

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 2.00 pm on 6 March 2013
at Council Chamber, Pippbrook, Reigate Road, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1SJ.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mrs Clare Curran (Chairman)
- * Mrs Helyn Clack (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Stephen Cooksey
- * Mr Tim Hall
- * Mr Chris Townsend
- * Mrs Hazel Watson

Borough / District Members:

- * District Councillor Valerie Homewood
- * District Councillor Raj Haque
- * District Councillor Philip Harris
- * District Councillor Chris Hunt
- * District Councillor Simon Ling
- * District Councillor Charles Yarwood

* In attendance

Open Forum

An open forum was held at the start of the meeting; topics discussed ranged from updates on petitions from previous committees, flooding on the Deepdene roundabout and signage on cycle routes.

59/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Cllr Charles Yarwood and Cllr Chris Hunt. Cllr Rosemary Dickson substituted for Cllr Hunt.

60/12 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

It was requested that the name of the Hookwood speed petitioner be corrected from Mrs Barker to Mrs Baker.

It was requested that the spelling of Westcott be amended.

Following the proposed amendments the minutes were agreed.

61/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Mr Tim Hall declared an interest for item 10 as he is a council appointed trustee of the Leatherhead Youth Project.

(a) PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

Mr Billard received a written response and as he was unable to attend, Mr Mudell was representing the cycle forum. The supplementary would be bought up in item 9.

Mrs Glyn received a written response from officers and Mr Ward asked a supplementary question on her behalf. Mrs Glyn wanted further information on when the speed assessment would be undertaken, what type of information would this report on and would it include distribution of speeds?

Officers confirmed they were looking to undertake the speed assessment within the next two weeks and this would assess vehicles travelling in both directions, type of vehicles using the road, clarity of road markings and road signs.

The divisional member confirmed she has spoken with residents on Parkgate Road and was aware of the issues on this road and other rural roads of high speed limits and poor sight lines. Most residents feel that extending the 30mph speed limit to the Surrey Oaks pub would improve the situation. It was also felt that a community speedwatch would help to improve the situation.

Mr Agius received a written response from officers and had no supplementary.

Mr Ward received a written response and thanked officers for the information provided.

Mr Carr received a written answer and requested further information on whether it would be possible to take back the retaining wall and use sheet piling?

Officers responded that at present there is a retained wall with sheet piling and a brick frontage, however this doesn't have to weight bear the same amount as the stairs. Either solution would require land gain which would be a lengthy process and has been problematic in the past.

Annex A

(b) MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

Questions were submitted by Mrs Watson and Cllr Haque.

Mrs Waston thanked officers for their responses and had no further questions.

Cllr Haque requested if timescales could be given for the proposed work. The Area Highways Manager confirmed these would be provided shortly for the Chairman and divisional member.

Annex B

62/12 PETITIONS [Item 5]

Mrs Wilson from Lincoln Road Residents' Association presented a petition on the parking issues faced in Lincoln Road, Dorking and the surrounding residential road. She received a written response and highlighted the concern of residents who are often found without parking or needing to be able to move their cars to ensure they are not ticketed yet despite the current restrictions designed to prevent commuter parking this is still an issue despite space in the station car park.

Mrs Watson, the Councillor for Dorking Hills acknowledged the issue and welcomed the response from officers. Mrs Curran highlighted the formation of the parking task group later on the committee's agenda designed to look at such issues in Mole Valley.

Annex C

63/12 HIGHWAYS SCHEME PROGRESS REPORT [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 6]

The Area Highways Manager gave an update on the Local Structural Repair schemes which were yet to be completed. All schemes are now finished or will shortly commence. The exception is The Priory in Ashted, due to issues with the proposed treatment, alternatives will need to be found and this scheme will now be done in early in the new financial year.

Concerns were raised with regards to parking restrictions and lines being put in place. Officers confirmed that this was due to the need for some areas to be readvertised, however as this was now completed work to put the new lines should be shortly underway.

Councillors also expressed concern over the flooding issue on the A24 as this had required for the road to be shut on several occasions and this is a key strategic road for Mole Valley. Officers confirmed that this was a key priority for next year and that the flooding and drainage plan would soon be confirmed.

