

Please, do not allow Surrey County Council to pedestrianise Ewell High Street.

See consultation at <https://ewellvillage.commonplace.is/> , and Vote Option E, before 12th March.

More information at www.safer4ewell.info .

If you have friends and neighbours without internet access, please help them vote.

FACTS:

The residents who originally suggested pedestrianisation had the best of motives – they were concerned about road safety, particularly of children walking to and from school.

Surrey County Council has a completely different agenda. Their Local Transport Plan is designed to minimise car usage.

However, Ewell High Street does not have a bad road accident record. See <https://www.crashmap.co.uk>. Pedestrianisation will divert a high volume of traffic from High Street onto neighbouring residential roads, for example doubling the number of cars travelling Southbound on Cheam Road in morning rush hour. Some of these roads already have a higher accident record.

The High Street from The Spring to Cheam Road was designated as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in 2011, but the upper section of High Street, which they propose to pedestrianise, does not fall within this area. Traffic backing up from Cheam Road is likely to increase congestion in the AQMA, and therefore increase the air pollution.

The Spring Street/Chessington Road one-way system often reaches gridlock in the rush hour, and the revised traffic flow is likely to make this a daily occurrence.

The proposals for widening the pavements at the Spring and Dog Gate junctions (*approved by 65-70% of respondents in 2023*) implies the removal of traffic lanes. There is no evidence that this has been seriously considered by SCC.

Almost all shopkeepers oppose pedestrianisation (Option B), with many fearing for the future of their businesses.

The County and Borough Councils, and the Residents' Association, are aware of this but they still support pedestrianisation.

One of the arguments is to increase space for outside dining and events. We have plenty of restaurant and café capacity - 17 hospitality outlets in a distance of 1/3 of a mile (excluding The Spring), seating for more than 600 customers, with outdoor seating for about 120. As far as we are aware, there is little demand for more outside dining space from the majority of restaurants & cafes.

Deliveroo-type mopeds will not be able to access restaurants for takeaways.

It is proposed to re-schedule deliveries to shops to specific times. The Co-op alone has 8 or 9 deliveries on some days, so designating perhaps an hour early morning for deliveries is impractical. Shops have individual re-cycling and waste collection contracts (often not with

EEBC), so those trucks could not remove the rubbish. Safegate and Co-op are courier pick-up and drop-off points, so they could not operate. It is likely that large companies would rather lose business than accept Council diktats on changes to service.

Proposals for easier access to car park, free parking period, on-street parking to replace 8 spaces lost outside Greenfields and 8 outside Co-op were in last year's consultation, but it appears that no negotiations have yet taken place to secure these concessions.

Parking spaces outside Co-op/Debra/Coral are privately owned, but have been ear-marked for outside dining/events space without prior negotiation.

Greenwood (Funeral Directors) have no rear access. Do we really want to see coffins carried to hearses parked in the car park or across the road?

SCC have promised an investigation into increasing the variety of shops. They have not revealed what magic powers they have to attract new shops on the one hand, whilst seeking to bankrupt them by closing the High Street.

Pedestrianisation can benefit locations with a large number of retail outlets, with destination shops – well-known brands or specialist outlets – that can attract shoppers from a wide area. Ewell Village shops are supported by local residents and workers, and by people driving through. The population within walking distance is not enough to support trade. The Council's desire to divert all passing traffic onto the by-pass will result in the village becoming a deserted backwater.

We should seek to emulate Ashted, which has a thriving High Street, with drive-through traffic and good parking, rather than Leatherhead, which is pedestrianised, but struggling even with a larger choice of shops.

Whilst there are some potential problems with Option E, there is a danger that voting for Option F (no change) will split the anti-pedestrianisation vote, and allow the Council to implement Option B. Please vote for Option E.

Do not forget the separate questions on Church Street and West Street. SCC acknowledge that pedestrianisation would lead to rat-running, necessitating further restrictions. Views on this are likely to vary, depending on whether you are a resident in the affected roads, or a parent or staff member in the respective schools, and we appeal to SCC to conduct a far more rigorous survey of the interested parties. In each case, Option 1 would only be necessary if pedestrianisation was implemented.

Thank you - Safer4Ewell.