

MINUTES: of the meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee held at 14.00 on Wednesday 21 June 2006 in Mole Valley District Council, Pippbrook, Dorking

Surrey County Council Members

Jim Smith, Chairman
Tim Hall, Vice Chairman
Timothy Ashton
Helyn Clack
Stephen Cooksey
Hazel Watson

Mole Valley District Council Members

Valerie Homewood
Ann Howarth
David Howell
Jean Pearson
David Sharland
Ben Tatham

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

PART ONE - IN PUBLIC

- 20/06 **ANNOUNCEMENT OF CHAIRMAN** [Item 1]
The committee was informed that the meeting of Surrey County Council on 3rd May had appointed Jim Smith as Chairman and Tim Hall as Vice Chairman of the Local Committee for the council year 2006/07.
- 21/06 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** [Item 2]
Apologies for absence were received from Ben Tatham, who was substituted by Rosemary Dickson.
Apologies for lateness were received from Tim Hall and Helyn Clack.
- 22/06 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** [Item 3]
No declarations of interest were made.
- 23/06 **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING** [Item 4]
The minutes were agreed and signed as a true record of the meeting that took place on Monday 13th March 2006.
- 24/06 **PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS** [Item 5A]
No written questions had been received from local residents or businesses.
- 25/06 **MEMBER QUESTIONS** [Item 5B]
Four questions were received, with responses tabled at the meeting:

Hazel Watson asked the following three questions:

Best Value Performance Indicators

How does Mole Valley compare with the ten other Boroughs and Districts in Surrey in relation to the condition of the principal, non-principal and unclassified roads and the condition of the footways according to the Best Value Performance indicators?

Response

Mole Valley's Best Value Performance Indicators are as follows:
(NB 'First Position' in the county would be the district with the least number of defects).

BV223 -- SCANNER Data 2004/06 - Principal Roads (100% 2004/05 & 50% 2005/06)

Mole Valley is third, with a 10% defective rating for the principal classified network according to SCANNER measurement. Otherwise interpreted as 90% of the principal classified network in Mole Valley being considered to be in reasonable condition.

BV224a -- SCANNER Data 2005/06 - Non Principal Roads (50% B Roads, 10% C Roads)

Mole Valley is seventh, with a 25% defective rating for the non-principal classified network according to SCANNER measurement. Otherwise interpreted as 75% of the non-principal classified network in Mole Valley being considered to be in reasonable condition.

BV224b -- Coarse Visual Inspection - Unclassified Roads, 2000 to April 2006 (25% D Roads Annually)

Mole Valley is eleventh, with a 20% defective rating for the unclassified network according to coarse visual inspection. Otherwise interpreted as 80% of the unclassified network in Mole Valley being considered to be in reasonable condition.

BV187 -- Detailed Visual Inspection - Cat 1 & 2 Footways, 2005/06 (50% Annually)

Mole Valley is seventh, with a 35% defective rating for the category 1 & 2 footway network according to detailed visual inspection. This could be interpreted as 65% of the category 1 & 2 footway network in Mole Valley being considered to be in reasonable condition.

In addition, the Area Transportation Group Manager confirmed that funding is allocated to areas based on greatest need. Mole Valley has seen an improvement across all categories.

Pelican Crossing, A25 Westcott

Construction of the pelican crossing on the A25 at Westcott started in February. What is the expected completion date for this crossing which is urgently needed to enable young children to cross the road to get to school?

Response

It is anticipated that the A25 Westcott pelican crossing near School Lane will be operational in two weeks. A number of unexpected incidents have occurred during construction, which have delayed the completion of this scheme.

Residents parking Scheme, Dorking

What is the timetable for implementing the residents parking schemes, as previously agreed by this Local Committee, in Dorking in Lincoln Road and in the Rothes Road/ Wathen Road area?

Response

There is currently no firm timetable for the implementation of the trial controlled/residents parking zone (C/RPZ) in Dorking, in the roads referred to in the question. However, the Local Transportation Service has commenced discussions with our Agent and partner Mole Valley District Council, who administer decriminalised parking enforcement in the local area, about the most cost effective way of producing the robust business case for the introduction of the C/RPZ referred to in the resolution of this Committee at its meeting in March 2006.

The development of the robust business case is critical to the success of the trial scheme. The business case will be developed from the outline proposal plans presented to this Committee in March, together with further consultation work with the communities affected by the proposals. It will also ensure that the Committee is not committed to a financial burden that it cannot sustain from future assets.

The aim is to deliver the trial scheme in Dorking during 2006/07.

Cllr Valerie Homewood asked the following question:

A24 Cats Eyes

Further to the question I asked (numbered 05/06) at the last meeting of this Committee on 13th March concerning the missing cats eyes on the A24 at the right hand turn off to Beare Green village travelling southward, I thank the Local Transportation Manager for his written reply and subsequent correspondence.

As he knows, I have already taken issue with him for describing the work as 'non-essential maintenance' but have accepted that the cats eyes might be replaced during the summer grass cutting 'subject to the confirmation of suitable budgets for 2006/7'.

The first grass cut was completed on 2nd May and the opportunity was not taken to replace the cats eyes. Could the Local Transportation Manager now advise me when local residents might expect this essential road safety issue to be resolved?

Response

The East Area Maintenance Team Manager is aware of the request to replace the 'cats-eyes' on the A24 at the right hand turn-off to Beare Green Village, travelling southward. Whilst they were not replaced during the first grass cut of the season, it is intended to undertake the work, together with the grass cutting operations along the A24 to reduce the cost of associated traffic management measures. At the moment, it is not possible to give an indication of when this will occur because these works remain subject to confirmation of budgets for 2006/07. The East Area Maintenance Team Manager will be able to give a clearer indication of timescale when the budgetary allocations for 2006/07 are confirmed.

26/06 **PUBLIC OPEN QUESTION SESSION** [Item 5C]

Mr Foulston asked a question relating to the A24 Deepdene Avenue junction with Ashcombe Road. Mr Foulston raised concerns about the potential confusion between the pedestrian traffic signal and the 'Give Way' immediately beyond the signal, as well as the number of lanes changing before and after the junction.

The Local Transportation Manager confirmed that the service was aware of the junction and the signal layout had been assessed earlier in the year. Lane widening optimises the capacity of signal junctions and is widely used.

Mr Peter Seaward asked a question relating to the contact with local highways officers and residents groups following reductions as a result of the County Council's Business Delivery Review. The Area Transportation Group Manager confirmed that the local transportation service has no desire to withdraw from FIBRAM (Fetcham Improvements By Residents & Members), LIMBRA (Local Interested Members & Bookham Residents Association) and AHF (Ashted Highways Forum).

Mr Peter Seaward also asked a question relating to the repair of potholes. Mr Seaward asked if it would be possible for local members to hold small budgets to carry out minor repairs to the highway. The Area Transportation Group Manager informed the committee that this would not be possible due to the highways contract that Surrey County Council have signed with its partner constructors Ringway and Carillion.

27/06 **PETITIONS** [Item 6]

There were no petitions to be presented to the committee.

28/06 **ANNUAL HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT PLAN EAST SURREY TRANSPORTATION SERVICE 2006/07** [Item 10]

The committee received a report on the draft annual highway management plan for the east Surrey Transportation Service. The report detailed the outcome for the financial year 2005/06 and set out the proposed new maintenance programme for 2006/07.

The Area Transportation Group Manager explained that the total budget for Mole Valley is set by the County Council's Executive and that he is charged with optimising delivery of the highway maintenance function within the budget given. 25 highways gangs will be working across the 5 boroughs and districts in the east area in 2006/07. They will work on a priority basis and it is anticipated that this will ensure any backlog of repairs classed 2B or higher will be completed over the next few months.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes this report, with its concerns over the following issues:
 - Grass cutting;
 - Gully emptying;
 - Capitalised footway works;
 - Tree works;
 - White lines;
 - Opening discussions with Mole Valley District Council regarding highway amenity works.
- (ii) Notes the outturn figures for the Maintenance Programme for 2005/06.
- (iii) Due to the financial need to maintain works upon the highway as listed within the body of the report, authorises the East Area Transportation Group Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman to continue the current work programme, but requires a full report which addresses the committee's concerns to be produced for the meeting in September.

29/06 **BYWAY OPEN TO ALL TRAFFIC 116, LEATHERHEAD (LEADING FROM ERMYN WAY TO SHEPHERD'S WALK) TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER [Item 18]**

This item was tabled as a matter of urgency as a decision was required before the summer break (section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972). Due to the need to seek legal clarification, the paper was unable to be dispatched with the agenda.

The Committee had previously considered a traffic regulation order for the whole of BOAT 116 (Byway Open to All Traffic). However, the whole route does not meet the County Council's policy for making traffic regulation orders. It is possible to consider only part of the route.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee agrees that:

- (i) In view of the potential legal difficulties, the Notice of Intention to make a Traffic Regulation Order for the whole length of BOAT (Byway Open to All Traffic) 116 Leatherhead as published on 4th February 2005 be not proceeded with.
- (ii) A Notice of Intention to make a Traffic Regulation Order restricting vehicular use, including horse drawn carriages between points 'E'- 'F'- 'G' of BOAT (Byway Open to All Traffic) 116 Leatherhead, as shown on Drawing 3/1/51/H102a of the report, be published.