The Local Committee AGREED to:

- i. Note the report for information

Reason for Decision

The committee were happy to note the report and thanked officers for the work undertaken this year.

64/12 PROJECT HORIZON UPDATE [NON-EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 7]

The Projects and Contracts Group Manager presented to the committee on the proposals of Project Horizon, a 5 year capital road maintenance plan. This gives a £120m investment in Surrey's roads over the next 5 years. Officers have given contractors a year fixed programme, to prevent down time and are looking to source a better material for local roads so they can lay roads quicker.

A full list of roads will come to the committee in June to be published.

Councillors agreed that public consultation would be vital in this. They also welcomed the new powers over vehicle relocation as this should prevent part completion of roads. Feedback has been received from some parishes on the draft list and divisional members welcomed this feedback. Meetings will be held with County Councillors to confirm roads.

The Local Committee AGREED to:

- i. Note the information given

65/12 FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE PUBLIC SAFETY PLAN [NON-EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 8]

The Surrey Fire and Rescue Service Group Manager updated the committee on the end of the two year action plan and the new action plan that is due to commence.

There are proposals in Epsom & Ewell and Horley to make changes to the current provision. Whilst this is not directly affecting Mole Valley it will impact on the north and south of the district. Consultation has been undertaken with residents and they are awaiting the result. 24/7 cover will remain at Horley until the proposed move to a new sites in Salfords. 2 appliances will be maintained in Epsom and Ewell with 24/7 service. There are no proposed changes to the Painshill site in Cobham.

Councillors raised queries as to whether the increase in volunteers had created a reduction in full time, paid staff. Officers reassured the committee that the 80 new volunteers had not come at the expense of full time, paid staff. Councillors were pleased with the work undertaken in Horley to guarantee service was continued following the withdrawal of West Sussex.

The Local Committee AGREED to:

- i. Note the progress to date on items in the Action Plan for 2011-13
- ii. Provide feedback on proposed Action Plan for 2013-16.
- iii. Consider those items that will be the subject of further public consultation at the appropriate time.

Reason for Decision

The Local Committee noted the good work of the fire service and appreciated the clarification on the changes to the service in Epsom and Ewell and Horley.

66/12 DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT CYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS BID [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 9]

The Road Safety Manager introduced the plans which had been submitted to the Department for Transport to provide high quality cycling schemes in Surrey. The proposed schemes are felt to improve the safety for all cyclists.

At present we do not know if we have been successful, however we hope to be notified shortly.

The divisional member for Leatherhead and Fetcham East expressed support for the Leatherhead Town Centre scheme, however was concerned about some of the aspects of the Leatherhead to Ashted route and whether a shared footpath and cycleway would be feasible due to pavement width. It was also highlighted that this would pass several sheltered housing schemes and the proposed route would impact on their residents.

Mole Valley Cycle Forum expressed concerns with regards to the Leatherhead to Ashted route as there are currently many obstructions on the road and previous attempts to introduce cycling routes had not succeeded. The Forum asked if due consideration had been given to the Linden Pitt Path route.

The divisional member for Ashted also expressed concerns with regards to the Leatherhead to Ashted cycle route due to the proposed crossing on the A24, however it was acknowledged this would be a more appropriate solution than the Linden Pitt Path route due to the expense this would incur.

The Road Safety Manager acknowledge concerns over the width of pavement and impact on residents' of the sheltered housing schemes and reassured the committee that it would be fully segregated path instead of a joint path as in previous schemes. Where there are existing obstacles, these will be relocated to allow a clear route. The routes proposed in the bid were the routes which best fit the DfT criteria, other routes were looked at in the initial scoping phases.

Councillors felt that given some of the questions raised the committee it would not be appropriate to approve the schemes today, however they were aware that postponing until future meetings could pose problems due to the delay to timescales. The Chairman of the committee suggested that if required a special meeting could be convened to agree the plans.

The member for Leatherhead and Fetcham East proposed the addition of a recommendation to ensure consultation with local residents, businesses, the Mole Valley Cycle Forum and Local Committee. This was seconded by the member for Dorking and the Holmwoods.

