

MINUTES: of the meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee held at 14.00 on Tuesday 7th December 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 Philip Harris
- * Cllr Valerie Homewood
- Cllr David Howell
- * Cllr Jean Pearson
- * Cllr Kathryn Westwood

- * Cllr James Friend (Subst.)

- * Present

During the Open Forum preceding the meeting five members of the public raised questions on different matters. The first two questions concerned the s106 expenditure on the Epsom Road/Knoll Roundabout scheme in Leatherhead; the third concerned the speed limit through Blackbrook; the fourth concerned the traffic streaming at Deepdene Roundabout and the final question concerned the speed limit on the A24 between Burford Bridge and Denbies.

PART ONE - IN PUBLIC

47/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

There were apologies for absence from Cllr Chris Hunt (Vice Chairman) who was substituted by Cllr James Friend and Cllr David Howell for whom no substitute member was present.

48/10 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** [Item 2]

County Councillors Clare Curran, Stephen Cooksey and Chris Townsend declared an interest in agenda items 13 and 14, as they are also members of Mole Valley District Council.

49/10 **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING HELD ON 13TH SEPTEMBER 2010**
[Item 3]

The minutes were agreed as a true record.

50/10 **PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS** [Item 4A]

- 1) The committee received three questions from Mr Ron Billard of the Mole Valley Cycling Forum. Mr Billard withdrew two of these questions from the agenda. Surrey Highways would consult with the Mole Valley Cycle Forum on future relevant schemes and it was agreed there was a desire for a closer working relationship between the two organisations.
- 2) Mr Fairweather was not present and therefore there were no follow up questions to the formal response he had received.
- 3) The matter of the speed limit in Blackbrook would be added to the committee's list of priority highways works. This list will be considered at the next informal meeting of the committee in February 2011. In addition, the Chairman agreed to write to the Leader of the County Council to request exceptional funds in order to implement a 30mph speed limit in Blackbrook.
- 4) As a supplementary question Cllr Caroline Salmon asked if the committee would support and fund a feasibility study to consider creating new cycle/footpaths along a given section of the A25. It was recommended that Cllr Salmon lobby her local county councillor to acquire support for this proposal. In addition, the committee would consider the matter at the next informal meeting in February 2011.
- 5) Two further questions relating to the Westcott-Dorking cyclepath were received and would receive formal responses after the meeting.

[Public questions attached at [Annexe A](#)]

51/10 **MEMBER QUESTIONS** [Item 4B]

- 1) Three Member questions were received. One from Cllr Tim Hall

and two from Cllr Hazel Watson

- 2) Cllr Hall queried the accuracy of the records relating to grit bin locations across the district. The meeting heard that certain problems had arisen because record keeping had moved from being district-wide to area-wide, but that these problems were being addressed.
- 3) Members expressed concern that there are instances where grit has been taken for personal use leaving none for the community and public places. It was noted that an essential message to local residents needed to be clearly relayed concerning the use of grit and grit bins for private drives and accesses.
- 4) The committee thanked council highways officers for their hard work during the recent period of severe weather.
- 5) It was confirmed that the highways scheme to reduce speed limits on the A25 Westcott to Dorking route and the B2209 Old London Road in Mickelham were scheduled to be completed within the current financial year.

[Member questions attached at Annexe B]

52/10 **PETITIONS** [Item 5]

The Local Committee received three petitions.

- 1) The Area Highways Manager apologised to the petitioners as the highways response to the petition regarding the speed limit on the A24 between Burford Bridge and Denbie's had been incorrect and a correction would be included in a report back to committee at the next formal meeting.
- 2) The matter of the speed limit on the A24 between Burford Bridge and Denbie's would be added to the committee's list of priority highways works. This list will be considered at the next informal meeting of the committee in February 2011. In addition, the Chairman agreed to write to the Leader of the County Council to request exceptional funds in order to implement a reduction of the speed limit on the A24 between Burford Bridge and Denbie's.
- 3) The Area Highways Manager advised the committee that since crossover permissions are issued within six weeks of application it would be challenging for the local committees to be involved in the process. It was further noted that new processes for planning were being issued by central Government that may have an influence on this matter.

