

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Elmbridge LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 4.00 pm on 15 June 2020  
at REMOTE.

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

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Dr Peter Szanto (Chairman)
- \* Rachael I. Lake (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mr Mike Bennison
- \* Mr Nick Darby
- \* Mrs Mary Lewis
- \* Mr Tim Oliver
- \* Mr John O'Reilly
- Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
- \* Mr Tony Samuels

**Borough / District Members:**

- Cllr David J Archer
- \* Cllr Steve Bax
- \* Cllr Barry Fairbank
- Cllr Roy Green
- \* Cllr Peter Harman
- \* Cllr Mary Marshall
- \* Cllr Christine Richardson
- \* Cllr Mrs Mary Sheldon
- \* Cllr Graham Woolgar

\* In attendance

---

**1/20 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE LOCAL COMMITTEE FOR 2020/21 [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 1]**

Noted the appointment of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the 2020/21 municipal year.

**2/20 APPOINTMENT OF BOROUGH COUNCIL SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 2]**

**Resolved:**

To co-opt the substitutes for Borough Council members for the municipal year 2020/21 as listed in the report.

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

**3/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 3]**

Apologies for absence were received from Ernest Mallet and Borough Councillors David Archer and Roy Green

**4/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]**

There were no declarations of interest.

**5/20 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 5]**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the virtual meeting of the Committee, which he was pleased to report was the first Local/Joint Committee to meet in this way. He thanked all the Borough and County officers and local volunteers for their efforts in supporting the community, especially the vulnerable during this time.

**6/20 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 6]**

Five questions were received. The questions and responses are set out in the supplementary agenda for the meeting. The following additional questions were asked:

Question 1: Mr O'Kane referred to an e-mail he had sent to all members which included a number of additional questions and which he read out at the meeting. The following points were included:

Prior to the Local Committee meeting of 5th December 2019 the 2019/20 Parking Review did not include these roads. There was no compelling evidence of congestion, disruption, poor access, resident complaints, excessive parking on the pavement, pinch points, road accidents involving pedestrians or vehicles. In fact these roads did not have any aspect of the profile of the other roads in the plan. Do you agree or did you see any evidence of such issues prior to the 5th December meeting or in fact since?

The situation for these roads changed after a petition was presented by a resident and was supported by today's sponsor. That petition was the only new factor. So the question now is - in the future after the Council has assessed need, obtained evidence and decided not to include a particular road then will the Council change it's plan because a resident organises a petition? Such a change would of course be very powerful for residents in a number of situations. I can see many wishing to follow suit or at least ask why their petition previously presented was ignored?

A total of 5 written questions have been sent to your Committee raising a number of specific issues. Those questions have all received a response from Adrian Harris. Have you been convinced by his answers and the post decision logic being applied? He also raised a number of issues relating to the replies given in relation to other questions asked.

The Parking Engineer was not able to respond to all the individual points raised, but undertook to respond in writing after the meeting. He stated that the proposal is for a parking scheme which will be subject to advertisement for comment before a final decision is made.

A member said she had received correspondence indicating that the petition previously received had not been valid. Officers responded that there was no reason to indicate that the petition had not met the relevant criteria.

*[The meeting was adjourned for approximately 30 minutes due to sound issues with the webcast]*

**7/20 WEY ROAD AND ROUND OAK ROAD PARKING PROPOSALS [FOR DECISION - EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

**Officers attending:** Adrian Harris, Parking Engineer

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** 5 questions received, see minute 6/20 above

**Member discussion –key points**

The Parking Engineer indicated that the proposal is for a controlled parking zone including, permit bays, paid for parking bays and time limited bays. The options are to agree the proposals for statutory consultation advertisement, amend the proposals or cancel them.

Some members raised concerns that the proposal will displace parking to other areas when there seems to be very little issue with the current situation.

The local county councillor indicated that he understood the strength of feeling both for and against the proposals, but this did arise from a petition signed by a number of local residents. He had discussed a potential scheme with the parking team and had undertaken a site visit. He had also consulted the local Borough members. The discussion is not on whether this scheme should be implemented, but whether it should be advertised for comment to gauge the level of support in the area. If the scheme were to go ahead he would like to see a substantial majority of people in favour of the scheme and their views on whether it should be implemented Monday-Friday or Monday-Saturday. Monday-Saturday would be in line with other restrictions in nearby roads.

The local Borough member, Ashley Tilling, was invited to speak on the matter. He indicated that he could see a good reason not to implement a scheme in this area as there are a number of roads in this area, closer to the High Street, which do not have restrictions and the roads in question have adequate off street parking available to residents. He felt that no further changes should be made until the effects of the implementation of agreed schemes in other roads could be assessed.

There was no suggestion that the Committee was trying to impose something which residents don't want. Advertising the proposals would give residents the opportunity to give a view on whether they were in favour of the proposals and if so which days they would prefer. One member was concerned at the removal of all day parking opportunities in favour of short stay for shoppers. The Parking Engineer indicated that this was the request in the original petition, there would still be some all-day parking but this would be chargeable.

It was not possible to give a firm idea of what a clear majority in favour would be as it depends on the number of responses and the associated comments, but somewhere close to 70% would probably be an indication of the support required.