The Local Committee AGREED to:

- i. Approve the cycle scheme proposals for Leatherhead Town Centre, subject to the outcome of the funding bid
- ii. Approve the cycle scheme proposals for Epsom Road and Leatherhead Road between Leatherhead and Ashted, subject to the outcome of the funding bid

SUBJECT to the additional recommendation below.

The Local Committee AGREED to ADD an additional recommendation of:

- i. **Should the bid be successful, detailed design will proceed and residents, businesses, the Mole Valley Cycle Forum, Chairman of**

the Mole Valley Local Committee, Vice-Chairman of Mole Valley Local Committee and the divisional member directly affected by the proposals will be consulted, to inform the design prior to construction. If required the design will come to the Mole Valley Local Committee for approval prior to construction.

Reason for Decision

The local committee felt that the proposals for Leatherhead Town Centre would be a positive contribution to the local area; however the committee felt that prior to construction of the Epsom Road and Leatherhead Road routes further consultation was required with local residents and members. Depending on the outcome of the consultation the Epsom Road and Leatherhead Road scheme may need to come back to the local committee for approval prior to construction. This will be decided by the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and divisional member.

67/12 YOUTH LOCAL PREVENTION FRAMEWORK CONTRACT SPECIFICATION [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 10]

Mr Tim Hall declared a conflict for this item and left the chamber.

The Chair of the Youth Task Group drew the committee's attention to the inclusion of the Bookham as an area of need in the specification, alongside North Leatherhead and the LINKS area, south of Dorking. Concerns were expressed with the mechanisms used to identify those at risk of becoming Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET).

Officers recognised this had been an issue in the previous round however this was being addressed for the second round by a duty to work in partnership to identify those at risk, being placed on the successful providers.

The Local Committee AGREED to:

- i. Approve the allocation of £17,000 to Personalised Prevention (see 1.3a for details).
- ii. b) Approve the local needs specification (Annex A) to be considered by providers focusing on the identified needs of Mole Valley and the geographical neighbourhoods prioritised by the Youth Task Group.

Reason for Decision

The Local Committee were happy with the specification that had been produced and noted the inclusion of Bookham as an area of need.

68/12 MOLE VALLEY LOCALISM PILOT UPDATE [NON-EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 11]

The Chairman of the Committee raised concerns about the lessening of pace with regards to the Localism work and felt it was time for this to be renewed. Members of the Committee agreed that the impetus on certain strands of the pilot had been lost.

Officers agreed that co-ordination hadn't been as strong as had been hoped, however they confirmed that work had been ongoing and they would arrange for groups to meet shortly.

The Local Committee AGREED to:

- i. Note the work undertaken this year on the Localism pilot
- ii. Support the ongoing work of the Localism pilot
- iii. Agree the removal of the Youth and Troubled Families strands from the pilot and for the work to continue as business as usual.

Reason for Decision

The Local Committee noted that some strands of work had lost impetus but looked forward to the progress in the new municipal year.

69/12 MOLE VALLEY PARKING TASK GROUP [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 12]

The Chairman updated the committee on the background context for the task group. Mole Valley District Council recently agreed their car parking strategy for off street parking. It was felt that a joined up approach to parking would better service the needs of those in the local area.

Members welcomed this and felt it would be an appropriate way forward.

The Local Committee AGREED to:

- i. Agree to the Mole Valley parking task group being constituted at the first Local Committee meeting of the new municipal year.

Reason for Decision

The Local Committee acknowledged that parking is often a key issue for residents and it is felt that by working closely with the district council through the task group that a more comprehensive approach to parking can be achieved.

70/12 LOCAL ALLOCATIONS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 13]

The Team Leader for the East highlighted the tabled bids of Cannon Court Park Recreation Footpath, Critique of Flood Risk Assessment of Tanners Meadow and Save Barnett Wood Lane Allotments.

The Committee agreed the bids detailed in the papers and the tabled bids of Cannon Court Park Recreation footpath and Critique of Flood Risk Assessment Tanners Meadow.

Following officer advice the committee agreed to vote on the approval of the Save Barnett Wood Lane Allotments subject to the name of the bid being amended to: **To allow Barnett Wood Lane Allotment Holders to form an association. Due to a conflict of interest the Chairman stood down for this item and the Vice-Chairman took the chair.**

The vote was carried with 3 in favour and 3 abstentions.