- 4) The petition relating to the Westcott-Dorking Cyclepath would be responded to at the next formal meeting of the committee on 3rd March 2011

53/10 **ADULT SOCIAL CARE SERVICES REPORT** [Item 6]

The Senior Manager for the Mid-Surrey Adult Social Care Team presented an overview of the contents of the report.

- 1) The meeting heard that the Service is seeking greater engagement with local partners to ensure vulnerable adults needs are met, especially in the designated priority place areas. Members also stressed the needs of more isolated members of the community in the more rural areas of the district.
- 2) Adult Social care services are working in partnerships with many different agencies including the Alzheimer's Society; carers support groups and in particular Central Surrey Health. Members noted that partnerships could be extended to cooperate to a greater extent with churches, parish councils and residents associations
- 3) It was noted that confidentiality could be an obstacle to working in partnership but that ways should be sought to facilitate more effective collaboration.
- 4) Adult Social Care ran and managed the re-ablement service that supported clients on either side of a hospital stay which kept hospital in-patient stays shorter or prevented hospital admissions altogether and enabled clients to be treated in their own homes. Last year 93% of clients stayed in their own homes thus reducing the cost of care.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- (i) to note the contents of the report

Reasons for Decision

The Local Committee was content with the report.

54/10 COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP FEEDBACK [Item 7]

- 1) Cllr Townsend was the local committee representative to the Community Partnership for 2010-11.
- 2) Cllr Townsend reported that he had attended a Community Partnership networking event held on the 24th November. He said that the event had been successful with effective presentations. It had been a good opportunity for partners to dovetail and exchange views and information.
- 3) Cllr Curran was the local committee representative to the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) for 2010-11.
- 4) Cllr Curran reported that the CSP had held quarterly meetings at which progress tackling the area priorities had been discussed. The CSP supported youth projects and initiatives concerning domestic abuse, substance abuse and other anti-social behaviour. The CSP work through an agreed annual strategic assessment of the community safety priorities affecting the district and these priorities are represented through the daily work of the partners.
- 5) The committee heard that the formal report would be brought to the June formal meeting.

55/10 INTERNAL AUDIT REVIEW OF THE KNOLL ROUNDABOUT IMPROVEMENT SCHEME [Item 8]

The Chief Internal Auditor addressed the committee.

- 1) The committee heard that all of the management recommendations made in the audit report had been implemented by the 30th November 2010.
- 2) The costs of the additional works undertaken did reflect additional works completed. Additional works had been compared wherever possible to other contracts and costs so as to ensure that were fair. On occasion it had not been possible to find a direct comparison for certain elements of the work but meetings had been held with engineers to evaluate the work.
- 3) The committee had not been advised when works exceeded budget.
- 4) The minutes of the local committee meeting where works were agreed had not been explicit.
- 5) Members noted that many reports still came to committee with inadequate costing and project management plans.
- 6) The committee heard that discussions had been undertaken at all levels in the council to ensure this overspend would not be repeated and that lead officers are now in place to monitor and ensure that protocols are followed.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- 1) To note the contents and conclusions of the Internal Audit report and management's response; and
- 2) To task the Area Highways Manager with undertaking an informal consultation process with local people, organisations and businesses regarding the future use of the Epsom Road site and to report back with a proposal to the formal meeting in June 2011; and
- 3) To register their deep concern with Cabinet that protocols had not been followed during the fulfilment of the scheme and that any future schemes must have a fully costed project management plan in place before being brought before the local committee; and
- 4) To refer the Epsom Road scheme and the Internal Audit report to the Transport Select Committee and the Audit and Governance Committee.

Reasons for Decisions

Members welcomed the report, but found little to reassure them that the same situation could not arise again.

56/10 **SECTION 106 MONITORING, CONTROL AND ACCOUNTABILITY**
[Item 9]

- 1) The Principal Agreement Officer presented the report. The meeting heard that currently under the Planning Infrastructure Contribution (PIC) scheme s106 monies were tied to specific developments and were subject to contract. It was expected that in the near future central Government would be abolishing the PIC in favour of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The CIL would be used to support planned community development schemes. It was recommended that members and officers would need to work together to identify and plan to enhance and develop areas of need within the Mole Valley with the agreement of the Local Committee.
- 2) Members expressed their desire that the county council retain the CIL computer project as a priority matter.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- (i) To note the contents of the report; and

- (ii) The proposals contained in the Mole Valley Localism pilot as regards s106 monies be supported as the way forward in aligning and integrating s106 monies secured through development including active involvement of the Local Committee and members; and
- (iii) That the item remain a standing item for the Local Committee agenda

Reasons for Decisions

The Local Committee was concerned that expenditure using s106 contributions should demonstrate full accountability.

