

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Epsom AND EWELL LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
 held at 7.00 pm on 22 June 2015  
 at Bourne Hall, Spring Street, Ewell, KT17 1UF.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

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

**Borough / District Members:**

- \* Cllr Michael Arthur MBE
- \* Cllr Liz Frost
- \* Cllr Vince Romagnuolo
- \* Cllr Clive Smitheram
- \* Cllr Tella Wormington

\* In attendance

---

**12/15 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE LOCAL COMMITTEE FOR 2015/16 [Item 1]**

The appointment by Council of Eber Kington as Chairman and John Beckett as Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee for the current municipal year was noted.

**13/15 APPOINTMENT OF BOROUGH COUNCIL MEMBERS [Item 2]****Resolved:**

That, Borough Council members be co-opted as substitutes for the municipal year 2015/16.

The Local Committee noted that at the Epsom & Ewell Borough Council's first meeting of this municipal year, 5 Borough Councillors and 5 substitutes were appointed to serve on the Local Committee for the municipal year 2015-2016, the substitute members being appointed subject to the decision above:

Appointed Members [5]

Cllr Michael Arthur MBE [Ewell]  
 Cllr Liz Frost [Woodcote]  
 Cllr Vince Romagnuolo [Court]  
 Cllr Clive Smitheram [West Ewell]  
 Cllr Tella Wormington [Town]

## ITEM 6

Substitutes [5]

Cllr Tony Axelrod [Town]  
Cllr Rekha Bansil [Woodcote]  
Cllr Steve Bridger [Stamford]  
Cllr Kate Chinn [Court]  
Cllr Humphrey Reynolds [Ewell]

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.

### **14/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 3]**

There were no apologies or substitutions.

### **15/15 CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS [Item 4]**

Borough colleagues were reminded to complete a declaration of interest form if they had not already done so, or to check their current declaration.

The County Council has very recently issued a list of Social Care, Community Support and Health Contacts in Epsom & Ewell for distribution to relevant individuals and community outlets. Copies were available to members for distribution in their area.

A leaflet on available funding sources for community and charity groups will be available shortly and copies will be sent to Borough Members of the Local Committee for distribution to local groups in their wards.

### **16/15 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 5]**

Two questions were received, the questions and answers are set out in Annex A. Mr Osgathorp was unable to be present at the meeting, the response to the question was noted. Further discussion of this and question 2 was deferred until consideration of Item 13.

### **17/15 ADJOURNMENT [Item 6]**

29 members of the public were present. 5 informal questions were asked (including three under Item 7 and 1 under item 13) and answers were provided at the meeting.

### **18/15 PETITIONS [Item 7]**

Two petitions were received, the petitions and answers are set out in Annex B.

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** Three members of the public asked questions under Item 3 in relation to this item.

**Petition 1:** The petitioner, Mr Tufo presented his petition. He indicated that he felt that there was no need for a study to be carried out as the traffic problems could be solved by the construction of the Kiln Lane link. Residents had previously been advised that traffic calming would be installed, there are frequent accidents which do not appear to be presented in the data included in the response to the petition.

A resident queried where the information had come from that indicated that the traffic had flowed better during the recent gas works and referred to the number of accidents in the area.

Officers responded that the accident data is supplied by the police and is publicly available on the Crash Map website. Incidents are generally only recorded if there is personal injury as there is no requirement to report damage only incidents to the police, more recent incidents are not included as there is a delay in publication whilst information is processed and verified. As the number of personal injury accidents has been low officers would recommend that limited resources are directed at areas with a higher incidence of accidents.

Whilst the Kiln Lane link may alleviate the problems there is no guarantee that it will be built in the foreseeable future. It was noted that the local highways team receive a high volume of correspondence and during the gas works received a number of requests for the one way system to be continued permanently. The feasibility study is aiming to look at whether this would be a good idea from a technical point of view and would recommend what changes would need to be made to ensure that there is no deterioration in safety in the area. If the feasibility study concludes that a one way system is appropriate, the Committee would need to agree to proceed and there would be a period of formal statutory public consultation before a final decision could be made.

**Petition 2:** The petitioner, Mr Tufo presented his petition. He indicated that residents had previously petitioned for traffic calming which had been agreed, but that all that had resulted was a series of staggered parking bays. It is difficult for residents to safely leave their driveways between parked cars and there are regular near misses. In addition when vehicles are not in the bays traffic is not slowed. Residents would like chicanes as in Manor Green Road, particularly as there are a number of facilities in the area, including a school and a church where users are vulnerable.

Three residents supported the request for traffic calming and indicated that they had witnessed vehicles driving at speed in the area resulting in accidents or near misses. One queried whether a one way system if agreed would lead to increases in traffic speeds and accidents.

Officers replied that a one way system can lead to increases in traffic speed but mitigating measures would be included in any proposed scheme to ensure that safety is not compromised.

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

**Member discussion – key points**

**Petition 1:** In response to members questions the Area Highways Team Manager indicated that around £5,000 had been spent on the feasibility study so far. He could not confirm how long the work would take, it is pencilled in for completion this financial year, but the officer doing the work is due to go on maternity leave in the summer and it is not yet known what cover arrangements will be put in place. Members queried whether the study could be redefined to look at alternative solutions, he indicated that once the model is established other scenarios can be tested, traffic calming solutions could be considered in the current study for an additional sum.

**Petition 2:** It was suggested that consideration could be given to reducing the speed limit to 20mph. Officers responded that this is not effective without engineering measures to reduce speeds, road humps are the most effective, but cause problems for emergency services, road cushions are the next best option followed by chicanes. These options could be evaluated by means of a road safety study which would cost in the order of £5,000.

**Resolved:**

- (i) (on a vote 2 AGAINST to 7 FOR) That, the feasibility study to consider whether a one way system in Hook Road and Temple Road would be appropriate should continue as previously agreed.
- (ii) (on a unanimous vote) That a report be brought to the next meeting of the Committee setting out how options for traffic calming in Temple Road and the surrounding area could be brought forward.

Reasons: To gather data to see whether a one way scheme would be appropriate in this area and to consider possible options for the road layout should the scheme progress.

**19/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 8]**

The minutes were confirmed as a correct record.

**20/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 9]**

There were no declarations of interest.

**21/15 EPSOM AND EWELL PAY AND DISPLAY PROPOSALS [Item 13]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Stephen Clavey, Senior Parking Engineer; Nick Healey, Area Highways Team Manager

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** One member of the public asked a question under Item 5 in relation to this item, a further question under item 5 was taken into consideration although the questioner was not present. A further member of the public also asked a question under Item 6.

Noted the following corrections to the report “Bankside” should read “Emerald House” “Prospect Place” should read “Providence Place”

Mr Olney stated that he represents the residents of Wheelers Lane and the majority do not want a Residents Parking Zone (RPZ) or pay and display. Around 10% would be prepared to pay for a permit to allow them to park close to their property during the day and he was therefore suggesting that an area for these residents could be created on the green area. The other questioner was also against the implementation of an RPZ and was also against the hardening of the green area.

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

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

Whilst hardening of the green area would be possible, officers would not recommend this option as it would take away space for parking on the road and it would be necessary to divert the pavement. It was also likely to be quite costly for very little additional benefit.

In relation to the Clayton Road proposal members asked whether it would be possible to time any implementation to coincide with the implementation of any new RPZ to prevent vehicles being displaced to residential roads. Officers could not guarantee this would be possible, but would aim to implement the two schemes as close as possible to each other.

#### **Resolved:**

- (i) (On a vote, members unanimously voted AGAINST the introduction of pay and display in Wheelers Lane and FOR its introduction in Clayton Road) To introduce new parking restrictions including pay and display parking bays in Clayton Road, if possible to coincide with the introduction of any agreed Residents' Parking Zones in the area, but that the proposals for Wheelers Lane be not progressed;
- (ii) 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;
- (iii) 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 and the Divisional Member and decide whether or not they should be acceded to and therefore whether the order should be made, with or without modifications.

Reasons: It is expected that the implementation of the proposals will both increase the safe passage of vehicles, improve the convenience of parking in these locations and also ease the parking situation within these areas.

#### **22/15 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 10]**

Eight questions were received, the questions and answers are set out in Annex C. The following supplementary questions were asked.

## ITEM 6

Question 2: A request was made to publish the steps and timescales on the Local Committee website following the meeting of the Committees Parking Task Group and this was agreed.

Question 3: It was noted that business permits are not currently available and therefore the double yellow lines cannot be converted to parking bays as they are required by the undertakers. Officers agreed to see if there was any other location where an additional bay could be introduced.

Question 4: It was not possible to give a more specific time for these works as the programme will not be drawn up until the autumn.

Question 6: The member asked to be updated on the result of the inspection.

Question 7: The member requested a loading ban to prevent parking in the area by blue badge holders. Officers agreed to consult residents in the area.

