

**MINUTES:** of the meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee held at 18.00 on Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> June 2011 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**

- \* Councillor Chris Hunt
- \* Councillor Raj Haque
- \* Councillor Philip Harris
- Councillor Valerie Homewood
- \* Councillor David Howell
- \* Councillor Charles Yarwood
  
- \* Present

During the Open Forum preceding the meeting members of the public raised eight questions on different matters. The questions concerned the County Council policy proposing on-street car parking charges in certain areas of the district, road markings on the Dorking Deepdene roundabout, the Epsom Road cyclepath and the speed limit on the A24.

**PART ONE - IN PUBLIC**

01/11 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTIONS** [Item 1]

There were apologies for absence from Councillor Valerie Homewood and Councillor Helyn Clack.

02/11 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** [Item 2]

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

Councillor Hazel Watson declared an interest against item 12, as she was Chairman of Projx.

Councillor Yarwood declared an interest against Item 16 as he was a

member of the Charlwood Community Group

03/11 **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING HELD ON 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2011**  
[Item 3]

The minutes were agreed as a true record.

04/11 **PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS** [Item 4A]

- 1) Mr Fairweather asked if the County Council would consider implementing a trial scheme to prevent verge parking in Fetcham. The meeting heard that enforcement of any parking restrictions would be a key issue, and that often the most effective means to prevent verge parking would be to install physical barriers. It was pointed out that physical barriers might impede emergency vehicles in certain situations. Officers would look at finances to ascertain if a trial scheme would be viable. Councillor Hall offered to raise the matter for further discussion at the local Highways Forum.
- 2) Mr Seaward was represented at the meeting by Mr Anderson who asked what would be the scope and parameters of the on-street parking consultation; and when, where and how would it happen. The meeting heard that a paper with proposals from the Transport and Environment committee would be brought to committee in September that would launch the consultation. There would follow a statutory process of consultation with advertisements in local newspapers and street signs. Consultative work undertaken by community groups, letters and emails would be accepted. All local responses would be tabulated and brought back to the Local Committee meeting in December.
- 3) Mr Carroll asked if the process of a scheme that would reduce the speed limit on the A24 could be moved forward more rapidly. He also asked if existing speed enforcement could be improved. The meeting heard that previous proposals from the Local Committee relating to speed reduction on the A24 were currently being assessed by the county's Legal Department and officers would do their best to move the process forward. A further report would be brought to the Local Committee in September. Officers reported that Police partners were regularly patrolling the area in marked and unmarked vehicles and that they would be advised of Mr Carroll's comments.
- 4) Mr Miles asked if during the consultation period for on street parking county officers could attend meetings and receive the views of local residents associations. The meeting heard that officers would do their best to attend and that there would be liaison set up to facilitate this.

05/11 **MEMBER QUESTIONS** [Item 4B]

- 1) Three Members submitted questions: Councillor Chris Hunt, Councillor Hazel Watson and Councillor Stephen Cooksey.
- 2) Councillor Hunt was invited to liaise with Councillor Townsend and the Area Highways Manager with regard to two questions referring to the widening of Woodfield Lane and grass cutting on refuge collection days.
- 3) Councillor Watson asked if the damaged gateways on either side of the A25 on the eastern side of Westcott village could be replaced by the end of June. The committee heard that officers would consult with partners and contractors and come back to the councillor with a date.
- 4) Councillor Watson asked if width and height signs could be installed on Coldharbour Lane to prevent HGV lorries using the route and becoming stuck. The meeting heard that officers would commence a feasibility study.
- 5) Councillor Harris asked if a road crossing might be installed adjacent to the alley leading to Middlemead, Bookham following a recent road traffic accident. The meeting heard that there had been a longstanding debate over this proposal and previous feasibility work had failed to identify it as a suitable place for a crossing. Spend priorities had already been agreed for the current year based upon members priorities. The matter could be placed on the priority list for 2011/12 to be the subject of a further feasibility study should members advise officers and also subject to the advice of the Casualty Reduction Group.
- 6) Councillor Harris heard that the disabled parking bay outside the house of Mr and Mrs Kirby of Newenham Rd, Bookham would be completed by the end of June.
- 7) Councillor Stephen Cooksey heard that the matter of the nomination of a Vice Chairman to the Local Committee would be heard at Surrey County Council's full meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> June.

06/11 **PETITIONS** [Item 5]

One petition, submitted by Bookham Retail and Business Association, was formally received that related to Surrey County Council's proposed policy to implement on-street car parking charges in various places across the district.

A petition submitted by Ashted Conservatives on behalf of residents was withdrawn and would instead be submitted at the September meeting.

**RESPONSE TO PETITIONS** [Item 5]

The meeting heard that charges would ensure turnover outside of shopping areas and that the aim of the policy was to seek a balance between on and off-street car parking. All areas named under the

proposal will be revisited during the public consultation period.

**07/11 A PRESENTATION FROM MAY GURNEY [Item 6]**

The meeting heard how the service had been restructured and was operating under new contracts with new contractors and partners. In particular, a presentation was received from Mr Rob Semeganda of May Gurney. May Gurney was the new contractor covering highways work in Surrey. Councillors were pleased to note the progress being made under the new arrangements.

**08/11 HGV LICENCES [Item 10]**

- 1) This item was brought forward on the agenda on the advice of the Chairman
- 2) The meeting heard that all HGV's (over 3.5 tons and transporting goods) must operate via a licensed operating centre.
- 3) Although Surrey County Council was not an authorising body for HGV operating centres, it had a statutory right to object and took an active interest on behalf of residents where licences were being issued across the county. The issuing authority was the Vehicle and Operator Services Agency (VOSA).
- 4) The County Council might object to VOSA over the issue of an operators licence in Surrey if they had concerns over safety (where the operating centre joins the public highway); capacity of the site (impact on local communities and residents) and/or the environment (conservation matters).
- 5) Objections could be received prior to the issue of a licence and licences were reviewed every five years.
- 6) It was noted that a parish council does not have a statutory right to object, but could make representation if it owns land nearby.
- 7) Councillors could find more information at the webpage for VOSA to learn more:

<http://www.dft.gov.uk/vosa/onlineservices/operatorlicensingsearchfacilities/operatorlicensingsearchfacilities.htm>

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) NOTE:

- (i) There was now an established system in place for notifying and consulting Members of applications in their Divisions.
- (ii) Training for Members was carried out in September and November 2009. This was made available to all County

- Councillors.  
(iii) The contents of the Annual Information Report.

Reasons for Decisions:

The committee was content and welcomed the report.

9/11 **HIGHWAYS SCHEMES PROGRESS REPORT** (Item 7)

- 1) The meeting received a review of progress to identified and prioritised works and schemes going forward in collaboration with the Casualty Reduction Group.
- 2) Financial pathways were explained, including the additional government winter maintenance budget
- 3) The Highways team will be contacting councillors to be advised of priority projects to be undertaken using the revenue budget.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- 1) To note the report

Reasons for Decisions

The Local Committee was content to note the report and progress made.

10/11 **COMMUNITY PRIDE FUNDING** [Item 8]

1. The meeting heard that the new fund would offer more choice to councillors and communities.
2. Councillors opted not to formally pool the funding, but might seek to come to arrangements over individual schemes if appropriate.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- (i) Funding is devolved to each County Councillor based on an equitable allocation of £5,000 per division
- (ii) Individual Members allocate their funding based on the principles detailed in attached document.
- (iii) That Members should contact the Area Maintenance Engineer to discuss any specific requirements and arrange for the work activities to be managed on their behalf.

Reasons for Decisions

The Local Committee was content with the report.

11/11 **EPSOM ROAD, LEATHERHEAD CONSULTATION** [Item 9]

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- (i) No further consideration be given to the provision of a shared pedestrian and cycle path on the northern side of Epsom Road, Leatherhead:
- (ii) No further consideration be given to the provision of advisory cycle lanes in Epsom Road, Leatherhead; and
- (iii) The Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Divisional Member, Area Team Manager and County Cycling Officer develop a prioritised list of cycling schemes for Mole Valley, to include improvements to the Linden Pit Path/St John's Close advisory cycle route.

Reasons for Decision

The committee agreed with the recommendations of the report and approved the consultation process.

12/11 **TASK GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE** [Item 11]

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- (i) To approve the terms of reference template annexed to the report, to be used for all Local Committee task groups.

Reasons for Decisions

The Local Committee was content to approve the terms of reference for a further year.

13/11 **LOCAL PREVENTION FRAMEWORK** [Item 12]

- 1) The meeting heard that a workshop involving local key partners in Mole Valley had already been held on the 27<sup>th</sup> May and had drawn views regarding the needs of young people locally.
- 2) The committee was asked to agree to form a task group to work on the information gained from the workshop. The task group would comprise of two county members, two district members and two LSP members along with four young people representing the views of young people from the district. The task group would consider the output from the workshop and, with the assistance of officers, draw conclusions to feedback to the Local Committee.
- 3) The meeting heard that the process of selecting providers to meet the needs of young people had begun. Councillors asked what the

option would be if none of the preferred suppliers could meet the needs identified by the task group. The meeting heard that officers had undertaken lengthy and detailed research in order to identify a good range of suitable providers. All potential providers had passed through a robust pre-procurement process lead by the Transformation Board. However, in the event that none of the providers could meet the need locally then the research process could theoretically begin again until satisfactory, viable local provision was in place.