57/10 **HEADLEY ROAD CROSSING, LEATHERHEAD – PROPOSED SAFER CROSSING FACILITY OUTSIDE OF HEADLEY COURT [Item 10]**

The committee was unanimous in support for the scheme.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- 1) The safer crossing facility shown in Annexe A is progressed and implemented, subject to funding provided by the Ministry of Defence; and
- 2) the necessary statutory process required to enable construction of the scheme be carried out.

Reasons for Decision

The committee agreed it a worthy scheme.

58/10 **WESTCOTT TO DORKING CYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ROUTE PROPOSAL [Item 11]**

- 1) Additional papers were tabled by officers to illustrate the £26,000 expenditure which had completed the Milton Court to Milton Court Farm section of the route. This left £154,000 remaining from the original £180,000 budget.
- 2) £15,000 of this budget was earmarked to undertake footpath drainage work to the route this financial year.
- 3) Officers could not guarantee that the county council budget would still be available in the next financial year 2011/12.
- 4) Cllr Friend moved an amendment to the recommendation which

was seconded by Cllr Westwood.

- 5) The amendment was passed by majority vote.
- 6) The committee received a statement of support for the scheme from Sustrans.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- 1) To note the contents of the report; and
- 2) to welcome the solutions of the Bailey Road north end flood risk and requests that the implementation of the solutions be undertaken by 28 February 2011 so as to be in place prior to the spring rains season; and
- 3) to note that the Mole Cycle Forum understand that the cycle link section from Abinger to Shere is completed; and
- 4) request that the County Council immediately move to adopt the landowners agreed route for the cycleway, and move the footpath (FP111) up to the Hedgerow Line, as it represents the only route available without resorting to additional expense and to provide certainty to the landowner as to the future use of this land to ensure that the adoption of this route as the preferred route is completed by 28 February 2011; and
- 5) request that the County Council immediately reapply to Sustrans for funding for the cycle link and, given the considerable improvement that will be made to road traffic safety to the A25, assess the availability of s106 funding for highways and access improvements in the Dorking area in order to identify funds that would supplement the Sustrans funding.

Reasons for Decisions

Members agreed there was a need to move toward completion of the missing section of the cyclepath.

59/10

GRIFFIN WAY ENTRY TREATMENT COMPLEMENTARY MEASURES TO DORKING ROAD DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS

The committee was unanimous in support for the scheme.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- 1) A raised entry table is constructed within the headway of Griffin Way in accordance with Annexe A, subject to consultation; and

- 2) locally collected s106 monies are utilised to partly fund the entry table

60/10 **MOLE VALLEY LOCALISM PILOT** [Item 13]

The Strategic Director of Mole Valley District Council presented the report.

The meeting heard that six pilot project strands were being undertaken in Mole Valley. An officer and member team drawn from both the County and the District councils would serve on the six project groups. Nearly all of the project groups had had an initial meeting.

The accuracy of the paper presented was questioned, as the membership of the project groups was not correctly recorded. The paper will be updated and represented to the next formal committee for approval.

There followed a discussion around the scope and future means of involving other members who were not members of the Local Committee.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- (i) To note the contents of the report

Reasons for Decisions

The proposed new pilot was to deliver improvements in local partnership working and had demonstrated the clear leadership and commitment from both Councils.

61/10 **LEATHERHEAD TOWN CENTRE UPDATE** [ITEM 14]

The Mole Valley District Council Corporate Head of Service (Planning) presented the report.