**Resolved** that:

- i. The county council's intention to introduce the proposal shown in Annex 1 is formally advertised, and subject to statutory consultation.
- ii. If objections are received the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager is authorised to try and resolve them;
- iii. If any objections cannot be resolved, the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of this committee and the county councillor for the division, decides whether or not they should be acceded to and therefore whether the order should be made, with or without modifications.

Reasons: To better manage parking demand in Wey Road and Round Oak Road, so as to improve access for short term parking for visitors to the Weybridge area, whilst maintaining parking as needed by residents and their visitors.

#### **8/20 PETITIONS [Item 7]**

There were no petitions.

#### **9/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 8]**

Confirmed as a correct record.

#### **10/20 DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED POWERS [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 9]**

Noted the decisions taken under delegated officer powers following the late cancellation of the previous meeting as a result of the Covid outbreak.

The Area Highways Manager updated the Committee on the active travel opportunities which are being developed in Elmbridge. Officers are considering schemes across Surrey. Funding from central Government will be allocated in two tranches, the first being up to £1.7m and the second £6.8m. Bids may submitted up to that value, following the announcement of funding there will be two weeks to start work and a further six weeks to complete the work. The first project has been implemented in Farnham and this is being evaluated. In Elmbridge four projects are being considered in Weybridge, East Molesey, Walton and Hersham. Three are to provide additional space for social distancing in shopping areas and the other is to promote active travel. Conversations are in progress with County members and this will be extended to Borough members, but it is not possible to include the public at this stage. Whether these progress is dependent on the amount of funding allocated.

Committee members were keen that the Committee's Cycling and Walking Task Group should meet in order to take forward investment in this area of work. It was agreed that meetings would take place shortly as this work feeds into a number of key work areas.

**11/20 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 10]**

There were no member questions.

**12/20 BROOKLANDS BUSINESS PARK ACCESSIBILITY PROJECT - CYCLE TRACK ORDER [FOR DECISION] [Item 12]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

**Officers attending:** Tim Vickers, Transport Planner

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

**Member discussion** –key points

It was noted that part of the route being considered is within Runnymede and part within Elmbridge. As a result the Cabinet is being asked to make the decision after taking into account the comments of the relevant Local and Joint Committees.

Members were in support of the proposals and felt that the route would be well used and could contribute to a reduction in congestion in the area. It was suggested that more work needs to be done to educate cyclists on the use of routes shared with pedestrians. It was noted that as part of the project there is a way finding signage package across the whole of the route.

**Resolved to:**

Recommend that the Cabinet Member should authorise the making of a Cycle Track Order to extend the cycle track along part of the formal pedestrian/cyclist route being created between Weybridge Railway Station (Heath South car park) and the Brooklands Community Park..

Note: if there are any objections, it is recommended that these are resolved if possible by the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Cabinet Member, and if necessary any unresolved objections are submitted by the Area Highway Manager to the Secretary of State for determining whether the Order can be confirmed or a Local Inquiry is required.

Reasons: The recommendations have been provided in order for a Cycle Track Order to be made to extend the cycle track along part of the formal pedestrian/cyclist route being created between Weybridge Railway Station (Heath South car park) and the Brooklands Community Park. This will best guarantee that both pedestrians and cyclists can use the route in the future and has been considered as a better option than providing rights to cyclists through a permissive agreement. Construction works are in delivery to provide a high quality facility in this location for pedestrians and cyclists.

**13/20 REPRESENTATION ON TASK GROUPS AND EXTERNAL BODIES [FOR DECISION] [Item 13]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

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

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

**Member discussion** –key points

There was a request for meetings of the Task Groups at iv-vi below to take place in the near future.

**Resolved that:**

The committee approves the membership of the task groups and appointments to outside bodies, as set out below for the 2020/21 municipal year:

- (i) The Elmbridge Community and Safety Partnership – Dr Peter Szanto
- (ii) Elmbridge Old Person’s Advisory Body – Mr Ernest Mallett
- (iii) Parking Task Group – SCC members: Dr Peter Szanto; Rachael I Lake; Elmbridge BC members: Cllr Steve Bax, Cllr Roy Green and **Cllr Peter Harman**.
- (iv) Cycling and Walking Task Group – SCC members: Mr John O’Reilly, Rachael I Lake, Ernest Mallett; Elmbridge BC members: **Cllr Mary Marshall**, Cllr Janet Turner and Cllr Ashley Tilling
- (v) Esher Transport Study Member Task Group – SCC members: Mr Tim Oliver, Dr Peter Szanto; Elmbridge BC members: Cllr David Archer
- (vi) Brooklands Transport Study Member Steering Group – SCC members: Mr Tim Oliver, Mr John O’Reilly; Elmbridge BC members: Cllr Peter Harman

Reasons: The report proposes local committee task group membership for the forthcoming year to enable the provision of informed advice and recommendations to the committee. The appointment of councillors of the Local Committee to external bodies enables the committee’s representation on and input to such bodies.

#### **14/20 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER [FOR DECISION] [Item 14]**

The Committee noted the completed actions and agreed to remove these from the tracker.

#### **15/20 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 15]**

Noted the Committee’s Forward Plan.

#### **16/20 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 16]**

Monday 16 November 2020 at 4.00pm

Meeting ended at: 5.42 pm

---

**Chairman**