Following the vote the Chairman resumed the chair.

The Chairman expressed the wish that any surplus members' allocations go to the Looked After Children's Bursary, though this was to be agreed on an individual member basis.

The Local Committee AGREED to:

- i. the items recommended for funding from the Local Committee's 2012/13 Member Allocation funding, as set out in section 2 of the report and summarised below:

Organisation	Project Title	Amount
Buckland Parish Council	Refurbishment Of Buckland War Memorial	£2,000
Mole Valley District Council	Cotmandene Conservation Project	£5,000
Ashtead Peace Memorial Hall	Sound Bites for Ashtead Peace Memorial Hall	£5,000
Ashtead Cricket Club	Parsons Mead Development	£5,000
Betchworth Parish Council	Betchworth Burial Ground Jubilee Pavilion	£3,000
Satro	Primary Science Workshops - Eastwick Infant And Junior School	£1,500
The Vine Project	Fix It Project	£1,000
The Harvest Community Church	Multimedia Project	£2,187
Dorking Concertgoers Society	Concert In Dorking Halls	£1,434
Bookham Residents Association	Electronic Sign Bookham High Street	£3,000
Brockham Choral Society	Replacement Staging Trailer	£500

- ii. Note the expenditure previously approved by either the Community Partnerships Manager or the Community Partnerships Team Leader under delegated powers, as set out in section 3.
- iii. Note any returned funding and/or adjustments set out within the report and at Appendix 1.

The Local Committee AGREED the two tabled bids of:

**Cannon Court Recreation Ground Footpath at £6,233
Critique of Flood Risk Assessment for Proposed Residential
development at Tanners Meadow, Strood Green at £500**

The Local Committee AGREED the tabled bid of:

**Save Barnett Wood Lane Allotments and surrounding green belt in
Leatherhead £296.04**

SUBJECT to the amendment of the project title to:

To allow Barnett Wood Lane Allotment Holders to form an association

Reason for Decision

The Local Committee were happy to agree the item and support the groups through their allocations.

71/12 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER [NON-EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 14]

The recommendation tracker was noted.

Meeting ended at: 4.30 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank



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

PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS

06 MARCH 2012

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

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

In Relation to SCC application for DfT funding for cycling safety improvements in the Leatherhead area, Mole Valley Cycling Forum requests the Local Committee to ask the officers concerned to reconsider the priority of the proposed schemes linking Leatherhead and Ashted. Our reasons are provided below.

The choice is between extensive work on the main roads linking the two areas and work on a footbridge over Leatherhead bypass. In both cases signage and redesignation of footpaths will be required.

The Linden Pit Path route meets the needs of:

- *School children trained at the lowest level.*
- *Parents of young children in prams and buggies.*
- *Users of mobility scooters.*
- *Shoppers,*
- *Commuters,*
- *Users of local sports facilities,*
- *Workers in the leatherhead industrial areas.*

The Linden Pit Path route requires engineering work to the bridge over Leatherhead Bypass to remove the steps and to raise the Parapet.

The Main Road proposal:

- *Brings users in proximity with heavy main road traffic.*
- *Includes discontinuities.*

- *Has already been rejected in part by SCC Cycling Officer and SCC Highways.*

The demolition and replacement of the Grange Road footbridge although highly desirable is not a safety scheme within the terms of reference of the work.

SCC has already spent in the region of £800,000 on pedestrian safety "improvements" at Knoll Roundabout. SCC has already spent around £80,000 on creating a segregated path on Epsom Road including the cost of its removal, when found to be impractical. To spend further large sums will provoke outrage and reflect badly on both officers and members.

- *Removal of trees,*
- *Rebuilding of bus stops to provide clear sight lines.*
- *Changes to an electricity substation.*

Even with these changes there are numerous blind sighted entrances, exits and corners all of which were highlighted in a MVCF report and which will present hazards to pedestrians, cyclists and other users. Land ownership is an issue where the route crosses the M25 and where access for Pedestrians and Cyclists would be severely limited.

Response from SCC Road Safety Team

When developing the bid to the Department for Transport (submitted on 30 November 2012), officers consulted with Mole Valley Cycle Forum and were aware of the Forum's support for developing cycling facilities along the Linden Pit Path and associated bridges over the Leatherhead bypass and M25.