- 1) The consultation process was described and it was recognised that traffic and parking were probably the biggest challenge to redesigning the town centre.
- 2) Another important issue was the attention to general maintenance and repairs.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- (i) The results of the public consultation should be fed back to the community and be made available on the District Council's web site and at the Help Shop in Leatherhead; and

- (ii) that a public exhibition should be held to summarise the results of the consultation and consult further on the next steps suggested by the consultation; and
- (iii) When considering these next steps, officers of both councils should investigate the following:
 - a) The arrangements for access to High Street/Church Street in the morning and late afternoon and its implications for the current Traffic Regulation Order; and
 - b) the arrangement for parking in High Street/Church Street during those times when it is permitted; and
 - c) The opportunities to enhance the barrier entrance and the environs of The Leatherhead Theatre in Church Street; and
 - d) the design and location of street furniture; and
 - e) the development of an action plan that will take forward ideas put forward during the public consultation to enhance the centre of Leatherhead and make it more attractive

Reasons for Decisions

The Local Committee was content with the report

LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING [Item 15]

62/10

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

To APPROVE eleven proposals from the Local Allocation funding. Details of the proposals are outlined in Annexe A [of the report]:

- £6,000 capital South Bookham YCA, security measures
- £2,752 revenue St Marys Church, archaeological investigation of churchyard
- £3,000 revenue Relate Mid Surrey, young people counselling sessions
- £1,140 capital Home-Start Mole Valley, computer equipment.

Members are also noted 5 bids that fell below the £1,000 threshold:

- £200 revenue Strood Green Shop Assoc., new food chiller
- £450 revenue Bookham Residents Association, winter flower baskets
- £550 revenue SCC Greville Primary School, children's garden
- £600 revenue SCC North Downs Primary School, supply mains water to staff room
- £950 revenue Bookham Residents Association, Christmas lights
- £500 revenue Goodwyns Residents Association, Christmas trip for local residents to London.

The additional proposal was tabled and APPROVED.

- £160 revenue Ashtead Tennis Club

Reasons for Decisions

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 Ended: 6.05 pm]

Chairman



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

PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS

07 DECEMBER 2010

The following question was submitted in accordance with Standing Order 66.

1. Question from Mr Ron Billard, Chairman of Mole Valley Cycling Forum

SCC recently created and then obliterated a cycle pathway in Epsom Road, Leatherhead, at a cost reported as £70,000 and with much adverse publicity. Would members please explain what steps they intend to take to ensure that proper consultation takes place in advance of such projects, between officers and recognised bodies of expertise within the voluntary sector? When, for example, will they arrange the reconvening of the East Surrey Cycle Forum, the last meeting of which took place on 27th April 2009?

It is noted that officers claim to be too busy to attend such meetings; would the members consider that one reason officers are too busy is that they are fully occupied rectifying failures caused by lack of proper consultation as required by their own codes of practice?

Response from SCC Highways Team

Consultation for roads and transport projects is intended to be based on a good practice guide published on the County council's website. The aims of the good practice guide are to :

- publish our broad principles of consultation and engagement when developing or delivering transport or work on Surrey's roads/highway.
- provide consistency on consultation and engagement for transport and roads work and activity across Surrey.

- keep relevant customers informed and for encouraging expression of views or ideas.

There are no agreed plans to reconvene the East Surrey Cycle Forum, but communications with cycling groups across the County will be kept under review.

2. Question from Mr Paul Fairweather, Chairman of Fetcham Residents Association

Will the Council please state how it intends to reduce its costs and potential liabilities and respond to residents' expressed concerns by extending enforcement of the existing verge-parking legislation to Fetcham?

Response from SCC Highways Team

Typically the most common method of preventing verge parking is to install posts or similar to act as a deterrent. This is relatively low cost and simple to install/maintain.

Waiting restriction can be installed if there is a safety issue, as these can be enforced to the highway boundary which includes the verge or footway behind the kerb. It is also possible to impose a restriction (or alternatively allow) on verge parking, however the signing required to do this is more onerous than installing waiting restrictions. Typically either of these methods would cost several thousand pounds and require regular enforcement to be effective.

Each location would be considered on its merits and the type of preventative measures prescribed would be dependent on the resources available and the scale of the problem.

Although verge parking is a problem in area's of the County there is no simple legislative solution available to the Council that would allow a wholesale ban on footway or verge parking without incurring significant costs in the placement of signs warning of the offence. Surrey Highways have discussed this problem with the DfT and will continue to seek a cost effective solution.

3. Question from WR Burdon, Resident and member of Blackbrook Speedwatch Team

In the light of the excessive speeds recorded by the Blackbrook Speedwatch team, will the County Council please urgently consider the reduction in speed limit from 40mph to 30mph in the most sensitive areas of Blackbrook Road?

Response from SCC Highways Team

Verbal response.

4. Question from Mole Valley District Councillor Caroline Salmon

For safety reasons, cyclists are using the southbound A24 footpath (rather than the road). Cycle usage has recently increased, especially since Surrey Highways recent flay back, which removed hazardous branches and undergrowth from beside the path throughout the Holmwoods Ward. However, this has left a potentially dangerous slippery surface in winter, due to grass growing over the path.

Following a report to this committee of October 2008 about turning this footpath into a dual use cyclable track, recently test patches have been cleared of the encroaching grass, thus proving the existing path's base to be up to 6 foot. This cleared width is adequate for a dual useage cycle and pedestrian path. All local organizations and the MV Cycle Forum are supporting the clearing of this path and making the southbound footpath into dual useage for both Cyclists and Pedestrians.

The intention is to do any work on this path at as low a cost as possible.

Would the committee be able to instigate appropriate action to make this path into a dual useage path for cyclists and pedestrians and can the committee suggest a process of how, once cleared of encroaching grass, the path might be maintained?

Response from SCC Cycling Team

As a need has been identified in terms of people wanting to cycle into Dorking alongside the A24 then Surrey County Council could propose providing a shared use footway on the east side of the A24 from the Holmwoods into Dorking.

In locations where there is very low pedestrian use a 6 feet (2 metre) wide shared footway, constructed to a standard whereby cyclists and pedestrians can use it easily and safely, is acceptable. If the Local Committee had agreed to support a proposal to convert the footway alongside the A24 into shared use the next step would be to undertake a feasibility study in order to identify the works (and costs) required to implement it and then to consult with affected organisations and individuals.

This would involve more than putting up signs and Surrey County Council has a duty to provide a good cycling (and therefore walking) surface and safe crossing points of access drives, minor roads etc. It would be hoped that the Mole Valley Cycle Forum could help in providing an appropriate design. A decision would need to be made where it would start and finish.

This work would require funding and we won't know the cost until completion of any feasibility study and the production of an outline design.

5. Question from Mr David Burton, Dorking resident and parent of children attending Westcott School

We have raised over 300 signatures of support for the Westcott - Dorking bike path in just 4 days. We have a "dream route" along the hedgerow line agreed in co-operation with the landowner, for free. We also have a bridlepath connection to Lince Lane (and hence the Westcott Sports Club), again with the goodwill of the landowner, again for free. If we build before next April (end of the financial year) we have a very high chance of getting the lost Sustrans funding (50% of the cost). SCC Officers say that the best time to build to minimise disruption to wildlife is in the dormant period - winter. Now.

The Hedgerow Route is the only one out of the other possibilities considered that meets all criteria. The other options seem to have major drawbacks. The Hedgerow Route, therefore, seems the only viable option. I have been informed that this is also the expressed opinion of the SCC Officer in charge.

SCC Officers estimate the cost at £24K (£12K with the Sustrans grant). We estimate the cost to the taxpayer of 'doing nothing' at £6-8K/year. It is as cost-effective to build as to not build.

There have been years of informal discussion and there are no objections of any seriousness or substance. (The flooding is now well understood and separate flood measures are well in hand).

A schoolchild was knocked down by a car on the A25 walking home from Dorking to Westcott yesterday.

What reasons can the Council give for not debating and approving this route as a matter of the utmost urgency?

Response from SCC Cycling Team

To be supplied

6. Question from Ms Lucy Lawrie, resident and local business person

In 2002 SCC carried out a Feasibility Study for a Westcott-Dorking cycle path. Seven years later, in December 2009, the Council were asked to agree to the cycle route. They did not agree to the route but did agree to further consultations with residents. In the year that has passed since this date there have been no formal consultations with residents. A flooding report was then commissioned and was due in April 2010. It finally appeared in September 2010. Our Councillor Hazel Watson says that she "has not yet determined...the route that [she] will support" because "it will be necessary to consult Westcott residents". There have been seven years of consultation now - what more is there to learn?

