

**MINUTES:** of the meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee held at 14.00 on Monday 25 September 2006 in the Council Chamber, 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**

39/06 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** [Item 1]

There were no apologies for absence.

40/06 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** [Item 2]

No declarations of interest were made.

41/06 **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING** [Item 3]

The minutes were agreed and signed as a true record of the meeting that took place on Monday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2006.

The committee were informed that the local transportation service aim to install the A24 cats eyes, referred to in 25/06, by October.

42/06 **PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS** [Item 4A]

Six questions were received, with responses tabled at the meeting:

Councillor Rosemary Dickson asked the following three questions:

**Vehicle Crossovers**

Why are applications for vehicle crossovers taking so long to be considered? I have heard of applications taking over four months to be determined. The Surrey County Council web site says that because of the backlog, there is an embargo on any more work until October. There is a high level of frustration over this. What are people to do?

### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

The recent restructuring of the County Council's Transportation Service has resulted in a reduction in the number of staff engaged in processing applications from the public for vehicle crossings.

At the present time the public who make an enquiry about having a vehicle crossing constructed are being invited to register their interest, and this is logged. They are advised that an application form will be sent to them in date order, once processing is back to normal; this is estimated to be October.

Despite major streamlining of the associated processes and procedures, there is currently a backlog in applications. Regrettably this will mean that for the present, the public may well have a wait of several months while their application is processed.

### **Section 106 funding**

For quite a while I have been wondering what becomes of 106 monies paid by developers to Surrey County Council Highways for road improvements in the Leatherhead area. The accountants at Mole Valley District Council have shown me how the money comes in and how it is then sent on to Highways. Please can you tell me to whom the money goes? Who then allocates it? How is it allocated? Who decides what it will be spent on? How is it accounted for? How can we, as Members know how much is being spent, on what and where?

### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

Developers contributions associated with planning consents are regulated by the terms and conditions of the planning system and their associated legal agreements.

Money forwarded to the Highway Authority is coded and accounted for within budgets being allocated to the appropriate local area.

The planning agreement will normally contain a specific reference to the type of work or general statement about work, which all parties to the agreement accept should reasonably be carried out following the grant of planning consent. Completed work is audited financially and against the terms contained within the planning agreement.

District and County Members influence varies throughout the overall planning process, i.e. leading up to and subsequently after the determination of an application, including the delivery of any associated highway works (e.g. regeneration of Leatherhead).

Mole Valley District Council policy committee are due to receive a report reviewing section 106 funding and it was agreed that this should also be presented to the Local Committee.

### **Height restriction bar, A243 lay by**

The height restriction bar at the entrance to the old AA lay by on the A243, is leaning ever more heavily. I was told last year that it would be attended to but not when. When I enquired, I was told it would be in the next financial year. We are now in that year. I was also told the cost of works would be £800. Surely a sum like that can be found to either straighten or replace this unsightly and dangerous looking structure. When can I expect something to be done?

### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

Unfortunately whilst work to effect a repair to the height barrier may be desirable, it is not essential and therefore, it has ranked very poorly against other priority tasks. However, we expect to see it replaced during the remainder of the financial year we will take corrective action.

Councillor Duncan Mountford asked the following three questions:

### **Speeding vehicles, Bridge Street, Leatherhead**

A resident has noticed drivers go too fast down Bridge Street, Leatherhead and also across the bridge. I have also noticed this as my office is in Bridge Street. Would it be possible to put a speed hump of something to slow them down by the mini roundabout at the bottom of the Street/end of the bridge?

### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

An assessment of the need for traffic calming measures in Bridge Street, near the mini-roundabout, will be added to our feasibility request list.

### **Width restrictors, Cleeve Road, Leatherhead**

A resident has noticed that the width restrictors in Cleeve Road, Leatherhead were recently installed and then removed. Could you give an update why this is as they stop lorries, vans etc, using this residential road as a cut through?

### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

The proposal in Cleeve Road is to provide a width restriction that prevents large vehicles from using the residential area as a cut through. The restriction will be completed when other associated works are undertaken.

### **Traffic Calming measures, Leatherhead**

A resident has queried whether speed humps or other traffic calming measures could be installed to Cleeve Road, Kingston Ave, Park Rise, St John's Road, Leatherhead as cars go fast in this residential area. Could you tell me if this would be possible?

### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

Cleeve Road contains a number of traffic calming measures. The existing measures were enhanced with junction tables installed with the width restriction.

Kingston Avenue, Park Rise & St John's Road would all require full feasibility investigations to evaluate the need for such measures. These locations will be added to the feasibility request list.

43/06 **MEMBER QUESTIONS** [Item 4B]

Three questions were received, with responses tabled at the meeting:

Hazel Watson asked the following three questions:

**Youth Service provision in Dorking**

Last year the Local Committee for Mole Valley approved a bid for £4,450 to provide a youth service session every Friday evening for a year at the Surrey County Council Youth Centre in Dorking (the Mulberry Centre) but the project has not been implemented and the funds have not been used. Why has the project not been implemented to date and when will it be?

**Response from Area Manager, Youth Development Service**

The delay in progressing this initiative was largely due to the Business Delivery Review freeze on recruitment; however, we are now in a position to recruit staff to operate the youth work session on a Friday evening. The Neighbourhood Youth Worker for Dorking is committed to this initiative and the Youth Development Officer for Mole Valley is currently attempting to recruit existing Youth Development Service staff to support the Friday sessions. If successful, we expect to commence the Friday sessions at the beginning of November 2006.

**Boxhill Road**

Boxhill Road has a very uneven surface and urgently needs to be resurfaced. When will the resurfacing of Boxhill Road take place?

**Response from Local Transportation Manager**

Highway maintenance works for Boxhill Road comprising Local Structural Repairs (LSR) were originally programmed for June/July this year. However, this work was deferred to facilitate emergency works along Partridge Lane during July. Boxhill Road LSR remains on the programme and subject to funding limitations; works may be undertaken during November/December this year. Meanwhile any immediate urgent repairs will be requested to maintain safety on the highway network.

**Vehicle Activated Signs**

The Local Committee has previously approved bids to fund the purchase of two vehicle activated signs for use in rotation in Westcott, Abinger Hammer and Pixham and a further sign for Headley. What is the status of this project and when will the vehicle activated signs be installed in these locations? Furthermore, can the rotational schedule for the signs between Westcott, Abinger Hammer and Pixham be made available?

**Response from Local Transportation Manager**

The utilisation of vehicle activated signs (VAS) at these locations is a current live project.

Getting hold of the Statutory Utilities information has delayed the installation of posts required for the VAS in Headley; however, an order has been placed for this work.

The use of VAS in Westcott, Abinger Hammer and Pixham is delayed by circumstances beyond our control. The Police resource arranging and organising the deployment of these signs was removed from service by injury and has only recently returned to work. The Police are keen to commence using these signs and the first deployment is expected in 3 to 4 weeks time. A schedule will be prepared and communicated to the Divisional Member.

44/06 **PUBLIC OPEN QUESTION SESSION** [Item 4C]

Betchworth Parish Councillor Julie Hardy asked a question relating to outstanding highway problems in Betchworth, particularly: White line and cats eye work on The Street; Poles installed for a level crossing queue warning system which has still not been commissioned; The poor state of Wellhouse Lane.

The Local Transportation manager agreed to contact the parish council regarding these specific issues, and also to arrange a meeting to discuss transportation matters.

Mr Alec Garnham, of Bookham Residents Association, asked a question regarding the level of funding that the Mole Valley area receives for highways: roads, lighting, drainage and transport. Helyn Clack confirmed that the Executive would be considering a report on highways funding shortly.

Mr Stuart Saunders and Mr Douglas Hunt from Minchin Close, Leatherhead asked a question about parking restrictions in Minchin Close. The parking restriction signage in the road is currently incorrect, and therefore the District Council cannot enforce the restrictions. There was concern from residents that when the signs are corrected, the residents are not going to be able to park.

Mr Tim Hall confirmed that the District Council would not progress the change to the signage until a solution can be considered.

The Committee requested that a report be prepared for the next Local Committee meeting to address this problem.

45/06 **PETITIONS** [Item 5]

Mrs Brayer of Boxhill Road addressed the committee to request that a bus service be established between Boxhill and Tadworth/Banstead.

Mrs Brayer informed that a previous weekly service, now discontinued, was underused due to a very inappropriate timetable.