In order to give Surrey County Councils' bid the best chances of success, officers developed schemes that would provide the best fit with the criteria set by the Department for Transport. This criteria included the perceived or actual risk to cyclists. Although the suggestion for improved cycling facilities along the Linden Pit Path route may have merit, it was the officers view that proposals for a fully segregated two way cycle path from Leatherhead along the B2122 Epsom Road past the Knoll Roundabout and then along the A24 Leatherhead Road to Ashstead offered a better fit to the criteria set by the Department for Transport.

These proposals improve safety for cyclists along a route that has suffered 10 cycling casualties, including 3 serious injuries over a 3.5 year period from January 2008 to July 2012. The proposals also improve accessibility and safety for cyclists and pedestrians at the Knoll roundabout and at the junction with Grange Road, which at present are difficult and inconvenient to negotiate. Should the bid be successful the detailed design will be closely supervised to ensure a high quality.

It is hoped that in order to build on the bid to the Department for Transport, proposals for further cycling facilities across the Mole Valley District will be developed in case any further funding becomes available in the future. This could include consideration for proposals that link Ashstead and Leatherhead along the Linden Pit Path and Barnet Wood Lane.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

2. Question from Linda Glynn, Dorking Rural resident

My family moved to Welsummer (formerly named Gerrans), Parkgate Road, Newdigate last September. Since moving I have become concerned about the speed of traffic along Parkgate Road between the 30mph sign and the Surrey Oaks pub. Given the bends and the number of houses along this stretch of road (many of whom have very limited visibility for egress), I consider that 40mph is simply too fast, and that consideration should be given to extending the 30mph limit.

My son, who is 15, has no choice but to cross the road outside our driveway each morning at the busiest time (around 8.00) to get to the only pavement on the other side, so that he can walk up to the Village Hall to catch a bus to The Priory School in Dorking. We have to check that there is absolutely no traffic coming from the left so that we can concentrate all our attention (in particular our ears) on any traffic approaching from the blind bend to the right; if there's a lull he dashes across and we both hope for the best!

There is an advisory 20mph on the corner near the junction with Hogspudding Lane which is very rarely observed by drivers, in fact, to the contrary, I think many regard the high speed with which they can hurl their cars around that corner as something of a challenge.

Can I ask if any studies have been carried out along this stretch of road to assess the safe speed that should be applied and would the Committee consider supporting a lower limit?

Can I also ask that if such a study has not been carried out and that if members of the Committee feel that there is no need to consider lowering the speed limit, they only come to that conclusion after trying to cross the road safely from my driveway to the other side at 8.00 on a weekday morning, and in particular if they would be happy to let their own families do so.

Response from SCC Highways Team

The speed limit in Parkgate Road, Newdigate changes from 30mph to 40mph approximately 250 metres west of the residential properties near Hogspudding Lane. Properties then extend from this for most of the length of Parkgate Road up to the Surrey Oaks public house, just west of Broad Lane. There is a narrow footway on one side of the road throughout this length of Parkgate Road. Parkgate Road is also on a bus route.

Parkgate Road bends sharply at Hogspudding Lane, reducing visibility of oncoming traffic for residents close to the bend as they exit their driveways. The bend is signed on both approaches with an advisory 20mph maximum speed limit.

Analysis of recorded personal injury accidents over the three year period November 2009 to October 2012 shows that there was one slight injury accident near the

properties. This involved a vehicle reversing out of a driveway onto Parkgate Road being hit by a northbound vehicle. Speed was not recorded by the Police as a possible factor in this accident.

Speed limits are set in accordance with Surrey's speed limit policy, which also sets out the process for assessing speed limits. Experience has shown that lowering a speed limit on its own will not guarantee that average speeds (the measure used to determine speed limits) will be reduced. If a speed limit is set much lower than the existing traffic speeds then some motorists may ignore the limit unless the character of the road or environment indicate otherwise.

