

Supplementary Agenda

We welcome you to
Mole Valley Local Committee
Your Councillors, Your Community
and the Issues that Matter to You



Supplementary Agenda

Item 4 Public Written Questions

Item 5 Member Written Questions

Venue

Location: Council Chamber,
Pippbrook, Reigate Road, Dorking,
Surrey, RH4 1SJ

Date: Thursday, 20 January 2022

Time: 2.00 pm

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

4 PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS (Pages 3 - 8)

To receive any questions from Surrey County Council electors within the area in accordance with Standing Order 66.

5 MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTIONS (Pages 9 - 18)

To receive any written questions from Members under Standing Order 47.

Mole Valley Local Committee – 20 January 2022**Written Public Questions****Four questions received from John Moyer, Leatherhead Living**

Q1. Has Cycle parking provision been improved in Leatherhead High Street during the period of the temporary traffic order? Assuming the answer is no, are there plans for some additional cycle parking in place of on-street car parking and within the part-time pedestrian zone? Permanent cycle hangars or racks would serve the same purpose as planters in reducing the indiscriminate parking in the evenings.

Response

The installation of new cycle parking requires careful consideration due to many competing interests within the High Street, for example although there is no kerb line delineating the pavement or the road, the different surfaces within the High Street delineate areas for pedestrians, vehicles and areas for businesses to load and unload. Therefore, there are several areas within the High Street, that need to be kept clear of permanent street furniture such as cycle parking.

There are also a number of cafés/restaurants in the High Street that want to provide temporary tables and chairs outside their premises and would therefore not want permanent cycle parking outside their café/restaurant. The market area also needs to be kept reasonably clear to ensure that it is not obstructed by permanent cycle parking. Items of other street furniture have also been recently requested, which also need to be provided and their location carefully considered and agreed with all parties, including businesses. Due to the number of competing interests within the High Street, it is planned to have further community engagement on what could be possible at this location.

Q2. What Continuing Professional Development or briefing have (a) Local Highways engineers and (b) members of the Local Committee received on the Government's permanent changes to legislation and policy on active travel, promotion of walking and cycling, and the hierarchy of road users, changes to highway code etc.?

Response

Surrey County Council's new Transport Plan (LTP4), includes plans to reduce the 46% of carbon emissions currently generated by transport in Surrey and will supersede the previous Local Transport Plan (LTP3) following adoption sometime in early 2022. LTP4 proposes measures to increasing and improving walking and cycling routes to encourage people out of their cars, providing more charging points and parking for electric vehicles, more bus services, charging for transport use and introducing car clubs.

LTP4 has been developed through engagement with Surrey County Council officers, borough/district councillors and county councillors, including those on the Local Committee. In July 2021 a Member Development Meeting was held with county councillors to provide an overview of the draft Surrey Transport Plan that was out to public consultation.

When new guidance or policy, is published by central government, the new guidance/policy is freely downloadable from the Government's website and Surrey County Council ensures that all local/design highway engineers are aware of and have access to any new guidance or policy.

New central government guidance regarding cycle infrastructure design was published in July 2020, under Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20. All officers are aware of this design guidance and some officers have had formal training from those who have written and

contributed to the LTN 1/20 guidance and are “practitioners” of, or working towards, the Professional Certificate in Active Travel Planning and Design. The Department for Transport has also set up training for local authority officers on Cycle Infrastructure Design Standards which is being held in February, which Surrey’s highway design engineers will also attend. The following Member Development Sessions have taken place covering active travel/promotion of walking and cycling. All county councillors, including those on the Local Committee, were invited to attend these and recordings of the sessions together with slides are also available to CountyCouncillors on the Local Committee.

5 Jul 2021 – Enabling Greener Futures

26 Jul 2021 – Introduction to Surrey Transport Plan

2 Sept 2021 – Introduction to Healthy Streets

1 Nov 2021 – Active School Movement and Movement for Change

On 28 July 2020 central government launched consultation on proposed changes to the Highway Code, which includes the new hierarchy of road users, the consultation ran for 12 weeks and ended on 27 October 2020. The outcome of the consultation was released on 18 June 2021 and the changes are due to come into effect on 29 January 2022. The Highway Code provides information, advice, guidance and rules for all road users, therefore all road users should be aware of the changes made within the updated highway code, which will be available online once it is released.

Q3. If, as appears, the 'refurbishment' by SCC of the traffic signals at Station Road / Waterway Road, planned and funded for early 2022, is a like for like replacement of the signals controlling vehicle movement, without any enhancement for those walking, cycling or using wheelchairs, how is this compatible with strategy and policy, DfT LTN circular 1/20? Can the project be paused to incorporate this?