30/06 **RESPONSE TO PETITIONS – POVEY CROSS ROAD** [Item 7]

The committee received a report in response to the petition on long stay parking in Povey Cross Road and Reigate Road presented to the members on 13th March 2006.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the content of the report.**
- (ii) Supports the actions of the County Council's Trading Standards Officers.**

31/06 **TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SERVICE REDUCTIONS** [Item 8]

The committee received a report updating members on the Transportation Development Control service reductions resulting from the impact of the County Council Policy and Productivity Review and Business Delivery Review.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the impacts of the Policy and Productivity Review and Business Delivery Review on the level of service that Transportation Development Control is now able to deliver.**
- (ii) Register its concern with the County Council's Executive regarding the decision to discontinue routine Transportation Development Control officer attendance at District Council planning committee meetings.**

32/06 **CAPITAL PROJECTS** [Item 9]

The committee received a report providing an update on the progress of schemes and outturn figures for the 2005/06 financial year. The report also provided an update on the committee's capital allocations for schemes planned for 2006/07.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the progress of schemes undertaken during 2005/06 and the outturn figures for 2005/06.**
- (ii) Agrees the capital allocations for the Committee's implementation programmes for 2006/07.**

33/06 **ASHTEAD WAITING RESTRICTIONS, FURTHER MEASURES** [Item 11]

The committee received a report updating members on Ashtead waiting restrictions. The report included the results of a survey carried out with residents in Broadhurst, Calverhay and Overdale, Ashtead with regard to 3 possible options for waiting restrictions in that locality. The report also set out proposals for waiting restrictions in Grange Road and Ottways Lane, Ashtead.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee agrees:

- (i) **The proposed Peak Hour Waiting Restrictions in Broadhurst, Culverhay and Overdale, Ashtead, be installed on site as originally published and that the Order be made.**
- (ii) **That the proposed Waiting Restrictions in Grange Road and Ottways Lane, Ashtead, as shown in Annex 4 of the report, be advertised and, if no objections are received, the Order be made.**
- (iii) **That authorisation is given to the Local Transportation Manager, or his representative, to consider and resolve any objections to the proposals that are to be published, in consultation with the Chairman and vice chairman of the Local Committee as well as the local County Member.**

34/06 **LEATHERHEAD HIGH STREET WORKING GROUP** [Item 12]

The Committee received an update on the work to address the problem of all day parking in High Street, Leatherhead. The Working Group recently agreed to maintain the existing Pedestrianised Zone (10.00 am to 4.30 pm Monday to Saturday) and to progress and advertise a new waiting restriction within the High Street, the operational hours of the restriction being 8.00 am to 6.30 pm Monday to Saturday.

The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised on 1st June 2006, with the period of objection ending on 23rd June 2006. The Local Transportation Manager tabled a summary of the responses received to date.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) **Reaffirms the working group's decision that authority be delegated to the East Area Transportation Group Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and vice chairman, to consider any objections and to make the Traffic Regulation Order in light of these.**

[Note: Helyn Clack joined the meeting at 16:00, during item 12]

35/06 **PETITIONS RECEIVED** [Item 13]

One petition was received.

Petitioners from Fortyfoot Road, Leatherhead and the surrounding area are concerned about the dangerous condition of the road and requested that the road be maintained in a safe condition.

The Local Transportation Service informed the Committee that the road is not maintained at public expense. The issue is currently being dealt with by Surrey County Council's Legal Department. The Committee should receive a report at its meeting in September 2006.

36/06 **BOOKHAM YOUTH CENTRE UPDATE** [Item 14]

The committee received a report updating members on the current position and future of Bookham Youth Centre. A community group is currently preparing a business plan and exploring the setting up of a community trust or similar to manage the centre.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) **Notes the progress of the community forum in addressing a sustainable future for youth services through the Bookham Youth Centre.**
- (ii) **Supports this work as the shape of youth services in Bookham becomes clear.**

[Note: Jim Smith left the meeting at 16:10 and the Chair passed to Tim Hall]

37/06 **MEMBERS' LOCAL ALLOCATIONS** [Item 15]

The committee considered the proposals for funding from members' local allocations, including 1 additional proposal tabled in a supplementary paper.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) **Approves the six proposals as detailed in Annexe A of the report totalling £18,250.**
- (ii) **Notes the approval of two proposals which fall below the £500 threshold totalling £1,000.**
- (iii) **Approves the proposal detailed in the supplementary report totalling £4,000.**

37/06 THE SURREY DRAFT MINERALS PLAN – LOCAL COMMITTEE RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION [Item 16]

The committee received a report, summarising the discussions and decisions of the local committee at an informal meeting to consider the Surrey Draft Minerals Plan.

There was concern from several members about the open location at Common Field, Betchworth and the level of mineral extraction agreed by the County Council's Executive.

Helyn Clack confirmed that the amount of extraction agreed by the Executive was held at the level of 2005/06, which is below those expected by central government.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes that members were encouraged to respond individually as part of the consultation by the deadline of 9th June 2006.**
- (ii) Notes that members present endorsed the views expressed in the Mole Valley District Council report, attached as Annex B of the report.**
- (iii) Agrees that the report be submitted and considered as part of the consultation process.**
- (iv) Is concerned at the mineral extraction levels for Surrey.**

38/06 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 17]

The forward plan for the local committee was noted. As agreed at 28/06, a further report on the Annual Highway Management Plan for East Surrey Transportation Service will be taken to the Local Committee meeting on 25th September 2006.

[Meeting ended: 16:18]

Chairman