

**MINUTES:** of the meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee held at 14.00 on Wednesday 26 September 2007 in the Council Chamber, Pippbrook, Dorking

**Members Present - Surrey County Council**

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

**Members Present - Mole Valley District Council**

Valerie Homewood  
Ann Howarth\*  
David Howell  
Chris Hunt\*  
Jean Pearson  
David Sharland

\* denotes substitution

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

**PART ONE - IN PUBLIC**

**42/07 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Councillors S. Sharland and D Burt were present as temporary substitutes for Councillors C. Hunt and A. Howarth respectively.

**43/07 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 2]**

Hazel Watson declared a personal interest in agenda item 11 – Local Committee Funding, by virtue of being Surrey County Council's representative on Age Concern and a personal interest in agenda item 9 – School Parking Initiative, by virtue of being a governor at The Ashcombe Schools, Dorking

District Councillor D. Sharland declared a personal interest in agenda item 8 – Church Street, by virtue of being a representative on the Leatherhead Area Partnership Ltd.

**44/07 MINUTES OF THE LAST [Item 3]**

The minutes were agreed and signed as a correct record of the meeting, which took place on the 20 June 2007.

**45/07 PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 4A]**

Two public written questions were received. The questions and answers are set out in annex A to the minutes.

**46/07 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4B]**

Seventeen Member questions were received. The questions and answers are set out in annex B to the minutes.

At the Chairman's agreement Mrs. Helyn Clack submitted a late Member question;

### **Povey Cross Road**

At the Local Committee on the 20 June 2007, Mrs. Clack asked that Officers be tasked with developing viable waiting restrictions in Povey Cross Road to overcome the issues raised by residents; She also asked the Committee to support this exceptional and special request for a one-off waiting restriction because of the history associated with the site.

Mrs. Clack requested that officers provide a formal report updating the Committee on the situation at the next formal Local Committee.

### **REVOLVED**

The Local Committee agreed to support Mrs. Clack's request and therefore, a report be brought to the next Committee on the waiting restrictions in Povey Cross Road.

#### **47/07 PUBLIC OPEN QUESTION SESSION [Item 4C]**

Two public questions were received on Lime Trees in Park Way Dorking:

Mr Stoner informed the committee that a large lime tree outside his property, number 29 Park Way, Dorking was very overgrown. He argued that branches were touching phone lines and views from his and neighbouring properties were obscured. Mr. Stoner commented that he had in the past contacted Surrey County Council to requested the tree be pollarded, as he believed this had been done in the past. To date he had had no reply.

He requested that Surrey County Council visit the road and assess the tree. Mrs. Upton-Taylor supported Mr. Stoners complaint and reiterated the question.

Mr. Stoner was advised that Surrey County Council's Transportation Arborist had visited the site in May 2006 and found no cause for concern. It was agreed that the Local Partnership Team would ask the Council's Arborist to revisit the site to ensure the earlier findings remain applicable.

#### **48/07 PETITIONS [Item 5]**

Two petitions were received.

##### **A) Leatherhead Car Parking Problem**

Dr. M. Degenhardt presented a petition regarding the Leatherhead Waiting Restrictions. Dr. Degenhardt argued that the current situation in Leatherhead was near crisis point, with residents suffering from overcrowded side streets, illegal parking and difficulty accessing the area. He stated that piecemeal policies to reduce parking on a few roads would only move the problem elsewhere.

The Chairman thanked Dr. Degenhardt for the petition, and his comments on the issues. Local Transportation Officers were asked to look into the problem, and provide a report to the next meeting of the Local Committee.

### **B) Pump Corner, Dorking**

M. N. Wright presented a petition regarding the ongoing work at Pump Corner, Dorking. Mr. Wright on behalf of Westcott Village Association argued that the continuing work at Pump Corner was resulting in traffic queues which they felt were unacceptable. They asked Surrey County Council's Highway department to reconsider the scheme currently in place and reset the traffic flow, in particular the removal of the lights at the end of West Street, Dorking.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Wright for the petition, and his comments on the issues. Local Transportation Officers were asked to look into the problem, and provide a report to the next meeting of the Local Committee.

### 49/07 **LIBRARIES** [Item 6]

The Area Libraries Manager, introduced the report that follows a fundamental staffing and structural review within the service. The result is to provide longer, standardised opening hours across the service. The review recommendations are largely based on feedback from users and lapsed users.

### **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed that:

- (i) It supports the approach of seeking improvements to opening hours and services through efficiency gains from Self-service new technology.
- (ii) It supports the proposed new Group structure – three Groups of libraries, A ('Town' centre), B ('District' Centre) and C ('Local' Centre), with a geographic / strategic approach.
- (iii) It supports the resulting improvements in opening hours in Libraries in Mole Valley

### **REASON FOR DECISIONS**

The Review has demonstrated that genuine efficiency gains result from enhanced automation and the introduction of self-service technology for library users. The benefit is a measurable improvement in hours of access in Surrey County Council libraries that meet the preference of current and potential users and encourage more people to visit a library

### 50/07 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT** [Item 7]

The Local Committee and Partnership Officer and Debbie Harrison, Community Development Worker presented the annual report on the Community Development work in North Leatherhead and Chart Downs,

Goodwyns and North Holmwood.

Members thanked the Officers for the work achieved in the last year.

## **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:

- (i) Note the initiatives in progress and in development in Leatherhead Common and Chart Downs, Goodwyns and North Holmwood;
- (ii) Agree that the Local Committee continues to monitor the work with County Services to ensure they are targeted towards community development areas.
- (iii) Consider ways in which members of both authorities could increase support to work in these areas where it is required.

## **REASONS FOR DECISION**

The benefits of achieving 'self-reliance' in communities include:

- Increased freedoms for individuals, better health and self-esteem;
- By taking a preventative approach, Surrey County Council, and its partners can achieve long term savings;
- Increased skills available to businesses and more people with money to spend;
- Reduction in crime and disorder and traffic accidents.

51/07

### **CHURCH STREET [Item 8]**

Members received a join report from the Local Highways Manager, Colin Langley, Director of Leatherhead Area Partnership Ltd and Jacobs in regard to the development of Church Street, Leatherhead.

Members were reminded, that the Leatherhead Healthcheck survey carried out in 2005 by Leatherhead Tomorrow identified, as one of three potential major projects, the need to improve Church Street, Leatherhead to benefit the town centre.

As a result of the Healthcheck, Leatherhead Tomorrow (now Leatherhead Area Partnership Ltd) obtained sufficient funding from both County and District Councils, and businesses, to engage urban design consultants to develop a feasibility masterplan for Church Street Leatherhead, including undertaking all necessary consultation with the public and stakeholders via engagement events during 2007.

Members were presented with the outcome of the consultation events i.e. final feasibility masterplan, realistic proposed budget with funding and construction programme for the Committee to consider, adopt and implement.

Members congratulated the team on their hard work and dedication to the project however, some Members voiced concern over the cost and future consultation with the residents and stakeholders. Some Members were also concerned with signing off the project without a further opportunity to discuss the finer details and final plan.

A motion was therefore put forward by the Vice Chairman to alter the wording of the recommendation to ensure the next process is brought back to the Local Committee and that Officers look for additional funds from other sources. The recommendation was seconded by Jim Smith. By a show of hands Members voted to accept the motion put forward by the Vice Chairman.

## **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed that;

- (i) the final feasibility masterplan design (Annex 3 to the report) be adopted as the basis for the detailed design of improvement works to Church Street, Leatherhead;
- (ii) authority be delegated to the Local Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to commission a suitable firm of urban design consultants to undertake the detailed design, tender and oversee supervision of the construction, including public and stakeholder engagement;
- (iii) a Working Group be established to oversee the final design process, to comprise the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, District Members for Leatherhead South and a representative from the Leatherhead Area Partnership Ltd;
- (iv) officers report back to the Local Committee and Local Transportation Plan Priority Meeting in the Autumn 2007 to establish its priority in the programme.
- (v) officers seek in consultation with Leatherhead Area Partnership Ltd alternative or additional sources of funding from elsewhere.

## **REASONS FOR DECISION**

The proposals are based on a public need, identified in the Leatherhead Healthcheck survey.

The final feasibility masterplan fulfils the general brief and is a well thought through design, which would provide a solid basis for the detailed design and implementation.

Throughout the project the public and stakeholders have been an integral part of the decision making. The final feasibility masterplan can be seen to represent the majority view regarding the proposed improvements to Church Street.

The proposed scheme has a realistic budget, with a funding programme and proposed construction programme.

Mrs. H. Watson recorded her opposition to the alternations to the recommendation (i) and (ii).

The Crime and Disorder Partnership, consisting of Surrey Police and Police Authority, District and County Council, Surrey Fire & Rescue Service and Surrey Primary Care Trust presented a report requesting that School Keep Clear markings are made enforceable in line with Surrey County Council's policy with regard to School Keep Clear markings. The initiative was supported by local schools and parents during an extensive campaign.

## **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed that;

- (i) 'No parking' on School Keep Clear markings be made mandatory enforceable by Traffic Regulation Order under Sections 1 and Part III of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose a prohibition of stopping of all vehicles on the existing School Keep Clear markings, between the hours of 08.15 – 09.15 & 14.30 – 16.00 during school term times; and
- (ii) authority be delegated to the Local Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to advertise the necessary Order(s), to consider any objections received and subject to those objections make the Order(s);

## **REASON FOR DECISION**

This measure

- will improve road safety outside schools
- will compliment other recommendations from the campaign
- is the most cost effective way to proceed
- will enable consistency regarding road markings within the District and County wide

### **53/07 PUMP CORNER [Item 10]**

The Group Highways Manager East presented the report on Pump Corner to the Committee. Members were informed that the operation of the traffic signals at Pump Corner, Dorking, could be made to function more effectively by introducing a 'No Left Turn' restriction from North Street into High Street, Dorking.

They were advised that the traffic signals can cycle through the green phase changes more frequently by introducing the 'No Left Turn' restriction, which results in virtually doubling the number of cycles per hour.

## **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed;

- (i) the all vehicle 'No Left Turn' restriction from North Street into High Street, Dorking, and the 'Yellow Box' junction at West Street / Station Road, be implemented; and

- (ii) authority be delegated to the Local Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to advertise the necessary Traffic Regulation Order, to consider any objections received and subject to those objections make the Order associate with the 'No Left Turn' restriction.

#### **REASON FOR DECISION**

The provision of a mandatory 'Yellow Box' junction on West Street at Station Road in lieu of the existing advisory 'Keep Clear' should reinforce the message to drivers not to block the junction.

The removal of the physically difficult vehicle left turn from North Street into High Street, Dorking should reduce a potential conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, enables its removal from the phasing of the traffic signals, which reduces the overall signal cycle time enabling greater flexibility to increase the overall frequency and cycles per hour for both pedestrians and vehicles; hence the recommendation to adopt and formally advertise a 'No Left Turn' traffic regulation order.

#### 54/07 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING** [Item 11]

Due to the need for an urgent decision, a supplementary paper was tabled containing 2 additional proposals.

#### **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:

- (i) to approve the three capital proposals detailed in Appendix A to the report totalling £3,100;
- (ii) to note the approval of three proposals which fall below the £1,000 threshold totalling £1,600;
- (iii) to note the withdrawal of two previously approved bids totalling £581 which is available for re-allocation by supporting member;
- (iv) to approve the one additional capital proposal detailed in Appendix B to the report totalling £2,073. and;
- (v) to note the approval of one proposal which fall below the £1,000 threshold totalling £500.

#### **REASON FOR DECISION**

The spending proposals put forward for this meeting have been assessed against the County standards for appropriateness and value for money and it is recommended that they should be approved.

#### 55/07 **LEATHERHEAD WAITING RESTRICTIONS** [Item 12]

The Local Highways Manager presented the report, updating the committee on the Leatherhead waiting restriction review.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee noted the report.

**56/07 CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE, DORKING [Item 13]**

The Local Highways Manager presented the report, update the Committee on progress with the development of the Dorking Controlled Parking Zone.

**RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee noted the report.

**57/07 BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS ROAD NETWORK [Item 14]**

The Highways Group Manger (East) presented the report showing the relative position of the road network in Mole Valley set against the Best Value Performance Indicators used to measure the highway network.

Members requested some clarity surrounding the figures.

**RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee noted the report.

**58/07 EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN [Item 15]**

**RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee noted the report.

**59/07 LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN SCHEME OF PROGRESS [Item 16]**

**RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee noted the report.

**60/07 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 17]**

**RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee noted the report.

[Meeting ended: 17.05]

Chairman



**Annex A Public Written Questions**

The following 17 questions were submitted in accordance with Standing Order 46.

**Questions from David Sharland, District Councillor for Leatherhead South****Barnet Wood Lane, Shared Cycleway**

**Now that the cycle way between The Plough Roundabout, Leatherhead and Harriotts Lane, Ashted has been completed it has become apparent that there is a serious conflict of interest between pedestrians and cyclists.**

This is most noticeable from the entrance to Business Park Number 9 towards the Plough Roundabout where the pathway is less than five feet wide. There is only just sufficient room for two pedestrians to walk side by side let alone room for a cyclist to pass a pedestrian or two cyclists going in opposite directions to pass each other.

Also, where it is wider there are no markings to show which parts of the path are for cyclists and which for pedestrians. Additionally it is noted that whilst there are white line markings around trees, which happen to occur on the footpath, there are no such markings around lampposts.

What, if any, further white lining work is proposed and has a safety audit been conducted on the completed project? If it is shown that there are dangers what actions are proposed?

**Response from Local Highways Manager**

Shared surface footway/cycleways can become very well used and I am pleased that this particular facility is proving popular with users. The feasibility, design and construction phases of the project have all received safety audit assessments and the output report from the Stage 3 construction audit is awaited. If the report contains recommendations for consideration action will be taken as deemed appropriate. The street lights referred to in the question are scheduled to be relocated to the back of the shared surface and will not be white lined; disconnection of the service supply has delayed their relocation.

**Bus Shelter, Leatherhead**

The bus shelter outside the Lidl store appears to have been incorrectly positioned and erected back to front. Also the vertical drops at the rear (as erected) should be adjacent to the kerb. There is also the suggestion from Transport for London that the shelter does not comply with the Disability Discrimination Acts as in its present position it does not leave sufficient distance between some of the vertical parts and the kerb.

Do the Surrey Officers agree that it is incorrect and if so what action is being taken to rectify the matter?

**Response from Local Highways Manager**

The size and type of bus shelter was determined in association with our Passenger Transport colleagues; it is correctly positioned, is not the wrong way around and facilitates ease of access / egress to the public service vehicles. Colleagues are aware of the need to provide an additional rear panel, which is scheduled for installation soon together with the relocation of the road sign to the traffic island, which improve passage along the footway.

**Removal of highway hazards, 'A' Boards**

The Council, as the authority for the Highway has a duty of care under the Highway Act 1980 to enforce the removal of all unauthorised obstructions from the highway. Within Mole Valley we have a very large number of disabled and visually impaired residents who have difficulty negotiating the hazards caused by shop notice boards, which are generally known as A-boards. When will the council exercise its duty of care and either take on the licensing of these boards or their removal from our streets?

**Response from Local Highways Manager**

Councillor Sharland will be aware of the discussions about 'A' boards that have taken place at the Mole Valley Access Group (MVAG) meetings. The engagement of Community Highways Officers for Mole Valley will assist in addressing issue like 'A' boards in the local area; I also acknowledge receipt of the MVAG's top five sites and will initially target these locations.

**A24, Beaverbrook to Givons Grove Roundabouts**

The A24 between the Beaverbrook Roundabout and the Givons Grove Roundabout has many similarities to the A24 between Chart Downs Lane South and the Holmwood Roundabout. Improvements have been carried out on the Dorking stretch of road as the result of a fatality. In the mid-part of the Leatherhead section a bridleway meets the A24 on one side of the road whilst on the other side there is an access road to the Givons Grove estate (Crabtree Drive). Pedestrians and equine users have difficulty crossing the dangerous A24 road at this point. To avoid further casualties at this spot would the Highway Authority please consider a suitable centre of the road refuge to prevent accidents similar in nature that last occurred in February 2007 when an elderly couple were knocked down?

**Response from Local Highways Manager**

I thank Councillor Sharland for his observations about the A24 and I will endeavour to negotiate the allocation of suitable resources to consider the feasibility of providing a suitable crossing as suggested and advise Councillor Sharland accordingly.