- 4) The meeting heard that the intention of the process was to commission outcomes and not a service. For this reason, the task group should present a clear picture of local need to present to providers. This picture was to include isolation, disability, drugs and alcohol use and school attendance.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- (i) To note the involvement of the Local Committee in the process outlined at Annexe B for the commissioning of local youth preventative services
- (ii) To establish a youth task group of four councillors, County Councillor Chris Townsend, County Councillor Hazel Watson, District Councillor Chris Hunt and District Councillor Raj Haque (the Youth Services Task Group) with terms of reference defined at Annexe C noting the amended wording: "The Task Group may also consult with other members of the Mole Valley Local Committee, appropriate agencies and other partners".
- (iii) To note that the cost of supporting centre based youth work delivered from centres not owned and operated by SCC may have to be met from the framework allocation during the first transitional year of the new arrangements

Reasons for Decisions:

The Local Committee was content with the report with the proviso that a change of wording is made to the Terms of Reference of the new task group (para (ii)).

14/11 **MOLE VALLEY LOCALISM PILOT UPDATE** [Item 13]

1. The meeting heard that currently there were no constitutional conflicts in agreeing the recommendations. Discussions were ongoing regarding future constitutional arrangements, which would facilitate continuing work on joint arrangements.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) NOTE:

- (i) Continued engagement with nominated Member Champions.
- (ii) Progress on individual projects

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- (i) an options appraisal report for Bull Hill, Leatherhead and Pippbrook, Dorking be brought to the September meeting
- (ii) that unallocated developers contributions as outlined in paragraph 2.1 (c) are passported to the Parish Council or an appropriately constituted community group for local spend; subject to agreement by the Mole Valley Executive and appropriate governance arrangements being established
- (iii) that community proposals for spend of developers' contributions be evaluated and where possible incorporated into an overall plan for spend of such monies.

Reasons for Decisions:

The Local Committee was content with the report.

15/11 **MOLE VALLEY PARTNERSHIPS NOMINATIONS AND DELEGATED POWERS** [Item 14]

1. Councillors were content with the recommendations of the report and approved retaining the existing nominations.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- (i) Nominate a County Councillor Chris Townsend to the Mole Valley Community Partnership.
- (ii) Nominate a County Councillor Clare Curran to the Mole Valley Community Safety Partnership.
- (iii) Agree the delegation of the allocation of the Surrey County Council Community Safety funding to the Community Partnerships Manager for use in accordance with the Community Safety Strategy for Mole Valley, in consultation with the County Councillor representative.
- (iv) Agree that the Community Partnership Manager manages



and authorises expenditure from the budget delegated to the Local Committee in accordance with the Local Committee's decision.

- (v) Note that the funding of £12,000 which is ring fenced for the use of the crime and disorder partnerships subject to Domestic Abuse outreach being provided, will be paid to the Surrey Community Safety Unit who are now managing and administering the funding to the Domestic Abuse Outreach providers in Mole Valley.

Reasons for Decisions:

The Local Committee was content with the report.

16/11

**LOCAL PROTOCOLS** [Item 15]

1. A discussion took place concerning the constitutional protocol that there be no debate over submitted petitions. It was concluded that local protocols could only include minor adjustments to suit local need.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

- (i) To the following Councillor suggested amendments applicable for the council year 2011/12:
  - a) Number of public questions received to be at the Chairman's discretion
  - b) Number of petitions received to be at the Chairman's discretion
  - c) The section of the meeting covering public questions and petitions not to exceed half an hour.
  - d) The agenda and timing of individual items will be managed so as to ensure the meeting does not exceed 3 hours in total;
- (ii) to make no further change to protocol and endorse the current arrangements for a further 12 months.

Reasons for Decisions:

The Local Committee was content to accept the member protocol suggestions (a-d) and to retain the existing protocols for a further 12 months.

17/11 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING** [Item 16]

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREE:

(i) To APPROVE **ONE** proposal from the Local Allocation funding.  
Details of the proposals as outlined in Annexe A [of the report]:

- £5,000 capital Evelyn Hall Management Committee, Abinger Common - Works to provide disabled access
- £4,000 revenue Norbury Park Wood Products (not for profit organisation)  
Housing and provision for new routing machine

(ii) To APPROVE **FIVE** bids that fell below the £1,000 threshold

- £1,000 capital Surrey Police Rural Crime Project
- £1,000 capital Betchworth Parish Council, village Hall power and water supply
- £1,000 revenue Charlwood & Hookwood Community Plan
- £450 revenue Bookham Residents Association, costings to cover a conference to discuss a new College of Further Education.
- £900 revenue Leatherhead Youth Project 'Flipside'  
Magazine production costs (tabled)

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 closed: 22:27 pm]**

---

Chairman