I have been a local resident all my life. Since this was first proposed, I have seen my older child go from Westcott to Ashcombe School (Year 7) and have had a younger child who is now in Year 3 at Westcott (Surrey Hills Primary). Every day that the Council procrastinates is another day that the children are forced to use

the A25. At this rate they will grow up and we will still be campaigning for this bike path for their children! There is landowner agreement, a "dream route", massive public support and no serious technical obstacles. There was even a grant to pay for half of it. The remaining cost is minimal - at approx £12K (with grant) - probably less than some Councillors annual expenses.

Why is this taking so long? Why is there no political will to see this completed? What sensible reasons can the Council possibly give for this cycle route having not been built yet?

Response from SCC Cycling Team

To be supplied



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

MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTIONS

07 DECEMBER 2010

The following questions were submitted in accordance with Standing Order 47.

Question from County Councillor Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East)

Grit Bins

The residents of Drayton Close and neighbouring parts of Badingham Drive are concerned about Grit Bins and would like answers to the following questions:

1. How many points under the County Council scheme would be needed to get a replacement grit bin at the junction of Badingham Drive and Drayton Close?
2. How many points did the site merit in the recent Officer review of the site?
3. Why was the previous Grit Bin at this site removed? By whom? And when?

Response from SCC Highways

1. There are no funds available for new grit bin locations this financial year and although the site has been scored against the provision of grit bins criteria no priority cut off point has been fixed for this year. Last year the priority cut off was 145 points.
2. 125 points.

3. Officers have no record of the grit bin being either in position or having been removed. On the grit bin records available dating back to 2006 this particular site was not listed.

In order for this site to progress alternative funding would be required to meet the cost of £2,500 which cover the supply of the grit bin filled with salt / grit mix, annual filling and maintenance of the grit bin for a ten year period.

Question from County Councillor Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)

At the September meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee it was agreed to fund and implement during the current financial year reduced speed limits on the A25 Dorking to Westcott and the B2209 Old London Road in Mickleham. What actions have been taken since the September meeting to implement these reduced speed limits and will they be implemented as agreed before 31 March 2011?

Response from SCC Highways

The A25 Dorking to Westcott speed reduction scheme has been designed and priced. The Speed Limit Order has been made. The scheme is on programme to be implemented this financial year.

The B2209 Old London Road, Mickleham speed reduction scheme has been designed but there is an issue with one location where the necessary signing cannot be provided due to land constraints. Officers are in contact with the Department of Transport (DoT) seeking special dispensation to permit only one sign to be provided at this location rather than the required two. Officers are also liaising with the Parish Council to investigate options for siting the second sign on private land, which would remove the need for DoT special dispensation. Officers are confident that this issue can be resolved and a price will then be sought for the works. The Speed Limit Order has been advertised and there were no objections. Once the sign issue has been resolved, the Order will be made. It is anticipated that this will be either later this month or early in January 2011. It is still the intention that the scheme will be implemented this financial year.

Question from County Councillor Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)

The Westcott to Dorking cycleway scheme costs are £180,000 and as the report on today's agenda shows a significant part of this budget has been spent on the improvement work to the existing public bridleway at Milton Court. A Conservative Party leaflet currently being circulated in Westcott claims that "dallying has led to this money being withdrawn." Can the Chairman of the Local Committee please explain how the whole of this budget can be withdrawn when a significant part of it has been spent on the purpose it has been set aside for and if no substantive answer can be given to this will the Chairman write to the District Councillor for

Westcott asking him to apologise to the residents of Westcott for circulating misleading information?

Response from SCC Highways

The section of route with existing cycle rights running along Milton Court Lane and Public Bridleways 110 and 112 has been upgraded, with improvements completed during 2009/10. The work included surfacing, drainage improvements and safety road markings at Milton Court (Unum). The funding for these works came from the Local Transportation Plan - Cycling Strategy. The cost was £26,000. Spending has also been carried out in recent years on several of the bridges over the Pippbrook. Although not included in the original scheme, this spending could be used as match-funding towards an amended Sustrans grant bid.

DRAFT MINUTES 07 DECEMBER 2010

ANNEXE C



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

PETITIONS

07 DECEMBER 2010

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

Petition 1

"We, the undersigned local residents and businesses do petition the Mole Valley Local Committee to resolve to reduce the speed limit on the A24/London Road between Denbies roundabout and the Burford Bridge Hotel roundabout to no more than 50mph. This reduction will make our community a safer place and reduce the danger to all road users."

