

MINUTES: of the meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee held at 10.00 on Monday 13 March 2006 in Mole Valley District Council, Pippbrook, Dorking

Surrey County Council Members

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

Mole Valley District Council Members

Hubert Carr
Valerie Homewood
Jean Pearson
David Sharland
Ben Tatham
Chris Townsend

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

PART ONE - IN PUBLIC

01/06 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received by Timothy Ashton.

02/06 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** [Item 2]

No declarations of interest were made.

03/06 **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING** [Item 3]

A summary of amendments to the minutes was circulated to members. The minutes, along with the amendments, were agreed and signed as a true record of the meeting that took place on Wednesday 15 December 2005. Chris Townsend asked why his request for an item on SCC development control had not been included in the minutes. Officers acknowledged the omission and agreed to include this item on the agenda for the next meeting.

04/06 **PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS** [Item 4A]

Mr Raj Haque submitted one written question on the proposed closure of Bookham Youth Centre. The local county member, Jim Smith, was asked to respond. He stated that local members had made representations and that he intended to present a petition on behalf of the young people who use the centre later on the agenda. He also explained that there was growing community interest in the use of the building, and meetings with community leaders would be convened with a view to finding a way of keeping the centre open whilst sustaining the required level of revenue funding. The Chairman welcomed the efforts of the local member in trying to mobilise the community.

05/06 **MEMBER QUESTIONS** [Item 4B]

Valerie Homewood asked one member question. Geoff Wallace was unable to respond at the meeting, but agreed to come back at a later date with a detailed answer.

06/06 **PUBLIC OPEN QUESTION SESSION** [Item 4C]

Mrs Sylvia Sharland asked a question relating to the condition of Greville Park Avenue and D'arcy Road in Ashted. Officers gave responses at the meeting.

07/06 **PETITIONS** [Item 5]

Two petitions were presented in accordance with Standing Orders.

Jim Smith presented a petition bearing 232 signatures on behalf of the users of Bookham Youth Centre protesting against the proposed closure of the centre. The Chairman accepted the petition without comment and asked officers to prepare a response for the next meeting.

Anna Clarke presented two petitions bearing a total of 132 signatures on behalf of the residents of Povey Cross Road and Reigate Roads objecting to a long stay car-parking company using the roads for car parking facilities. In addressing the committee, she drew members' attention to the increased levels of traffic congestion, and problems of access and safety when entering and exiting driveways. A file containing photographic evidence of the problem along with several letters of objection from residents was passed to officers. The Chairman accepted the petition, stating that she had been in communication with the local MP about the problem, and would ask officers to prepare a response to the next meeting.

08/06 **MEMBERS' LOCAL ALLOCATIONS** [Item 6]

A supplementary report was tabled outlining proposals that would use up the remainder of the local allocation budget for 2005/06. The proposals in both reports were agreed.

RESOLVED

- (i) to approve the twelve bids for Members' Local Allocation as detailed in the report totalling £24,225**
- (ii) to note the approval of seven proposals that fall below the £500 threshold totalling £3,120**
- (iii) to approve the three bids for Members' Local Allocation as detailed in the supplementary report totalling £17,451**
- (iv) to note the approval of one supplementary bid that falls below the £500 threshold totalling £350**
- (v) to allocated any remaining local allocation balance for 2005/06 of £7,538 to demand responsive transports schemes such as Buses 4 U and Taxi Vouchers**

09/06 **LEATHERHEAD TOMORROW FINDINGS** [Item 7]

Lynne Martin introduced this report. She explained that the Healthcheck was a community led piece of consultation carried out by volunteers. The purpose of the exercise was to identify what the community would like to improve about Leatherhead and the surrounding area. The project was managed by a steering group (made up of volunteers and officers) who employed a project co-ordinator. The Local Committee and Mole Valley District Council jointly funded this post.

The Chairman welcomed Colin Langley, the Chairman of Leatherhead Tomorrow, and invited him to outline the key findings from the report. He explained that over 100 project ideas had been identified and that the steering group were now in the process of working with the county and district councils to set some priorities and identify a few key longer-term project (such as the High Street in Leatherhead) as well as some projects that would bring about some "quick-wins". Colin Langley invited the Local Committee to support the work they were doing and advise on where the community play their part.

Members acknowledged the overall quality of the report and the work carried out by the project team and all volunteers. The report was praised for its objective and independent views, and described as a solid basis on which to take forward issues for Leatherhead.

The only criticism from members was that the officer recommendation was a bit "cool" and should be more engaging. Lynne Martin agreed to "jolly-up" the first recommendation. Furthermore, members were disappointed that more work was not undertaken by volunteers, and that in future more support would need to be mobilised in order to ease the pressure on the steering group.

The Chairman welcomed the support for the report, and noted that the community-based approach taken should enable the release of funds that are not open to statutory agencies to access.

RESOLVED

- (i) **To note the challenging processes and major achievements of the Leatherhead Healthcheck and the actions identified.**
- (ii) **To agree that the Local Committee monitors the work with county council services to ensure they are targeted towards delivery of the key actions agreed with the Healthcheck Steering Group and key officers and partners.**

10/06 **BDR IMPLICATIONS FOR LOCAL SERVICES** [Item 9]

It was agreed to take Item 9 before Item 8.

Lynne Martin introduced the report, stating that the annexe highlighted only some of the service impacts. The Chairman explained that the full proposals would come before the SCC Executive on 11 April, when a final decision would be reached.

Members acknowledged the need to make year on year efficiencies through improvements to ICT and procurement. However, some members expressed

concern about the financial and public impact that the Business Delivery Review (BDR) would have on SCC staff and the overall quality of service.

RESOLVED

- (i) **To note local impacts of the Business Delivery Review on services and consider any actions appropriate in the light of these changes.**

11/06 **HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE** [Item 8]

The Chairman welcomed a range of partner representatives to the meeting: Kate Cameron, Head of Community Services at Mole Valley District Council; Sally Dubery, Assistant Director at Central Surrey Council for Voluntary Services; Suzanne Ricard-Greenway (representing Dr Jonathan Hildebrand, Director of Public Health), East Elmbridge and Mid Surrey Primary Care Trust; and Guy Hall, Director of Adults and Community Care, Surrey County Council. For the benefit of members, the Chairman invited each guest to outline their role and contribution to the health and social care agenda in Mole Valley.

Members and partner representatives all agreed that the Mole Valley Health and Social Care Planning Group (H&SCPG), currently chaired by Councillor Jean Pearson) was a useful forum for identifying any barriers to progress. Presently, the key challenges are:

- **Demographics** – Mole Valley has an aging population and services in the future will be stretched to cope with the demands from people living longer. Providers are not able to support as many people as they would like to.
- **Structural** – present PCT boundaries are not co-terminus with other providers. In recognition of the increased amount of partnership working this was seen as a key barrier to progress.
- **Financial** - the financial challenge faced by the PCT at present means that when people leave they are not being replaced. This stretches capacity even further and frontline staffs are working on a red-amber-green service.
- **Accountability** – there is no level of political accountability within the PCT and the recent decisions regarding the site of a hospital for Epsom and St Helier have highlighted the need for improved accountability.
- **Support to voluntary sector** – the challenge for providers is working smarter in the way they engage the voluntary sector and in finding ways to support them in the best way possible. The CVS were acknowledged as a crucial link in this process, as they represent a range of groups on forums such as the H&SCPG.

Kate Cameron stressed that although there was a great deal of good will between partners in trying to improve services, it was important to note that a number of services provided by Mole Valley District Council were discretionary. Furthermore, community strategies often focus on the needs of young people and the needs of older people are often forgotten about.

Members agreed that their local allocations could prove useful in addressing problems.

RESOLVED

- (i) To note the initiatives in progress and plans for the future**
- (ii) To identify with partners any barriers to successful delivery of these initiatives**
- (iii) To consider specific actions which the Local Committee can take to encourage and support successful delivery and outcomes with partners**
- (iv) To agree that the Local Committee continues to monitor and support this work**

12/06 **A24 CHART LANE SOUTH** [Item 10]

Stephen Cooksey welcomed the report and the process that the Working Group went through to achieve the report, stating that he believed the public would welcome the recommendations. The recommendations were agreed without further discussion.

RESOLVED

- (i) the course of action as set out in paragraph 2.2 of this report,**
- (ii) that following monitoring, a decision regarding whether any amendments should be made to the scheme, will rest with the Area Transportation Director or his representative, in consultation with the Chair and Local County Member of this Committee.**

13/06 **SPEED LIMIT REQUESTS** [Item 11]

The report was introduced by Michelle Armstrong. She highlighted paragraph 3.1 and confirmed that the emergency services and police had no objections to the proposals.

RESOLVED

- (i) Approval be given to advertise the necessary Traffic Regulation Orders for all speed limits detailed in section 2.0 of this report and that if no objections are maintained, the Orders be made,**
- (ii) The consideration and resolving of any objections are delegated to the Senior Local Transportation Manager, or his representative, be authorised to consider any objections received in consultation with the Chairperson of the Local Committee and the Local County Member,**
- (iii) Officers be authorised to determine the exact lengths of the proposed speed limits.**

14/06 **DORKING RURAL TRANSPORT FORUM** [Item 13]

It was agreed to take Item 13 before Item 12 to enable the Chairman to leave the meeting to attend another appointment.

The Chairman explained that this forum brings together all the parish councils in the Dorking Rural division to discuss transportation issues. It is envisaged that this blueprint will be used as a model for other rural divisions to follow.

LOCAL COMMITTEE FOR MOLE VALLEY, 21 JUNE 2006, **ITEM 04**

Valerie Homewood was appreciative of the efforts that have gone into Brockham, particularly with the Speedwatch campaign. However, there were some concerns about the amount of volunteer time that was consumed.

Valerie Homewood expressed particular concerns that the reduction in sight lines would make the roads less safe, as would the removal of the central white line. The ATD responded by saying that the removal of central white line had been tried out in other parts of Mole Valley. Valerie Homewood asked for her dissent on these two areas of concern to be recorded, although stated she was fully supportive of all other proposals.

The Chairman commented that she felt the proposals would make the roads safer for horses, as presently there is a danger of overtaking too closely. She stressed that this report already has the agreement of all the parish councils in the division.

The Chairman thanked the parish councils, Surrey Police, and Roger and his team for their efforts in getting to this stage.

RESOLVED

- (i) To note the contents of this report**
- (ii) To give support to the general concept of progressing with any of the measures listed in the Annexe A.**

[Note: Helyn Clack left the meeting at 1pm and the Chair passed to Tim Hall]

15/06 MOLE VALLEY PARKING STUDY [Item 12]

The Chairman welcomed the proposals outlined in the report and invited comments from members.

Hubert Carr expressed disappointment that there was no recognition in the Parking Study of the petitions on parking received by the Local Committee in the past. Members, otherwise, were generally supportive of the recommendations. It was noted that the MVDC Environment Committee had agreed to carry out consultation on shorter charges.

RESOLVED

- (i) to note the contents of this report, particularly paragraph 2.14 with respect to on-street parking enforcement,**
- (ii) to note the draft parking strategy and support it as a basis for further consultation with key stakeholders,**
- (iii) that authority be delegated to the Area Transportation Director in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to work with Mole Valley District Council in producing a suitable consultation document for key stakeholders in order to produce a final draft parking strategy for the Committee to consider at a future meeting,**
- (iv) that authority be delegated to the Area Transportation Director in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to commission a firm of consultants, who have experience in this work, to develop a robust business case for the introduction of Residents Parking Schemes as described in paragraph 2.7 of this report and to implement the proposals.**

16/06 **LEATHERHEAD HIGH STREET** [Item 14]

This was an agenda item only. It was agreed without discussion.

RESOLVED

- (i) **To agree to delegate authority to the Area Transportation Director in consultation with the Chairman and Local County member, to implement the review following discussion with the Leatherhead Working Group.**

17/06 **A25 JUNCTION WITH LONDON ROAD** [Item 15]

David Sharland requested that the details of the scheme be shared with the Mole Valley Access Forum.

RESOLVED

- (i) **to note the intention to implement the scheme as detailed in Annexe A**

18/06 **LTP SCHEMES PROGRESS** [Item 16]

This report was for information only. A number of comments were made, a number of which were noted for the minute.

- Officers agreed to incorporate a bell-type facility at the Knoll roundabout as part of the Safe Routes to School scheme for St Mary's Infants School.
- Officers agreed to repair the wooden fencing on the A24 at Mickleham as part of the next grass-cutting exercise.
- Geoff Wallace would be chasing up information from the developer so that the Linden Pitt ramp could be progressed.
- Representations have been made to The Weald School.
- Discussions had taken place between Surrey and West Sussex officers regarding the A24 Horsham Road scheme. The ATD explained that the RTB were not supportive of a major scheme at this time.

19/06 **FORWARD PROGRAMME** [Item 17]

This item for information was noted.

[Meeting ended: 13.35]

Chairman.