

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 2.00 pm on 9 December 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**

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

**42/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Neil Dallen, Cllr Arthur Abdulin substituted for him.

**43/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 2]**

There were no declarations of interest.

**44/19 CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS [Item 3]**

There was no Chairman's business.

**45/19 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 4]**

12 written public questions had been received. The questions and responses are set out in the supplementary agenda. The following additional points were made:

**Question 1:** The questioner stated that correspondence with the police had indicated that they would be prepared to carry out a speed survey. Does the

Committee agree that this issue needs to be addressed and what can be done to address the noise issue?

The Area Highway Manager responded that it would be best to consider the data before considering whether there is any further action which can be taken. It is not uncommon for drivers to exceed the speed limit to some degree, but a lot depends on the extent and whether there is a history of speed related casualties. There is a limit to what can be done to reduce noise levels and it would be unusual for the Committee to promote a scheme based on noise alone.

**Question 2:** Cllr Frost asked whether the co-ordination of the signals at the Spread Eagle with those at Ashley Avenue could be reviewed as currently traffic is being held on red when the road ahead is empty. The Area Highways Team Manager agreed to pass this to the signals team.

**Question 3:** Members hoped that a yellow box would be possible.

**Question 4:** The questioner was not present. Cllr Kington asked where the best practice guidelines come from, why other councils do not comply with them and why those trees being felled are not replaced.

The Area Highways Manager acknowledged that there is a demand to plant more trees. There are national guidelines on the clearances required by utility companies and the Manual for Streets 2 sets out the requirements for access for the disabled on pavements which has already been relaxed to 1.6m. All councils are bound by the same guidelines. London authorities have significantly higher budgets for maintenance which may assist in making locations more suitable but it is difficult to get trees to thrive in an urban environment. It would be possible to pay for the relocation of utility services but this would be very expensive.

**Question 12:** The questioner stated that slow moving traffic creates hazardous emissions. The Abelea Green area is part of the solution to this issue. He asked that the Committee consider the latest pollution data and not make the situation worse by permitting parking in this area.

#### **46/19 PETITIONS [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**

Members were concerned that there are a number of potential schemes for consideration across the Borough and that traffic calming is likely to be beyond the scope of Committee funding. It could be many years before any substantial work could be done, but it was considered that it may be possible to make some small changes at a lesser cost which could be funded from the divisional members budget and these should be considered.

**Resolved:** to include a scheme on the prioritisation list for consideration in a future highway programme.

Reasons: To consider measures to address the issues identified in the petition and to evaluate them against other priorities for funding from the Committee's available budget.

#### **47/19 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 6]**

Confirmed as a correct record.

#### **48/19 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]**

One member question had been received. The question and response are set out in the supplementary agenda. The following additional comments were made:

Cllr Kington was disappointed with the response and felt that his points had not been addressed. He wished for officers to consider ways in which more tree planting could be achieved rather than putting obstacles in place. He pointed out examples of trees being planted very close to kerbs in London.

The Area Highways Manager responded that the example of the tree shown in London could be obstructing the footway and that there was potential for challenge and that the tree was unlikely to thrive in such a location. The team are trying to be flexible within the constraints and will be looking at more shrubby plants which will have less impact on utilities. They have engaged with a number of stakeholders in formulating the Surrey policy. He agreed to circulate the list of trees to be planted in Epsom & Ewell to members.

#### **49/19 ROAD SAFETY OUTSIDE DANETREE PRIMARY SCHOOL [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 8]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

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

**Member discussion –key points**

It was queried whether the School is complying with the requirements of its planning permission in terms of its travel plan.

The Area Highways Manager stated that all the proposals put forward have some merit but they could be implemented individually. The divisional member although not present was supportive of the proposals.

Members were concerned at the number of schemes being considered for prioritisation when the available budget is small and it was proposed that "prioritisation" should be deleted from the recommendation. This was supported unanimously.

**Resolved:** To agree:

- (i) the measures set out in paragraph 3.2 of this report be added to the list of possible future highway improvements in Epsom and Ewell for consideration for future Local Committee funding. Officers will also seek any alternative sources of funding that may arise, for example as a result of property development in the local area.
- (ii) that the Safer Travel Team will work with the school to encourage them to take up more of the road safety education and training activities offered by the county council, this will include a Modeshift STARS school travel plan and “Pedals” Year 2 (age 6/7) Scooter and bicycle training.

Reasons: These proposed highway measures would improve the safety of pupils walking to and from Danetree School and help to reduce antisocial parking. They would reduce the risk of collisions and improve the road environment to encourage more walking and scooting to school. A successful increase in these modes would contribute to fewer car journeys and less motor vehicle congestion. However the measures at this site would need to be considered alongside other schemes across Epsom and Ewell. 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.

**50/19 COMMUNITY PROTECTION GROUP UPDATE [SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN] [Item 9]**

Noted that due to an emergency there was no one available to present this report. It would be deferred to a future meeting.

**51/19 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

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

**Member discussion** –key points

The Divisional member was happy to defer the Stoneleigh Park Road scheme in his division on cost grounds.

It was noted that the feedback and options for the scheme near Aldi would be discussed with the divisional member but it may not be possible to deliver it without additional external funding.

It was agreed that possible schemes for delivery and new feasibility studies will be considered at an informal meeting as there is insufficient budget available to take them all forward and decisions will need to be taken on which are priorities. Those put forward will be brought to the March meeting for confirmation.

**Resolved: to**

- (i) approve the recommended capital ITS programme for next Financial Year 2020-21 as detailed in Table 5;
- (ii) approve a minor amendment to the Epsom and Ewell parking review, to reduce the length of a parking bay to facilitate the widening of a dropped kerb outside no. 125 Hookfield Road, Epsom, as shown in Annex D;
- (iii) 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, and to make one minor amendment to this year's parking review, 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.

**52/19 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER [FOR DECISION] [Item 11]**

Noted progress and agreed to remove those actions marked as closed.

**53/19 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 12]**

Noted.

**54/19 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 13]**

Monday 30 March 2020 at 7pm in Bourne Hall, Ewell

Meeting ended at: 3.45 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

**SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN EPSOM & EWELL – 9 December 2019****OPEN FORUM IN ADVANCE OF FORMAL MEETING  
VERBAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS****Question 1: Anne Alden**

As part of the 2019/20 parking review, proposals have been advertised to amend the timings of residents parking in Zone M following the submission of a petition from residents. During the advert period a leaflet giving three options had been distributed with election material. What weight will be given to the opinions expressed by residents in response to the questions asked?

**Response:**

The Chairman replied that she had circulated the leaflet which she considered to be impartial and giving a choice of 3 options. She had done this as a result of the high number of objections which were being received following advertisement of the proposals. In some areas residents are unanimous in wanting the restrictions to be unchanged and more than 40% are opposed to change. She felt that it may be best to postpone the changes and to consider in a future review if there was sufficient support. The petitioner was concerned that they had carried out a full consultation and knocked on all doors and that it now appeared that there were different views. The Chairman had no views on which option should go forward, she is happy to follow the wishes of residents.

**Question 2: Andrew Burke**

Asked if it would be permissible to submit further information in respect of the advertised parking proposals for Bradford Drive after the closure of the advertising period. He felt that the proposals had been submitted when the road had been closed and that the situation had now changed.

**Response:**

The Area Highways Manager responded that any views submitted before the end of the statutory advertising period must be considered and anything submitted after this time may be considered at the discretion of the Parking Manager and divisional member. The divisional member stated that the petition had been submitted to improve sight lines and that there had been an accident in the area. He agreed to take the words of the alternative put forward by the questioner and to consult those who may have signed the petition and for whom he has contact details to obtain their views. He would then take this into account in the final deliberation when all the views submitted have been analysed.

This page is intentionally left blank