Response from Surrey County Council's Highways Team

The Local Committee gave approval in June 2009 to advertise the necessary Traffic Regulation Order for a 60 mph limit on the A24 between Mickleham and Dorking, subject to comments from Surrey Police being favourable. The report to the Local Committee provided data that showed mean speeds on this section of road were not sufficiently low to meet the criteria associated with a 50 mph limit. The A24 north from Denbies roundabout is dual carriageway and the national speed limit applies throughout the section up to and beyond the Burford Bridge roundabout. Since the speed limit reduction requested by the petition is lower than recorded mean speeds, the recent review of the County's speed limit policy is pertinent. Minute number 196/10 from the Cabinet's meeting on 26 October 2010 states, inter alia, "A proposed new lower speed limit should only be introduced as an individual measure if it is likely to lead to lower speeds. Ideally, the new speed limit should bring average speeds down to a level

DRAFT MINUTES 07 DECEMBER 2010

ANNEXE C

approaching or below the proposed limit. A local committee may decide, exceptionally, to implement a speed limit which does not reduce speeds to a level approaching the new limit, although a new limit should always reduce average speeds. Where the Police object to the proposed speed limit reduction and the local officer also recommends against proceeding with the reduction without additional measures the decision should be endorsed by the Cabinet Member for Transport, having taken advice from officers and the Police. The local committee may find it useful to have a site visit of the road in question, to which the Cabinet Member should be invited." It is therefore proposed that a report on the merits of a 50 mph limit on A24 between Mickleham and Dorking be prepared for a future meeting of the Local Committee.

Petition 2

'In the light of the established case law giving local authorities extra scope outside the Highways Act 1980 to refuse vehicle crossovers (dropped kerbs) we the undersigned request that Surrey County Council withdraw the permission granted to the occupier of 38 Vincent Road to install a vehicle crossover and commence a proper consultation process with the residents of Vincent Road.'

Response from Surrey County Council's Highways Team

Proposed vehicle accessway at 38 Vincent Road Dorking:

In brief, approval has been granted for the vehicle crossover in line with the County Council's policy and approval process. This appeared to be a reasonably straightforward application. However, because there were no planning issues identified or planning application required at the time of application for the vehicle crossover, no consultation was required.

This has been challenged by those living nearby who feel they have not had the chance to put a case forward to object to the crossover. They have raised a petition to halt the process and prevent the work going ahead. The concerns raised are understood, however the access has been approved in accordance with county guidance and is due to be constructed within the next week or so.

Other issues are regarding the listed wall (which was not listed prior to application and is yet to be) have been raised, together with issues about the surface treatment within the new drive. None of these constitute a valid reason to prevent the already approved crossover from proceeding. It is understood that any works to the wall (gate posts etc) will be in matching materials and in character with the original wall construction.

DRAFT MINUTES 07 DECEMBER 2010

ANNEXE C

Surrey County Council has observed the requirements of s184 of the Highways Act 1980 . As well as the other considerations detailed in the County Council's guidance notes

S184 requires the County to consider the following issues:

1. The need to prevent damage to a footway or verge
2. The need to ensure as far as is practicable safe access to and egress from the premises
3. The need to facilitate, as far as is practicable, the passage of vehicular traffic in highways

This application raised no issues in terms of the above matters. Case law has established that the highway authority can look at other matters and the petition refers to the case of **R v Kensington and Chelsea ex p Eminian** July 19 2000 (unreported). In that case the Council refused a request for a crossover from the owner of a house within a controlled parking zone (CPZ) on the grounds that the construction would result in the loss of on-street residents' parking and thus have an adverse effect on the operation of the CPZ.

In the case of Vincent Road no such restrictions apply and officers' view is that this particular case is not a relevant consideration.

Bearing all this in mind, it is considered that there is no justification for withdrawing the approval that is currently in place.

Petition 3

From Westcott Safe Cycle Route Supporters.

We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to prioritise the quick completion of the unfinished safe cycle route between Westcott and Dorking in order to provide a direct, easy and practical route for those who need or want to travel without a car and who currently have to brave the hazardous section of the A25 to the east of Westcott, which is particularly dangerous for our vulnerable schoolchildren and nearly impossible for mobility scooters and parents with buggies.

This petition has not been received within 14 days and will receive a response at the next formal meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee.