

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 7.00 pm on 16 September 2019  
at Bourne Hall, Spring Street, Ewell KT17 1UF.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

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

**Borough / District Members:**

- Cllr Steve Bridger
- \* Cllr Nigel Collin
- \* Cllr Neil Dallen
- Cllr Debbie Monksfield
- \* Cllr Humphrey Reynolds

\* In attendance

---

**OPEN FORUM QUESTIONS & RESPONSES**

The questions asked in the open forum and the responses provided are attached to the minutes.

**30/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Steve Bridger and Debbie Monksfield. Cllrs Phil Neale and Kate Chinn substituted for the respective councillors.

**31/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 2]**

Bernie Muir declared a personal prejudicial interest in item 8 as a resident of St Margaret Drive.

**32/19 CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS [Item 3]**

The Chairman reported that the County Council had secured funding for the planting of 1.2m trees and would be working with RHS Wisley to find appropriate species.

Noted that the Local/Joint Committee Chairmen had asked SCC to work more closely with members on the highway implications of large planning applications.

### **33/19 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 4]**

23 public questions and statements were received. The questions and responses are set out in the supplementary agenda. The following supplementary questions were asked:

**Question 2:** How will the safety of residents on the Abelea Green estate be ensured, when access by emergency vehicles is often required. Officers responded that they are satisfied that access to the estate can be maintained in an emergency.

**Question 8:** The Air Quality Management Action Plan for Ewell Village has recommended the removal of parking in the area to improve air quality. Can this be considered when considering the parking proposals for the Abelea Green area?

**Question 15:** Many of the parents driving to St Joseph's School are from outside the Borough. Will the Committee agree to cut back on parking to reduce the reliance on cars?

**Question 18:** The questioner asked for next steps and timescales. The Chairman responded that the vegetation had already been trimmed as far as it could be as part of it is on private property and signs have been installed at the top of the hill.

**Question 19:** Could this location be added to the Committee list for consideration of traffic calming? It is unlikely at the present time that the Committee would have sufficient funding to prioritise work at this location.

**Question 20:** Is there a date for the gas works in East Street? SCC is not aware of a date currently but only 3 months' notice is required.

**Question 21:** Whether work can be prioritised in this location will depend on the Committee's budget for the next financial year.

### **34/19 PETITIONS [FOR DECISION] [Item 5]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** One petition, petitioner not present

**Member discussion –key points**

The Committee noted that the county council's Safer Travel Team will investigate concerns raised by the petition using the Road Safety Outside Schools Policy. The outcome of the safety assessment will be reported to the school and local County Councillor, containing the results of the road safety education assessment and a description of any recommended potential highway improvements and measures to encourage more sustainable travel. Members asked that any recommendations for improvements should have estimated costs attached.

### **35/19 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 6]**

Confirmed as a correct record.

### **36/19 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]**

One member question was received. The question and response was published in the supplementary agenda.

### **37/19 EPSOM AND EWELL PARKING REVIEW (PHASE 12) [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 8]**

**Declarations of Interest:** Bernie Muir declared a prejudicial interest as a resident of St Margaret Drive and left the meeting during the consideration of the proposals in that area.

**Officers attending:** Steve Clavey, Parking Engineer; Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** Questions had been considered in the open forum and in Item 4

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

Noted the amendments to the report published in the supplementary agenda.

Members agreed to the changes to the Zone M resident parking area discussed in the open forum. Although they will be advertised this year if they are agreed implementation will be in the following financial year as there is insufficient funding available in the current year. The Committee also agreed the amendments and additions outlined below. Noted that it is not possible to apply a three hour limit for the use by disabled drivers of residents bays in The Parade.

In relation to the proposals for Abelea Green, the Chairman who is the divisional member stated that she did not feel that they would help in accessing the School and that the proposals included for White Horse Drive would be safer and more effective. A walking bus could be established from White Horse Drive and young children would not have to walk along the main road to access the School. All residents of the Abelea Green estate except three are opposed to the proposals and this has been confirmed by a petition which has been received. However there is an opposing petition from the School seeking the relaxation of parking restrictions in Abelea Green.

The Area Highways Manager reported that providing improved facilities for parents to drop off and collect their children by car from St Joseph's School could encourage more parents to drive. If the proposals for White Horse Drive do not result in any further parents driving and the commuters currently displaced from this area decide to use sustainable transport methods it could be a sustainable option but this may not be the case. He considered that the situation at the School was similar to many others in the County and asked what the Committee hoped to achieve.

Many members felt that the Committee should not be encouraging more vehicles into the Borough by making parking easier. Others felt that all

options should be explored and that they should be advertised in order to get as wide a range of views as possible, including the residents of both White Horse Drive and Rosebank. It was suggested that there could be a case for independent mediation between the school, parents and residents to try and find an acceptable solution to the issues in accessing St Joseph's School. It was considered that there were other options that the school could explore to make a difference such as car sharing or minibus transport.

On a vote in relation to map 68 there were 7 votes FOR including the proposals in the advertisement and 2 AGAINST. In relation to map 70 there were 8 votes FOR its inclusion and 1 AGAINST. The Committee requested that the final decision on whether or not to implement these proposals should be made by the Committee, but that this should not delay the implementation of the remainder of the review.

There was a discussion on whether the two residents bays at the top of Rosebank should be added to the review for possible removal or relocation to help with the school pick up and drop off zone. The Borough Council owns a small strip of land between the pavement and the school fence which could potentially be used to improve public access and or to relocate the resident bays, but the Area Highways Manager advised that until the feasibility study is complete not all the information is available to advise the Committee on these options. The Parking Engineer indicated that feedback from residents suggests that they are unhappy that there are insufficient residents bays available as they are being used by parents. On a vote it was AGREED by 7 VOTES for to 1 AGAINST not to include the removal of the resident parking bays at the top of Rosebank in the review.

**Resolved:**

- (i) To advertise all the proposals outlined in Annexe 1 of the report, subject to the following amendments and additions:

That the proposals to split the Zone M residents parking area and change the hours as set out in the petition submitted by residents be added to the review;

That double yellow lines at the junction of Sunnymede Avenue and Riverhome Drive to improve sight lines be added to the review;

Map 21 Orchard Close should read Carnforth Close;

Maps 27 and 34 road names to be checked and corrected if necessary;

Map 30 Queensmead Avenue to extend the one hour restriction to Sheer Avenue

Maps 36/37 and 38 junction protection lines to be longer than the statutory minimum;

Map 55 – disabled bay/s to be advertised in Castle Road in the vicinity of number 14;

Map 59 – to advertise restrictions in the spaces not currently included at the top of the Lynwood Road;

Maps 62/63 – restrictions to be added outside number 14 Milburn Walk.  
Two unrestricted spaces to be left outside number 7 Milburn Walk,  
proposals to be changed to make parking on alternate sides in Walnut  
Close as in the adjacent roads if residents agree;

- (ii) That the committee contribute £18,000 funding towards the proposals in Annex 1 from the 2018/2019 parking surplus.
- (iii) That the committee contribute £12,000 funding towards the proposals shown in Annex 1 for a verge parking ban, from the 2019/2020 parking surplus and the amendments to Zone M as outlined above also be funded from next year's budget, subject to their agreement.
- (iv) That the County Council's intention to make an order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 be advertised and, if no objections are maintained, the order be made;
- (v) That if objections are received the Parking Strategy and Implementation Group Manager is authorised to try and resolve them, in consultation with the Chairman / Vice Chairman of this committee and the county councillor for the division, and decides whether or not they should be acceded to and therefore whether the order should be made, with or without modifications. The decision in relation to maps 68 and 70 to be brought back to a future meeting of the Committee.

Reasons: Changes to the highway network, the built environment and society mean that parking behaviour changes and consequently it is necessary for a Highway Authority to carry out regular reviews of waiting and parking restrictions on the highway network.

It is recommended that the waiting restrictions in this report are progressed as they will help to:

- Improve road safety
- Increase access for emergency vehicles
- improve access to shops, facilities and businesses
- Increase access for refuse vehicles, buses and service vehicles
- Reduce traffic congestion
- Better regulate parking

### **38/19 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

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

**Member discussion** –key points

In relation to the planting of more trees as announced earlier in the meeting, a member asked where the trees will be planted and when the new policy on planting highway trees would be published. The Area Highways Manager indicated that he would be drafting the policy and a very small proportion of

the trees will be planted in the highway as there is little scope for changing the current requirements around pavement widths and the avoidance of utilities. The team are working with RHS Wisley to consider whether there are any woody shrubs which may be suitable for verge planting, but these may require more maintenance.

The Area Highways Manger indicated that the CIL funding allocated to the Borough will be used to provide additional cycle facilities, any money allocated for tree planting will be returned as there is insufficient space.

Noted in Table 4 that the extension of the street lighting is in the path connecting to West Street and that the report should be amended.

Members discussed the Waterloo Road proposals and the Area Highways Manager confirmed that there is no requirement to move the bus stop in order to construct the cycle way.

Members requested frequent and regular updates on the progress with projects and spend within their divisions.