Response

The maintenance work on traffic signals, such as that on the Station Road/Waterway Road junction considers not only the replacement of the traffic signal heads themselves but also a review of the operation and timings of the signals. If necessary, it will also include the replacement of other traffic signal infrastructure at this junction such as, chamber covers, damaged underground ducting, electrical service pillars and other traffic signal equipment. If necessary mobile communications to the traffic signals will also be upgraded to improve their operation.

Any enhancements to the Station Road/Waterway Road traffic signal junction for pedestrian use, would require the installation of push button pedestrian crossing facilities. When installing such facilities on existing traffic signals, consideration needs to be given to the increased delay to vehicles, including cyclists, who would be using the carriageway at this point as there are no “off carriageway” cycle facilities at this junction. The increased delay to vehicles, following the installation of push button pedestrian crossing facilities at this junction, could lead to increased traffic congestion around the existing one-way system resulting in increased vehicle emissions and poor air quality. Therefore, any pedestrian/cycle enhancements at this junction would require detailed feasibility design, including traffic modelling of the one-way system to assess the impact that such enhancement would have on other junctions around the one-way system. Prior to any decision on the priority of such improvements being made to this junction.

Unfortunately, such detailed feasibility design cannot be funded from the maintenance budget which is being used to replace and improve the existing traffic signal equipment at the Station Road/Waterway Road junction. However, there are future plans to create an

enhanced walking/cycling route along the B2122 Waterway Road as part of Transform Leatherhead.

Q4. Is the design of the shared use pavement now about to be installed in Randalls Road compatible with the current DfT circular on segregation of walking and cycling and reduction in road space available to vehicles to make room for cycling? Also, will the junction of Randalls Way, the only one on the short route, be adjusted in favour of those walking and cycling to give them priority over vehicles? Again, can the scheme be paused if incompatible with current policy set out in 1/20 to capture some redesign to future proof it, rather than use a 2016 design? Have the consultants used on the SCC Active Travel bids and draft Transport Strategy been consulted - Living Streets etc, or local cycling stakeholders?

Response

The previously proposed shared use footway/cycleway did not align with the new guidance from central government regarding cycle infrastructure design, taking this into account as well as objections from residents during the consultation on this scheme, has meant that the shared footway/cycleway is no longer being progressed. However, the existing footway, which is very narrow in places, is to be widened to improve safety and provide an improved walking route between the junctions of Cleeve Road and Station Approach.

Question 5: from District Councillor Elizabeth Daly

Residents continue to express frustration and concern at the lack of effective action on speeding in Bookham, especially in hotspots such as Little Bookham Street/Church Road, East Street, The Lorne/Hawkwood Rise, Crabtree/Dawnay/Howard/Dorking Roads, Groveside/Dowlans Road, Downs Way, Woodlands Road, the traffic lights at Hylands garage (which is becoming a regular crash site), and many others; and about the lack of safe routes to school for young pedestrians and cyclists, whom motorists should not be passing at more than 20mph.

When will Surrey County Council start taking a strategic, whole-village approach to addressing these concerns, and start meeting its public equality duty and wellbeing/environment objectives - for example, by trialling 20mph speed limits in residential streets and outside schools, and promoting measurable improvements in active travel for people of all ages in Bookham?

Response

Excess vehicle speed can increase the risk of collisions and can make the consequences of any collisions much more severe. Speeding vehicles can also make places less pleasant to live in due to increased noise and pollution. The fear of road danger could deter more walking and cycling, too. Therefore, Surrey County Council works closely with Surrey police to create local speed management plans. This means that whenever there are concerns over speeding we will measure the speeds using a speed detection radar box. This is a black box mounted on street furniture for a week or so without anyone really knowing it is there or what it is doing. A week's worth of speed data is then used alongside data on the number of injury road collisions to determine the extent and nature of any speeding problem. This is then shared and discussed with the police to prioritise interventions at the sites that need the most attention, and in response to community concerns. Interventions might include Community Speed Watch, enforcement by the police using different methods, and where funding allows there may be opportunities to invest in vehicle activated signs, traffic calming or speed cameras.

With regards to the locations referred to, taking each in turn:

- Little Bookham Street/Church Road: Speeds were measured in June 2021 using a speed detection radar box mounted on lamp column number 18 on Little Bookham Street, and the mean average was recorded as 26mph. Another survey was conducted on lamp column number 28, and the mean average speed was recorded as 36mph. This shows that there are some stretches where the compliance with the speed limit is very good, and others where there is endemic speeding. Previously the police provided training and equipment to local Community Speed Watch volunteers. Through collaboration with Bookham Residents Association the county council is arranging for two vehicle activated signs to be installed. These will illuminate to remind drivers of the 30mph speed limit if they are travelling too fast and have been shown to help encourage greater compliance with the speed limit.
- East Street: Speeds were measured in June 2019, using a speed detection radar box mounted on lamp column number 2 and the mean average speed was 22mph northbound and 23mph southbound. This shows that the existing speeds are well within the existing 30mph speed limit. It would also be possible to introduce a new lower speed limit of 20mph using signs alone.
- The Lorne, Hawkwood Rise, Crabtree Road, Dawnay Road, Howard Road, Dorking Roads, Groveside, Dowlans Road, Downs Way, Woodlands Road: Speed data has not previously been collected for these roads, but we will add them to our list for investigation.

Officers have checked the county council's database of personal injury collisions recorded by the police for the traffic signal junction between the A246 Leatherhead Road and Eastwick Road where Hylands Garage is located. This shows that there have been three collisions resulting in slight injury to car occupants in the last three years. There may be other collisions resulting in damage only (without injury), but these are not necessarily reported or systematically recorded by the police, so we don't hold any information on them. Although any one collision is one too many, this does not represent a very large number and pattern of collisions that the council would prioritise for safety improvements as there are many other locations with a greater and potentially solvable problem. Summary data on injury collisions can be viewed via www.crashmap.co.uk.

Mole Valley Local Committee has already trialled the implementation of 20mph schemes in the vicinity of schools. For example, several years ago a lower advisory 20mph speed limit was implemented on Bell Lane, The Street and School Lane in the vicinity of Fetcham Village Infant School and Oakfield Junior School. This used flashing wig wags and advised "20 when lights show" during the school journey times. It was found that this signed only scheme had negligible impact on speeds. Therefore, in more recent years a permanent 20mph scheme with supporting traffic calming has been implemented and has been much more successful at reducing speeds near the schools.

Within Surrey a budget for highway improvements is delegated to each local committee. Implementing successful 20mph schemes in residential and busy shopping areas would help reduce the risk of collisions and support more active travel. Where existing mean average speeds are above 24mph additional supporting measures (e.g. traffic calming) would be required to get the speeds down successfully; however, there are likely to be many roads where a 20mph speed limit would be possible without the need for traffic calming. It is for local members to decide how to prioritise their local highway budget, and 20mph schemes can form part of that. There have been a number of signed-only 20mph schemes across Surrey in recent years, including Reigate Town Centre, and a number of residential roads in Guildford Town Centre, to name just two.

Question 6: from District Councillor Elizabeth Daly

Proctor Gardens is one of a number of roads in the Bookham/Fetcham area with dipped sections which flood every time there is heavy rain, in this case because the number, size and location of drains are inadequate to cope with water flowing down from Eastwick Road and Candy Croft, notwithstanding periodic drain-clearing measures.

How satisfied is the Council that there is adequate capacity in the Bookham/Fetcham area to cope with surplus rainwater, and, following the work near the squareabout, is there any hope we can offer to residents that the design problems with other roads, such as Proctor Gardens, can be fixed?

Response

The council believes that the road drainage capacity in the area mentioned is sufficient to maintain road safety in periods of normal and heavy rainfall. The road drainage network is, however, only designed to drain water from the carriageway itself and not surface water runoff from surrounding areas and urban development. Highway drains and other watercourses often become vulnerable to flood risk in severe storms which may exceed their designed capacity. Local development leading to a reduction in permeable surfaces will often also contribute to increased surface water entering the road drainage network.

Surrey County Council has no input or comment to any changes or housing development below 10 properties or the block paving and lowering of curbs as examples. These changes are subject to assessment and approval from the local borough council, in the case Mole Valley District Council. Investigations by the SCC Flood and Climate Resilience Team are however showing that these applications and changes to Surrey towns and villages appear to show a highlighted flood risk to local communities.

Proctor Gardens has a wetspot on the eastern end of the access road with a prioritisation score of 100. This means that this wetspot is not currently prioritised above other locations for a drainage scheme, but could prioritise for further investigation work when resource could be available and prioritised. The highway drainage gullies in Proctor Gardens were cleaned in November 2021 and of the 20 gullies 16 were successfully cleaned and proved running with 4 not being cleaned due to being parked over by cars. This road is currently on a lower risk biennial cleaning cycle and the gullies are next planned for cyclical cleaning in November 2022. The soakaways, that form an integral part of the highway drainage system, were successfully cleaned in November 2020.

Further details about wetspots and prioritisation of drainage scheme works can be found on our website via this link:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/report-a-highway-problem/drainage-and-flooding/flooding-and-wetspots>

Question 7: from Monica Weller

What Active Travel initiatives is Surrey County Council currently pursuing in Great and Little Bookham?

Response

Currently there are no Active Travel Initiatives being pursued in Great and Little Bookham. In addition to prioritised specific Active Travel bids, the approach taken to support walking and cycling networks is through the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs). Surrey County Council is collaborating with Boroughs and Districts and the intention is to have LCWIPs developed to provide countywide coverage, and ready for taking priority schemes forward to delivery subject to funding streams availability. The infrastructure plans enable a long-term approach to developing local cycling and walking networks, ideally over a

10-year period, and form a vital part of the Government's strategy to increase the number of trips made on foot or by cycle. Further detailed information and guidance on the LCWIP process can be found on the DfT website using the link here:

[https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-cycling-and\[1\]walking-infrastructure-plans-technical-guidance-and-tools](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-cycling-and[1]walking-infrastructure-plans-technical-guidance-and-tools)

The initial Mole Valley LCWIP Project meeting was held last week. First stage LCWIP output report is due around July/August, to then move into feasibility stage which should be completed by the end of the year. We should then be in a position to publish the LCWIP for Mole Valley in Spring 2023.

The active travel list is awaiting funding, which is likely to be a lesser priority to the funding for LCWIPs.

Mole Valley Local Committee – 20 January 2022

Written Member Questions

Question 1: from District Councillor Caroline Salmon

On 14 December, just days after a major paint job was put on the road at the Mill Road/A24 South Holmwood turning, there was a three-car accident on the Southbound side of the A24. On installation, comments from residents on social media had immediately warned this work made the turning more rather than less dangerous, with many saying it was confusing.

Taking into account that Police were in attendance at this accident where this new work may or may not have contributed to the accident, can Surrey Highways say what did occur?

Are they now considering closing this dangerous turning and enhancing the cross-overs at Folly Lane to the Southbound side and South Holmwood turning onto the Northbound side (effectively making a very long roundabout with reasonable sight lines at both cross-overs) to finally solve the problem and safely accommodate the additional traffic?

Response

At the beginning of December 2021, a scheme was implemented to lay road markings in the gap in the central reservation of the A24 Horsham Road, South Holmwood at the junction with Mill Lane. This scheme was in response to concerns that had been expressed about road safety for vehicles turning right in to and out of Mill Road. These new road markings are intended to make it clearer to drivers where to position their vehicles in the gap in the central reservation when turning right into and out of Mill Road.

During the design process for this scheme, three feasibility options were considered as follows:

- Option 1 No right turns into and out of Mill Road no U turns, close gap by laying additional kerbs
- Option 2 No U turns, right turns into and out of Mill Road still permitted, changes to kerb lines and road markings in gap
- Option 3 Right turns in and out of Mill Road and U turns still permitted, lay road markings in gap to advise drivers where to be

These options were subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) carried out by road safety professionals in the County Council's Safety Engineering Team, who are independent of the scheme. This RSA raised legitimate safety concerns about closing the gap in the central reservation completely and also banning U turns which are summarised as follows.

- **Right turning vehicles into and out of Mill Road.** If the gap is closed northbound vehicles wanting to turn right on to Mill Road will need to go to the next gap, wait to turn into southbound lane, get into inside lane on the Southbound carriageway and then turn left into Mill Road. Vehicles turning out of Mill Road to go north, will need to turn into the southbound lane, get into outside lane, enter gap and wait before turning into the northbound lane. This means that drivers need to change from one lane to another over a relatively short distance, and it puts right turning drivers both into and out of Mill Road into an increased risk of conflict compared with the current situation.

- It is not clear if the length of deceleration lanes at the gaps both north and south of Mill Road are long enough to accommodate all traffic that wishes to U turn in them. If they are not there is a risk that traffic queuing at busy periods may need to queue in the outside lane of the A24 with the increased potential for collision particularly after dark.
- The visibility at the gaps north and south of Mill Road is restricted due to the horizontal and vertical alignment of the carriageway, therefore U turning drivers who will be initially travelling at slow speeds are at increased risk of conflict due to the restricted visibility.
- Some large vehicles U turning at the gap north of Mill Road are unable to complete the turn without overrunning the eastern verge and shared footway of the A24. Such manoeuvres are likely to be carried out at slow speeds with the increased risk of conflict with southbound traffic.
- If U turns are banned some northbound drivers may turn right into Mill Road and turn there with the increased risk of conflict with drivers on Mill Road.

For these reasons, it was decided to proceed with Option 3, by laying road markings in the gap of the central reservation to clarify to drivers where to position themselves when turning right into and out of Mill Lane. Detailed design was carried out, along with a second RSA. The Police were consulted and were in support of the new markings.

Surrey Highways are aware of the collision that took place on the A24 Horsham Road at the junction with Mill Road on 14 December 2021. Officers are not able to comment on the circumstances of the collision, which is the subject of ongoing investigation by the Police.

Concerns have been raised by the Holmwood Parish Council and some road users about the design of the new road markings. It is proposed to carry out a Stage 3 post construction RSA. The site visit for this audit will be attended by Officers from the Safety Engineering Team, Highway Engineers and Surrey Police. The concerns raised about the new road markings will be discussed at that site visit. Should the stage 3 RSA recommend any changes to the road markings then they will be made in due course.

Question 2: from District Councillor Caroline Salmon

Lack of regular highways maintenance is a problem across Mole Valley, but it is worst linked to the A24 South of Dorking, although the footpath between Wooton and Westcott is almost unwalkable!

We have fast roads and footpaths beside them where grass and vegetation intrudes, making paths narrower than they could be and grass breaking up the tarmac below. Southern Villages linking roads often don't have any paths at all, and those we do have now suffer neglected surfaces. All need topping and made flat to walk on to help people visually impaired or for those who use mobility bikes. The last small pot of footpath money seemed to be used to top paths that by rural standards were already reasonable!

Our paths are often breaking up, plants grow in from the sides making them narrower than they should be and they rarely get swept regularly. You can pass footpath sweeping back to me as the portfolio holder in Mole Valley, but the contract arranged before my appointment (specifically to save money), is flawed as far as schedules of regular work are concerned. It also somewhat skirted over responsibility of paths beside main roads! However, if Surrey

agreed to do what it should be doing to the surfaces and vegetation, then perhaps we could get JWS to link better into essential maintenance sweeping works.

A good example of poor maintenance is the dual use "cycle" path from Spook Hill in South Holmwood to Beare Green. The footpath was flayed in December, but that only made it safe for anyone to cycle along it without 20:20 eyesight being hit by a branch, better than nothing, but the surface now needs work. NO surface maintenance or sweeping has been done since it was scraped back about 6 years ago. Grass has growing back, breaking up the tarmac topping and making a problem that needs solving, or at least putting onto a list to solve.

As the cycle path uses the South Holmwood Subway, over Christmas I had a look at it and was appalled by its filthy state. I then came home and cleared the brambles in the Beare Green subway, as I know no-one else has time to do it that quickly or as well, and the drapes of brambles had got worse in the last few months so were dangerous to people with eye problems or buggies! I know that there are 5 subways from Dorking Station there are 5 along the A24, and having looked at them recently, all need regular maintenance they are not getting.

Once upon a time there was supposed to be a schedule of works set up to improve all the A24 SurreyCC subways - What happened to it?
Surrey CC is failing to maintain our footpaths and subways south of Dorking to even a reasonable standard - has to stop?

What plan or process can be put in place to make maintenance work of our footpaths/cycle tracks and subways a priority, that can be regularly monitored by our Local Committee?

Without a plan to do regular maintenance to our footpaths and subways we can only continue to fail our residents especially those with poor sight and wanting to walk and cycle. After all the problems of 2021 can we initiate something positive for 2022 and beyond.

Response

Pavements have highway safety inspections on a regular basis and any defects that meet the intervention criteria are repaired in accordance with our policies. Further details about those policies can be found on our website via this link: [Highway Safety Inspections - standards and procedures - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](#). Sometimes there are requests for works on paths that do not meet the safety criteria. There are more requests for this type of work than it is possible to deliver in any given year, and these requests are prioritised for the funding available. Where requests are not affordable from the budgets available to the County Councillors on the Local Committee, residents may choose to carry out works under the Community Highways Volunteering scheme. Further details of this can be found on our website via this link: [Community Highways Volunteering - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](#). Community Leaders often work with resident groups to encourage coming together to improve the appearance of a local subway or a stretch of path and carry out some regular vegetation clearance work.

Maintenance work was carried out to the paths next to the A24 and to the subways, in previous years, and funded by the delegated and prioritised budgets available to the Local Committee at the time. The progress on this was reported through the Local Committee tracker. The Stakeholder Engagement Officer will be contacting each County Councillor to discuss the choice and priority of works that could be carried out from the delegated budget available for the next financial year. Members can track planned strategic maintenance using the online self-serve functions and details of this can be found on our website via the link here: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/report-a-highway-problem>. The best way to raise individual specific issues is to contact SCC

Highways directly through the website, or alternatively via email at highways@surreycc.gov.uk or via telephone.

Question 3: from County Councillor Hazel Watson

Directional Sign – A24, Approach to the Givons Grove Roundabout

At the Local Committee on 29 September 2021 the response to a Question on the reinstatement of the first main directional sign on the A24 southbound approach to the Givons Grove Roundabout, the reinstatement of which was initially reported to County Highways as damaged (partially missing) in March 2020 (Reference: 1528477) with a request made for the sign to be reinstated, stated:

It is appreciated that it has taken longer than usual to arrange for this direction sign to be replaced. This has been due to several factors, outside of the KPI process, including supply difficulties for specialist support clips for the new sign. The sign is on passive type posts, because of the speed and nature of the road, and specialist clips are needed to attach the sign to these posts. The sign work has been chased, and although the replacement sign has been delivered there is still a supply difficulty for the clips to attach the sign to the passive posts. The contractor made an initial visit to the site on 20 September, however, the work has been delayed due to the clip supply difficulties. The sign installation will take place as soon as is possible once the specialist clips have been delivered. The Principal Maintenance Engineer will inform County Councillor Hazel Watson when the replacement sign has been installed.

Can an update be given on why the sign has still not been reinstated and whether the specialist support clips have now been sourced. If not, would it not be more appropriate for the County Council to install a traditional sign which did not need these specialist support clips similar to the second directional sign about 100m further along the road?

Response

It has not been possible to complete the repair of the sign. The Principal Maintenance Engineer will inform the County Councillor when this work is completed.

Question 4: from County Councillor Hazel Watson

Deepdene Roundabout – Flooding

Significant flooding occurs on the A25 eastbound approach to the Deepdene Roundabout whenever it rains despite significant work having been carried out only a few years ago to replace a collapsed drain at this point in the network. Even in moderate rainfall the resultant flooding can cover the whole of the eastbound lane of the road, the grass verge, and the whole width of the pavement as demonstrated in photographs supplied to County Highways.

The response received in February 2021 on raising this issue (Highways Reference 1783130) stated *This gully has now been inspected and it has been decided that further investigation is required by a jetting machine to identify any issues. It has been added to the gully investigation programme for Mole Valley, this work is completed in priority order based around highway safety* and the follow-up response received in November 2021 stated (Highways Reference 2061415) *This location is due for cyclical clean this month. It has also been identified for further investigation. Unfortunately this has not been a priority site as locations with internal and external flooding have taken priority. Once the new Maintenance Engineer who will cover the area has been employed I will highlight this with them.*

This is an increasingly problematic issue with the flooding covering both the whole of the eastbound carriageway and the adjacent pavement. Can a commitment now be given as to

when this flooding will be resolved and a firm date set which can be provided to residents who increasingly feel let down by the apparent inaction in response to this reported issue?

Response

Deepdene roundabout has been added to the prioritised list to carry out a full CCTV investigation and cleaning in the next financial year. This could be subject to prioritisation changes if an urgent flooding issue may occur elsewhere. The investigation is required to confirm the best longer-term solution.

In the interim, any highway flooding could be reported directly to us, and an urgent response crew could attend as required.

Question 5: from County Councillor Hazel Watson

A24 Leatherhead By-Pass

On 28 August 2021 I was advised, in relation to the resurfacing of the A24 Leatherhead By-Pass between the Beaverbrook and Givons Grove Roundabouts, that:

Unfortunately due to rain showers over the weekend the planned surface dressing on A24 By-pass Road, Leatherhead could not be completed. The engineering team have been working with Streetworks to see if there would be an alternative time to complete these works however for a variety of reasons this is not going to be possible. This includes lack of crew availability, falling temperatures meaning more likelihood of the surface treatment failing and prohibitive costs for overnight working.

For these reasons the team have decided to cancel the surface dressing scheme on A24 By-pass Road. The Asset Policy & Programme team have advised that they will continue to monitor the road taking a view on deterioration and consider options in line with those previously discussed with you.

The road surface has continued to deteriorate since August and is now in need of even more work than that which was planned for August 2021.

Can confirmation be given that the planned work and the additional work that will now be required is included in the plans for Summer 2022 and that the necessary work will be carried out this year?

Response

The surface treatment works planned for A24 By-pass Road have been rescheduled for next financial year (2022/23). As you have pointed out these works were scheduled to take place over the summer this year, but these could not happen for a few different reasons. The main ones being weather and roadspace availability. As you will be aware, those stretches of road are very busy, and as such the Streetworks team requested that these works were completed on a Sunday when traffic volumes are lowest. This was therefore scheduled for 15 and then 22 August, however due to poor weather works could not be completed on either of these dates.

The surface treatment planned for this stretch of road requires warm dry weather to be completed, otherwise it is likely to fail which will mean further works would be required. The decision was taken to postpone the works until next summer to give the treatment the best chance of success.

Following this decision, the Asset Policy & Programme team advised that they will continue to monitor the road taking a view on deterioration and consider appropriate options for its maintenance and repair next financial year.

For up to date information about the Horizon maintenance programmes is available on the interactive map via this link <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/horizon-highway-maintenance-investment-programme>

Question 6: from County Councillor Hazel Watson

Mickleham Bends Signage

There is a missing sign on the A24 Southbound carriageway close to the junction with Swanworth lane where the road changes from one lane to two lanes. This was reported on 6 July 2021 (Highways Reference 1947720) and the response received was:

The larger post that had another post lying on the ground nearby, should be a double-post sign to advise drivers that the single lane splits to become two lanes. I have raised a job to have these posts renewed and the sign reinstated under reference SCM-1054964 on WMS.

Can an update please be given on the reinstatement of this sign together with a confirmed date when the replacement sign will be installed?

Response

These works are awaiting the required permits to be able to be carried out safely. The Principle Maintenance Engineer will liaise directly with the councillor on the progress of these works.

Question 7: from County Councillor Tim Hall

Could we be told which roads and pavements have been cleared by Amey and their sub-contractors as part of the additional Leaf Clearance Cleaning in Autumn/Winter 2021/22 in Mole Valley?

Response

The street cleaning contract with Amey is output-based, which means that Amey can allocate their resources as needed to ensure they meet the performance indicators as set out in the contract.

During leafing season Amey would normally bring in additional resource to assist the crew and as part of this, during leafing in 2021, a sub-contractor, Go-Plant was brought in to assist. Go-Plant was assigned specific roads to clean, and these roads were ring-fenced to their crews only. This allowed the normal Amey street cleaning crews and mechanical sweepers to focus on other roads, ie public highways which comes under the street cleaning contract in the district including any street cleaning requests received from members of the public.

The list which was provided covered only roads which had been ring-fenced for Go-Plant and did not include those which the normal Amey crews and sweepers are required to attend

We are unable to provide a list of roads that Amey's crews visited during leafing as the current Amey system is not one which allows this level of reporting; however, I can confirm that we worked with Amey to flag any leafy roads which required attention. We are continuing to raise any roads which have either been brought to our attention or we have found to be below standard as part of our site visits when out and about in the district.

Question 8: from District Councillor Paul Kennedy

Natural England is currently engaging with residents and stakeholders on a possible extension of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which covers much of Mole Valley.

As a key stakeholder, would Surrey County Council support an extension of the Surrey Hills AONB northwards to include Bookham Common and round to include the beautiful and sensitive areas around the River Mole between Fetcham and Leatherhead?

Response

The AONB Boundary review is at the evidence-gathering stage until 31st January and we would encourage Cllr Kennedy to submit his evidence to the Review - details are on this link <https://www.surrey-hills-aonb-boundary-review.org/review>. Surrey County Council is not in a position to support or otherwise any particular additions to the AONB until the evidence has been gathered and analysed and the proposed changes set out.

Question 9: from District Councillor Paul Kennedy

Given the recent Commons report about pollution in Britain's rivers, and the refusal of MPs to back tougher rules against sewage discharge by water companies, what assessment has Surrey County Council made of the state of the River Mole and what steps is it taking to address the sources of river pollution for which it has responsibility in Mole Valley?

Response

The responsibilities for river water quality lie outside the remit of Surrey County Council. The Environment Agency (EA) carries out water quality assessments of the waterbodies across England including its rivers and regulates discharge licenses of wastewater to those waterbodies. It works closely with water companies to ensure that they are closely monitoring and reporting back on their discharge activity. Water quality measurements are regularly carried out within the EA sampling regime and the data published, with chemical or biological results above the thresholds of the discharge permits investigated. Sampling data is available here; <https://environment.data.gov.uk/water-quality/view/landing>

Individual Water Companies would each have their own business continuity arrangements and licenses to ensure that they stay within the agreed discharge limits from the EA. A simple tool to help residents find the water companies for each area is available here www.dwi.gov.uk/consumers/find-your-local-water-company/. The www.discoverwater.co.uk/ website has good interactive data provision on the issues raised in this question.

Surrey County Council (SCC), as it has no specific remit for water quality monitoring, has not specifically asked the EA for an assessment of water quality for any of the rivers within its borders. However, individual teams and officers do work closely with EA on local issues and particularly with the Catchment Partnerships. The catchment partners are multiagency groups designed to help waterbodies achieve good status under the Water Framework Directive. The objectives and action plan for the River Mole can be found here; <https://surreynaturepartnership.org.uk/surreys-catchment-partnerships>. The data regarding the Mole catchment, including current assessment of water quality, can be found here; <https://environment.data.gov.uk/catchment-planning/OperationalCatchment/3277>.

A River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) provides data on the water quality of a river basin, with assessment points at various section of the river. There are two RBMPs for the River Mole, the full data for which can be found here: [Mole Management Catchment | Catchment Data Explorer](#).

Surrey Nature Partnership, of which Surrey County Council is an active partner, have produced a Catchment Plan for the River Mole. River Catchment plans are drafted and implemented by partnerships to identify and deliver river restoration and water quality improvement projects. Surrey County Council is an active partner in the catchment plan with various projects being delivered by the Council's Countryside Partnerships, who carry out volunteering activities on the River Mole in conjunction with Mole Valley District Council.

Please find a link to the River Mole Catchment Plan here:

<https://surreynaturepartnership.files.wordpress.com/2018/05/rmcp-mole-catchment-plan-draft-v4.pdf>. Further information and questions can be directed to Emma Barry at Surrey Wildlife Trust via the email address included in the link.

