

Minutes of the meeting of the
EPSOM AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 2.00 pm on 27 November 2017
at Epsom Town Hall, The Parade, Epsom KT18 5BY.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr John Beckett (Chairman)
- * Mrs Tina Mountain (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Eber A Kington
- * Mrs Jan Mason
- * Mrs Bernie Muir

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Michael Arthur MBE
- Cllr Rekha Bansil
- * Cllr Kate Chinn
- * Cllr Neil Dallen
- * Cllr Mike Teasdale

* In attendance (Mrs Mason joined the meeting at 4pm)

26/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Rekha Bansil, Cllr Hannah Dalton substituted for her.

27/17 CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS [Item 2]

The Chairman reported the recent disappointing news that the two bids submitted to the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership which would have delivered improvements in the Borough had been refused. It was hoped that these could be resubmitted and the schemes delivered in the future if funding could be secured.

The part-night street lighting times had been amended to keep the light on until 1am.

There is public engagement planned on how the library service should be delivered in future, that Members may be interested in submitting their views to.

28/17 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 3]

Eight public questions were received. The questions and answers were published in the supplementary papers for the meeting. The following additional points were made:

Question 1: Cllr Olney asked what the Committee was spending its highway budget on. He was referred to Item 8 Highways Update.

Question 4: Cllr Mountain stated that the new parking restrictions in Chartwell Place had been agreed to improve safety as currently a disabled child and those with buggies are often forced to walk in the centre of the road as the pavement is obstructed by vehicles. She reported that she had agreed to modify the times so that restrictions would operate between 8.30 – 11.30am and 2.00 - 4.30pm to allow nursery children to be collected and dropped off at school during this period. Cllr Mountain agreed to forward to the Headteacher a copy of a letter she had been shown by a resident in relation to vacant vehicles being left with their engines running.

It was suggested that commuters will continue to park on the outer ring of the road and that the current proposal will not make any difference to safety. Cllr Mountain agreed to consider further restrictions in a future review if necessary.

Noted that parents are permitted to leave vehicles on the yellow line in order to guide children to school. The Headteacher asked if it would be possible for the School to receive confirmation of how long this period would be, before an enforcement notice would be issued. Enforcement is carried out by the Borough Council on behalf of the County Council and the matter would be discussed with them.

The Headteacher reported that it was a resident who had alerted the School to the advertisement of the proposed restrictions and not a member of staff as stated in the response.

Question 7: Mr Collin highlighted a number of residents who rely on the 166 bus service and asked why the County Council is not able to do more to secure this service. The Area Highways Manager indicated that all bus services are run on a commercial basis, it does subsidise some services to extend timetables and maintain viability, but the funding available is limited. Transport for London services are operated on a different basis and the County Council is not able to support these financially although it can highlight the effect the changes will have locally. The local MP has also been made aware of the issue.

Question 8: Mr Collin felt that the response appeared to be only concentrating on services for those over 65 and that transfer of services from Epsom General Hospital to St Helier are ongoing to the detriment of local residents. He felt that it was important to address the issue now and not leave it until it was too late. The Cabinet member for Highways indicated that healthcare does not necessarily follow local authority boundaries and it is important to get the best care for Surrey residents although this may not be within the County. The health service, like local government, is facing significant financial pressures. It was agreed that the officer who had responded to the question would be asked to address this issue and their response sent to the questioner.

29/17 PETITIONS [Item 4]

One petition was received.

Declarations of Interest: Mr Eber Kington declared a personal interest in this item as he lives in a road adjacent to Meadow Walk and had signed the petition.

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: The petitioners, indicated that they had the support of 115 local residents. They take great pride in their area and many residents already maintain the verges outside their properties, to avoid the mess left when they are cut by the council. Both the road and the pavement are in a bad condition, but residents have been told that the condition is not bad enough to be a safety concern. However, other roads in the area have been treated.

The Chairman reported that the grass is cut by the Borough Council on behalf of the County and is subsidised by the Borough to fund 12 cuts per year when the County only pay for 4.

The divisional member thanked the petitioner for raising the issues and confirmed that the condition of highway is not considered a safety concern. The reduction in the budget available to the Local Committee means that it is no longer in a position to fund extra work requested by residents although a repair has been possible in Highfield Drive. He recognised that many residents no longer felt safe now that the streetlights had been turned off and that he would be challenging the figures produced by Surrey Police on whether crime had increased as a result.

The petition was noted.

30/17 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 5]

The minutes were confirmed as a correct record.

Cllr Dallen asked why the responses to the advertisement of proposed changes in on street parking restrictions, arising from the recent parking review, had not been brought back to Committee for consideration. He was informed that the Committee had agreed to delegate the decision to an officer in consultation with the Chairman/Vice-Chairman and relevant divisional member in order to avoid the delay in waiting for a Committee meeting before restrictions can be confirmed.

31/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 6]

Mr Eber Kington declared a personal interest in relation to Item 4.

32/17 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Three questions had been received. The questions and responses were published in the supplementary papers for the meeting. The following additional points were made:

Question 2: The Cabinet member was asked whether there were any plans to abandon the part-night street lighting policy and why he needed further discussions on whether the light could remain on on Christmas and New Year's Eve. The Cabinet member responded that consideration is being

given to the use of LED lighting. However, as the lights have only recently been replaced the savings are smaller, but there may still be a case. It is unlikely that even if this is done that the lights will be turned back on all night. If the lights are to be left on for one night there needs to be a system to reset them for the next day and the Cabinet member wanted to be sure that this is possible before giving a commitment.

33/17 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points

Members discussed how the limited capital funding for 2018/19 should be divided and there was support for dividing it on a divisional basis in order to support resident requests. Small jobs could be batched and allocated to the community gang to carry out in a similar way to the £5,000 community pride funding which was previously available. Members were reminded that the community pride funding was revenue, whereas the funding under discussion is capital.

Cllr Dallen asked whether it would be possible to allocate £2,000 for a feasibility study to look at whether it would be possible to install a zebra crossing in Waterloo Road using the s106 money available from the station development. The Chairman indicated that there was some funding remaining from the £15,000 currently allocated to signing improvements in Ewell village (Table 3 of the report) and proposed that £2,000 from this could be used. Cllr Dallen seconded the proposal.

A member asked whether it would be possible to use the surplus on the parking account to improve roads rather than on parking reviews. The Area Highways Manager agreed that this would be possible, but that as the amounts were relatively small it would not be possible to achieve much with what's available and he would advise its use on something with a long term gain.

Members asked whether the £42,000 underspend on the previous year's revenue budget had been lost. The Area Highways Manager indicated that some of the amount would have been lost, but that procedures are now in place to prevent this in future years. The Committee expressed their concern at the loss of funding and hoped that this would not occur again.

[Mrs Jan Mason joined the meeting at 4pm]

The divisional member reported there was local concern at the proposal for a shared pedestrian / cycle surface on the northern footway of Chessington Road, between Longmead Road and Riverholme Drive as this is a very busy pavement and it was felt to be unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians to mix. She asked whether the opposite side of the road could be used instead as this is less used by pedestrians. The Area Highways Manager responded that the concerns expressed are common when such schemes are proposed, but

there is no evidence of complaints once they are operational. The proposed route joins up two existing routes and is aimed at less confident cyclists and children to help them cycle safely and to reduce car usage on short journeys. The route is not wide enough for a segregated pathway for the whole length and the opposite side of the road is not wide enough for a shared use path. A safety review after 12 months was requested if the scheme is agreed. The Area Highways Manager responded that all schemes are subject to a safety audit once they are operational.

That the Local Committee [Epsom & Ewell] **agreed:**

- (i) To agree formally the 2017-18 budget allocations that were agreed informally in May 2017 as set out in the report;
- (ii) To allocate the anticipated £42,273 revenue from the 2018-19 budget for day to day maintenance;
- (iii) (on a vote **6 votes FOR, 2 AGAINST and 1 ABSTENTION**) To allocate the anticipated £36,364 capital from the 2018-19 budget to, option C, a divisional allocations of £7,273 per Division;
- (iv) (on a vote **5 votes FOR, 3 AGAINST AND 1 ABSTENTION**) To approve the implementation of the new cycle route, as shown in Annex C, as a shared pedestrian / cycle surface on the northern footway of Chessington Road, between Longmead Road and Riverholme Drive;
- (v) (On a vote **7 votes FOR and 1 ABSTENTION**) To allocate £2,000 of the £15,000 currently allocated to signing improvements in Ewell village (Table 3 of the report) to carry out a feasibility study and establish the likely costs of a zebra crossing in Waterloo Road, Epsom to the north of the railway bridge in the area of the shops as an option for the use of the s106 funding allocated to this area;
- (vi) 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 2017-18 Highways programmes funded by the Local Committee and to facilitate development of Committee's 2018-19 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.

34/17 COLIN KEMP, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY - UPDATE [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers and members attending: Colin Kemp, Cabinet Member for Highways; Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points

Colin Kemp, the Cabinet member for Highways, set out his plans for working with the Local Committee going forward. His priority is to improve communication with the Committee and he would like to share plans for centrally funded work taking place in Epsom & Ewell at an earlier point in 2018/19 to allow Committee input into the process. He, therefore, intended to return to a future meeting in the Spring.

£90m will be spent on Surrey's highway network in the current financial year. This should be just enough to maintain the network at its current standards in the short term, but if funding is not increased there will be a deterioration in highway condition. Government funding is currently based on road length rather than traffic volume. The County Council is lobbying the Government to increase the funding, given that Surrey has some of the highest traffic volumes in the country. It is therefore important to use what funding is available to treat the worst areas of the County and the amount of work done in each Borough and District will therefore vary.

Additional funding is being sought via bids to Local Enterprise Partnerships and other funding sources. However, the preparation of schemes to submit bids is costly and match funding is often required. Members were concerned that the recent bids which had been rejected had failed as the bids were not sufficiently robust. The Cabinet member agreed that there was a need to review the reasons behind this refusal and learn any lessons for the future.

Members asked whether as a result of the failure of the A24 resilience bid the Horizon schemes which it was linked with would still go ahead and if so when. The Area Highways Manager undertook to check and report back to members.

He highlighted that in commercial areas parking charges can help businesses by creating churn and he would be considering proposing schemes for pay and display parking in these areas. It would be possible to incorporate a short free period with charging for a longer stay. Any surplus income could be reinvested in the highways in the area by the Local Committee. Capital funding for equipment would be provided centrally if necessary on an invest to save basis. The final decision on whether to implement pay and display and in which locations would be a matter for the Local Committee and a report will be brought to a future meeting.

A member commented that whilst the project Horizon and pavement reconstruction programme had been good, the priorities for funding cuts were not those of local residents who would like to see more funding for local committees and for the street lights to remain on all night.

It was noted that some street lights had been turned back on at the request of the police and members had requested details of where these hotspots are. The Cabinet member reported that of the 10 areas requested by police 7 were already lit although the lit area had been expanded to allow police to pursue suspects more easily. The details of the areas could not be released until the police had indicated their agreement as it may affect ongoing investigations.

Members were pleased that the road in Stoneleigh Broadway which is the second largest shopping centre in the Borough had been recently resurfaced, but felt that the footway should also be considered as much of it is uneven.

The Area Highways Manager agreed to review it for safety defects, but also mentioned that some areas are in private ownership.

Members were proud of the street trees in Epsom & Ewell and would like to see them replaced when they have reached the end of their lives. As such they have reached an agreement with the Tree Advisory Board to replant and maintain trees in the Borough and had offered some of their member allocation to help fund the project. However they had now been advised that they could not use their allocation for this work as it would result in an ongoing maintenance liability even though this had already been taken into account in the agreement. The Cabinet member felt that there was unlikely to be a change in the criteria for Member Allocations in the current financial year. The Area Highways Manager responded that the Borough had previously undertaken tree maintenance on behalf of the County, but the work had now been returned to the County. With a limited budget available there is a need to address the safety of existing trees across the County, but in the future it may be possible to consider replacing trees.

Noted the update report.

35/17 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers and members attending: Nicola Morris, Partnership Committee Officer

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points

Members asked why the signs in the first line of the tracker had still not been installed. The Area Highways Manager replied that there had been a change of officer since this action and he would check on progress.

Cllr Dallen did not feel that he had received an update on the LEP bidding process although this was marked as closed. The Partnership Committee Officer would follow up this action with the relevant officer.

With the exception of the item above the Committee agreed to remove those actions marked as closed from the decision tracker.

36/17 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 11]

Monday 12 March at 7pm in Bourne Hall, Ewell

Meeting ended at: 5.30 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL – 27 November 2017****OPEN FORUM IN ADVANCE OF FORMAL MEETING
VERBAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS****Question 1: Colin Taylor**

Mr Taylor queried why, despite a petition, the request for time limited bays outside the shops in Manor Green Road in the recent parking review had not been progressed. The shops are being inconvenienced by residents parking in the area and delivery vehicles are unable to park. He asked how shopkeepers are to ask for restrictions where residents are not in favour if agreement of 70% of residents is required.

Response:

The Cabinet Member for highways responded that the 70% agreement threshold is only for Residents Parking Zones and not for yellow lines. The county councillor for the area agreed to look at this area again.

Question 2: Colin Taylor

When will the proposed crossing in East Street be built?

Response:

The Highways Area Manager reported that the design has been completed and cost estimates are being sought prior to a period of consultation. Construction will be difficult as this is a busy road and there is no diversion route for vehicles wishing to access Kiln Lane.

Question 3: Colin Taylor

With the recent Government focus on the development of electric vehicles, what plans do the County and Borough Councils have for the provision of electric charging points.

Response:

The Chairman responded that the Borough Council are considering installation of charging points in car parks and the County Council will also be looking at the issue.

Question 4: Annie Thackray, Headteacher St Christopher's School

Given that a survey of the residents of Chartwell Place has shown that 92% of those responding are not in favour of all day parking restrictions in the road, will the divisional member reconsider the decision to implement these restrictions?

Response:

This was deferred to be considered with the public questions at Item 3.

This page is intentionally left blank