Members discussed the response to the member question in item 7. They felt that it was unacceptable for the bus to stay in this town centre location, other than to pick up and drop off passengers, as it is causing delays to drivers as well as emergency vehicles. They requested that the appropriate officers attend the next informal meeting with a solution which can be implemented in the next few months.

**Resolved:**

- (i) To approve the provisional allocation of assumed budgets for 2020-21 as shown in Table 3 of the report;
- (ii) On a vote [9 votes FOR to 1 AGAINST] to confirm the decision to construct the cycle way in Waterloo Road;
- (ii) Authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

**Reasons:**

Recommendations are made to facilitate development of Committee's 2019-20 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.

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.

**39/19 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER [FOR DECISION] [Item 10]**

Members requested further information on the issue arising from the last parking review which had been referred to solicitors.

Members were unhappy that the question asked by Cllr Mason in relation to the Edge Youth Centre had not been resolved and felt that she deserved an apology. An update on youth services would be provided to the next informal meeting. In the meantime it was reported that Surrey Clubs for Young People are interested in providing services from the Edge and arrangements are being discussed.

The Chairman thanked all the officers working for the Committee for their hard work.

**40/19 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 11]**

Noted.

**41/19 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]**

Monday 9 December at 2pm in Bourne Hall, Ewell.

Meeting ended at: 9.50 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

**SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL – 16 September 2019****OPEN FORUM IN ADVANCE OF FORMAL MEETING  
VERBAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS****Question 1: Sarah Iles**

The questioner asked whether parking on Walnut Close could be on alternate sides of the road as on other roads in the area and whether parking restrictions could be put in place outside no 14 Milburn Walk.

**Response:**

The Parking Engineer responded that it would be possible to put restrictions on alternate sides in Walnut Close, but this can sometimes make enforcement difficult as it can become unclear where the times change. Ms Iles agreed to check with residents and report back. The amendment to Milburn Walk to be considered under item 8

**Question 2: Philip Holbeche**

Mr Holbeche asked whether two unrestricted spaces could be left outside his house at 7 Milburn Walk as his driveway is too steep to park a car.

**Response:**

This request would be added to Item 8.

**Question 3: Julie Morris**

Ms Morris asked why the petition submitted by residents to split residents parking zone M and amend the timings was not included in the agenda

**Response:**

The Parking Engineer apologised that this had been overlooked during the preparation of the report. He agreed to check what had been requested and to send to Ms Morris and the Chairman for agreement prior to advertising, subject to consideration by the Committee under Item 8.

**Question 4: Sally Nestor**

The questioner reported that residents were pleased with the parking proposals for Lynwood Road, but asked whether restrictions could be added to the gap at the top of the road.

**Response:**

The Parking Engineer reported that this space had been left for two residents of Burgh Heath Road who have nowhere else to park, one of whom is elderly. He agreed to add to the advertisement, subject to consideration under item 8 and to check the current position with the Borough Parking Manager. If the spaces are needed the restrictions will not proceed further.

**Question 5: Martin Thompson**

Following on from his question to the last meeting regarding the installation of barriers around the market place when it had been confirmed that only a short length would be installed, Mr Thompson

asked for this to be checked as he had been informed by a council official that more barriers would be installed.

**Response:**

There were no officers present able to respond so the information would be provided to Mr Thompson after the meeting.

**Question 6: Val Garrett**

The questioner asked for clarification of the rest of the process for the parking review in relation to Middle Lane and whether the road could be split in two if the residents at the Kiln Lane end did not want a Resident Permit Zone.

**Response:**

The Parking Engineer reported that if the Committee agree the proposals will be advertised for comment for at least 28 days, once the comments have been collated a decision will be made on whether to proceed with the proposals or not. Whether Middle Lane could be split into two would depend on the feedback. Residents at the Kiln Lane end thought that they already had allocated parking bays, but have now been told that the area is public highway.

**Question 7: Beth Legg**

Ms Legg thanked the Committee for their work on the parking review. She queried why after a similar proposal for Abelea Green had not gone ahead in 2013 this was being considered again when practically people cannot turn round without trespassing on private drives and car parks. How this meets sustainability requirements and why this is the only proposal allowing additional parking. She asked for the proposal to be withdrawn.

**Response:**

These points will be covered under Item 8.

**Question 8: Sue Neimira**

Ms Neimira indicated that the air ambulance had recently had to land on Abelea Green and this would not be possible if parking were to be permitted.

**Response:**

This would be considered under item 8

**Question 9: Resident of Queensmead Avenue**

The resident asked whether the restrictions proposed for Queensmead Avenue could be extended to Sheer Avenue as requested in the petition submitted.

**Response:**

This can be amended under Item 8, subject to the agreement of the Committee.