Under the requirements of the Water Framework Directive, all SCC activities are required to have regard to water quality impacts; each department within Surrey County Council would assess the areas of potential pollution which fall under their responsibility. For example within Environment, Transport and Infrastructure we are working with Catchment Partnerships and the water companies to carry out an assessment to model the levels of pollution which might result from runoff from Surrey Highways. This is a key step in trying to prioritise and mitigate pollution from this source. Day to day, the use of sustainable drainage systems within Surrey Highways and other Council developments helps improve water quality as well as reducing flood risk and improving amenity and biodiversity.

Question 10: from District Councillor Raj Haque

Please can you provide a status report on the following flooding issues that are affecting residents in Fetcham:

- a) the flooding of the footpath between Cannon Grove and Mill Lane along the railway line between Fetcham and Leatherhead;
- b) the flooding of homes in The Glade, as reported in a recent getsurrey article: <https://www.getsurrey.co.uk/news/surrey-news/surrey-homes-flooded-sewage-reality-21983587>;
- c) other regular flooding hotspots such as Friars Orchard, School Lane and outside The Bell.

Response

The footpath near Cannon Grove is still a Wetspot (MV112) and is showing as In Progress on the SCC Website with a score of 176. The resolution of the flooding on the footpath is dependent on Network Rail carrying out their embankment works along that section. It is understood that these works will use heavy plant machinery that will seriously damage the current footpath and then require reinstatement. It is also not possible to increase the flow of water in this area without risking further destabilising the Network Rail embankment. Network Rail has indicated that works are planned for this summer but these have been delayed previously due to funding cuts arising from reduced rail usage, and Covid. We are currently awaiting a response from Network Rail to confirm their planned start date. We have not received an Ordinary Watercourse consent submission to see final designs.

The media article about The Glade talks about a problem with sewage; Thames Water handles these problems, rather than SCC, and they have been informed. However, on this and the other roads highlighted in the Councillor's question, all the relevant outstanding Highways issues will be included on the jetting list.

Further details about wetspots and prioritisation of drainage scheme works can be found on our website via this link:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/report-a-highway-problem/drainage-and-flooding/flooding-and-wetspots>

Question 11: from District Councillor Raj Haque

What assessment has Surrey County Council made of the resilience to flooding and erosion of the path at Fetcham Splash, and what active travel funding options are available to secure this important link between Fetcham and Leatherhead, and reduce the risks to walkers, cyclists and horse riders, including commuters and school children?

Response

'Fetcham Splash' is on River Lane, Byway 145 Leatherhead. We recognise that it is used by cyclists and walkers as a way of connecting Fetcham and Leatherhead. The River Mole at that point diverges into two arms and the area between is prone to flooding by the River. The River Mole is a Main River and the Environment Agency is the main flood authority. They will be in control of any works that may be proposed in the future for this location. This would include any surfacing. Without major groundworks we are unlikely to be able to prevent the surface of the Byway from washing out for this section. The EA do not usually grant permission for such works this close to a main river.

The route for funding this scheme would be through inclusion in the soon to be developed Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP); these are being developed across each Surrey district to form a strategy for improving active travel and applications for funding are made to government to deliver new cycle and walking routes. This particular route has been passed on to the team who are developing LCWIPs.

Question 12: from District Councillor Lynne Brooks

The current Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) Local Plan states that all conditions have been met for presentation to the inspector, with agreed statements of common ground on all areas of provision between MVDC and Surrey County Council (SCC). SCC has a particular responsibility alongside MVDC to make forward plans and partnerships work that in health, improve quality and developing new models of care; improve health and wellbeing of local people; and improve efficiency of services.

So what criteria did SCC Sign off the MVDC Local Plan across the service areas? and were they met?

Response

In order to demonstrate that a Local Plan is based on effective co-operation with neighbouring authorities, including the County Council, the Local Planning Authority ensures that Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) are produced to inform the examination process. In this case it details the progress made around joint working on strategic cross-boundary matters that form part of the County Council's responsibilities, for example Education provision or Highways. The County Council's Public Health responsibilities mainly relate to improving public health and co-ordinating local efforts to protect the public's health and wellbeing. Many issues will be common to all SoCGs with SCC, however the full range of issues may vary from area to area and as such there is no checklist that the County Council use in agreeing them. However, each Local Plan SoCG that the County Council enters into reflects on the progress made on issues of concern that have been identified by County Council services throughout the Local Plan development and in particular at the formal consultation stages of the Local Plan. The current SoCG between SCC and MVDC highlights those areas where there is agreement between the two authorities, but also where there is disagreement.

An updated SoCG, to reflect work following the County Council's Regulation 19 submission, will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate when the Plan is submitted for examination.

This page is intentionally left blank