Surrey does not hold any data on traffic speeds in Parkgate Road. It is proposed that Officers carry out speed surveys to determine if an extension of the existing 30mph speed limit would comply with Surrey's speed limit policy. If compliant with the policy, the request for a reduced speed limit would have to be assessed and prioritised against set criteria (Congestion, Accessibility, Safety, Environment and Maintenance) in accordance with the County's Local Transport Plan to ensure that the limited available public funds are used effectively. Following consultation with the divisional Member, the request could then be added to the Integrated Transport Schemes list for consideration for future funding.

3. Question from Peter Seward, Chair of Bookham Residents' Association

The long standing issue associated with SCC Flooding Wet Spot programme in Bookham has been improving thanks to many actions by Highways. The cause of many problems still lies at the southern end of the Dorking Road. Attempts to resolve this to date have been unsuccessful. Would Highways please provide an update on this situation and how the other main Bookham flooding areas be alleviated? These are mainly East Street/Lower Road, Church Road and Fife Way.

Response from SCC Highways Team

Flooding issues in Great Bookham are being identified as a part of the work of the Bookham Flood Forum, chaired by County Councillor Clare Curran. The Flood Forum membership is made up of key representatives from the community, and the various authorities and organisations who share responsibilities for drainage and flooding matters in the Bookham area.

Good progress has been made in the identification of the specific issues that concern the community, mapping the problem areas, and highlighting areas of responsibility for the maintenance and repair of the various sections of the drainage systems. This work is ongoing and involves considerable background research and site investigation into matters such as land ownership and asset ownership. The alleviation of flooding will require a joint effort by those organisations, authorities and land owners to deal with specific issues identified from the Flood Forum. These include issues identified in Church Road, Lower Road, East Street and Fife Way in Great Bookham.

The solution initially identified to resolve the drainage issues at the southern end of Dorking Road involved negotiations with a local land owner, to identify the scope that exists for surface water from the road to be received by a facility on private land. Unfortunately, the necessary agreement with the local land owner could not be obtained.

Officers are continuing to explore other options to find a solution for the southern end of Dorking Road which will be sufficiently robust. This site remains at the top of the priority list and officers will continue to seek a solution during 2013/14. Resources will be made available to carry out further feasibility work and, should this result in a deliverable scheme; it will immediately be awarded funding.

4. Question from Mike Ward, Dorking and the Holmwoods Resident

Residents have complained about parking on diagonal yellow lines near Newdigate School. On investigation, it turns out that the parking restrictions cannot be enforced until a traffic order is in force. Apparently this situation applies to a number of schools. When will these traffic orders be made?

Residents have also expressed safety and access concerns about parking in Old Horsham Road, Beare Green. These concerns are in relation to the area at and near the bend at the south end of the road, where parking limits visibility causing potential danger and further north towards the station where there is a large amount of commuter parking causing similar problems as well as access issues. Some of these issues have been reported via the website and/or by email without response so far. Could consideration be given to measures to improve safety and safeguard access, perhaps involving double yellow and white lines as appropriate?

Response from SCC Parking Team

It is planned to make all the school keep clear markings in Mole Valley enforceable - proposals have been agreed and a statutory consultation is underway, ending on the 8th March. The actual markings have already been refreshed and once any objections have been considered, the signing will be ordered, put into place and the Order made. This will make all of the markings enforceable and is likely to be during April 2013.

We have responded to a number of concerns about commuter parking in Old Horsham Road, Beare Green in recent months. All the residential driveways near the station have been given access protection markings and it is planned to place additional markings at the junction of Hawksmoore Drive and the bus stops near the station.

Any additional changes to on street parking in Beare Green, particularly near the shops can be considered as part of the next parking review, although consideration must be given to safety it is important not to cause unnecessary displacement and take the needs of local businesses into account. The next parking review is due to be presented to the Local Committee on 12 June 2013.

5. Question from Hubert Carr on behalf of Bookham, Leatherhead, Ashted and Fetcham Residents' Associations

The circulatory road system at Bull Hill in Leatherhead continues to suffer from increasing traffic congestion especially at peak hours. A way of improving the traffic flow would be the removal of the old Staircase in Station Road enabling a faster flow of vehicles into Randalls Road and so reducing back up.

Could Highways please advise if and what traffic flow studies they have made on the effect such a removal would have and what plans and timescales they have for the removal of this structure.

