

MINUTES: of the meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee held at 14.00 on Wednesday 21 March 2007 in the Council Chamber, Pippbrook, Dorking

Members Present - Surrey County Council

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

Members Present - Mole Valley District Council

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

* indicates part of meeting only

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

PART ONE - IN PUBLIC

01/07 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** [Item 1]

Apologies were also received from Tim Ashton, Helyn Clack and Tim Hall, who would be arriving late for the meeting.

02/07 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** [Item 2]

Tim Ashton declared a personal interest in agenda item 15 – Local Committee Funding by virtue of being a member of the Ashtead Rotary Club.

Tim Hall declared an interest in agenda item 6 – Fetcham Schools and the Old Street by virtue of being a governor at the Fetcham School.

Hazel Watson declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 – Youth Development Services in Mole Valley by virtue of being the Chairman of the youth project, Projx.

03/07 **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING** [Item 3]

The minutes were agreed and signed as a true record of the meeting that took place on Wednesday 22 November 2007.

04/07 **PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS** [Item 4A]

One question was received, with responses tabled at the meeting:

Tony Chaperlin, Rothes Area Residents Association

Ansell Road, Hart Gardens, Hart Road, Jubilee Terrace, Rothes Road, and Wathen Road

“Will the Council consult with the Rothes Area Residents Association in the process of formulating proposals for consideration to the feasibility of implementing a resident’s parking scheme and traffic calming measures in the area covered by Ansell Road, Hart Gardens, Hart Road, Jubilee Terrace, Rothes Road, and Wathen Road?”

The Local Transportation manager responded:

The Local Committee has as Item 10 on the Agenda, to consider a report about a proposed Controlled Parking Zone for Dorking, which includes the roads referred to in the question.

If the Committee accept the recommendations of the report, public consultation will be undertaken both informally on a draft proposal and formally on the final Controlled Parking Zone proposition; therefore, the Rothes Area Residents Association would be consulted.

05/07 **MEMBER QUESTIONS** [Item 4B]

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

Hazel Watson, County Councillor for Dorking Hills, asked the following questions:

Boxhill Road

“In view of the serious flooding on Boxhill Road in Box Hill and in Westcott Street near Rokefield in Westcott, both of which require urgent attention, when will action be taken to alleviate the flooding in these locations?”

The Local Transportation manager responded:

Work to address the flooding of Boxhill Road in the vicinity of the low point near Fraser Heath House, during periods of intense sustained rainfall, has historically been undertaken to mitigate the problems experienced. However, water collects in this low spot in heavy rain and when the ground is already saturated; permanent road liable to flooding signs are in place to warn drivers of this eventuality.

A works order to clean out and reinstate silt traps, replace/reset displaced kerbs, clean soakaways, gullies and connecting pipe work is in place to ensure the highway drainage system is in good working order.

Vehicle Activated Signs

“The two vehicle activated signs for use in Pixham, Westcott and Abinger Hammer have not been rotated on a 3 weekly basis as previously agreed and have not been put in Abinger Hammer at all despite a specific site having been agreed with Highways for the sign, have not been located on the agreed sites and information on the siting of the signs promised at the last Local Committee has not been provided to me. Can an explanation be

provided as to why the signs have not been rotated as agreed, why a sign has not been placed in Abinger Hammer, why the signs have not been placed in the agreed locations and why it has been necessary to ask this question to seek information on the siting of the signs when the provision of this information was agreed at the last Local Committee meeting and not provided despite further requests for this information? Will the Local Member be kept fully informed about the siting of these signs in the future?"

The Local Transportation manager responded:

With respect to Westcott Street near Rokefield, an order with the necessary Statutory Undertakers information is with our Constructor to repair two blocked/broken pipes and to clean the drainage system locally.

I apologise for the limited flow of information to the local Member about the placement and usage of the mobile vehicle activated signs (VAS) in the three locations mentioned. Colleagues in the Police undertake the operational installation, rotation and maintenance of these signs and do so independently of the local office.

However, the Police have encountered some difficulties at the agreed locations, which working together we are seeking to overcome:

Westcott eastbound: situated on existing lighting column, initially required an alternate bracket to suit the location, problem resolved and operational.

Westcott westbound: situated on existing lighting column, required alternate bracket, but location partially obscured by vegetation; temporarily located nearer to Westcott until alternate location found, which is on the south side of the A25 below the warning signs near the bus stop. By raising the existing signs the pole is already high enough to facilitate use of the VAS.

Abinger Hammer: situated on existing signpost, however mounting height too low, new post on order before VAS can be used.

Pixham: situated on existing lighting column, required alternate bracket, but twice vandalised and currently deployed elsewhere in Pixham Lane until issues resolved at agreed location.

Therefore, the signs have not been rotated or located as originally envisaged because of the above difficulties. However, we are working jointly with the Police to resolve the problems and deploy the signs as required.

I will agree a communication protocol with the local Member to address concerns about usage and placement of these signs.

School Places

In southern Mole Valley, why is there a clear correlation between the number of children transferring at 7+ and the 7+ PAN, but at 8+ there are insufficient places in the 8+ PAN to cater for the number of children transferring at that age? There are three infant schools for 4-8 year olds: St Michaels in Mickleham, Westcott School and Abinger Common School with a combined 4+PAN of 61, yet there is only an 8+PAN of 28 (Powell Corderoy 7, St Martins 15 and St Pauls 6) for these 61 children. What action will the County Council take to ensure that for September 2008 entry the 8+ PAN is the same as the number of children transferring at 8+ in southern Mole Valley?

The School Place Planning Manager responded:

There are 3 First Schools in the Mole Valley 1 School Planning Area, Abinger Common School, St Michaels CE First, and Westcott CE School. The other schools are primary schools. The primary schools have historically had an additional admission of pupils aged 8+ into Year 4. Parent/carers may apply for a school place at any school that has vacancies in any year

group. Therefore, schools that do not have a formal admission round at 8+ may accept pupils.

Whilst Abinger Common School, St Michaels CE First, and Westcott CE School have a combined Planned Admission Number (PAN) of 61, the actual number of pupils applying for a place is less than this, for example 39 for September 2006 and 47 for September 2007. Pupils aged 8+ have been accommodated satisfactorily in previous years owing to sufficient school places being available. Therefore, the difference in PAN has not been an issue in the past.

Section 13 of the *Education Act 1996* places a general duty on to secure that efficient primary education is available to meet the needs of the population of their area. Section 14 of the *Education Act 1996* places a duty on local education authorities to secure that sufficient schools for providing primary education are available in their area. Section 5 of the *School Standards and Framework Act 1998* places a duty to promote high standards. Therefore, there is a duty to provide efficient education and sufficient schools to do so. The school provision should match demand as surplus places reduce efficiency.

There are other Schools, which historically admitted pupils at 8+. Some schools no longer admit pupils at 8+. Each Governing Body considers the interests of their pupils when arriving at decisions and it is legitimate for them to amend their admission arrangements if they believe it would be in the best interest of their school. Several of the schools in the area are Voluntary Aided schools. Voluntary Aided and Foundation schools are their own Admission Authorities and, therefore, may determine their own Admission Arrangements. The removal of admission at 8+ affects the pattern of applications in neighbouring areas, which has a 'knock on' effect further away.

There are a number of parent/carers who have applied for a place at 8+ for September 2007 who were not offered their schools of preference. Surrey County Council will look at the school provision in the area in order to secure sufficient school provision for children that require a place. We will analyse patterns of parental preference and demographic data in order to do so. The solution may or may not entail matching the 8+ PAN to the combined PAN of the First schools in the area.

Stephan Cooksey, County Councillor for Dorking and the Holmwoods, asked the following questions:

Lower Punchbowl Lane

“For the past two years I have been trying to persuade County Highways to act to deal with a number of problems on Lower Punchbowl Lane in Dorking. These include blocked drains, flooding, overhanging trees which appear to be a threat to a row of cottages facing them and the encroachment of soil from an embankment onto the road facing the cottages - the only positive action has been unblocking drains which were immediately filled again by soil from the embankment.

In the last week of February a visit to the site was made by Highways officers who reported that parts of the road were covered from 2 - 4 feet by the encroaching verge but that no action could be taken because of fears of the stability of the bank.

Would the Highways Department please indicate why no action is possible and would they be prepared to guarantee the safety of the road, and the

cottages given the conditions that currently exist?"

The Local Transportation manager responded:

I thank Councillor Cooksey for acknowledging the positive action taken about the drainage works in Punchbowl Lane; the drainage unit has made a further two visits in the last six months and the Community Gang has assisted in releasing jammed drainage covers.

With respect to encroachment and trees, the County Council's arboriculturist is aware of the prevailing conditions and will take action as appropriate; notwithstanding the encroachment of material over the highway its removal, at the foot of an embankment, could generate an instability of the adjoining land. Removal of this material will not be immediate and discussions with the adjoining landowner will be required to agree safe disposal and recovery of the public highway.

The liability associated with third party land adjacent to the highway rests with the owners of said land; the County Council has not aggravated the situation by undertaking its works on Punchbowl Lane.

Tim Ashton, County Councillor for Ashtead, asked the following questions:

Removal of damaged lighting

"Despite an order being placed for the removal of a damaged lighting column situated on the traffic island at the junction of Parkers Lane and the A24 Leatherhead Road, Ashtead on the 1st of March 07 with an anticipated removable date within 10 days of the order being placed, the column still hasn't been removed. This column was damaged last September and requests have been made since that time for its removal, as it is unsightly and also a danger to oncoming vehicles.

Could the East Area Transportation Group Manager explain why the removal of damaged/replaced lamp columns can take anything up to between six months and a year to remove? Will he please also submit an order for the remaining broken/damaged lamp columns littering parts of Ashtead to be moved as soon as possible?"

The Local Transportation manager responded:

The removal/replacement of street lighting columns and associated electrically powered street furniture involves various supplier/contractor organisations in the delivery chain. Officers' acknowledge delays in the chain that make it difficult to accurately predict completion dates for specific tasks. However, the damage on the A24 at Parkers Lane is being actively pursued and the removal/replacement of other equipment in Ashtead continues to progress as resources permit.

David Howell, District Councillor for Ashtead Common, asked the following questions:

Carillion

"In the light of the attached article showing Carillion's poor CAT performance score with the Highways Agency, (confirming that it is not just Surrey County Council that have experienced poor performance from the Contractor) can officers please advise what tangible actions are being taken to ensure that Carillion address the issues of concern, and what sanctions will be taken in

the event of any further incidences of poor performance.”

The Local Transportation manager responded:

I have spoken with the Asset Management Group Manager who has responsibility for the Surrey Highway Partnership and the ongoing partnership review, he is aware of the article. The review is seeking to address the concerns expressed in the question.

Grass Verges

“Our environment is becoming more and more scarred by repeated infringement of regulations that forbid vehicles to park on grass verges. Within Ashted there are various sites where constant infringement has destroyed the verges completely yet no action is taken. If there are (as I believe) regulations in force that allow action to be taken, why are these powers not used in cases of severe infringement?”

The Local Transportation manager responded:

The verges and grassed areas within the local area are assets, which contribute to the overall environmental charter of the area. Verge parking problems generally fall into the following headings: road safety; obstruction of footway/verge; damage to the verge; and visual intrusion.

Mole Valley District Council may, in some instances, have local byelaws in place that seek to address the problems but often these are difficult to enforce.

It is an offence to park heavy commercial vehicles on footways and verges. For cars and light vans the position is more complex; driving on (as opposed to ‘onto’) the footway is illegal under the Highways Act 1835 and the Road Traffic Act 1988 but it has proved difficult to use this legislation to combat footway and verge parking. It is necessary to demonstrate that any driver seen parking on the verge was actually responsible for damaging it. Additionally, Council officers do not have powers to require a driver to give their name and address.

The police can enforce where such parking is either creating a road safety hazard or an obstruction to either pedestrians or other highway users. However, in most cases complaints received tend to relate to verge damage or visual intrusion and the police are not normally involved.

Where a waiting restriction exists this normally applies to the whole width of the highway, including the verge. In these circumstances parking attendants can ticket the vehicle as if it were parked on the yellow line.

However, the introduction of waiting restrictions simply to address verge parking problems is not supported and their introduction may simply displace the problem.

Meeting the necessary evidential criteria and the considerable staff resource required to pursue enforcement is not considered financially viable.

Furthermore, in many cases reported parking is by residents rather than commuters or visitors and prohibition can be particularly difficult.

Accordingly, in areas that require protection, physical measures are normally considered appropriate to address the problem.

A phased approach to addressing verge parking is considered more effective than prosecution and this usually comprises: minor repair of isolated verge damage; physical protection where alternate parking could safely take place elsewhere; and the consideration of parking bays. However, the cost of tackling verge-parking problems varies from site to site.

06/07 **PUBLIC OPEN QUESTION SESSION** [Item 4C]

Two public questions were received:

Mr Ryan on behalf of Mr Mills asked a question relating to Tilley Lane in Headley. Mr Ryan raised concerns that with a large number of horses and riders using the lane motorists were unaware of the hazards and therefore the lane had become a potential accident hotspot. Mr Ryan also highlighted the financial involvement Mr Mills was prepared to give to help solve the problem.

The Local Transportation Manager thanked Mr Ryan for the question and advised that he would explore their concerns, raised, which would be put in a written response to Mr Mills.

District Councillor Bridgett Lewis-Carr asked a question relating to Kingscroft Road and the additional traffic that would be caused should the proposed development of land at Leatherhead Trinity School be permitted. Residents were concerned that the road would become a drop off point for parents. Councillor Lewis-Carr informed the Local Committee that a petition had been circulated with 18 signatures from anxious residents of Kingscroft Road.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Bridgett Lewis-Carr and clarified that the proposed development had yet to go through the County Councils Planning and Regulatory Committee, however with the Local Committees agreement he would accept the petition and ask the Highways Department to report back at the next possible formal Local Committee.

RESOLVED

That the Committee agreed that the petition by residents of Kingscroft Road would be submitted for a response at the next possible formal Local Committee following the County Council Planning and Regulatory Committee's decision.

Tim Ashton, Helyn Clack and Tim Hall arrived to the meeting during the above item.

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

Three petitions were received.

A) Fetcham Schools, Fetcham

A representative from the Fetcham Schools Road Safety Action Group presented the petition, containing 413 separate signatures from parents and carers who were extremely concerned about the dangerous state of the road around the two Fetcham schools and requested that the County Council introduce a 20mph zone, permanent crossing and pavement widening to improve road safety conditions in the area.

The Chairman thanked the Action Group for presenting the petition and informed the petitioner that a report had been prepared as agenda item 6. The Local Committee in advance of agenda item 6 noted the petition.

B) Lower Road, Great Bookham

Mrs Hulford presented a petition on behalf of the Residents of Middlemead Estate Committee relating to Lower Road, Great Bookham. Mrs Hulford informed the committee that the road has becoming increasingly busy and a permanent crossing was needed to enable children and young people crossing the road near the recreational ground to cross safely.

The Chairman thanked Mrs Hulford for presenting the petition, which was noted by the committee.

RESOLVED

That the Local Transportation Manager write to the petitioner following an assessment of the site with a view to find an amicable solution.

C) Ansell Road, Hart Gardens, Hart Road, Jubille Terrace, Rothes Road and Wathen Road, Dorking

Mrs Bradley presented a petition on behalf of the residents of Ansell Road, Hart Gardens, Hart Road, Jubille Terrace, Rothes Road and Wathen Road, Dorking, requesting traffic calming measures. Mrs Bradley asked the Committee to consider introducing gateways to the aforementioned roads and a 20mph zone to reduce speeding in the area. Mrs Bradley brought to the attention of the Committee a survey completed by 81% of the residents of Ansell Road, Hart Gardens, Hart Road, Jubille Terrace, Rothes Road and Wathen Road, of which 91% were in favour of traffic calming measures.

RESOLVED

That a report on the installation of a traffic calming measures on Ansell Road, Hart Gardens, Hart Road, Jubille Terrace, Rothes Road and Wathen Road, Dorking, be presented to the next meeting of the Local Committee.

08/07 **FETCHAM SCHOOLS AND THE OLD STREET**[Item 6]

The Local Transportation Manager presented a report, which proposed to provide a Pelican crossing on The Street near Fetcham Infants School to assist Safe Routes to School; and to consider a junction alteration of The Old Street where it meets School Lane, Fetcham.

RESOLVED

That the Committee agreed:

- (i) that the proposal to provide a Pelican crossing on The Street, Fetcham, was progressed and implemented as shown on Drawing A attached to the agenda;
- (ii) that the carriageway signing and lining along Bell Lane and The Street be enhanced to compliment the installation of the Pelican Crossing;
- (iii) that the proposal to alter the junction of The Old Street and School Lane was progressed and implemented as shown on Drawing B attached to the agenda; and
- (iv) that authority be delegated to the Local Transportation Manager, in

DRAFT MINUTES
TO BE AGREED AT LOCAL COMMITTEE ON 20 JUNE 2007

consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local Member, to advertise any necessary traffic regulation order(s), to consider any objections received and subject to those objections make the Order(s) associated with i, ii, and iii above.

09/07 RESPONSE TO PETITION – RANDALLS ROAD [Item 7]

The Local Transportation Manager presented a report in response to the petition received in November. He informed the Committee that the demand for long stay parking along the A245 Randalls Road between Cleeve Road and Station Approach, Leatherhead had recently increased and the type of vehicle has changed.

He advised that the long-term solution was probably the introduction of waiting restrictions along A245 Randalls Road from Cleeve Road to Station Approach.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee agreed:

that waiting restrictions be considered for A245 Randalls Road between Cleeve Road and Station Approach as part of the Leatherhead waiting restriction review, which commences this month.

10/07 EPSOM ROAD [Item 8]

The Local Transportation Manager presented a report in response to a Member request regarding dangerous parking on the B2122 Epsom Road, Leatherhead, between its junctions with Leret Way and Garlands Road.

Members thanked the Officers for the report and asked that the drawings of the central white lines be provided before the next formal Local Committee.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee agreed:

- (i) that the carriageway central white lines be refreshed with a slight offset acknowledging that currently on-street parking takes place on Epsom Road between Leret Way and Garland Road; and
- (ii) that further consideration of additional waiting restrictions along Epsom Road be considered as part of the Leatherhead waiting restriction review currently underway.

11/07 FORTYFOOT ROAD [Item 9]

The Local Transportation Manager provided an update on Fortyfoot Road and the Executive's response to the Committee's request to identify sufficient funds from central budgets to facilitate making up and adoption of Fortyfoot Road with costs being shared, subject to negotiation, with the major frontagers.

There was some concern that Fortyfoot Road would continue to be a concern for residents. The Vice Chairman informed the Committee that the District Council could provide some additional funds for the upkeep of the

Road. It was therefore decided that the Leader of the District Council and the Executive Member for Families meet to discuss possible solutions.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee agreed:

- (i) to note the report; and
- (ii) that the Leader of Mole Valley District Council and the Executive Member for Families be asked to meet to consider the situation surrounding Fortyfoot Road further.

12/07 CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE, DORKING [Item 10]

The Local Transportation Manager provided the business case developed for the introduction of a Residents / Controlled Parking Scheme in Dorking. He highlighted that proposal for a wider area CPZ in Dorking had advantages that it was financially viable, negated the impact of displaced vehicles, addressed residents' key concerns and could be implemented within a reasonable timeframe.

The Local Committee widely supported the recommendations, however there was agreement that the working party should include the Chairman, Vice Chairman and three nominated Members of the committee and that one Member represent the rural residents.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee agreed:

- (i) that the business case for a wider area Controlled Parking Zone in Dorking be adopted as the basis for the implementation of the CPZ,
- (ii) that authority be delegated to the Local Transportation Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to commission a firm of consultants who will undertake and oversee the detailed design of the CPZ, including public consultations, developed from the business case in readiness for its implementation on-street, and subsequently to administer the implementation of the CPZ on-street,
- (iii) that a Member Working Group be established to govern the process of CPZ design in readiness for its implementation on-street; membership to comprise the Chairman, Vice Chairman, County Councillors Stephan Cooksey, Hazel Watson and District Councillor Jean Pearson.
- (iv) that authority be delegated to the Local Transport Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Member Working Group to advertise any necessary Traffic Regulation Order(s), to consider any objections received and subject to those objections make the Order(s) associated with the implementation of the CPZ in Dorking.

13/07 COMMUNITY SPEED WATCH [Item 11]

The Local Transportation Manager provided an update on the successful Community Speed Watch scheme. He highlighted that the strength of the Community Speed Watch scheme comes from the volunteers who operate in their local areas. Without them the scheme could not exist, with them the data showed inappropriate speeds are reducing with time.

Members of the Local Committee joined together to congratulate the volunteers and PC Ken Wheeler, Casualty Reduction Officer, on the success of the scheme.

Concern was raised when Members of the Local Committee reported that some of the volunteers had experienced intimidation from drivers. The Chairman asked that the Area Director inform the Crime and Disorder Partnership on this matter and seek ways to support volunteers.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee resolved;

- (i) to notes the report; and
- (ii) that the Area Director provide an update to the next Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership for Mole Valley on the success of the scheme and flag the concern raised that some volunteers had experienced intimidation by drivers.

14/07 LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN SCHEME PROGRESS REPORT
[Item 12]

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee notes the report.

15/07 CHILDREN SERVICES REPORT [Item 13]

Mrs Sue Weston (Mole Valley Locality Team Manager) and Mrs Melanie Harris (Local Education Officer) provided an update on the significant changes to Children Services following the Business Review. They informed the Local Committee that specialist functions had been separated out and were now delivered countywide from bases in the east and/or west.

Members thanked the Officers for their comprehensive and useful report and asked for some clarification on how the new integrated service joined up with other partners. They also requested that a follow up report be brought back to the Local Committee in 12 months time.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee notes the report.

16/07 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SERVICES IN MOLE VALLEY [Item 14]

DRAFT MINUTES
TO BE AGREED AT LOCAL COMMITTEE ON 20 JUNE 2007

Mr Peter Hare (Area Manager) and Mr Mark Haythorne (Borough Youth Development Officer) presented the report, which provided an update on the work of the Youth Development Service in 2006 and outlined the objectives for 2007.

The Local Committee noted the Youth Services achievements however; some Members queried the service provided to Mole Valley's rural communities. Officers offered to provide further information to the Local Committee on their involvement and support given to rural communities via the Local Partnerships Team.

Concern was raised over the recruitment and retention of Youth Workers in Mole Valley and the future of property used by the Youth Development Services. The Area Director was asked to ascertain more information and report back to the next formal Local Committee.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee resolved;

- (i) to note the contents of the report;
- (ii) endorse the delivery plan for 2007-08; and
- (iii) that the Area Director provide an update at the next formal Local Committee regarding the concerns raised around property used by the Youth Development Service.

Hazel Watson left the meeting during this item

17/07 LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING [Item 15]

Supplementary papers were tabled at the meeting, which contained 9 additional allocations and a recommendation regarding demand responsive transport.

The Area Director informed the Local Committee that they had successfully spent their Member allocations for 2006/2007.

The Chairman requested that the bid for £6000 for Ashtead Vehicle Activated Signs included a condition that the Member ensures that the Highways Department are consulted on the best locations before erecting the signs. With regards to the £3430 for Dorking Youth Café the Chairman requested that the Member speak to the Youth Development Service for additional information. The Local Partnership Team assured Members these additional conditions would be included on the service agreements.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee resolved;

- (i) the following proposals totalling £40,063.20 be approved:

DRAFT MINUTES
TO BE AGREED AT LOCAL COMMITTEE ON 20 JUNE 2007

- £400 for North Leatherhead Community Safety Group
- £488.20 for Box Hill Project Steering Group
- £500 for Ashted Guides
- £2000 for Leatherhead Drama Festival
- £2500 for Leatherhead Tomorrow, Leatherhead Partnership
- £500 for Charlwood Son et Lumiere Project
- £350 for Bookham Residents Hanging Baskets
- £5000 for PLAY, Playground for Leigh's Active Youth
- £5000 for Charlwood Parish Council, St Nicholas Church Extension
- £2500 for Little Bookham Village Hall Restoration

- £3000 for Liquid Connection, Freestyle Residential Camp
- £500 for Dorking Chamber Orchestra, 20th Anniversary
- £482 for Brigitte Trust, Recruitment of Volunteers
- £3430 for Dorking Youth Café Evenings
- £600 for Dorking Operatic Society, new kitchen equipment
- £580 for Dorking & District Preservation Society, Art Preservation
- £400 for Olivier Cenary Festival, Dorking Halls
- £500 for Melisma Music, Low Price Concerts Dorking Halls
- £500 for Dorking Groups of Artists, Diamond Anniversary
- £3433 for St John Evangelist Church, Community Building
- £6000 for Vehicle Activated Signs, Ashted
- £1400 for St Nicholas Church, War Memorial

- (ii) that the request for a change of funding use, for an allocation previously agreed in 2005/06 totalling £2,500 be agreed;
- (iii) the additional following proposals totalling £17,465 be approved:
 - £1609 for Liquid Connection, Freestyle Residential Camp
 - £1400 for Brigitte Trust, Recruitment of Volunteers
 - £2574 for Vehicle Activated Signs, Ashted
 - £1532 for Fetcham Scout Hut, new equipment
 - £3500 for Ashted Youth Centre, Internet Café
 - £2500 for Ashted Rotary Club, equipment for the village day
 - £350 for Surrey Fire and Rescue, YES Scheme
 - £1500 for Buses4U Sunday Service for Bookham and Fetcham Feasibility Study

DRAFT MINUTES
TO BE AGREED AT LOCAL COMMITTEE ON 20 JUNE 2007

- £2500 for South Bookham School, Community Facilities; and
- (iv) that the £9140 carried forward from 2005/06 for Demand Responsive Transport be allocated as follows, £5000 to be allocated to Buses4U and the remaining £4140 be allocated to the Taxi Voucher Scheme.

18/07 **FORWARD PLAN** [Item 16]

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee notes the report.

19/07 **RECEIVE ITEM IN PART 2** [Item 17A]

RESOLVED:

That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS OF BUSINESS WERE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE BY THE EXECUTIVE. HOWEVER THE INFORMATION SET OUT BELOW IS NOT CONFIDENTIAL.

20/07 **ADULT AND COMMUNITY LEARNING** [Item 17]

Mrs Linda Piercy (Head of Adults & Community Learning) and Mrs Viv Ottaway of the Learning Skills Council provided an update on the County Council's Executive decision to agree with proposals by the Surrey Learning and Skills Council on a new strategy for Adult and Community Learning, based on a partnership model. The Learning and Skills Council had offered a contract for the provision of learning in South East Surrey, including Mole Valley, to a new provider. Negotiations were not yet concluded, but the Officers outlined some potential changes and improvements to the learning offered for local residents.

RESOLVED:

- (i) to note the proposals made by the Learning and Skills Council for the delivery of adult and Community Learning in Mole Valley from August 2007.
- (ii) to advise officers of any local issues or concerns that the Learning and Skills Council should take into account in planning Adult and Community Learning in Mole Valley.

[Meeting ended: 17.05]

Chairman

