

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 21 MAY 2003

Local Committee for Mole Valley 24 September 2003

MINUTES: of the meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee held at 10.00 on Wednesday 21 May 2003 at Mole Valley District Council Offices (Pippbrook)

Surrey County Council Members

David Gollin (Chairman)
Helyn Clack
Bob McKinley (Vice Chairman)
Jim Smith
David Timms
Hazel Watson

[All references to Items refer to the Agenda for the meeting]

PART ONE - IN PUBLIC

The Meeting started with Kevin Gill, the Local Director, in the Chair.

44/03 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE, 2003/04 [Item 1]

David Gollin was elected as Chairman for 2003/04 (Nominated by Bob McKinley, seconded by Jim Smith).

David Gollin assumed the chair for the remainder of the meeting.

45/03 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 2]

No apologies for absence were received.

46/03 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were received.

47/03 ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE, 2003/04 [Item 4]

Bob McKinley was elected as Vice-Chairman for 2003/04 (Nominated by Helyn Clack, seconded by Jim Smith).

48/03 PETITIONS AND QUESTIONS [Item 5]

No petitions were presented and no public questions received, oral or written. No Member questions had been submitted.

49/03 MINUTES OF THE LOCAL COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 12 FEBRUARY 2003 - MORNING [Item 6]

The minutes were agreed as a true record and signed.

50/03 ADULT AND COMMUNITY LEARNING [Item 7]

The Committee welcomed Clare Wenley, Chair of the Mole Valley Community Learning Partnership, and Carole Tessier, Area Manager, Adult and Community Learning. Both officers presented reports which were then discussed. Members congratulated the officers on the achievements demonstrated.

Among the points arising from the discussion were:

- North Leatherhead is a particular priority and officers are having to overcome a feeling among adults that their own education and opportunities are over
- Some design students at NESCOL have been commissioned to produce promotional leaflets and posters for e-learning
- The Adult Learning Plan was agreed by the Executive but is still being modified in conjunction with the Learning and Skills Council, Surrey
- The ACL service is currently under considerable pressure to respond to a growing number of government initiatives, including Success for All and the National Skills Strategy. A White Paper is also expected in June
- Adult and Community Learning services are being taken into the community, which is time-consuming but effective. They are currently looking for better premises in Leatherhead (It was suggested that both Bookham and Ashted youth centres might be possibilities since they are underused during the day)
- The ACL concentrates on non-accredited learning, which does limit their access to funding, most of which is available for accredited provision. They face some difficulty in convincing the Learning and Skills Council that non-accredited learning also requires funding. At present half the funding for the Service comes from the Learning & Skills Council and the remainder is raised through fees, including the costs of courses for people with learning and other disabilities

No formal decision was required for this item but the Local Committee agreed that it would seek to support officers in whatever way it could. Additionally Members were invited to advise officers of any suitable venues for learning, especially access to ICT and e-learning in more remote communities.

51/03 **CHILDRENS SERVICES** [Item 8]

The Committee welcomed John Belfield, Multi- Professional Team Manager, and Janet Forster, Areas Manager. It was clarified that John works to Janet in respect to Mole Valley only and that the management structure is due to be simplified in the near future. A revised Annexe 1a was circulated and is appended to this minute.

The Multi-Professional Team will be fully operational by September. Although recruitment and retention is an issue, they are currently fully staffed for educational psychologists. The MPT will overcome some of the difficulties experienced in the past with retention of local knowledge.

John advised that the number of pupils on the role who are currently stated had increased from the figure quoted in the agenda papers and was now 2.6%. Figures quoted were for the rolls of schools in Mole Valley and do not include the private sector. Schools are required to identify the number of pupils they have who have special educational needs against two levels, identified as School Action, which can be handled by the school unaided, and School Action Plus which requires some external support. Schools receive funding to support additional special needs funding against a graduated scale of need. Those schools that provide special units, such as language units, also receive dedicated funding for this.

Surrey has just been awarded beacon status for its CAMHS (Mental Health) work and there is high level of commitment among schools staff and governors to working with difficult children, and keeping exclusions low. It was agreed that this was a good news story that merited greater exposure. It was also agreed that a further report on looked-after children, including SEN, academic attainment and fostering would be brought to a subsequent meeting of the Local Committee.

52/03 **FUTURE OF LAND AT BURFORD BRIDGE** [Item 9]

Two papers were tabled and are appended to this minute. The first of these was the outcome of a consultative meeting, held on the 13 May, to discuss the implications should SCC decide to dispose of the Burford Bridge site. The second, an e-mail from the Dorking Town Centre Manager, added an additional concern to those identified at the meeting.

Kevin Gill was thanked for arranging the consultative meeting. It was also clarified that the Asset Panel had invited evidence of local views on the prospective disposal of the site and that the Local Committee might wish to comment on the view already set out in the paper.

The Committee agreed to send a response to the SCC Asset Panel, to be drafted by the Chairman and Local Director and approved by other Members, to indicate its support for the social and environmental concerns about the disposal of the site as tabled, but subject to economic and highways aspects being considered more fully.

53/03 LOCAL FUNDING [Item 10]

A correction to the agenda papers was advised – the bid for the Leatherhead Healthcheck was for 50% of the cost and should therefore read £12,500.

With this amendment, **the Committee agreed:**

- Up to £12,500 towards 50% of the costs of a Leatherhead Healthcheck, subject to match funding being provided by other agencies
- £2,000 towards the replacement of chairs at Barn Hall, Bookham
- £2,000 for new PCs at Ashted Youth Centre
- £1,600 to replace furniture at Ashted Youth Centre
- £1,500 towards Leigh playground improvements

The Committee also noted the approval of two bids, totalling £850, which fell below the £500 threshold.

54/03 LOCAL UPDATES [Item 11]

Updates were noted on the appointment of a Partnership Development Worker for North Leatherhead, and the proposals for a Leatherhead Healthcheck (towards which funding had been approved in the previous item). Additionally, the Committee were updated on the proposals for Adult and Community Care Planning in the District and comments were invited. It was noted that the proposed list of partners should also include the providers who need to be involved.

The Committee agreed their support for the proposal to rationalise the number of forums involved in health and community care planning in the District, and agreed that officers should take forward discussions with other partners to develop it further.

55/03 ANNUAL REVIEW [Item 12]

This was noted.

56/03 FORWARD PLAN [Item 13]

This was noted.

[Meeting Ended: 1.20 pm]

Chairman

Appendix of additional papers circulated a the meeting:

The following papers are appended:

1. Revised Annexe 1a (Item 8)
2. Outcome of consultative meeting (Item 9)
3. E-mail from Dorking Town Centre Manager (Item 9)

LOCAL COMMITTEE FOR MOLE VALLEY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2003, **ITEM 6**

ITEM 8: Revised Annexe 1a

BOROUGH	ELM	EPEW	GUIL	MOLE	REBA	RUNN	SPEL	SYHT	TAND	WAVE	WOKI	SURREY
SEN COUNT	419	296	706	353	674	351	420	370	315	507	499	
	23	11	67	29	42	21	26	20	32	84	24	
Total	442	307	773	382	716	372	446	390	347	591	523	5289
POP 0-19	30024	15965	30287	18508	30219	17802	20648	20134	19555	27973	22404	253519
% POP	1.5	1.9	2.6	2.1	2.4	2.1	2.2	1.9	1.8	2.1	2.3	2.1
CENSUS 2001												
Borough		Age 0 - 4		Age 5 - 9		Age 10 - 14		Age 15 -19		TOTAL		
Elmbridge		8046		8275		7474		6229		30024		
E and E		3978		4009		4064		3914		15965		
Guildford		7067		7412		7527		8281		30287		
Mole Valley		4589		4819		4929		4171		18508		
Rei and Ban		7772		7811		8078		6558		30219		
Runnymede		4278		4537		4164		4823		17802		
Spelthorne		5169		5595		5337		4547		20648		
Surrey Heath		4924		5300		5239		4671		20134		
Tandridge		4773		4912		5408		4462		19555		
Waverley		6582		6895		7351		7145		27973		
Woking		5671		6037		5685		5011		22404		
		62849		65602		65256		59812		253519		
VI	6	4	13	7	15	7	4	7	8	12	14	97
HI	10	3	21	9	21	12	9	13	4	19	8	129
PD	31	19	41	14	23	23	18	20	23	35	27	274

Disposal of land at Burford Bridge

Outcome of consultative meeting held on 13th May 2003

The meeting was attended by:

- County Councillor Hazel Watson (in the chair)
- Mole Valley District Councillor Ben Tatham
- Richard Roberts-Miller, Chairman, Mickleham Parish Council
- Frank Warren, Chairman, Westhumble Residents Association
- Heather Kerswell, Chief Executive, Mole Valley District Council
- Sandy Munn, Head of Property, Surrey County Council (part of meeting)
- Kevin Gill, Local Director, Surrey County Council
- Roger Archer-Reeves, Local Transportation Director, Surrey County Council
- PC Ken Wheeler, Surrey Police casualty reduction officer
- Steve Walker, Area Manager, National Trust.

Observers:

- County Councillor Bob McKinley
- County Councillor David Gollin (part of meeting)
- County Councillor Jim Smith (part of meeting)
- County Councillor Helyn Clack (part of meeting)

After extensive debate the meeting agreed that the following statement represented its joint view, and should be conveyed to the Mole Valley Local Committee and the County Council's Member Asset Panel and Executive:

"Box Hill is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and together with Norbury Park contains rural locations which are the subject of multiple protected designations. The adjacent Burford Bridge car park serves their many visitors. On fine weekends for many years the car park has become a venue for hundreds of motorcyclists, with huge noise and environmental impact. While the majority of bikers act sensibly and responsibly, sadly a few use the adjacent A24 to perform stunts and drive recklessly at speeds way above the legal limit, watched by a crowd of spectators who line the roadway. Pedestrians were injured last August when a bike crashed into the spectators, and the Police, County and District Councillors were forcibly reminded of their responsibilities for public safety. A short but graphic video has been made showing the nature of the problems, which the Member Asset Panel is invited to view.

Over the years significant efforts have been made by the public authorities to manage these problems effectively including better speed enforcement, changes to the road layout, installing barriers at the roadside and negotiations with the café lessee about the management of the site. The current tenant of the café in the car park has been supportive of these efforts and is working in partnership with the authorities to reduce the nuisance. A sensitive balance has to be struck between the rights of the motorcyclists, the rights of local residents and the need to maintain public safety.

Given the nature, extent and longevity of the problems associated with the Burford Bridge car park it is considered imperative that the public authorities retain maximum capacity to influence the future use and development of this site. Planning and enforcement legislation alone do not give sufficient powers to achieve this – witness the difficulties currently being faced by other local authorities in Surrey regarding land purchased by travelling families and used inappropriately without planning permission. Who owns the land is the critical factor in being able to exert positive control. Maintaining future ownership of the Burford Bridge car park by a public body is essential to the public interest. Future generations will not thank the County Council for disposing of this land in such a way as to reduce the capacity of the public authorities to manage these problems.

Our preferred outcomes for the disposal of this land, in priority order, are therefore:

1. That the County Council retains ownership of the land and subcontracts its management to the lessee of the café. Although this arrangement has been unsatisfactory in the past, following recent effective action by Highways and by the Police, and with the co-operation of the new tenant, this arrangement is currently working reasonably well. Given sustained efforts by Highways and the Police, it holds the prospect of further improvements for public safety and the environment. While foregoing a capital receipt, the County Council would continue to receive an ongoing revenue stream from the café lease.
2. That the County Council offers the site for consideration by another public body such as Mole Valley District Council. This would mean accepting a considerably reduced capital receipt in order to safeguard future public ownership of the site.
3. That the County Council only considers selling the site on the open market if a covenant can first be made in favour of the National Trust (if the Trust agrees) to provide appropriate safeguards to the local environment, including Box Hill, and its community. In order to ensure that such a covenant can be legally enforced in the future a financial settlement would need to be made to the National Trust.

We urge the County Council not to dispose of this land without first ensuring that adequate safeguards are in place. In particular we would ask that arrangements are made which (i) bar any future expansion of the buildings or facilities or hours of operation and (ii) limit visitor numbers and (iii) secure further improvements in public safety and in the protection and enhancement of this designated rural environment.”

Drafted by Kevin Gill
Local Director, Mole Valley
19/5/03

LOCAL COMMITTEE FOR MOLE VALLEY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2003, **ITEM 6**

Please respond to "Dorking Town Management" <town.manager@visitdorking.com>

To: <k.gill@surreycc.gov.uk>, <iand@surreycc.gov.uk>, <d.timms@surreycc.gov.uk>

cc:

Subject: Land at Burford Bridge/Rykers - URGENT!

Kevin

As per our phone conversation regarding the agenda item for the land at Rykers/Burford Bridge.

Considering my involvement in developing Dorking's visitor and tourism market and role as Dorking's Town Manager I would have ideally liked to be consulted on this matter, rather than via this 11th hours approach. However hopefully this email response can be considered as part of the background papers.

At present the SCC Burford Bridge car park provides the only long stay coach parking facility for Dorking, South Leatherhead and the Mickleham/Westhumble areas. With particular reference to Dorking we have been actively developing the visitor and tourism markets to maintain and stimulate the economic vitality and viability of the town centre. The coach party market is one that we wish to develop further as it brings into town high numbers of people but in a single, albeit large vehicle. At present we can offer coach operators the long term parking facility at Rykers where the driver can rest and get a meal at the cafe. Without such a facility the coach operators would not consider Dorking as a potential tour destination. There are already plans underway for the West Street antiques dealer to encourage coach operators which would be undermined should the facility be lost. The new sports centre in Dorking would also suffer as there would be no parking for school parties and large groups.

Taking the coach parking aside, the car park at Rykers is also an essential parking place for those visitors wanting to access Box Hill from the bottom, explore historic Mickleham or explore Westhumble and the Mole Gap Trail. The loss of this facility would severely reduce the attraction of this area and undermine not only our local tourism policy but also that of the Surrey Hills AONB. If the County Council were considering the future of this area in terms of the disruption caused by the weekend bikers, then I feel that this should be considered as a separate issue needing specific measures rather than losing the facility for all concerned.

Without briefing papers on the proposal I am unable to make more specific observations and would welcome the opportunity to be consulted further on the matter should a decision not be reached at this stage.

Yours - Simon Matthews

Dorking Town Management

Phone: 01306 655017

Mobile: 0794 1618390

Fax: 01306 742359

email: town.manager@visitdorking.com

website: www.visitdorking.com

mail: c/o Barclays Bank Business Section, 87-99 High Street, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1AN.