Mrs Brayer stated that many residents in the Boxhill area have family in Sutton, and without a bus service to Tadworth/Banstead, it is very difficult for them to visit.

Residents also felt that Boxhill would benefit from the service as more people would be able to visit the area, which has some excellent beauty spots.

Helyn Clack informed the committee that she had been in contact with local representatives regarding this issue. The committee agreed that discussions continue, with a view to finding a solution, and a report be brought to the next committee meeting.

46/06 **COMMUNITY SAFETY – STRUCTURES AND STRATEGIES** [Item 6A]

The committee received the first of 2 community safety reports, which provided a broad overview of community safety issues, in the context of recent developments nationally and countywide.

There was discussion about the member involvement in community safety matters. Although councillors are not statutory members of the community safety partnership, they have been involved in the audit and development of the community safety strategy in Mole Valley. Members requested that they be kept informed of projects that the community safety partnership funds, as they may be able to support locally.

**RESOLVED**

**That the Local Committee:**

- (i) Notes the implications of government proposals and the Local Area Agreement for community safety partnership working;**
- (ii) Endorses and supports the Community Safety Strategy and the arrangements that have been agreed with the CSP for spending the County Council's funding allocation.**

47/06 **COMMUNITY SAFETY – LOCAL ACTIONS** [Item 6B]

The committee received the second report on community safety, which focused on the work of the community safety partnership, and individual organisations locally.

Representatives from the Fire and Rescue, Youth Development Service, the Community Safety Partnership and Surrey Police were in attendance to discuss local community safety.

There was discussion on the Dorking designation order, youth centre opening times, street lighting and smoke detectors.

**RESOLVED**

**That the Local Committee:**

- (i) Notes the achievements of the Mole Valley Community Safety Partnership and the ongoing strategic aims of the Mole Valley Community Safety Strategy 2005-08;**
- (ii) Encourages local members to continue to support partners in the successful delivery of the community safety strategy, particularly in relation to anti-social behaviour, alcohol or drug related crime, public reassurance and environmental issues such as criminal damage and graffiti;**
- (iii) Recommends that smoke alarms for vulnerable households are included in the Fire and Rescue Service Integrated Risk Management Plan for 2007/08;**
- (iv) Receive a regular report on community safety and the work of the community safety partnership in Mole Valley, to monitor and support the achievements locally.**

48/06 **ANNUAL HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT PLAN EAST SURREY  
TRANSPORTATION SERVICE 2006/07** [Item 7]

The committee received the report, which provided further information on the annual highway management plan.

Members were encouraged to report any gullies that they believe are not being cleaned, to ensure they are included in the

**RESOLVED**

**That the Local Committee:**

**(i) Notes the contents of the report;**

**(ii) Approves the expenditure levels as follows:**

<b>Structural Maintenance</b>	<b>£743,000</b>
<b>Environmental Maintenance</b>	<b>£311,000</b>
<b>Safety Maintenance</b>	<b>£405,000</b>
<b>Damage to Council Property (DCPs)</b>	<b>£37,000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1,496,000</b>

Hazel Watson and Stephen Cooksey requested that their opposition to resolution (ii) above be minuted.

**(iii) Requests the chairman to bring the question of under funding for highways to the attention of the County Council's Executive;**

**(iv) Notes that there is discretion for the Area Transportation Group Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman to vire up to 100% of the indicative allocations for each expenditure head within the revenue budget whilst retaining the County Council's policies and standards.**

49/06 **FORTYFOOT ROAD, LEATHERHEAD** [Item 8]

**RESOLVED**

**That the Local Committee agrees that:**

**(i) Option 4b in the report {to make up and adopt the road with costs shared, subject to negotiation, with the major frontagers} is the most practical and cost effective way to proceed; it ensures suitable repairs are undertaken and creates an opportunity for adoption of the road; and**

**(ii) The County Council's Executive be requested to identify sufficient funds from central budgets to facilitate the implementation of Option 4b.**

- 50/06 **BYWAY OPEN TO ALL TRAFFIC 116, LEATHERHEAD, (LEADING FROM ERMYN WAY TO SHEPHERD'S WALK) TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER**  
[Item 9]

**RESOLVED**

**That the Local Committee:**

- (i) **Resolve that a Traffic Regulation Order for Byway Open to All Traffic 116 Leatherhead restricting vehicular use, including horse drawn carriages, between points 'E'-'F'-'G' as shown on Drawing No. 3/1/51/H102a (Annex A of the report) be made.**

- 51/06 **PETITIONS RECEIVED** [Item 10]

This item was withdrawn at the request of the local member, as there was some concern that it could implies a decision to the petition has already been made.

