

MINUTES: of the meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee held at 14.00 on Wednesday 24th June 2009 in the Council Chamber, Pippbrook, Dorking

Members Present - Surrey County Council

Helyn Clack, Chairman
Clare Curran – Vice Chairman
Stephen Cooksey
Tim Hall
Christopher Townsend
Hazel Watson

Members Present - Mole Valley District Council

Valerie Homewood
David Howell
Derrick Burt
Jean Pearson
Sylvia Sharland
David Sharland

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

PART ONE - IN PUBLIC

15/09 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTIONS** [Item 1]

There were apologies for absence from Ann Howarth and Chris Hunt.

16/09 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** [Item 2]

Hazel Watson declared a personal interest in agenda item 09A, 09B, 10 and 13. This is due to being Chairman of PROJX, LEA governor of Federated Schools of Westcott and Abinger Common, and County Councillor representative on the Surrey Police Authority.

Councillors David Sharland declared a person interest in agenda item 08 due to sitting on the Leatherhead Parking Review Committee.

17/09 **MINUTES OF THE LAST** [Item 3]

The minutes were not agreed and signed as a correct record of the meeting, which took place on the 24th March 2009 due to outstanding issues;

1. Stephen Cooksey has not received a response to members questions. The Local Committee and Partnership Officer is to ensure questions are responded to.
2. Confirmation is needed that comments on options have been submitted to Head of TfS and Exec Member regarding South Street Bus Stand. The Local Committee and Partnership Officer is to confirm this to members.



LOCAL PROTOCOLS [Item 4]

Local Protocols were agreed for Mole Valley Local Committee with these additions (see bold).

A maximum of 3 petitions can be presented at any one meeting of the local committee **at the discretion of the Chairman.**

A spokesman for the petitioners can address the local committee on the subject of the petition for 3 minutes. The Chairman will then accept the petition on behalf of the local committee. If the petition is submitted 14 days before Local Committee, an officer will respond to the petition. If the petition was not submitted 14 days before the Local Committee the petition will be referred without discussion to the next appropriate meeting of the local committee **at the discretion of the Chairman.**

TASK GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE [ITEM 5]

Task group Terms of Reference were agreed by members.

18/09 PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 6A]

All public written questions were responded to in the Local Committee (see Annexe A), apart from a written Question submitted by a member of the public regarding Leatherhead Parking Consultation and Randalls Road. A Senior Engineer from Traffic Management is to respond to this written question, and all other responses are to be circulated to members of the public who have asked questions.

19/09 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6B]

Five Member questions were received. The questions and answers are set out in Annex B. There were several supplementary questions with regards to clarity.

- (i) Question regarding Pippbrook bridge works: The Local Highways Manager is to request full report from the Structures Group on progress for next informal committee meeting
- (ii) Question regarding Weeds on A25: The Local Highways Manager is to ensure all works are completed and are on schedule for the future.
- (iii) Question regarding Vegetation on A25 at Westcott: The Local Highways Manager is to ensure close monitoring and report to the local councillor
- (iv) Question regarding Ashtead verge damage: Surrey Highways to organize site meeting with relevant Local Councillors

20/09 PUBLIC OPEN QUESTION SESSION [Item 6C]



Three public questions were asked.

- (i) Regarding Epsom Road speeding, and the installation of speed cameras. The Local Highways Manager has agreed to note the issue for parking and S106 schemes and would send a formal response.
- (ii) Regarding signs being removed from public highways. e.g. Wotton Church. Surrey Highways to respond to questioner when detail received in writing. Surrey highways to provide a report detailing temporary signs and bring to next committee
- (iii) Regarding Deepdene Station work and the amount of time it is taking to complete which has increased and whether the work was performance managed. Concerns around the monitoring of air quality. Concerns around the amount of time the traffic lights are red for. The Area Highways Manager gave assurance that Surrey structures are monitoring performance and that the time it is taking has been extended due to information they found during the excavation. The Structures Group is to submit a report on progress to Local Committee.

21/09 **PETITIONS** [Item 7]

Six petitions were received – however 4 were regarding the same issue – Leatherhead Parking Consultation. All petitions and responses were given in the Agenda.

With reference to the Lower Road, Bookham Petition, on receiving the response – the petition spokesperson has asked for a Zebra Crossing to be installed. Surrey Highways are going to discuss this further with the Local Councillor.

With reference to the Leatherhead Parking Restrictions Petition the Parking Team will endeavour to send the petitioner the objections report by the end of December 2009.

22/09 **LEATHERHEAD PARKING REVIEW** [Item 8]

The Leatherhead Waiting Restrictions Members Task Group has met on three occasions and given consideration to the parking issues, especially within residential areas, within Leatherhead town centre.

Proposed options have been formulated and those within mainly residential areas were included within individual leaflets delivered to the affected roads and residents were invited to comment.

The task group considered comments received from residents and some of the options have been changed.

Local Committee is now asked to agree to the formal legal advertising of the proposals.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed that:



- (i) The report is noted
- (ii) The Local Committee (Mole Valley) has agreed to the formal legal advertising of the proposals with amendments to Randalls Road parking restrictions, which replace DYL with SYL between 24 and 33, but leaving Crematorium entrance. There are also corrections to the High Street and North Street, which changes operational times from 18:30pm to 18:00pm.
- (iii) The Leatherhead Parking Task Group will monitor parking in Kingscroft Road and the impact of the opening of Trinity School.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

To ease parking problems in Leatherhead.

23/09 RESPONSE TO PETITIONS FROM PREVIOUS LOCAL COMMITTEE ON THE 3RD MARCH 2009 [Item 9]

Members received a response to a petition regarding Abinger Common, Speeding from Surrey Highways. The petition and response is noted in Annexe B.

Members received a response to a petition regarding Abinger Common, Road Gritting from Surrey Highways. The petition and response is noted in Annexe B.

24/09 COMMUNITY SAFETY UPDATE [Item 10]

The Local Committee has a role in influencing and contributing to the community safety strategy for Mole Valley, delivered through the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.

The Local Committee also has a devolved power for the community safety funding allocated to the crime and disorder partnership, spent in accordance with the community safety strategy.

Representatives from the Police, Fire and Rescue, Youth Service, Trading Standards, NHS, Mole Valley District Council and Mole Valley Housing Association updated the Local Committee with the work they have been doing over the past 12 months with the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership in Mole Valley.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:

- (i) Note the work of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership in Mole Valley



- (ii) Consider how the Local Committee and County Council services can support the work of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.
- (iii) Note the distribution of Surrey County Council community safety funding allocated to the Crime and Disorder Partnership in 2009/10.
- (iv) Allow the Area Director, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, agree the allocation of Surrey County Council community safety funding allocated to the Crime and Disorder Partnership, in accordance with the community safety strategy priorities.
- (v) Nominate Clare Curran as the County Councillor representative to the Mole Valley Crime and Disorder Partnership (CDRP).
- (vi) discuss in the next informal local committee how members can become more involved in the Crime and Disorder Partnership in Mole Valley.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 places a requirement on Surrey County Council to consider crime and disorder in all the services it provides.

25/09 LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP [Item 11]

Surrey County Council is a statutory partner on the Mole Valley Local Strategic Partnership (LSP). The Local Committee must Nominate a County Councillor to the Mole Valley Local Strategic Partnership.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee nominated Helyn Clack to the Mole Valley Local Strategic Partnership.

26/09 INTERGRATED TRANSPORT SCHEMES 2009/10 – 2013/14 [Item 12]

The report seeks to put in place a five year rolling programme of Integrated Transport schemes so that officers can move these forward and report back to committee appropriately to gain further direction and or recommendations to proceed.

Councillor Holmwood expressed concern over road safety issues at the entrance to the Weald School, which is very close to the A24. The Local Highways Manager has agreed to send further information to the Local Councillor.

Councillor Sharland requested further information regarding Taxi bays approval and enforcement. The Local Highways Manager has agreed to provide and circulate information to all members of the local committee.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee has agreed to:

- i) Note the financial outturn for the previous financial year for Integrated Transport schemes (2008/09).
- ii) approve the programme of Integrated Transport schemes for Mole Valley District for progression in 2009/10 - 2013/14 funded by Local Transport Plan and Local Allocation budgets as set out within the report.
- iii) Approve the Local Allocation of £100,000 for integrated transport schemes, as detailed within the report.

27/09 **SPEED LIMITS PROGRESS REPORT** [Item 13]

Members are asked to consider and approve for formal statutory consultation various speed limits on roads in the Mole Valley District.

Councillor Sharland asked why Leatherhead High Street has not been reduced to 10 miles per hour speed limit as agreed previously. The Local Highways Manager agreed to provide information regarding this, and circulate to the Councillor.

Councillors considered that Dorking Road, Leatherhead should be 30 mile per hour speed limit. The Local Highways Manager responded to this by agreeing with the councillors, however stating that research shows that a 30-mile per hour speed limit in such a road would not deliver the desired effect, therefore would not be cost effective to implement.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:

- (i) Approve advertising the necessary Traffic Regulation Orders, as set out in Annex A, subject to comments from Surrey Police being favourable.
- (ii) [If no objections are maintained] Approve authority to make the Order(s) and implement the speed limits set out in this report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- (i) The speed limits suggested for progression are in accordance with the guidance set out for the setting of local speed limits and would contribute to the achievement of the County Council's Local Transport Plan objectives.

28/09 **PROGRESS OF HIGHWAYS REPORT** [Item 14]

Members were reminded that at the Local Committee on the 11 June 2008 they agreed a programme of work for the 2008/09-2010/2011 financial year



funded from the Integrated Transport Budget and Local Allocation. The authority was delegated to the East Area Group Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman in relation to any amendments to the 2008/2009-2010/2011 scheme list, as a result of changes in available funding following the closing of the 2007/2008 accounts. The committee was updated on the progress made against the schemes.

It was noted on page 180 that Dorking Holmwood as listed, should be replaced with Dorking Hills.

Councillor Townsend and District Councillor S Sharland asked for further information on Woodfield Lane which the Local Highways Manager has agreed to provide and circulate to all members.

District Councillor Homewood requested information regarding vehicle restraint barriers on the A24 and where they were The Local Highways Manager has agreed to provide and circulate to all members.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee noted the report.

29/09 **HIGHWAYS IMPROVEMENT FUNDED THROUGH PLANNING AGREEMENTS FOR DEVELOPMENT IN LEATHERHEAD [Item 15]**

Local Committee approval is sought for highway improvement schemes in Leatherhead, funded by monies taken through planning mechanisms, known as Section 106 agreements. The schemes will improve pedestrian routes, cycle routes and signing within Leatherhead including links along Epsom Road and Randalls Road. Widening of Station Road is also proposed.

Local members have requested further information before implementation, which the Local Highways Manager has agreed to provide. It was agreed that any amendments to proposals would come to the next Local Committee.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) approved:

- (i) the scheme shown on Annexe 3 for cycle and pedestrian links from Leatherhead Road to the town centre, including Knoll Roundabout.
- (ii) the scheme shown on Annexe 4 for cycle and pedestrian links on Randalls Road.
- (iii) the scheme shown on Annexe 5 for Station Approach.
- (iv) the accessibility improvements outlined in paragraph 3.
- (v) the scheme for road sign improvements outlined in paragraph 3.
- (vi) further investigation to develop proposals for a pedestrian and cycle scheme to link Leatherhead Station with Leatherhead Leisure Centre.

30/09 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING** [Item 16]

Members were asked to support the proposals for formal approval from the funding from the Members' Local Allocation. Detailed proposals are outlined in Annexe A to the report:

- 1st Fetcham Scout Group £1,000 capital
- Brighter Fetcham £1,200 revenue

Members are also asked to note one bid that falls below the £1,000 threshold:

- North Leatherhead Youth Football Club £600 revenue

Members are asked to note re-allocation of £1800 capital funding due to change of circumstances as outlined below:

- Placement of speed limit sign on A246, Bookham £600
- Purchase and siting 2 salt bins, Fetcham £500
- Repair and re-instate Vehicle Activated Sign, Abinger Hammer £280
- New sign, Pixham Resident Association £420

RESOLVED


The Local Committee (Mole Valley):

- (i) Approved the proposals detailed in Appendix A totalling £2,200
- (ii) Noted the approval of proposals which fall below the £1,000 threshold totalling £600

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

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

Meeting finished at 17:30pm



Chairman



Annex A Written Public Questions

Question from Mr Paul Finch Pixham Lane Speed Restrictions

This from the document, "Inventory of 20mph Zones in Surrey" updated in March 2007 by Surrey County Council.

Because of the documented benefits of 20 mph zones, Surrey County Council included the following key proposal within their Local Transport Plan (LTP), covering the period April 2001 to March 2006:

"We will implement 20 mph zones in a systematic way as part of area wide schemes in urban areas, and the streets around schools will generally be made 20 mph zones. If there are clear reasons for a higher speed limit being retained, other lining, signing and calming measures will be employed." (LTP section 4.9.6, page 72).

We also refer you to the Council to the House of Commons, Transport Committee, "Ending the Scandal of Complacency: Road Safety beyond 2010: Eleventh Report of Session 2007-08: Report, together with formal minutes, oral and written evidence", printed by the House of Commons 15 October 2008.

58. The safety benefits of lower speeds—20 mph or below in residential areas, town centres and around schools—have long been recognised by the Department for Transport.

Progress has been made with tackling inappropriate speed and many areas have been traffic calmed, with 30 mph or 20 mph limits. Yet this has been a slow and expensive process and, although effective in engineering terms, they have rarely enhanced the attractiveness of our streets in the way that schemes in other countries have done.

60. Ways must be found to satisfy the desires of local communities for safer streets. We recommend that local authorities be given the powers and resources to introduce 20-mph limits much more widely. Flexibility is required to avoid the prohibitive costs associated with some approaches. The balance of engineering measures, technology, policing and community influence should be a local matter.

The situation in Pixham Lane, Pixham (a B road) is similar to that in Highlands Road, Leatherhead (a B road), already a 20mph area. We believe that the accident rate per year in the 3 previous years is higher in Pixham Lane than 0.66 accidents/year used in determination for the 20mph zoning in Highlands Road.

At both ends of Pixham Lane the motorist has to stop and it would take approximately 44 seconds longer to travel the distance of the Lane, unimpeded at 20mph than at the current 30mph limit. There is a primary school (on a blind bend), nursery, home for the elderly and a church opening out onto the Lane. There are a number of properties with no footpath from which residents have to walk directly into the Lane. There are, especially at weekends, a number of walkers crossing the Lane to access Box Hill. Residents are continually reporting to the Residents Association incidents where they have narrowly avoided being struck by speeding motorists. From the Denbies end it is 320m to the central bollards, 142m to the pinch point, 285m to the traffic lights and 332m to the end at Reigate Road, all arguably existing traffic calming measures.

The Residents within Pixham have requested action to reduce the speed of traffic travelling through Pixham. Given that there was a road traffic accident in Pixham Lane on the morning of 9th June where a resident narrowly avoided being fully struck by a car

rolling over onto its side following a collision and two young drivers managed to get out of their vehicles without serious injury, at what point will the County Council actually implement 20mph zones which it promised to do in 2007. There is absolutely no reason to maintain a 30mph limit in Pixham Lane and the Residents Association now formally request it be lowered. Please support our request.

Response from Surrey Highways

The County does not have specific proposals to reduce the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph in Pixham Lane. Whilst it is desirable to improve safety on public highways such as Pixham Lane, proposals should be considered against other priorities and be designed to achieve effective improvements. For instance, in comparison to the accident statistics considered before the Highlands Road scheme was designed, Pixham Lane would not offer such potential for accident rate reduction.

During the period of the first Local Transport Plan for Surrey (April 2001 to March 2006) a number of 20mph schemes were implemented at priority sites in Surrey. The second and current Surrey Local Transport Plan 2006/7 to 2010/11 states 'where appropriate we will consider reducing speeds in urban and rural areas through such measures as 20mph zones'. Such proposals could be progressed as integrated transport schemes in Mole Valley if they were a higher priority than others competing for funding.

The Department for Transport (DfT) publication 'Travelling to School: A Good Practice Guide' advises... 'we would like all transport authorities to consider the case for 20mph zones around schools, although we recognise that whether or not to introduce such zones must remain a local decision'. County policy states that a 20mph zone or limit will only be authorized if the average free flow speed at a representative site does not exceed 20mph.

There is a difference between a 20mph speed limit and a 20mph zone. A 20mph zone works through the introduction of engineering measures designed to slow drivers, and is supported by signing. A 20mph speed limit involves signing without other supporting measures. However, research has shown that 20mph limits without traffic calming created reductions in speed of only 1 mph. Unlike other limits, '20mph' is associated with effective self-enforcement. In order to sustain this understanding it is important that drivers continue to appreciate that '20 means 20' and current policy reflects this.

Pixham Lane has a school located at approximately mid way. This is where, for a time particularly in the morning and afternoon, there is vehicle congestion, short-term parking mixing with other rush hour traffic and pupils crossing. A similar situation exists at many schools but in most cases, excessive vehicle speed is not the main problem. The congestion can reduce speeding and thus solutions to improve safety are more likely to involve improved visibility and crossing facilities. At this stage, without adequate feasibility and design work being undertaken, it is not easy to anticipate what measures would be effective at reducing speeds to enable a 20mph zone to be imposed.

Question from Sophie Yauner

Dorking Parking

Residents of Rothes Road, Hart Road and others in the immediate vicinity suffer a great deal of stress and inconvenience in relation to parking. The problem is caused by people leaving cars parked in our roads while they commute from Dorking stations or work/shop in Dorking. Car parks are provided but are underused as people avoid charges, preferring to leave their cars in our roads. During the week cars arrive as we go off to take children to school etc. and do not generally leave till around 6pm. This means

that we have great difficulty parking when we come back to the house during the day, and again when we come back with children after school, as workers and commuters have not yet left. A rise in car parking charges and a charge for evening parking has only made this worse and extended the period of difficulty.

Additionally I have documented a number of occasions in the past few months when cars have been parked for a week or more unmoved. Enquiries made with the police have identified the owners as resident outside Dorking. One car that sat outside my house for over a week had a residents permit for Wandsworth. It would not be unreasonable to presume that the owners had used our road as a free car park while taking a train to Gatwick.

This 'displacement' of vehicles has been successfully dealt with by residents parking schemes in many other town centers and around stations etc. Esher introduced a CPZ in April 08. This covers 4 roads and was introduced in response to a similar problem to that encountered by us. Residents being unable to park near their properties. If it has been accepted by Surrey CC that it is right to protect Esher residents in such a way, what justification can there be not to do the same for us? In Esher this CPZ includes provision for 2 hour free parking but as Dorking already has some short term free parking and has a number of car parks I do not think that this should be part of a Residents Parking scheme around Rothes/Hart Roads. If it was, it is likely that the extra space made available by workers and commuters no longer being able to leave their cars all day, would no doubt be taken up by greater numbers of shoppers avoiding car parking charges.

The argument that the High street businesses will suffer if we have such a scheme is surely spurious. There is plenty of parking in Dorking and at Dorking Station. If people are put off using it because of the charges then it is the charging system that should be revised. It can surely not be justifiable for residents and to bear the fall out from this situation.

Response from Surrey Highways

Your request for the development and implementation of a controlled parking zone (CPZ) has been noted and will be considered. The location has been added to a list of sites for further assessment.

Surrey County Council's Parking team undertake site assessments on a phased basis with a view to making a number of changes in any one area at the same time. If their assessments result in a proposal to introduce a parking scheme in the centre of Dorking, this will be added to a report which will be submitted to the Mole Valley local committee.

If the local committee approves the proposal to progress the scheme, the legal process involved in introducing parking controls requires consultation with residents, businesses and other stakeholders and the making of a traffic regulation order, which allows the controls to be in place and enforced, to make sure they are effective.

There is an outline plan for funding the design and implementation of parking schemes in the Dorking area in the financial year 2012/13, with a view to obtaining funding for the necessary assessment and preliminary development of these schemes in the coming financial year

Question from Eric Wright

Randalls Road Parking proposals

Points for the committee to consider regarding the proposals for west end, south side No 24-34



Against the wishes expressed by residents in their petition, it is proposed to put double yellow lines between No 24 and the Cleeve Road traffic lights, on the south side.

This will seriously inconvenience not only the residents in 24 - 34 but also those in the preceding stretch to No 23, because displaced parking will occur there - these residents may well be worse off than under the present arrangements (something we had experience of when the Police Federation building was under construction).

The reason the proposal has been retained is solely for (theoretical) safety considerations - although the logic is difficult to follow - why is it so important to restrict all parking where the road has an extra lane on the south side rather than where the road is single lane? It is understood that no other group of residents or road users have requested this measure.

The experience of residents who have lived here for more than 20 years is that there is no (practical) safety issue; we know of no accident on this stretch of the road - serious or otherwise. In fact traffic rarely backs up from the lights as far as 24, so no long delays are suffered as a result of occasional short stay parking.

The imposition of such inconvenience for a theoretical risk which is not borne out in practice is grossly disproportionate and essentially would amount to maladministration - another example of misapplied 'health and safety' considerations to which we are subjected so often these days.

The committee is urged to reject this part of the proposals and follow the single yellow line proposed by the residents.

Response from Surrey Highways

The Chairman will accept this question on behalf of the committee. A formal written response will be issued after Local Committee.

Question from Richard Mason

Fairfield Drive

Last year Andrew Rundle and I petitioned the whole of Fairfield Drive to address safety concerns and irritations with regard to the parking in our road. We had a staggering level of support.

We presented the petition to the council at the meeting, and subsequently met the highways officer in our road to discuss the issues. He noted the problem. To try and speed up the process of addressing our concerns, he contacted the fire services who got a fire engine up our road 9 out of 10 days. This was, in their view, acceptable.

However, our problems still persist. I would like to question the timescale for taking action for addressing parking issues in Dorking.

Response from Surrey Highways

Surrey County Council's Parking team undertake site assessments on a phased basis with a view to making a number of changes in any one area at the same time. If their assessments result in a proposal to introduce a parking scheme in the centre of Dorking, this will be added to a report which will be submitted to the Mole Valley local committee.

If the local committee approves the proposal to progress the scheme, the legal process involved in introducing parking controls requires consultation with residents, businesses



and other stakeholders and the making of a traffic regulation order, which allows the controls to be in place and enforced, to make sure they are effective.

There is an outline plan for funding the design and implementation of parking schemes in the Dorking area in the financial year 2012/13, with a view to obtaining funding for the necessary assessment and preliminary development of these schemes in the coming financial year.

A handwritten signature in purple ink, consisting of stylized initials and a flourish.

Annexe B Member Questions

Questions from Councillor Hazel Watson for Dorking Hills

Pippbrook bridgeworks

Given public concern about the significant over-run in completing the Pippbrook bridgeworks on the A24 near Dorking Railway station, does the County Council monitor on-site the productivity of the contractors to ensure that the work is completed as speedily as possible? If so, how frequently does the on-site monitoring take place?

Response from Local Highways Manager

Under the current contractual arrangements the Constructors (Ringway in this case) are responsible for site supervision and progress. Their sub-contractor Osbourne Construction is carrying out the work at Pippbrook. Surrey staff audit the situation on a weekly basis. There has been a substantial increase in output in recent weeks as the more complex part of the project has been completed. The contractor has recovered some of the delays and is now expecting to complete in week beginning 20th July.

Weeds alongside the A25

When will the County Council cut back the weeds on the footpath alongside the A25 between Wotton and Abinger Hammer to make the footpath passable for pedestrians so that they are not forced to walk on the A25? As this problem has occurred for the last three years running and has caused significant public concern, can the County Council ensure that funding is allocated for this footpath so that it is maintained to a higher standard to avoid this problem occurring again?

Response from Local Highways Manager

An inspection by County officers this week confirmed that the overgrown footway between Balchins Lane & Abinger requires attention. The contractor is now programmed to be on site within the next week. It has also been agreed that instead of dealing with this matter separately each year, it should be included as part of the rural grass cut.

Vegetation between Westcott House and Lince Lane

When will the vegetation between Westcott House and Lince Lane alongside the pavement by the A25 at Westcott be cut back to restore the width of this narrow pavement which is much used by pedestrians including schoolchildren?

Response from Local Highways Manager

This footway was walked and inspected by County officers on Monday June 22nd 2009. An area of the footway has already been subject to some work by the Community Gang and the rest is in reasonable condition. Width is a difficulty, especially with the footway so close to the A25, however, it is clear for passage for pedestrians with care. It will continue to be monitored during the summer period.

Questions from County Councillor Christopher Townsend, and District Councillor David Howell, Ashstead Common

Winter Service Policy and Operations

Bearing in mind that over 1,000 Ashtead residents travel to and from work by rail (2001 census) also that the level crossing at Ashtead railway station is the only vehicular access for over 1500 Ashtead residents living to the north of the railway, can the Local Highways Manager confirm that the short stretch of Woodfield Lane from its junction with Craddocks Avenue and Barnett Wood Lane, Ashtead, up to and including the station and

level crossing, will be included in the review of the County's Winter Service Policy and Operations referred to in his response in Agenda Item 9B.

Response from Local Highways Manager

The Asset Planning Group of Surrey Highways has confirmed that the short stretch of Woodfield Lane from its junction with Craddocks Avenue and Barnett Wood Lane, Ashted, up to and including the station and level crossing, will be included in the review of the County's Winter Service Policy and Operations.

Question from District Councillor David Howell, Ashstead Common

Damage to Verges

Following the raising of the question of damage to verges from vehicle parking at an earlier meeting of the Committee and the identification of two specific instances (one at a private residence and the other adjacent to Tesco Express in Ashted) to the Local Highways Manager, no action appears to have been taken despite assurances that reported instances would be dealt with. Can the Local Highways Manager confirm that appropriate actions will be taken in the near future.

Response from Local Highways Manager

A site meeting with Councillor David Howell and County Councillor Chris Townsend is to be arranged to consider the most appropriate actions to be taken.

A handwritten signature in purple ink, consisting of stylized initials 'AK' followed by a flourish.