Response from SCC Highways Team

That removal of the steps was seen as not viable due to prohibitive costs and the need for land gain which was causing significant issues. Officers also looked at the removal of the opposite footway to enable widening of the carriageway, however this was also found to be prohibitive due to the cost of protecting existing services and the cost benefits of reducing queuing lengths on the junction or at the bridge. No new data is available for this Area. However I have asked my colleagues in the Economy, Transport & Planning Team at the NMIC Centre to do another traffic survey of this signalised junction. The results will be given to the Chairman / Vice Chairman and Divisional Member once they have been completed in the new financial year. This will enable officers and Members to seek an alternative solution if at all possible.

MVLC 06 March 2013



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

MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTIONS

06 MARCH 2013

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

1. Question from the County Councillor, Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)

1. The Westcott village gateway on the A25 to the west of the village on the north side of the road has been damaged for a number of months. What is the reason for the delay in repairing the gateway and when will the work to replace it be done?

2. When will the broken drain cover on the edge of the pavement in Church Lane in Headley opposite Broome Close be replaced and what is the reason for the delay in replacing it?

Response from SCC Highways Team

1. It is confirmed that instructions have been issued for the repairs to the A25 North side gateway feature. The delay in carrying out the repair has been caused by resource issues as a result of the unprecedented amount of flooding and need to prioritise the general maintenance gangs workload towards resolving those priority problems. The situation is now easing and it is hoped that other routine activities can be resumed. It is anticipated that the North side gateway feature will be restored by the end of March. The divisional member will be kept informed of progress by the Maintenance Engineer.

2. It is confirmed that instructions were issued to replace two side entry gullies in Church Lane Headley. Limited resource availability has meant that only the most urgent one could be completed to date. The remaining side entry gully will

be replaced in the new financial year when further funds are available. In the meantime the situation is being monitored by the Community Highway Officer to ensure it remains safe and the divisional member is to be kept informed of progress.

2. Question from the District Councillor Raj Haque (Fetcham West)

Is it possible to investigate a water leak near monks green in Fetcham which is running down through Cobham road in to river lane causing severe winter freeze making it extremely difficult for the Morley court elderly resident to walk on the pavement.

Having investigated the leak may I request for the relevant officer to fix this long standing issue?

Response from SCC Highways Team

We are aware of a surface water issue on Cobham Road, Fetcham in the vicinity of Monks Green.

Initial investigations have already been carried out by the Community Highway Officer and the Maintenance Engineer although these have proved inconclusive. Utility companies have no reported leaks in this area and it appears that Thames Water have no Surface Water apparatus at this particular location.

Further detailed investigations and research is required to determine the exact location of the cause of the problem as resources become available. Further investigations may well involve our colleagues in Thames Water as the issue is carried forward.

MVLC 06 March 2013



**OFFICER RESPONSE TO PETITION
LOCAL COMMITTEE
(MOLE VALLEY)**

LINCOLN ROAD PARKING

PETITION

06 MARCH 2013

This petition of 71 signatures was submitted by Mr Nick O'Shea

We are residents or property owners in Lincoln Road, Dorking. Being close to Dorking stations and with several offices and businesses locally, many commuters and office workers regularly try to park in our street, with the result that local residents are frequently not able to park near their homes. There is no other parking available to us except the railway station car park where the commuters should be parking instead of parking in Lincoln Road. To try to address this problem, several day-time parking restrictions have been enforced over the years, but they are far from satisfactory and frequently result in residents receiving parking tickets. Also, many commuters and business workers understand how these restrictions work and deliberately time their parking to comply with them, which totally defeats the objective of ensuring that local residents have somewhere to park reasonably near to their homes.

We have been campaigning for a scheme to enable us to park in the street where we live. A succession of Highways Officers over many years have promised that a suitable scheme is only months away. Several times we were asked to demonstrate local support and have been able to show that there is overwhelming support for a scheme among residents. On a number of occasions, we have also shown that without parking by commuters and from business which are not located in the street, there is adequate parking for all residents and for businesses which are located in the street. However, no scheme has ever actually been implemented.

This is to ask that your committee undertakes to trial a scheme during the coming 2013/14 financial year restricting parking in the street to residents and bone fide business with premises on Lincoln Road, with a view to making it permanent within 12 months.