- 52/06 **TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ACT 2004 STREET WORKS AND ROAD WORKS**  
[Item 11]

The Local Transportation Manager confirmed that street works refers to utilities work, whereas road works encompasses council works.

There was some concern that the duration of some street works is longer than necessary, causing unnecessary disruption.

The committee were informed that Surrey County Council is working to reduce the level of street works reinstatement failures.

The chairman requested that the local transportation officers work with planning colleagues in the District Council to ensure reinstatement standards are high.

**RESOLVED**

**That the Local Committee:**

- (i) **Notes the report.**

- 53/06 **SURREY SAFETY CAMERA PARTNERSHIP UPDATE AND PROGRESS**  
[Item 12]

The committee heard that the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership work on a priority basis, tackling areas with the worst accident rates.

The committee would be keen to see the Mole Valley area benefit from high sheriff funding for vehicle activated signs.

An additional recommendation was proposed by Timothy Ashton, seconded by Helyn Clack and agreed.



## **RESOLVED**

**That the Local Committee:**

- (i) Notes the benefits of the creation of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership;**
- (ii) Notes that safety cameras continue to be highly effective at reducing speeding collisions and casualties;**
- (iii) Notes the safety scheme including a safety camera on the A24 at Mickleham has reduced collisions by a highly successful 73 per cent;**
- (iv) Notes that following 2006/7, local authorities will be provided with an enhanced grant for road safety as part of the LTP process, replacing the current system of “netting off”. The County Council’s Executive have approved that this be invested to ensure the continued operation and success of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership;**
- (v) Requests that the Local Transportation Service produce a report on vehicle activated signs to a future committee meeting and consideration be given in the future Local Transportation Plan budgets locally.**

**54/06 LEATHERHEAD HIGH STREET [Item 13]**

The committee noted the minute of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> July that considered all the objections and representations received, associated with the advertisement of the proposed new traffic regulation order in Leatherhead High Street.

The committee also noted that the Traffic Regulation Order was made, coming into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2006.

**55/06 LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING [Item 14]**

There was discussion around the proposal to support the allocation to Dorking Christmas Lights. It was agreed, by a vote of 2 to 1 (with 3 abstentions), that the allocation be approved, subject to further agreement from the Chairman and Vice Chairman following additional clarification of the payment process and conditions.

## **RESOLVED**

**That the Committee:**

- (i) Approves the following four proposals totalling £18,610:**
  - £610 for Taxi vouchers in Leatherhead/Fetcham**
  - £2,000 for Dorking Healthcheck**
  - £2,000 for the Grange Centre**
  - £1,000 for St John’s Ambulance**

- (ii) **Approves the following proposal, totalling £13,000, subject to further clarification of the payment process by the Chairman/vice Chairman:**

- **£13,000 for Dorking Christmas lights**

Timothy Ashton requested that his opposition to the above proposal be minuted.

- (iii) **Notes the previous approval of the following three proposals which fall below the £500 threshold totalling £1,100:**

- **£500 for Liquid Connection community BBQ**
- **£500 for developing a leaflet to highlight the problem of illegal and dangerous parking.**
- **£100 for Ashted Tennis Players Club to purchase a new cup for their competitions.**

56/06 **SCHOOLS WASTE RECYCLING SCHEME** [Item 14]

The committee noted the report.

57/06 **LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN SCHEMES PROGRESS REPORT** [Item 16]

The committee raised questions on Dorking Controlled Parking Zones, A25 route study, Leatherhead Parking Management, Leatherhead Town Centre signage, and Linden Pit path ramp. The Local Transportation manager provided verbal responses at the meeting.

The committee expressed its thanks to local transportation officers for their attendance and responses to questions and requests for information.

58/06 **FORWARD PROGRAMME** [Item 17]

The forward plan for the local committee was noted.

[Meeting ended: 17:32]

Chairman