**Fortyfoot Road**

We have previously raised the matter relating to the potholes, which developed in Fortyfoot Road Leatherhead and the matter of the road being adopted by the County Council. The road was patched only last year but again more potholes have appeared and the road is in a similar state to that prior to the previous repair.

Will the Officers please undertake a thorough review of the status of Fortyfoot Road and utmost urgency seek a permanent solution to the evolving problems with this road?

**Response from Local Highways Manager**

A comprehensive report was prepared and presented to the Committee at its meeting on 25 September 2006 about Fortyfoot Road. The Committee resolved to request that the Executive 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 (SCC Education, Mole Valley District Council and NHS- Primary Care Trust).

The Committee, at its meeting on 21 March 2007, received a report following the Executives decision taken at their meeting on 5 December 2006, which after Officers' from Education had carefully considered the request indicated that judged against other competing education priorities improvements to Fortyfoot Road could not be considered as a priority for investment from the Education capital programme for 2007/08.

The March 2007, report concluded that the Highway Authority is not legally obliged to take action when a privately maintained highway falls into disrepair, but does have powers (under Section 230 of the Highways Act 1980) to require the frontagers to carry out necessary repairs to make the highway safe for users. If the frontagers refuse the Authority can carry out work and recharge the expense.

Therefore, the responsibility for the future maintenance of Fortyfoot Road continues to rest with the frontagers.

### **Epsom Road**

Parking in the Epsom Road Leatherhead between the traffic lights and Garlands Road continues to be a major problem. In fact since it was last raised at the Local Committee the parking has become worse.

When will the Highway Officers be in a position to bring forward parking proposals, even temporary, to remove parking from this section of highway?

### **Response from Local Highways Manager**

Officers' are aware that adhoc parking along the Epsom Road continues to have an effect on traffic flows. With reference to Agenda Item 12 'Leatherhead Waiting Restriction' the update report indicates that consideration of measures to relieve the current situation will be discussed at the next meeting of the review group. Officers' will in the interim consider the viability of introducing temporary short-term measures to address key hot spots along the Epsom Road.

### **Questions from Cllr David Howell, District Councillor for Ashted Common**

#### **Epsom Road**

Are Officers aware that parking in Epsom Road Leatherhead (from the traffic lights up to St John's School and Downsend Lodge) is causing a severe traffic hazard? Cars are now regularly parking on this stretch of road throughout the day, reducing the useable carriageway to one lane in areas and severely restricting the carriageway for this main route into Leatherhead from Ashted and the A24. Can consideration be given to introducing waiting restrictions to increase road safety and ease congestion?

#### **Response from Local Highways Manager**

Officers' are aware that adhoc parking along the Epsom Road continues to have an effect on traffic flows. With reference to Agenda Item 12 'Leatherhead Waiting Restriction' the update report indicates that consideration of measures to relieve the current situation will be discussed at the next meeting of the review group. Officers' will in the interim consider the viability of introducing temporary short-term measures to address key hot spots along the Epsom Road.

#### **Woodfield Lane, Ashted**

Consideration has been given to reviewing parking provisions and waiting restrictions in the vicinity of the approaches to Ashted station from Craddocks Avenue. Can officers please advise on progress made as traffic is regularly backed up Craddocks Avenue at one end, and across the level crossing at the other causing significant hazards.

#### **Response from Local Highways Manager**

The feasibility of finding an alternate way to accommodate parking within Woodfield Lane, linked with potential development funding, has not progressed beyond a site inspection and an initial informal approach to Mole valley District Council about the status of Ashted

Common. I will endeavour to negotiate the allocation of suitable resources to progress the development of this matter and advise Councillor Howell accordingly.

### **Questions from Tim Hall, County Councillor for Leatherhead and Fetcham East**

#### **Removal of Hazards**

Could the Highways Dept please explain why the District is littered with the rusting stumps of old signs and other highway furniture bound with gaffer tap? These are almost always left standing when new signs are put up or old ones removed.

Could the Department please tell the Committee what it is doing to get the County Council's Contractor to remove these items and by when this programme will be completed, before this becomes a health and safety issue?

#### **Response from Local Highways Manager**

Generally the redundant elements of various different items of street furniture described in the question are waiting for the transference of live services to the new equipment. The redundant item is initially left in a safe condition and periodically monitored to ensure it remains safe until the service is transferred. The disconnection and reconnection of the live service is usually electrical power and delays experienced in arranging these with the relevant company has led to delays and a backlog of work, which is now beginning to be addressed by the power company.

Only after the County receives notification that the service is transferred can work to remove the redundant item be arranged with the County's contractor. Occasionally service transfers occur without notification, on these occasions Officers only become aware of the situation by inspection or notification by third party's that work may be complete.

Officers' will liaise with Councillor Hall to ensure we are aware of any specific locations of particular concern in the local area.

#### **Epsom Road, Windfield, Poplar Road**

Could the Highway Dept please tell us when the consultation with residents about parking in Epsom Road, Windfield, Poplar Road and other roads in South Leatherhead is going to start?

#### **Response from Local Highways Manager**

Officers' are aware that adhoc parking along the Epsom Road continues to have an effect on traffic flows. With reference to Agenda Item 12 'Leatherhead Waiting Restriction' the update report indicates that consideration of measures to relieve the current situation in Epsom Road will be discussed at the next meeting of the review group; there will also be an opportunity to discuss issues in the other roads mentioned by Councillor Hall.

#### **Mole Road and River Lane**

Could the Highway Dept please tell us when the constantly postponed major repairs to Mole Road and River Lane, Fetcham are scheduled to take place?

#### **Response from Local Highways Manager**

The rolling programme of highway maintenance works includes both roads, which are currently programmed for 2009/10, however, the rolling programme is also subject to annual reassessment.

**Cobham Road and Guildford Road**

Could the Highway Dept please tell us when the major repairs to the Cobham Road between Slyfield and Guildford Road, Fetcham will take place?

**Response from Local Highways Manager**

Although major maintenance work is scheduled for another section of Cobham Road near the M25 over bridge this year, the section mentioned in the question will require an appraisal for consideration into the bid profile for future works when these are assessed next year.

**Pump Corner**

Could the Highways Dept please tell us what it is doing to alter the Pump Corner scheme in Dorking, which is obviously having detrimental consequences to traffic flow in the town and Westcott.

**Response from Local Highways Manager**

As reported previously to the Committee in updates or responses to either Public or Member questions Officers' continue to assess viable adjustments to the signal timing and phasing of the Pump Corner signals and post installation survey work has commenced to give statistical rather than anecdotal information about the performance of the highway network. Agenda Item 10 'No Left Turn' from North street is proposed as a viable proposition resulting from the post implementation review to improve the situation for all highways users.

**Questions from Hazel Watson, County Councillor for Dorking Hills****Abinger Bottom and Hollow Lane**

When will the missing finger sign on the directional signpost at the junction of Abinger Bottom and Hollow Lane showing the direction to Abinger Bottom be replaced?

**Response from Local Highways Manager**

The replacement finger post is in manufacture and should be in position on-site by the end of October 2007.

**Mulberry Centre**

The Mulberry Centre in Dorking is a purpose built facility used by the youth service for the benefit of local young people and other community groups. Can an assurance be given that the Mulberry Centre will continue to be the Dorking base for the local youth service and that services will continue to be provided from the Mulberry Centre for the foreseeable future i.e not less than the next two years at least? If such categorical assurance cannot be given, what is being considered for this site?

**Response from Surrey County Council Estates and Property Department**

SCC in partnership with Mole Valley District Council is considering the future use of all of its properties in Dorking, The Mulberry Centre will continue to be the base for the Youth Development Service operations for the foreseeable future and a movement from this location will only be considered if and when a suitable alternative site can be provided from which to deliver all of the services delivered by the Youth Development Service and other Services operating out of this building.

It is not possible to give a specific timetable as much may well depend on the availability of potential alternative sites and the development of any potential community hub in the town.

**Response from Surrey County Council Youth Development Service**

From YDS position it is business as usual at the Mulberry and will continue to be so until Property Services override us with decision to sell up.

**Abinger Common**

In view of the concern by Abinger Common residents about vehicles driving too fast for the road conditions in Abinger Lane through the centre of the village, can a reduced speed limit be introduced in Abinger Lane between Hollow Lane and Elixwood Cottages?

**Response from Local Highways Manager**

The Local Committee received its annual report on recommended alterations to speed limits in the local area at its meeting on 20 June this year. Subject to negotiation and allocation of the available resources, an on-site speed assessment can be arranged for Abinger Lane. Dependant on the outcome of that assessment informal consultation will be undertaken with the police and the Divisional Member, to consider whether an appropriate recommendation should be presented to the Committee for its consideration.

**A25**

The zebra crossing on the A25 near the Green at Westcott is faded and consequently not visible to all drivers. In view of the potential risk to pedestrians using this zebra crossing, when will it be re-painted?

**Response from Local Highways Manager**

I thank Councillor Watson for her observations about the zebra crossing on the A25 near the Green at Westcott and I will endeavour to schedule a visit from the white lining gang, due to visit Mole Valley in November, to refresh the crossing.

**Annex B Member Written Questions**

The following question was submitted in accordance with Standing Order 65.

**Question submitted by:**

**Tony Chaperlin Chairman  
Roth Area Residents Association**

Will the Council explain why a timescale was implemented that made it impossible for proper consultation in the Controlled Parking Zone survey by way of the fact that the leaflet distributed inviting residents to register their thoughts and volunteer to take part in Focus Groups had a closing date of 17/09/07, JMP in association with the Council would then '*carefully select a representative sample of volunteers,*' presumably this would take place on 18/09/07 as the Focus Group meeting was to be on 19/09/07 or 20/09/07, therefore it would have been impossible to notify people in time.

As a result of this the following related questions arise.

- 1.1 What date was the CPZ Focus Group Meeting held, 19 or 20 September 2007?
- 1.2 Who attended the meeting?
- 1.3 What was the agenda?
- 1.4 Are Minutes and/or Report available?
- 1.5 Why was the Rothes Area Residents Association not invited to participate?

**Response from Local Transportation Manager**

I would like to thank Mr Chaperlin for asking his question about the Dorking Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and for giving me this opportunity to help resolve some of the confusion associated with process to date.

In reply I firstly apologise to the resident and business communities of Dorking for the anxiety generated by the distribution of the leaflets and for the misunderstanding about the purpose behind their distribution.

The leaflet drop was part of the initial awareness raising campaign organised by our consultants to inform residents and businesses that this process was underway and to gather peoples initial views about parking generally in Dorking. The leaflet also provided a way to get in touch with residents and businesses that were willing to express some of their views on parking in and around Dorking Town Centre at a focus group, which were part of the fact-finding exercise alongside surveys of demand and street audits undertaken during the period May to September in accordance with the projects outline programme.

Agenda Item 13 to this Committee sets out in more detail the work undertaken by the consultants to date.

The development of the CPZ proposal includes for two significant periods of public consultation, the first during the Autumn 07 on a draft CPZ proposal for Dorking, the second during the Spring 08 on a final CPZ proposal.

Furthermore a Member Working Group comprising the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Divisional Members for Dorking Hills, and Dorking and the Holmwoods, plus District

Member for Capel, Leigh & Newdigate, was created to govern the development and design process for a potential CPZ in Dorking.

Residents were selected for the focus group as follows:

- **Step One:** The Dorking area was separated into seven different locations (plus one more "location" equating to private roads) to create eight "*location groups*";
- **Step Two:** Age demographic information was collated for the study area;
- **Step Three:** Three representatives from each "*location group*" were chosen, at random, from amongst those residents that responded to the leaflet (or email) and indicated they wished to attend the focus group;
- **Step Four:** The randomly selected residents were compared against the age demographic for Dorking to ensure a representative sample was selected for the focus groups;
- **Step Five:** Selected representatives were invited to attend the focus group. Where individuals declined alternatives were chosen who matched the same location and age profile.

The residents' focus group was held on Wednesday 19 September 2007, from 7pm to 8.30pm; a business focus group was held on Thursday 20 September 2007.

Twenty-four residents were invited, of whom twenty two agreed to come along to the meeting; on the night eighteen attended. The consultant started the proceedings by providing a short presentation on CPZ's followed by group discussions to determine the core understanding of parking issues within Dorking.

The output from both focus groups and other details accumulated by the consultant during the information gathering stage of the process will be presented to the Member Working Group as background information to the development of the initial draft CPZ proposal.