Response from SCC Highways:

Background

Residents parking schemes are often introduced to make it easier for residents to park near their homes and to improve access for visitors. Lincoln Road is very close to Dorking station and used by commuters to avoid parking charges in the station car park, (which is often under utilised).

Lincoln Road may well be suitable for a residents parking scheme however a consultation would be needed with residents and business to determine whether their needs can be accommodated. It is proposed to include this location in the 2013 parking review (due at the Local Committee in June) and subject to funding and committee agreement, consult with residents about the available options in this road. An FAQ about residents parking is attached.

Frequently asked questions (FAQs)

How does a Resident permit parking zone work?

Permit parking is intended to help residents and their guests find somewhere to park during the days and times that the scheme is in operation. It is important to mention that a permit does not guarantee a space and there is a cost for each permit requested (see below for charges). However, by limiting the parking by non residents, it follows that there should be more space available for residents to use than there is at the moment.

During the controlled times only vehicles displaying a valid Resident Parking Permit or a valid Visitor Permit would be allowed to park in the zone.

The zone would be indicated by entry/exit signs and would not require parking bays to be marked on the road, thereby maximising the space available.

When do restrictions apply?

If a scheme were to be introduced in this area, the operational hours would be decided based on the feedback received to this consultation.

What about blue badge holders?

Blue badge holders could park in the zone for as long as they need provided their blue badge is displayed. However, it may not be possible to mark specific parking bays within a zone of this type.

Who would be eligible for a resident permit?

Residents who live on a road within the permit zone would be eligible to apply for a resident permit. Residents from nearby roads may also be eligible, depending on the nature of the roads in question and the relative parking capacity and requirements of these roads. This would be decided based on the outcome of this consultation and would be fully defined in any formal proposals.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

How much do permits cost?

Resident permits are valid for a year at a cost of £50 for the first permit issued to a household and £75 for each subsequent permit. This cost is to cover the administration and enforcement of the scheme.

How many permits can I have?

The maximum number of resident permits that can be issued to a household is usually calculated by the number of vehicles registered to the household minus the number of off street parking spaces for that property. For example, 3 registered vehicles and 1 off street parking space would mean the members of the household could apply for up to 2 resident permits. In some cases where road space is very limited, a lower allocation of permits may be agreed to improve the availability of parking space.

Those residents who have adequate off street parking do not need to purchase any residents permits, but may find that they would need to purchase visitors permits. These are available to all households in the zone up to a maximum limit of 120 per household per year.

There may be additional limitations on the number of permits allowed if demand exceeds on-street capacity.

Can any type of vehicle have a permit?

Only vehicles of a type and class detailed in the parking orders are eligible. Generally these are cars and small vans.

What do I do about visitors, workmen and deliveries?

Each household is entitled to a maximum of 120 visitors' permits per annum. They cost £2 per permit and can be bought in batches of up to 20 at one time. Each permit entitles one vehicle to park in the zone, and lasts for the whole day. They can only be used once and must be displayed on the visitor's vehicle. Any vehicle can park in the zone to make deliveries, and wait for up to 20 minutes to load and unload and does not require a permit to do this.

What do I do about medical needs / carers?

There are two different types of permits which can be issued. An operational permit allows medical professionals (such as qualified doctors and nurses) to park within the zone, and is issued free of charge to the medical professional. Alternatively a carer's permit can be issued to the resident, which is for carers, or individuals acting in the capacity of a carer, and allows them to park within the zone to carry out their duties. This permit costs £10 and lasts up to one year.

How much does a replacement permit cost?

If you lose your existing permit or change your vehicle you will need to pay an administration fee of £15 to replace your permit.

What if I can't find a parking space?

We think that there will be enough spaces for residents and visitors through the course of the day, however, if you can't find a space you will need to find an alternative legal parking space elsewhere, for example in a public car park or a non restricted area.

Who does what?

Surrey County Council as the highway authority is responsible for the design, implementation and maintenance of the parking controls, parking strategy and policy, and all the legal work involved in the making of the corresponding traffic regulation orders (TROs) required.

Mole Valley District Council manages enforcement and administration of on street parking controls on behalf of the county council.

MVLC 06 March 2013