



## OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

### MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTIONS

03 MARCH 2011

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

#### **1. Question from County Councillor Clare Curran ( Bookham and Fetcham West)**

1. To be updated on the Dorking Road drainage scheme please - one of nine schemes agreed last September. It is noted with thanks that the Lower Road scheme in Bookham has been completed.
2. Also, there has been significant flooding in East Street/Lower Road , Bookham ('Squareabout'). Is this a recognised wet spot? If so, is it on the list of priority drainage schemes? If it is not on the list what are the prospects of having it included and if it were included what priority would be assigned to it?

#### **Response from SCC Highways**

- 1) Lower Road is substantially complete and site observations have shown it works to full effect. Some remedial works to replace surfacing materials, perceived to be sub-standard, may be required subject to the results of testing presently being conducted. Any repair works deemed necessary will only take a day or two to complete.  
Phase 1 of the Dorking Road scheme is presently in progress. Works have comprised rehabilitation of existing drainage connections and soak-aways. Work in progress comprises two new deep bored soak-aways at the junction of Guildford Road and Griffin Way; new gullies in Guildford Road to receive surface water; new gully connections and surface reprofiling in Broderick Grove to address ponding; a new footway gully and surfacing in Broderick

Grove to eradicate ponding; a new road table in the mouth of Griffin Way to prevent surface water entering the cul de sac.

Phase 2 of the Dorking Road scheme will take place between May 2011 and March 2012 and will look at means of intercepting surface water entering Dorking road from the carriageway and surrounding areas of Chapel Lane.

2. There are in excess of 500 sites countywide where a drainage issue has been identified. The solutions vary in scale and cost but, on average, the available budget allows us to address perhaps 10 or 12 each year. So that we may be assured we are dealing with the most urgent problems first, all sites are scored against the following criteria:

- social impact
- safety
- flooding of property
- duration water remains on the highway
- whether foul water remains on the highway
- level of community representation
- whether the problem has generated claims for damages against Surrey
- whether the problem affects an A road
- whether there may be engineering opportunities (whether the problem can be resolved by including it in a highway scheme)

Lower Road/East Street appears on the list of wetspots and has a score of 7; sites currently being addressed typically have scores between 70 and 80. The criteria met are social impact and duration. For the time being, officers are unable to predict when a drainage scheme may be funded to address this problem.

Members should note that, of the drainage schemes undertaken throughout Surrey's 11 districts and boroughs, Mole Valley has received two schemes during 2010/11 and will be receiving two schemes in 2011/12 (Dorking Road phase 2 and Deepdene Avenue).

## **2. Four Questions from County Councillor Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)**

1. Would the Chairman agree that the most appropriate way to undertake a major capital project, such as the Westcott to Dorking cycle route which is likely to cost more than £100,000, is to follow the County Officers recommendations as set out in reports to this Committee and to ensure that the work is properly assessed, specified, costed and planned before it is commissioned in order to avoid potential cost overruns and a waste of public money and that it is inappropriate for Cllr James Friend to seek to bounce the officers into taking specific actions whilst our officers have not completed their professional work and concluded, in their

professional view, the best way to proceed with the project. In short, will the Committee Chair back our officer's approach to this complex project as I do?

**Response from the Chairman of the Local Committee will be provided at the meeting**

2. When will the broken grit bin at the junction of Broadmoor with Sheephouse Lane at the top of a steep hill be replaced? This grit bin was damaged during the Winter of 2009/10 but despite repeated requests for it to be replaced remains broken and unusable half way down the hill and means that local residents are completely cut off during snow.
3. When will the broken grit bin in St John's Road at the junction with Furlong Road in Westcott be replaced, as it is important for making Furlong Road safe for traffic on the slope and the bend near to the junction with the A25?

**Response from SCC Highways**

This has been followed with Operations who have confirmed that the replacement grit bins are included on a schedule issued to Carillion and the programme should have commenced on Monday (28<sup>th</sup> February). With the grit bin at Broadmoor long over due and repeated request to replace we await a call to confirm commencement.

4. When will action be taken to resolve the longstanding and regular problem of flooding on the A25 just east of the Deepdene roundabout which is hazardous and floods private property?

**Response from SCC Highways**

There is currently no scheme on the Asset planning list which falls within the description given. The nearest recorded wet spot identified for capital funding is at the Dorking Roundabout (A25 j/w A24) which cites poorly functioning gullies as the problem. This scheme is at position 44 on the list of proposed schemes, which means at current funding level, it may receive attention in 4-5 years' time. Please see the answer to Question 1 (2) with regards the scoring criteria for the wetspot list.

Any drainage works deemed necessary, that do not feature on the wet spot list, will need funding from local revenue streams.

**3. Question from District Councillor Valerie Homewood ( Beare Green)**

At the meeting of this Committee held on 23rd September 2009 I submitted a written question asking if County Highways could examine the possibility of putting in place a lower speed limit on the A29 between Henhurst Cross Corner and the Beare Green roundabout. The current speed limit is 60 mph, but the 26 households who access this stretch of road find it difficult and dangerous to do so.

I also asked (at the same time) if as an interim measure Highways could examine the possibility of putting up signs saying 'Concealed Entrance' to warn approaching traffic at Wigmore on the S. side of the road and Smallborough on the N. side. In reply to my first question, County Highways responded that the request for a lower speed limit would be placed on the list for future review. The reply to my second question, in summary, was that 'Concealed Entrance' signs were not among those permitted by the Dept.of Transport for permanent use.

1. Where does this stretch of the A29 stand at present on the list for further speed limit review?
2. If residents of Smallburgh and Wigmore pay from their own pockets for 'Concealed Entrance' signs, would erecting these be illegal?

**Response from SCC Highways**

## Question 1

At the most recent Informal meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee it was decided to dedicate funding for the A24 Corridor speed management and officers will be investigating with the Members views to a reduction to 50 mph.

Officers will be bringing a report to the next Formal Mole Valley Local Committee on the 3 March seeking approval to start the investigations/consultation to implement any measures this financial year.

Once the investigation/consultation is completed we will bring a report back to the June Formal Committee.

## Question 2

The "Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002" is statutory document, prepared by the Department for Transport, which sets out what signs and markings may be displayed on the highway with precise details of wording and illustrations to be used. "Concealed entrance ahead" is not a prescribed sign, is not featured in the document and thus has no recognised format. If such a sign is to be considered, site-specific authorisation must be sought from the Department of Transport.

There are many instances of concealed entrances on Surrey's roads and a sign alerting drivers will only be considered in the most exceptional cases and if a safety issue has been established. If such a sign is to be considered, a business case must be presented to the Department of Transport but would not be a guarantee of receiving consent for placing a sign on site.

Setting a precedence for using signs on approaches to concealed entrances is to be avoided as their prevalence would quickly lead to them becoming completely disregarded by drivers rendering the signs valueless. Department for Transport legislation and the difficulties imposed for providing such signs, reflects this situation.

#### **4. Question from County Councillor Stephen Cooksey ( Dorking and Holmwoods)**

Some months ago the dates of meetings of the Mole Valley Local Committee for 2010-2011 were agreed and published. When dates of meetings are published members have always previously been able to take those as firm and organise other arrangements around them in order to ensure attendance.

In January 2011 members were informed that the meeting scheduled for 15th June 2011 could no longer be held on that day and that another date was required. It was later revealed that the reason for this was that the 3 other County Councillors had made other arrangements for that date which took priority over attending the Local Committee meeting.

An alternative date (22nd June 2011), when a number of County Councillors were available, was located and imposed on the rest of the committee by the Chairman. I had made arrangements to attend the committee on 15th June when that date was published and the Chairman was aware that it would be impossible for me to be available for a meeting on 22nd June.

In the light of the above would the Chairman indicate:

1. Why the date of the meeting had to be changed from the original published date in order to accommodate the requirements of the other County Councillors?
2. Why a date was chosen which the Chairman knew would be impossible for at least one County Councillor thereby ensuring that he would not be able to represent the views of his residents on important local issues?
3. Why it was not possible to find an alternative date on which all members can attend?
4. Why was the Chairman unwilling to seek an alternative date after the discussion that was held at the Informal meeting on 17th February when

it was clear that a number of other members took the view that this should be attempted?

5. Whether members can have any confidence in future published dates in the light of the Chairman's willingness to change dates to suit the requirements of members of her own party to the exclusion of other members?

#### **Response from SCC Local Partnership Team**

It was regrettable that a number of county councillors found diary conflicts for the Mole Valley Local Committee meeting that had been scheduled for the 15<sup>th</sup> June 2011. This resulted in the submission of a number of apologies and there was a danger that the committee may not be quorate. Therefore, with the consent of the Chairman, a new date was sought. The 22<sup>nd</sup> June was agreed in consultation with all members of the Local Committee and was finally selected as five out of the six county council members were able to attend and the Mole Valley District Council Chamber was available to us.

In the light of the comments received about conducting the meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup> June the Chairman has agreed that we might return to members with a suggestion for another alternative date and this is currently being explored.