hours of work etc.)
- A timeline detailing the work plan for the development
- A timeline for action on the proposed parking arrangements (TROs through to paint on the road)
- The final agreed drawings for the waiting restrictions and parking bays
- Confirmation that the school travel plan has been submitted and agreed.

**Officer Response:**

A senior project manager has discussed the issue of the generator with Cllr Mason and apologised that a wider community of interested parties had not been informed that a generator was required whilst the electricity board arrange the connection to the mains supply. In respect of the specific questions:

- All documents relating to the planning application are available on the Surrey County Council website.  
<http://planning.surreycc.gov.uk/planappdisp.aspx?AppNo=SCC+Ref+2015%2f0265>
- The work on the new building will be starting in the autumn of 2016 ready for occupation in summer 2017. It is difficult to give precise timings for phases of the works as these may be subject to change during construction. However a senior project manager will contact the Councillors shortly to discuss the timeline in more detail and further details will be made available as the project progresses.
- The detailed highways proposals will need to be submitted to Planning for approval and will be subject to a separate Traffic Regulation Order process. There will be public consultation at both of those stages, as there was in respect of the initial planning application.

- The proposed design of the works is currently being finalised and a final drawing will be issued to Members once this has been completed.
- The school has updated their Framework School Travel Plan to a 'Full' and submitted to County in July 2016.