Question 8: Any suspected misuse of a blue badge should be reported to the County Council contact centre for investigation.

### **23/15 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

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

**Member discussion – key points**

Members expressed concern that £27,000 of last year's budget had not been spent and had not been carried forward. The Area Highways Team Manager reported that local officers felt that they had spent all of the allocated budget and that this may be due to a delay in processing payments. He would investigate further and challenge the loss of this sum if it was found to be due to delayed payments. He would report back to the September meeting.

Noted, in relation to the feasibility study at the Cheam Road junction with Ewell Bypass, that officers had recently met with officers from the traffic signals team and have suggested some improvements.

**Resolved:**

To authorise the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

Reasons: to facilitate the delivery of the 2015-16 Highways programmes funded by the Local Committee, while at the same time ensuring that the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant Divisional Members are fully and appropriately involved in any detailed considerations.

**24/15 EPSOM PLAN E HIGHWAYS IMPROVEMENTS - PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT ANALYSIS [Item 12]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Steve Howard, Project Manager, Transport Policy; Caroline Tuttle, Transport Planner

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

**Member discussion – key points**

The local member was concerned that residents concerns had been ignored and that a number of roads in the area would become rat runs when the scheme is implemented. The local member also suggested that some shopkeepers on South Street are also concerned that loading restrictions, which may be required, will damage their businesses. Officers responded that over 2,500 comments had been received as a result of the public exhibition and engagement and that these are being analysed to see what changes can be incorporated into the detailed design to address some of the concerns expressed. Noted that the Cabinet member had given an undertaking to consider the roads that could be potential rat runs, the local member requested that they be looked at in the winter when traffic levels are higher. The Officer explained how the team had made several visits to local businesses to explain the plans and elicit their views. Officers would be engaging further with businesses to ensure that any concerns are considered. The Committees Task Group would be kept informed of the detailed design process and any other issues arising.

The Committee noted the results of the public engagement event on the Plan E improvements proposals and that an additional £0.675m has been awarded from the (C2C LEP) Local Growth fund to increase the overall funding to £3.375m

**25/15 LOCAL COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS TO LOCAL GROUPS AND TASK GROUPS [Item 14]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

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

**Member discussion – key points**

It was agreed that the Community Partnership and Committee Officer would circulate further information on the family, friends and community support project and the role of the champion.

Mrs Mountain expressed her view that her right to represent her residents is being impaired following her removal from the Major Schemes Task Group. The Chairman responded that the decision of the Committee is a democratic means to determine representation.

**Resolved:**

- (i) To make the following appointments from the Local Committee for 2015/16 municipal year:
  - a) Community Safety Partnership - John Beckett
  - b) a Family, Friends and Community Support Champion for 2015/16 – to be decided.
  - b) Youth Task Group - County Councillors Jan Mason and Tina Mountain and Borough Councillors Neil Dallen and Lucie Dallen.
  - c) On Street Parking Task Group - County Councillors Eber Kingston, John Beckett, substitute Stella Lallement, Borough Councillors Neil Dallen, Michael Arthur, substitute: Clive Smitheram
  - d) Major Schemes (Epsom & Ewell) Task Group – County Councillors Stella Lallement, Jan Mason and John Beckett, Borough Councillors – to be advised by the Borough Council.
  
- (ii) Note the requirement that Members appointed to outside bodies should update the Local Committee on the group/service they are appointed to/represent on a six monthly basis or as appropriate.

Reasons: To enable the Local Committee to be represented on local bodies and to appoint the Committees Task Groups.

**26/15 COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION) [Item 15]**

**Declarations of Interest:** Cllr Smitheram declared an interest as a Borough member involved in the funding of the Community Safety Partnership

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

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

**Member discussion – key points**

Cllr Smitheram queried the impact that retaining the budget may have on the work of the Community Safety Partnership if this funding is allocated to another organisation. He was reassured that the money could be made available to the Partnership if a suitable project is put forward which meets the criteria, however if a project cannot be identified the Committee will seek to use it on another suitable initiative to prevent the funding from being lost.

**Resolved:** To retain the budget of £3,337 allocated to the Committee for community safety purposes under its control and delegate authority to the Community Partnership Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee to authorise any expenditure meeting the criteria set out in the agenda and to oversee the expenditure of this budget.

Reasons: to ensure that the funding is allocated to an appropriate community safety project.

**27/15 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 16]**

Monday 21 September at 7.00pm, Bourne Hall, Ewell

Meeting ended at: 9.50 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank