

MINUTES: of the meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee held at 14.00 on Friday 18th June 2010 in the Council Chamber, Pippbrook, Dorking

Members Present - Surrey County Council

- * Mrs Clare Curran – Chairman
- * Mr Stephen Cooksey
- * Mr Tim Hall
- * Mrs Helyn Clack
- * Mr Christopher Townsend
- * Mrs Hazel Watson

Members Present - Mole Valley District Council

- * Cllr Chris Hunt Vice-chairman
- * Cllr Margaret Cooksey
- Cllr Valerie Homewood
- * Cllr David Howell
- * Cllr Jean Pearson
- * Cllr Kathryn Westwood

- * Cllr Derrick Burt (Subst.)

* = Present

PART ONE - IN PUBLIC

NOTE: The Chairman for 2010/11 was officially appointed in May 2010 at full council. Mrs Clare Curran replaced Mrs Helyn Clack as Chairman and opened the meeting by introducing Cllr Chris Hunt as the Vice-chairman. Cllr Hunt's appointment marks a new departure for the Local Committee as this is the first time that a District Councillor has been appointed to that role.

16/10 **PETITIONS** [Item 5]

[NOTE: This item was taken out of sequence to allow a press photographer from the Leatherhead Advertiser to take pictures of the petitions being presented by Mr Stephen Cooksey and Cllr Raj Haque.]

Both petitioners then made their statements and the petitions were subsequently appended as Annex A to these minutes.

17/10 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTIONS** [Item 1]

There were apologies for absence from Cllr Valerie Homewood, Cllr Derrick Burt substituted.

18/10 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** [Item 2]

There were none at this stage of the meeting but subsequently the Chairman declared a personal interest in Items 9 and 11 as an Executive Member of the District Council with responsibility for Customer Service and Partnerships, Finance and Assets and Planning. Mr Tim Hall declared a personal interest in Item 9 as a member of the Transformation Governance Board and a trustee of Bfree. District Members all declared an interest in respect of their roles as members of the district council in Items 9 and 11.

19/10 **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING HELD ON 3rd MARCH 2010** [Item 3]

On a point of accuracy, Mrs Hazel Watson asked that Annexe B [Member Questions, Page 16, Line 5] be amended to substitute 'Watson' for 'Cooksey'. The minutes were then agreed as a true record.

Additionally, Mr Cooksey asked that it be noted that ref [Para 03/10] *"Stephen Cooksey requested an update on the letter sent to Cabinet from the Chairman of the Mole Valley Local Committee regarding Dorking Nursery School. Tim Hall will receive the response shortly and share with councillors."* - no response had been forthcoming. Mr Tim Hall tabled the letter which he had written for information and it was agreed that the matter of processes be taken up at the next informal meeting.

20/10 **PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS** [Item 4A]

Two public written questions were received and responded to. [Attached as Annexe A]. In response to Mr Meudell, and to Mr Peter Brown, who had asked a question in Open Question Time, Mr Tim Hall asked that the Local Partnerships Team make some enquiries of the Freedom of Information team to try to ascertain the extend of public interest in this particular issue so that it could be addressed in a single comprehensive report to Committee covering all the points raised.

21/10 **MEMBER QUESTIONS** [Item 4B]

Nine Member questions were received. Seven from Mrs Hazel Watson; one from Cllr David Howell and two from Cllr Chris Hunt tabled as a supplement. The responses to Cllr Hunt's questions were not available due to an unforeseen delay and he was promised a response which would be minuted at the next formal Committee meeting in September 2010 unless, as Mr Chris Townsend suggested, they were resolved at the next divisional Highways' Forum, which he was invited to attend. [The questions and responses are attached as Annexe B.]

Further to Cllr David Howell's question, the Chairman said that the Parking team would be invited to the next informal meeting and that she would write to the Parking manager in the meantime raising concerns.

22/10 **LOCAL PROTOCOLS** [Item 6]

Members are required to review their locally agreed protocols on an annual basis and to suggest any amendments they may wish, within certain parameters, that will facilitate public participation. Mr Stephen Cooksey made the point that he had asked last year whether Committee could meet in the evening to allow more members of the public, who might have daytime commitments, to attend. It was subsequently agreed that at least one meeting would be held in the evening although no date was specified.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley):

- (i) CONSIDER the local protocol as set out in the report and suggest any amendments deemed necessary based on the experience of the last 12 months, and
- (ii) ENDORSE the current arrangement for a further 12 months.

Reason for Decision

Amending standing orders allows Local Committees to be more accessible to local residents, promote local responsibility and give residents the ability to affect local decision-making in line with the County Council's commitment to localism and encourages Members to give consideration to how, based on their experience, this might be maintained or improved.

23/10

MOLE VALLEY PARTNERSHIPS NOMINATIONS AND DELEGATED POWERS [Item 7]

The Local Committee has a role in influencing and contributing to community planning in Mole Valley and in planning for effective crime reduction initiatives particularly in relation to funding contributed by Surrey County Council towards the local crime prevention programme. Members were asked to nominate representatives to the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) and the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) otherwise known as the Community Safety Partnership (CSP). The appointment to the LSP was proposed by Mrs Helyn Clack and seconded by Mrs Clare Curran and the appointment to the CDRP (CSP) was proposed by Mrs Helyn Clack and seconded by Mr Tim Hall.

Mr Stephen Cooksey asked that the representatives report back to Committee on a regular basis as this had not happened consistently in the past. This was agreed.

There was also some discussion on joint scrutiny. Mr Tim Hall expressed his support with a proviso that County Members be given a longer notice period in advance of the next scrutiny meeting.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED

- (iii) to nominate Mr Chris Townsend to the Mole Valley Local Strategic Partnership.
- (iv) to nominate Mrs Clare Curran to the Mole Valley Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.
- (v) that the Area Director, in consultation with the County Councillor representative, agree the allocation of Surrey County Council

Community Safety funding allocated to the CDRP, in accordance with the Community Safety Strategy priorities.

Reason for Decision

The Local Committee's service monitoring role and devolved budgets provide an excellent opportunity for supporting the work of the LSP and the CSP.

24/10 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING** [Item 8]

Each County Councillor has a delegated sum of £8250 revenue and each Local Committee has a capital budget of £30,000 to spend on local community initiatives and this report asked its County Members to consider the proposals contained within the report for approval.

- 25/10 The Chairman drew the Committee's attention to an amendment to the report. Para 1.2, which refers to Highways capital, should have been deleted in its entirety as this funding has been withdrawn and is no longer available.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed:

- (i) to consider five proposals for formal approval from the Local Allocation funding. Details of the proposals are outlined in Annexe A and approved the following:
- £2,500 revenue Bookham Resident Association
 - £1,000 revenue Newdigate School
 - £1,000 revenue Surrey County Council Youth Services
 - £1,000 revenue Temple Lane Allotment Society
 - £1,750 revenue Liquid Connection
- (ii) to note eight bids that fall below the £1,000 threshold:
- £750 revenue Oakwood Hill Village Hall, to remove asbestos from storage rooms prior to building an extension.
 - £625 revenue Bookham Mother & Toddler Group, to purchase new educational toys and equipment.
 - £350 revenue Dorking Links Friendship Club, to purchase a moveable ramp to facilitate wheelchair users and less mobile individuals accessing the parish room.
 - £300 revenue Charlwood Mother & Toddler Group to fund a summer trip to Brocketts farm.
 - £100 revenue Surrey County Council Cultural Services to purchase an A frame for use on mobile library 5 covering Mole Valley.
 - £750 revenue Young Enterprises South East – to fund one day enterprise programme for children at St Paul's Primary School, Dorking.
- (iii) to consider an amended proposal from Dorking Town Twinning Association, Annexe B, and approved:
- £448 revenue - Funding was originally approved on 4 March 2009 towards costs for setting up the Association. Following careful structuring the Association asked if they could use the unspent balance towards a new project to set up a Museum in Dorking. The funds will be used to bring together Dorking and Gieglingen representatives to see how the Gieglingen experience can benefit Dorking.

Reasons for Decisions

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

26/10 **SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE – LOCAL DELIVERY PLAN** [Item 9]

The Youth Development Service is required to submit a local delivery plan that outlines its planned provision in 2010/11 for approval by the Local Committee. In addition to this, the report introduced the transformation strategy intended to modernise all Services for Young People in order to fulfil the Council's ambition to offer world-class services for young people against a reducing budget. In a long and wide-ranging discussion, Members were assured that there would be no cuts to the existing Youth Development service in this financial year. The

Youth Development Service made its savings through a mixture of measures that were all outside of the Mole Valley team. Savings had also been found from other parts of the Youth Service as a whole, such as Connexions and Youth Justice, through efficiencies such as managing vacancies.

When asked how the Local Committee could influence the future shape of the service, the attending officer assured Members that Local Committees would be involved in the design of any new local services and invited Members to actively participate in consultation with young people and the Needs Assessment, locally.

There was, however, no assurance that youth centres would still be housed in existing locations as building stock was expensive to maintain and not sustainable at current levels of use.

Members expressed concern that the focus should remain on those young people most at risk and that that should be foremost among priorities when targeting services and commissioning and that the services commissioned should be appropriate to their needs. Members expressed a view that World Class was aspirational in the circumstances but welcomed the opportunity to engage with the community in designing effective local services for young people in Mole Valley which has a good track record for partnership working.

Officers could not give a definitive answer as to what new outsourced service provision would look like as it is too soon to pre-empt the outcome of discussions with potential providers but, at the suggestion of the Chairman, agreed to include independent schools in their deliberations.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE to:

- (i) approve the Youth Development Service element of the Services for Young People Delivery Plan 2010/11 (Attached as Annexe A).
- (ii) note the transformation strategy for young people

Reasons for Decisions

To ensure that the Local Committee had an opportunity to consider the content of this report so that the Plan could be implemented in Mole Valley.

- 27/10 **FINANCIAL ALLOCATIONS 2010 / 2011 FOR HIGHWAY WORKS** [Item 10]
This report invited Members to consider the most appropriate use of the £100,000 revenue funding available to them in this financial year.

After much discussion, where Committee considered alternative options such as completing parking or other integrated transport schemes, it was agreed that the most equitable solution, that would be appreciated by the majority of local residents, was that suggested by the Local Highways Manager.

The Chairman gave assurances that a community gang would be focussed on Mole Valley priorities and would not be redeployed except in the most extreme circumstances.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE to:

- (i) note the funding for highway maintenance revenue works as set out in Annex A;
- (ii) approve use of the £100,000 Local Revenue allocation to fund an additional Community Gang and undertake drainage works.

Reasons for Decisions

To allow officers to use the Local Revenue as approved by the Local Committee.

28/10 **LEATHERHEAD TOWN CENTRE ENHANCEMENTS AND EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC SCHEME** [Item 11]

As this report had already been considered by Mole Valley District Council (MVDC), Andy Bircher attended to respond to questions on behalf of MVDC.

Members were warmly enthusiastic about the partnership approach and expressed a view that, if the timing could be effectively co-ordinated, it would be an excellent model for future work of a similar nature. The Vice-chairman recorded thanks to Mr Tim Hall for his efforts in getting the group together and keeping it on track and also to the officers involved from both Local Authorities who had worked hard to align their differing timescales and pressures.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- (i) As set out in Annexe A [of the report] :
 - That approval be given to Option 1 in this report, including
 - That officers prepare, with assistance from District officers, a public consultation on a public realm and infrastructure strategy based on the principles outlined in section 5 of this report;
 - That agreement be given in principle to the review of the current TRO and to consult the public on an experimental TRO that would restrict access to part of Church Street and all of High Street Leatherhead for a period of up to 18 months;
 - That approval be given to tackling the list of urgent and short term tasks within the High Street and Church Street to be funded from Section 106 payments and that officers work with District officers to implement the list.
 - That approval be given to allocate £25,000 of Section 106 funds towards the work outlined in this report.
- (ii) As set out in Annexe B [of the report] :
 - That the Experimental Traffic Order, as detailed in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.8, [of the report] to amend the access restrictions on High Street and part of Church Street, be advertised and implemented on site, subject to informal consultation being satisfactory.

Reasons for Decisions

To allow the process to go ahead having been approved by both Mole Valley District Council and Surrey County Council.

29/10 **ALLEGED PUBLIC FOOTPATH 602 (DORKING) BETWEEN WESTCOTT STREET AND BRIDLEWAY 112 (DORKING)** [Item 12]

Mrs Diane Holden submitted an application in October 2007 for a Map Modification Order (MMO) to add a public bridleway from Westcott Street to Bridleway 112 (Dorking) to the Surrey County Council DMS. Although the application was for a bridleway, Mrs Holden has since confirmed that she had intended to claim the route as a footpath.

The reporting officer explained to Committee that since submitting his report received representation from two more equestrians about the use of the route as a bridleway and two others who had witnessed its use by riders. However, in the officer's view, this was insufficient to change the recommendations as they stood. He reassured Members that, if sufficient evidence of equestrian use were to come to light, a further order could be made to add the route to the Definitive Map as a bridleway.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- a) That public footpath right be recognised over the route shown A-B-C-D on drawing number 3/1/50/H42a and that the application for a MMO (made under sections 53 and 57 of the WCA 1981) to modify the Definitive Map and Statement by the addition of a footpath over that route be approved. The route will be known as Public Footpath 602 (Dorking).
- b) That public footpath rights be recognised over the route E-F-G on drawing number 3/1/50/H42a and, should the relevant landowner fail to complete the dedication of a footpath over that route within three months of this decision, the application for an MMO (made under sections 53 and 57 of the WCA 1981) to modify the Definitive Map and Statement by the addition of a footpath be approved. The route will also be known as Public Footpath 602 (Dorking).
- c) That legal orders should be made and advertised and if objections are received they will be submitted to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for confirmation.

Reasons for Decisions

In the considered view of officers there was sufficient evidence for the period between 1987 and 2007 to raise a presumption that footpath rights had been established under section 31 of the Highways Act 1980 over the route between points A – B – C – D and E – F –G [ref. Annexe A of the report].

30/10 **PROPOSED UPDATED SPEED LIMIT POLICY FOR CONSULTATION WITH LOCAL COMMITTEES** [Item 13]

This report was for consultation and feedback in respect of a report due to go to Cabinet in September. Members were largely supportive, and were in agreement about the need to limit speed around schools to 20 mph. Policing in rural areas was also a concern. However, the draft policy was welcomed as a good start although, in the current financial climate, practical application was

likely to be slow.

Mrs Helyn Clack suggested that money from Development Control (S106), which was due to be the subject of a Cabinet review, could be used in the future for assessing and implementing new speed limits, given the loss of the integrated transportation scheme budget.

The Local Committee:

- (i) PROVIDED comments they wished to have considered in finalising the report and policy to Cabinet, and
- (ii) NOTED the content of the report.

Reasons for Decisions

The proposed new policy balances the need to reduce road safety casualties against the importance of increasing the powers and flexibility of local committees. Cabinet has asked that the views of the Transport Select Committee and the local committees inform the new policy.

[Meeting Ended: 5.00 pm]

Chairman



**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE
(MOLE VALLEY)**

PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS

18TH JUNE 2010

The following 2 questions were submitted in accordance with Standing Order 64.

1. Questions from Nick O'Shea, resident of Lincoln Road in Dorking, and member of the Lincoln Road Residents' Association.

People living in many of the residential roads in Dorking such as Lincoln Road, Watham Road and Rothes Road have been campaigning for some form of 'residents parking' for over 30 years. At the beginning of this year, we were assured that sufficient funds had been allocated in the revenue and capital budgets over the next few years to enable the necessary work to be undertaken to develop some pilot schemes.

1. **Could you please confirm that this is the case, and outline a timetable for the consultation and if agreed implementation of these schemes?**
2. If this is not the case, what alternative proposals do the officers and committee have to help residents in these streets overcome the daily nightmare of shoppers, commuters and workers parking in our streets to such an extent that it is frequently impossible for us to park anywhere near our own homes, since the present situation including occasionally restricted parking on some street, has become so onerous that it is now making our lives unbearable?

Response from SCC Parking Team

We are aware of the problems in the Lincoln Road area.

We have had at least one meeting, at the beginning of this year, with representatives of Lincoln Road and other areas in Dorking, as well as Councillor Hazel Watson explaining and outlining the sort of proposals that could be progressed in these roads.

The latest parking review for Mole Valley was due to be carried out during February / March with the intention of a report being presented to Committee in June - this has, however, been postponed to the Committee Meeting in September because of the elections.

The legal process involved in introducing or changing parking controls requires us to then consult with residents, businesses and other stakeholders, after which, we have to make a traffic regulation order, so that our enforcement staff can take action against people parking illegally. This whole process - from start to finish - does take some months to progress.

We are aware of the residents' issues and will do what we can to alleviate them, although we have not yet been allocated any funds for parking by the Local Highways Team, so cannot make any comments as to how this particular review will progress.

2. Question from Mr John Meudell (Dorking), Mole Valley Cycling Forum

The Knoll Roundabout, and associated Epsom Road Scheme, to improve accessibility and safety for pedestrians and cyclists:

These two schemes were intended to improve pedestrian and cycling safety between Ashted and Leatherhead town centre, would the committee explain:

- a: "What the individual and total costs of the works at Knoll Roundabout and Epsom Road in Leatherhead?"**
- b: "Why money intended for works to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety elsewhere in Leatherhead was used to fund these works?"**
- c: "Why it is that Surrey's contractors installed facilities so obviously outside all relevant guidance, both national and Surrey's own; adding to cyclist and pedestrian hazards whilst unnecessarily removing green features in what should have been a simple design exercise?"**
- d: "Why it was that there were no safety audits/reviews during the design process for the Epsom Road element of the project?"**
- e: "How Surrey will go forward with replacement of the Epsom Road cycle facility (including consultation and finance) and improvements to pedestrian and cyclists safety at the Knoll Roundabout, which is now more hazardous now than was previously the case?"**
- f: "The increasing failure of Surrey Highways to carry out public consultation; let alone any that inclusive, appropriately timed and meaningful; prior to the approval of projects and instituting works?"**

(I would note these are latest in a long line of Surrey Highways projects with little or no consultation; a list that would include the Pump Corner Scheme and Deepdene Avenue Culvert Repairs)

- g: “How Surrey Highways intend to schedule, design and consult on highways projects in the Mole Valley in the future?”**

Response from Surrey County Council

- a: The final works cost for Epsom Road is £73,817.42p. The final works cost for Knoll Roundabout is £454,143.08p. These figures do not include fees of £44,381.92p or Baxter indices (price fluctuation increases) £54,509.88p.**
- b: The Local Committee Mole Valley received a report on the 24th June 2009 seeking agreement to a number of proposals only in outline, with tentative cost proposals. Within the body of the report it clearly stated the scope of the projects for Knoll Roundabout and Epsom Road and the built schemes do not go beyond what was agreed by committee.**
- c: The proposals are in line with Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 and the Local Transport Plan. The projects were worked up by external consultants to Surrey Highways and the works commissioned through Conway Construction through an enabling arrangement.**
- d: The design work would have been reviewed by the external consultants to Surrey Highways.**
- e: Works at Knoll Roundabout and Epsom Road are complete. The improvements include a wider metalled surface which is to the benefit of parents with push chairs and those with mobility concerns.**
- f: We aim to be open, fair and consistent when undertaking transport work or activity on or around our roads. We have a statutory duty to consult on some matters, but we sometimes choose to consult when we are not required by law to do so. Even when we don't consult, we aim to be open, fair and consistent, so we will try to keep those potentially affected by our work informed of our plans.**
- g: Surrey's third Local Transport Plan is now being developed. The new plan will commence from April 2011 and will influence the scheduling, design and consultation on projects. We will also be developing the Surrey Transport Asset Management Plan to determine the best long-term strategy for maintenance of the highway network. We will be consulting Members about this strategy, and will aim to produce developed proposals with a prioritised list of schemes.**

MVLC 17 June 2010



**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE
(MOLE VALLEY)**

MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTIONS

18TH JUNE 2010

The following questions were submitted in accordance with Standing Order 64.

Questions from Councillor Hazel Watson for Dorking Hills

1. Speed Reduction

On 3 March 2010 the Mole Valley Local Committee agreed to implement a reduced speed limit on the A25 between Dorking and Westcott from 50mph to 40mph following speed surveys and public consultation. When will this reduced speed limit be implemented following the decision by councillors to that effect? If the decision is not being implemented within the next month, what is the reason for not implementing a member decision and how much money has been spent to date on progressing this reduced speed limit?

Response from Local Highways Manager

It is intended that the new speed limit for the A25 will be implemented as soon as possible after allocation of necessary funding. The Local Committee has in recent years allocated funds to progress new speed limits from the budgets for Integrated Transport in Mole Valley. Since there are no funds currently allocated for new speed limits, schemes are not able to progress. To date there has been £3880 capital expenditure on the A25 speed limit scheme.

2. Highways Expenditure

In 2009 all of the County Councillors representing Mole Valley were consulted about their priorities for Highways expenditure for their four year term of office and those priorities were reflected in the planned expenditure for Highways for each year from 2009-2013. Following decisions made at County Hall to reduce the overall Highways budget which resulted in significantly less money for Local Committees to spend on Highways, why were all the County Councillors for Mole Valley (not just the Chairman of the Local Committee as stated in item 10 of this agenda), not consulted about their priorities for 2010-2013 given this significant change in circumstances?

Response from Highways

The views of County Councillors given in 2009 were taken into account in setting priorities that have not been changed for 2010/11. Budget constraints were explained at a seminar to which all County Councillors were invited in the early part of this year. Budget proposals were agreed at the meeting of the Council held on 9th February 2010.

3. Dorking Library

Given the strong local opposition to the decision made by the Cabinet for the Dorking Library to move out of the Pippbrook House building and the lack of public consultation prior to making the decision, can the Cabinet's decision be reversed to allow the library to remain at Pippbrook House?

Response from Estates Planning and Management

The reasoning for a move being proposed is that :-

- The lease on the existing Pippbrook house has come to an end on the 1 January 2010.
- The area of the Pippbrook House, plus the adjacent tennis courts, Bowls Green and the DC offices - have been designated since November 2008 as part of the site identifications of the Strategic Housing Land Allocation Assessment ("SHLAA") - as being available to deliver housing units in 2013-2018. It is identified as site HS-061
- The allocation has been made by the MVDC as Planning authority. MVDC are also the freehold owner of the Pippbrook House, the existing library.
- As and when this area does become a residential estate, if the Library is still there it would lead to both the Library becoming a building in the middle of a small Housing Estate and the residents having the traffic going to and from the Library disturbing that which should be a quieter area (of housing).
- Throughout this process MVDC have been reasonable about the Library and offices above staying on until a new place(s) is found to replace the function.
- The Library service believes that it can offer better services from such a new location as the existing building is too small (with the current service being restricted compared to the population numbers it serves).
- The local Opposition reported by the Library is in 2 parts. Firstly, that of concerns about the Historic building and it's potential loss. Apparently some members of the public have thought that the building is going to be demolished. Secondly, there have been concerns about the Car parking given that the existing parking is nominally free. However, that facet does not include the fact that those who drive to the Library are extremely likely to also drive to the town centre to go shopping. If the Library is in the town centre, it will lead to one less vehicle movement per visit to the Library.
- The Statement made to the Press (published on the 21st May 2010) - to better inform the people of Dorking about the reasoning of having to move the Library, appears to have led to a better understanding as to why there is a need to move.

Below is an extract from the 'GetSurrey' web site (part of the group which the Leatherhead and Dorking Advertiser is in) picking up on the dialogue with the Press via the Comms team :-

"Move on the cards for Dorking Library

<http://www.getsurrey.co.uk/search/hpsbq/10/1/1//%23>

May 21, 2010

A NEW chapter is in store for Dorking Library after Surrey County Council (SCC) announced it was likely to leave Pippbrook House and move to a new home within a year.

The county council's lease on the Reigate Road building ran out on January 1 this year, and the site's future has been the subject of consultation amid suggestions it could be used for housing.

Mole Valley District Council is allowing the library to remain as SCC negotiates a new venue, which it promised would have more space and be more accessible to people in the town centre. It is hoped the move will go ahead by spring 2011.

Pippbrook House, the library's current home, was built in the 1750s and its listed status and inflexible internal layout make it unsuitable for SCC's plans to turn the old-style "book warehouses" into "interactive spaces" as part of its county-wide programme of library refurbishments.

Recommendations for libraries like Dorking suggest they should provide between 500 and 750sq-m of public lending space, but Pippbrook provides only 335sq-m.

Katie Kinnear, SCC's property and environmental lead for libraries, said: "The library service has developed. What a library is now is different to what it was 10 or 15 years ago and the building is just not big enough to offer the best service we can to residents of Dorking."

The council is not naming the site it is negotiating on for commercial reasons, but the public space at the venue is some 500sq-m.

It is said to be in a location "which would be visited by people who are also visiting the town centre", not always the case with Pippbrook, which is to the east and below the council buildings.

SCC hopes the relocation will have the same impact as Walton Library's £2m move in 2008, which provided facilities specifically for children and young people and brought about a 311% increase in issues of junior fiction books and a rise in visitors of all ages.

The Dorking facility would also offer meeting rooms and encourage children's use and events in the library, and SCC hopes to consult users on the services it will provide.

Mole Valley District Council will publish its preferred choice for the future of the current library building early next year.

The site has been included in a list of sites for housing development, and it is believed that the conversion of Pippbrook House and the redevelopment of the next-door council offices could lead to the creation of 120 homes.

Other Dorking sites which have been subject to the development discussion include the police station, the former Malthouse Pub in Mill Lane and the High Street's White Horse Hotel.

4. Westhumble Rail Bridge

The residents of Westhumble are concerned that the bridge over the railway line on Westhumble Street has a weight limit because it is a weak bridge that needs to be strengthened. This means that heavy vehicles including fire engines have to reach the village along narrow country lanes with the resultant delay in the event of a fire which could be a matter of life and death. However some heavy vehicles are reported to ignore the weight restriction with the resultant concerns that the bridge could collapse. When will the bridge at Westhumble be strengthened to resolve these problems and to overcome the delay in a fire engine reaching a fire at Westhumble?

Response from Highways

Boxhill and Burford Bridge is not in the current Bridge Strengthening programme, which covers the period up to 2012/13. It will be prioritised after that time. In the meantime, a weight restriction of 7.5 tonnes has been placed on the bridge pending reconstruction to prevent it being used by vehicles which may cause it damage.

5. St Martin's School – Pixham Annexe

St Martin's School in Dorking was significantly oversubscribed which has resulted in children from northeast Dorking and Pixham not obtaining places at the school for September 2010 and being allocated places at schools in surrounding villages. In view of this, can the decision to close the Pixham Annexe be reversed in order to retain more primary school places for children in the northeast of Dorking and Pixham, in other words, in the area where they are most needed?

Responses forwarded by the Local Education Officer from:

Jane Gorecka and James Masters Headteacher and Chair of Governors

"It is important to understand that the decision to close Pixham Annexe was made on educational grounds in response to the increase in numbers caused by the change in the year of transfer from village schools. This meant an additional 15 children will join the school in year 3 from September 2010 which has in turn led to the need to reconsider the class structure in the lower half of the school. The governing body concluded that consolidating the school on the Ranmore Road site is the optimum educational way of accommodating the increase in numbers and consequent changes in class structure.

We have focused on providing a class structure which ensures smooth transition through the school, which has previously been impossible to achieve. The Headteacher and the Governing Body have considered a wide range of issues at length, met with local residents and parents, and presented a plan that puts educational provision at the centre of its thinking. The roll at St. Martin's has already been expanded to accommodate 15 additional children in year 3 giving us two-form entry into KS2. Any further expansion in intake at the lower end of the school naturally works its way through the school as children progress. St. Martin's cannot accommodate a further increase in the roll - unless there is to be a major building programme providing additional classrooms throughout the school.

Given that primary provision in the Dorking area is broadly in line with demand this does not seem to be a sensible use of diminishing resources. It would also impact on demand for other primaries, notably St. John's, in which Surrey has made a significant financial and reputational investment."

Mark Burton, School Place Planning Manager for SCC:

"An outcome of the Dorking Review was to increase the number of places available in the Dorking area. The spaces are above the Audit Commission figure of 10% for an area. The Dorking primary planning area is larger than normal planning areas owing to the amount of movement of pupils between schools making it problematic to divide the area. There are sufficient Reception places in the area, but there are more applicants than places available at St Martins CE Dorking.

The project to be funded by the Primary Capital Programme (PCP) would enhance provision, to the benefit of children in the area served by the school. This is replacing the Pixham Annexe provision.

It would not be practical to provide more Reception places for children at the Pixham Annexe as this would require additional provision to be provided for higher year groups in the school. There is no funding for this. Moreover, this would further increase the number of surplus places in the area.

I hope that this fully addresses Councillor Watson's query. It would be helpful if all members of the Mole Valley Local Committee were aware of this response so that they are not misled into believing that the County has made insufficient provision of school places."

6. Clearway Signs

Highways has recently erected large Clearway signs on the A24 near residential properties in Mickleham which are obtrusive eyesores. There is also a gap in the enforceable Clearway on the A24 at Mickleham which needs to be changed to disallow parking. In view of this, when will the Clearway on the A24 at Mickleham be reviewed to remove the gap in the parking restriction and which would allow the removal of the large signs?

Response from Surrey Highways

The clearway signs have been reinstated so that the clearway complies with the original 1965 Traffic Order. This is necessary to enable enforcement by Surrey Police. The gap had to be left to comply with the original Traffic Order although it would be desirable to review the lengths of the clearways so that they take on board current usage of the A24 at Mickleham. It is not possible to say when such a review will be carried out since funds have not been provided for the work.

Question from District Councillor David Howell

It is understood that a parking review in Mole Valley is being undertaken. In previous reviews there has been proper consultation with local interest groups such as the Resident's Association, Local traders and all relevant local Councillors (District and County) to ensure that the proposals for consideration are a reasonable reflection of the views of the local community. This process does not appear to be being followed on this occasion and there is therefore a real risk that a number of local concerns will be overlooked. Why has the system, which worked well been dropped?

Response from Surrey County Council's Parking Team

Parking reviews are undertaken by experienced Officers who examine all implications. The county council welcomes comments from all members of the community at any time. These will be properly assessed at the next available parking review and reported back to committee as appropriate. Comments can be sent directly to the parking team through our website www.surreycc.gov.uk, by e-mail parking@surreycc.gov.uk, or by phoning 0300 200 1003. Before any new restrictions are introduced, there is also a statutory consultation period, which includes as a minimum advertising in the local paper and erecting street notices. Again, the county council welcomes all comments"



**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE
(MOLE VALLEY)**

**MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTIONS
(Supplement tabled)
18TH JUNE 2010**

The following questions were submitted in accordance with Standing Order 64.

Questions from Cllr Chris Hunt

1. Woodfield Lane

Ashtead is grateful for the rebuilt Woodfield Lane, especially as it was so smooth to start with. When some of Ashtead's Councillors questioned why, after the whole of the road had been resurfaced with a nice new smooth surface – except for the two brick-faced humps which serve as crossing points which were retained, why humps were going to be separately installed, we were told that the design of the new humps would be such that they would not go 'edge to edge', and so have a gap to allow rainwater to freely flow around them. Why then was the new road surface cut into from edge to edge and new humps installed which go from edge to edge, meaning that rainwater again ponds at the humps?

Secondly, during the construction phase it was clear that the temporary signage was ineffective. Whilst the signage at the top end, at The Street, was good, for the other feeder roads such as Meadow Road and The Marld, there was little if any signage and the result was that vehicles went right up to the barriers before realising that the road was closed, when they could easily have taken a diversion had earlier warning been given. The problem was exacerbated by the utility work - yet again being undertaken in Craddocks Avenue - which led to road chaos. What programme planning had been in place to so expertly coincide these major pieces of roadworks? Why was the signage inadequate?

2. Barnett Wood Lane

The ponding of water at the junction of Agates Lane and Barnett Wood Lane is now nearly one year old. Whilst the cause of this has been investigated, and Village Ward councillors are grateful for that, will the Highways department confirm that the problem awaits funds from the allowance given to the Ashtead Division County Councillor to solve it?

The water pooling around humps is continuing to be a problem, especially for pedestrians who get soaked as vehicles splash past. Is there any 'safe routes to schools' money or other sources of funding that may be used to cut ditches around the kerbside edges of the humps to allow water to flow past them and towards the road drains? Or could funding from the allowance given to the Ashted Division County Councillor help solve this problem?

RESPONSE FROM SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL TO FOLLOW

Cllr Hunt was invited to attend a meeting of the local Area Highways Forum at which his queries were addressed in full.

MVLC 18 June 2010



**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE
(MOLE VALLEY)**

PETITIONS

18TH JUNE 2010

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

Petition received on behalf of local residents from the Dorking Advertiser with in excess of 700 signatures as follows:

We, the undersigned, petition Surrey County Council to grit priority 2 Roads as often as they grit priority 1 roads.

Response from Surrey County Council's Asset Planning Team

The County Council is committed to reviewing the Winter Service Policy and operations following the 2009/10 season. We have received numerous requests for additional roads to be added to the priority 1 salting network across the county.

Currently the priority 2 network is only treated during severe weather and after the satisfactory completion of the priority 1 network. Providing a similar level of service for both the priority 1 and 2 networks would require greater stocks of de-icing material and an increase in the number of gritting vehicles.

Select Committees and Local Committees of the County Council are submitting information about the winter service for consideration in advance of final recommendations to Cabinet, scheduled for September.

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

Petition received on behalf of local residents from District Councillor Raj Haque with in excess of 100 signatures as follows:

Fetcham traders & residents are concerned about the lack of coordination and consultation, which is resulting in continual digging up by utility services of our paths and roads around Fetcham.

We therefore ask Surrey County Council to create and follow a process that not only consults with the traders, but which also coordinates the work undertaken by the utility services to minimise disruption and closure of Fetcham's footpaths and roads.

If you agree that there must be more co-ordination in the planning of such works and that traders in the vicinity should be consulted beforehand about timing and temporary arrangements to minimise disruption, please sign the petition below.

*This petition will be submitted to Surrey County Council. If you have any queries, please contact me by telephoning 07903 358358 or Email cllr.haque@molevalley.gov.uk
Councillor Raj Haque*

We, the undersigned, call for adequate co-ordination and consultation prior to carrying out work on underground services in Fetcham.

Response from Surrey County Council will be provided at the next meeting of the Local Committee on 13 September 2010.

1 April 2010

Dear Helyn,

I am writing in response to your letter, dated 3rd February 2010, regarding the access issues for Dorking Nursery School, that have arisen subsequent to the sale of the Old Fire Station in West Street, Dorking.

You will be pleased to know that a project is well underway to address parking at the nursery. This solution has been determined in consultation with the Nursery, the new owners of the Old Fire Station and neighbouring residents. Sixteen additional parking spaces will be provided adjacent to the west side of the Nursery. These will be available for use by Autumn 2010, subject to planning consent.

This additional parking means that significantly fewer parents and children will need to cross West Street to access the nursery.

Not only will this mean that a crossing is unnecessary, Highways have also advised that a crossing would increase traffic congestion.

I trust this response satisfies your concerns, but please do not hesitate to contact either Perry Stock, the officer responsible for this scheme, or myself should you require further dialogue.

Yours sincerely,

Mr Tim Hall

Cabinet Member for Corporate Services

Cc: Perry Stock, Area Development Manager
Cc: Sarah Rayner, Relationship Manager Schools

MVLC 18 June 2010