

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 1.00 pm on 18 June 2014  
at Council Chamber, Pippbrook, Reigate Road, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1SJ.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

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

**Borough / District Members:**

- \* Cllr Tim Ashton
- \* Cllr Howard Jones
- \* Cllr Mary Huggins
- \* Cllr Valerie Homewood
- \* Cllr Raj Haque
- \* Cllr Simon Ling

\* In attendance

---

The Chairman welcomed the three new members of the committee, Councillors Tim Ashton, Mary Huggins and Howard Jones. Cllrs Ashton and Huggins has been committee members

**OPEN FORUM**

Questions were raised on the Local Government Challenge and member support.

**1/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

There were no apologies or substitutions.

**2/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as an accurate record.

**3/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

No interests were declared.

**(a) PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]**

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

Mr Billard received a written response and clarified that the cycle forum were not asking for change of use for the path on the A25, they were only asking that the 100m segment of Reigate Road in questions be changed to dual use to allow cyclists coming in from the outlying areas of Dorking legally getting to the facilities of Dorking. Mr Billard also asked that exit onto the main highways be engineered safely if the changes are made.

The Area Highway Manager confirmed that officers will be looking into this with the Divisional member for Dorking South and the Local Committee Chairman and invited Mr Billard to attend a site visit for the route. The divisional member requested that the views of local people also be taken into account when investigating this proposal.

Mr Troughton received a written response and Mr Billard asked officers on his behalf that while they are in correspondence with Tesco could they also raise the matter of a pedestrian entrance.

Mrs Glynn has received a written response and had no supplementary. The divisional member commented that the road was very busy and perception of speed is higher on that stretch. It was felt that 30mph limit should be extended within which there is a 20mph speed limit outside the school to develop a whole village plan.

The Area Highways Manager confirmed a meeting would take place with the divisional member to explore further options, though confirmed that a change in speed limit would require a decision by the Cabinet Member.

## **ANNEX A**

### **(b) MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

Mrs Watson asked whether an underground camera had been used to investigate the flooding on the Ashcombe Road in Dorking and whether there are funds present to carry out the proposed works. The Area Highways Manager confirmed he would look into the results of the survey and share this with the member. It was confirmed there was a pot of money available for this work.

Mrs Watson asked if she could meet with highways officer and Thames Water to discuss the flooding at the junction of Chalkpit Lane. The Chairman offered to share contact details for Thames Water.

Mrs Watson would like to know if the proposed blanket 40mph speed limit could be investigated. The Area Highways Manager confirmed that previous initiatives were carried out in the 1990s and this could not be repeated at this time, however he would look into it further and the liaison with the divisional member. The Chairman suggested this matter be raised up to the Environment and Transport Select Committee to look into.

The divisional member for Bookham and Fetcham West felt that the issue of speeds on rural roads should be taken up with the Police and Crime Commissioner, in particular the focus of police enforcement. The Area

Highways Manager informed the committee that lower speed limits require engineering measures and that education is required alongside enforcement.

Mr Cooksey raised concerns over the delays to the wet spots and delays to progress. Mr Cooksey also raised concern over the flooding on the west side of the Deepdene Roundabout and that the matter was being reassessed but this had not been communicated. The Area Highways Manager apologised to the divisional member over delays and committed to keeping the member informed. Phase 2 of the Deepdene roundabout must be looked at with regards to traffic management and confirmed that as soon as dates are confirmed they would share these with the divisional member and Chairman. The divisional member for Dorking Hills expressed her thanks for the work done on the East side of the Deepdene Roundabout but added that it was important to resolve the west side and that she be informed of the proposed work.

The ward member for Ashted Village had not received a written response due to the timescales with the appointment of district members to the Local Committee. The Chairman confirmed he had a site visit at the Leatherhead end and appreciated that this scheme had caused disruption to the local area.

The ward member for Ashted Village raised concern about the delays and the quality of works. The divisional member for Ashted agreed with the concerns and that work was undertaken at the same time as Barnett Wood Lane but had worked with officers to improve this. Concern was also raised that some residents were not notified in advance of the work due to take place.

## **ANNEX B**

### **4/14 PETITIONS [Item 5]**

#### **Declarations of Interest**

There were no interests declared for this item.

#### **Officers attending**

John Lawlor, Area Highways Manager

#### **Petitions, Public Questions and Statements**

Mr Strudwick has received a written response but was unable to attend the meeting.

#### **Member Discussion – key points**

The divisional member for Dorking Hills thanked the residents for coming forward with a sensible solution and asked the committee for their support.

#### **Resolution**

The Local Committee AGREED the proposals.

## ANNEX C

### **5/14 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [Item 6]**

#### **Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared.

#### **Officers attending**

Victoria Jeffrey, Community Partnership and Committee Officer – Mole Valley

#### **Petitions, Public Questions and Statements**

There were no public comments for this item.

#### **Member discussion – key points**

There was no further discussion of this item.

#### **Resolutions**

The Local Committee AGREED to note the item.

### **6/14 DECISION ON LOCAL COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 7]**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED:

Under the County Council's Constitution (Part 4. Standing Orders, Part 3 40 (f)) to allow substitutes for district/borough council co-opted members of local committees.

Reason for Decision

The Committee wished to continue to allow district members to have substitutes as they had previously.

### **7/14 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 8]**

#### **Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared.

#### **Officers attending**

John Lawlor, Area Highways Manager and Anita Guy, Senior Highways Engineer

#### **Petitions, Public Questions and Statements**

There were no public comments for this item.

### **Member discussion – key points**

The divisional member for Bookham and Fetcham West asked whether the recent accident would influence the work on the High Street, East Street scheme. The Area Highways Manager confirmed that the data would be shared with the member, and that the police would investigate the accident and then highways team would work with them.

The divisional member for Ashted asked if the proposed scheme for the footway on The Street was looking at the alignment of The Street or Woodfield Lane. The Area Highways Manger confirmed this would be picked up with the divisional member.

The ward member for Ashted Village asked for haste on the proposed scheme Ottways Lane. The Area Highways Manager confirmed they were waiting for permission to use the common land, should this not be secured the scheme would have to be revisited.

### **Resolutions**

The Local Committee AGREED to note the item.

## **8/14 BLACKBROOK ROAD, DORKING SPEED REDUCTION [Item 9]**

### **Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared.

### **Officers attending**

John Lawlor, Area Highways Manager and Anita Guy, Senior Highways Engineer

### **Petitions, Public Questions and Statements**

Comments were circulated from the Chairman of the Blackbrook Road Action Group, highlighting their concerns of the safety risks on the road and urging the committee to take action.

### **Member discussion – key points**

The divisional member for Dorking South and the Holmwoods thanked for the circulation of the views of the action group. This road had been submitted to the portfolio holder previously for consideration and felt it was important that this is still an issue of local concern, especially given the recent accident as a result of speed.

The Area Highways Manager confirmed the only option was to take this back to the portfolio holder to be reconsidered.

The Chairman asked if the action group could have their points responded to. The Area Highways Manager confirmed the points could be responded to and a meeting could be held with the divisional member.

The divisional member for Bookham and Fetcham West felt that more regular speed enforcement would provide comfort to residents and whether the whole section of the road needs to have the speed limit reduced. The divisional member asked if the only certain sections of the road having the speed limit reduced could be investigated. The Area Highways Manager agreed they would meet with the divisional member.

### **Resolutions**

The Local Committee AGREED to note the item.

## **ANNEX D**

### **9/14 WINTER SERVICE ARRANGEMENTS [Item 10]**

#### **Declarations of Interest**

There were no interests declared for this item.

#### **Officers attending**

John Lawlor, Area Highways Manager and Anita Guy, Senior Highways Engineer.

#### **Petitions, Public Questions and Statements**

There were no public comments for this item.

#### **Member discussion – key points**

An update was presented the committee on winter maintenance arrangements and they were asked for any comments.

The divisional member for Dorking Hills did still have concerns with the A25 in Wotton and ice and if this could be reviewed. The Area Highways Manager asked if the member could confirm the sections of the road then this could be looked at.

Members asked for an update on the status of the Beare Green depot. The Area Highways Manager confirmed the depot is in use and has an emergency pile of salt; although the long term plan is outside the remit of the local highways team. The divisional member for Dorking South and the Holmwoods commented as a member of the winter service arrangements task group that there were improvements for last year although the weather was not sufficiently cold to test them. A recommendation to keep the Beare Green Depot open will be put forward to keep it open for another year and there is another proposal that the total number of grit bins does not decrease. The matter of footways is also being looked at by the task group.

### **Resolutions**

The Local Committee AGREED to note the report.

## **10/14 PARKING UPDATE [Item 11]**

### **Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Ling declared a pecuniary interest as he owned property on Ottways Lane, Ashtead which was being considered in this report.

### **Officers attending**

David Curl, Parking Team Manager

### **Petitions, Public Questions and Statements**

There were public comments for this item.

### **Member discussion – key points**

Last year the Local Committee set up a parking task group to look into Dorking High Street and Leatherhead North Street. The proposals in the report are the result of the work of that task group. An initial consultation has been carried out with the Chamber of Commerce in Dorking and officers will continue to work with them.

The report also includes proposals for Ottways Lane in Ashtead in Annex 3 and for further proposals in Lower Shott, Bookham. They will go to consultation and report back in December.

Members asked if the schemes could be implemented promptly. The parking manager highlighted that objections could be resolved through the Chairman, Vice Chairman and divisional member and unless there was a high number of objections then the schemes could be implemented more quickly.

The Chairman confirmed this would be dependent on the number of objections raised and would be resolved quickly if possible.

The Chairman requested that Annex 2 be amended as at present it showed no waiting Monday- Sunday. This is incorrect and should show no waiting Monday-Saturday.

### **Resolutions**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED to:

- (i) The proposals in Dorking High Street as shown Annex 1.
- (ii) The proposals in Bridge Street and North Street, Leatherhead as shown in Annex 2.
- (iii) That the proposals in Ottways Lane as shown in Annex 3.

- (iv) That where necessary the Parking Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local Member make any necessary adjustments to the proposals and agree detail, based on informal consultation, prior to statutory consultation.
- (v) That the intention of the County Council to make an Order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on street parking restrictions in Mole Valley as shown in the Annexes (and as subsequently modified by iv) are advertised and that if no objections are maintained, the order is made.
- (vi) That if necessary, the Parking Team Manager will report the objections back to the local committee for resolution.
- (vii) To allocate funding of £15,000 in 2014/15 to implement these parking amendments and the Mole Valley review.

#### Reason for Decision

The Local Committee thanked the work of the parking task group for progressing these issues. It was requested that they be progressed with all expediency and if possible be agreed through delegated powers. However it was acknowledge that if there were a large number of objections raised then there would be a need to bring the decision back to committee. The committee noted that the times included in Annex 2 Leatherhead, were incorrect. Where it stated no waiting Monday to Sunday this should be no waiting Monday to Saturday.

### **11/14 EAST COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP [Item 12]**

#### **Declarations of Interest**

There were no interests declared for this item.

#### **Officers attending**

Gordon Falconer, Community Safety Manager and Patrick McCord, Partnership Manger (MVDC)

#### **Petitions, Public Questions and Statements**

There were no public comments for this item.

#### **Member discussion – key points**

The Community Safety Manager for Surrey County Council asked the committee to agree the delegation of funds to the district, note the formation of the East Community Safety Partnership and to nominate a representative.



Members sought clarification on how the funds would be used and how transparent the process of allocating the funds was. Officers confirmed there is an application for community safety funds and this is available on the MVDC website. The projects will need to meet local priorities. There has been positive work supported through this fund; with Ladz Night in Leatherhead, Fairs Road Leatherhead clean up and the SADAS drugs outreach worker.

Members requested if the committee could be updated on how the money is spent and that the minutes of the East Community Safety Partnership be circulated.

### **Resolutions**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED to:

- i. That the community safety budget of £3,294 that has been delegated to the Local Committee be transferred to the Mole Valley Partnership Manager for the purposes of addressing community safety priorities, authorising the Partnerships Manager to carry out this transfer on the Committees behalf.
- ii. Note the formation of a new East CSP, which includes Mole Valley, and the new way of working across the East.
- iii. Nominate a County Councillor to represent the Mole Valley Local Committee on the East Surrey CSP in 2014-15 and a named substitute if so wished.

### Reason for Decision

The Local Committee noted the changes and asked that they be updated at the end of year as to how the funds had been spent. The nomination of the representative and substitute would be dealt with under item 15, Nominations to task groups and outside bodies.

## **12/14 SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE LOCAL RECOMMISSIONING 2015-2020 [Item 13]**

### **Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared for this item.

### **Officers attending**

Leigh Middleton, Lead Youth Officer – West Surrey

### **Petitions, Public Questions and Statements**

There were public comments for this item.

### **Member discussion – key points**

Officers presented the recommissioning paper and asked for the committee support on adding centre based youth work to the youth task group and the local committee's remit. It was also asked for the support to expand the youth

task group's remit to co-commission and look at all the needs of young people, working with other agencies where appropriate.

The Cabinet Associate for Young People highlighted the improved outcomes for young people in Surrey in 2.1 of the report. This has bucked the national trend. The youth task group can help to shape the appropriate youth provision for young people in Mole Valley.

The Chairman of the Youth Task Group highlighted 3.1 and was keen to support more joined up commissioning and to continue the good work of the task group. Members felt this was positive work but the commissioning needed to be accessible to smaller groups and that the need in the rural areas was also addressed alongside the towns.

### **Resolutions**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED:

- iv. To support increased delegation of decision-making to include the current Centre Based Youth Work so that it can be re-commissioned alongside the current Local Prevention Framework.
- v. That local priorities for the newly delegated commissions within Services for Young People will be decided by the Mole Valley Local Committee informed by the work of the constituted Youth Task Group.

### **Reason for Decision**

The Local Committee felt that increased delegation of decision making would enable a positive improvement to youth services within the district and where happy to seek the advice of the youth task group.

## **13/14 LOCAL PREVENTION FRAMEWORK PERFORMANCE UPDATE [Item 14]**

### **Declarations of Interest**

Mr Tim Hall declared an interest as a council appointed trustee of the Leatherhead Youth Project.

### **Officers attending**

Leigh Middleton, Lead Youth Officer – West Surrey

### **Petitions, Public Questions and Statements**

There were no public comments for this item.

### **Member discussion – key points**

Officers highlighted that number of those Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) had reduced in Mole Valley but also that the work of the youth centres and local prevention framework had increased school attendance and decreased the number of exclusions.

The Youth Support Manager for Mole Valley highlighted the hard work of the youth providers in reducing the number of NEETs and that this had been through joined up work. The role of the individual prevention grant was acknowledged in supporting young people to achieve their aspirations. The main area for future development is to get more local businesses to provide opportunities for experience for young people. The youth support service can support young people in this and it is on the job that young people benefit the most.

The summary of the Individual Prevention Grant spend, Youth Small grant spend and other commissions were highlighted to the committee.

Members asked for clarification on the numbers for Leatherhead Youth Project given the difference in numbers between 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. Officers will investigate this matter and confirm back with members.

Members requested that the County Council and District Council could look to expand their work experience offer. It was acknowledged that they do already provide work experienced and that members could use their local contacts to find further opportunities.

### **Resolutions**

The Local Committee AGREED to note the report.

## **14/14 LOCAL COMMITTEE TASK GROUPS AND NOMINATION TO OUTSIDE BODIES [Item 15]**

### **Declarations of Interest**

There were no interests declared for this item.

### **Officers attending**

Victoria Jeffrey, Community Partnership and Committee Officer – Mole Valley.

### **Petitions, Public Questions and Statements**

There were no public comments for this item.

### **Member discussion – key points**

Members were asked to note the proposed county membership of each task group and to nominate district membership to the task group as highlighted in the report.

### **Resolutions**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED to:

- (i) The terms of reference for the Youth Task Group, Property Task Group and the Parking Task Group, as set out in Annexes 1, 2 and 3.
- (ii) The membership for these task groups for 2014-15:

- a) Youth Task Group – Chris Townsend (Chairman), Helyn Clack, Howard Jones and Mary Huggins
  - b) Parking Task Group – Hazel Watson (Chairman), Tim Hall, Tim Ashton and Raj Haque
  - c) Property Task Group – Tim Hall (Chairman), Stephen Cooksey, Hazel Watson, Simon Ling and the MVDC portfolio holder
- (iii) A representative of the Local Committee and deputy for the East Community Safety Partnership as Tim Hall (representative) and Stephen Cooksey (substitute)

Reason for Decision

The Local Committee felt the task groups provided a valuable contribution to the work of the committee and should continue for the next year.

**ANNEX E**

**15/14 MEMBERS' ALLOCATIONS [Item 16]**

**Declarations of Interest**

There were no interests declared for this item.

**Officers attending**

Victoria Jeffrey, Community Partnership and Committee Officer – Mole Valley

**Petitions, Public Questions and Statements**

There were no public comments for this item.

**Member discussion – key points**

Members had no comments on this item.

**Resolutions**

The Local Committee AGREED to note the item.

Meeting ended at: 2.57 pm

---

**Chairman**

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

DATE: 18 JUNE 2014

LEAD OFFICER: VICTORIA JEFFREY, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP AND COMMITTEE OFFICER

SUBJECT: PUBLIC QUESTIONS

DIVISION: MOLE VALLEY



### **Question from Mike Ward, Dorking South and the Holmwoods Resident**

The A25 passes through a residential area on the north side of Brockham and the speed limit is 50 mph. Residents are concerned that speed is excessive along this stretch and some elderly residents on the north side of the road have expressed concern about not being able to cross the road (they need to do this if they are to use the buses). The 50 mph limit contrasts with the 40 mph limit immediately to the west along a more rural stretch of road, although with bends and turnings.

There is also concern about the junction with Chalkpit Lane. This is very lightly signed and there are no road markings to assist turning vehicles or signs to warn through traffic of the possible dangers.

What consideration has been given to these issues and what conclusions have been reached? If the answer is none, then please specify when this will be looked at and a response provided.

### **Response from the SCC Highways Team:**

The A25 Reigate Road in Brockham has a current speed limit of 50mph. This speed limit extends from a point at the western edge of the bridge over the river Mole, adjacent to the junction with Castle Gardens to a point approximately 60m west of the junction with Tranquil Dale in Buckland. There are a number of residential properties (Puddenhole Cottages) fronting onto the north side of the A25 close to the junction with Brockham Lane. In addition there are a number of residential properties in Chalkpit Lane which is on the north side of the A25. There is a footway along the entire length of the south side of the A25 between Reigate Heath and Dorking. There is also a short section of footway on the north side of the A25 between the entrance to 1 Puddenhole Cottages and Chalkpit Lane. The A25 Reigate Road is on a bus route.

Analysis of recorded personal injury accidents between Chalkpit Lane and Puddenhole Cottages over the three year period March 2011 to April 2014 shows that there were seven slight injury accidents. The police considered speed to be a contributory factor in only one of these accidents.

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.

An investigation into the existing 50mph speed limit on the A25 Reigate Road will be added to the work programme. Any data that Surrey holds regarding the speed of traffic on the A25 Reigate Road will be analysed, and if appropriate additional speed surveys will be carried out, to determine whether a reduction in the speed limit from 50mph to 40mph 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 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. Consideration of whether additional signs and road markings are required at the junction of the A25 Reigate Road and Chalkpit Lane would take place as part of the investigation into the speed limit.

**Question from Ron Billard, Chairman of the Mole Valley Cycling Forum**

Please would the local committee extend the south side Reigate Road Shared cycle way along the rest of Reigate Road as far as Dorking Sports Centre?

This measure would help many visitors to the sports centre, Dorking Halls and Pippbrook, particularly those with small children on bicycle Child Carrier Seats.

The paved area, although in need of clearance of encroaching vegetation appears wide enough to cope with the pedestrian and cycle traffic.

At present cyclists are forced to rejoin the road at one of the busiest junctions in Dorking, or cross the Reigate road with an average waiting time for pedestrians of 60 Seconds and disruption of traffic of a similar period, then Cross Deepdene Avenue with two waiting periods and further disruption of traffic, then finally recross Reigate Road at the London Road junction, entailing another 60 second wait and more disruption of traffic.

**Question from Roger Troughton, Member of Mole Valley Cycling Forum**

Could we please have a progress report on what can be done to improve safety at the entrance at Tescos, Reigate Road, Dorking, where access crosses the pavement, which is also a designated shared cycle path / "safe" route to school. The main issue as I see it is the volume of movements crossing a shared used pavement – often used as if it were a road junction – there is little to cause traffic to slow down (compared with, say the platform at the bottom of Punchbowl Lane). (This matter was initially raised in December 2013.)

**Response from SCC HighwaysTeam:**

As the requests refer to adjacent parts of the A25, it is considered appropriate to address these together.

The current cycle route provision provides a shared-use path on the south side of the A25 Reigate Road up to the signalised crossing to the east of Deepdene Roundabout (A25/A24, also known as The Cockerel Roundabout). The shared-use facility crosses the access to the Tesco store and Travelodge hotel. Cyclists are then directed to cross the road at the signalised crossing to continue on the designated facility on the east side of the A24 towards Leatherhead.

The section of footway from the Deepdene Roundabout is not currently designated for cycle use. Signs were installed recently to enforce the current status, i.e. 'end of route' sign to the west of the signalised crossing and 'cycles prohibited' signs on both sides of the A24 on the south side of the roundabout, and on the A25 to the west of the roundabout. The provision of the signs was supported by the local divisional member, in response to concerns raised by residents. Officers have visited the site to observe the conditions and attempts have been made to contact planners acting for Tesco.

It is appreciated that there may be a considerable number of cyclists travelling westbound from the Deepdene Roundabout towards Dorking town centre, for example to the leisure centre. Therefore it is recommended that the extension of the existing shared-use path, from the signalised crossing to the leisure centre, be considered for inclusion on the Mole Valley programme of local highway works. Subject to approval by local committee, this would include consultation with road safety and sustainable transport officers within the council, as well as Mole Valley Cycling Forum, Surrey Police, and the local divisional member.

It is also appreciated that the amount of traffic using the access to the Tesco site has increased following the opening of the store. It is proposed that additional signing is provided to

- (a) warn cyclists of vehicle movements across the shared-use path; likely to be on each approach to the access
- (b) warn drivers emerging from the Tesco site of cyclists and pedestrians on the shared-use path.

Signs would be situated such that the message conveyed is clear, without compromising visibility or the available shared-use space. The signs would also have to be in accordance with relevant legislation. It is anticipated that signs can be installed within the current financial year (2014-15), subject to any consultation with third parties (i.e. Tesco) that may be necessary. It is recommended that appropriate consultation takes place with Mole Valley Cycling Forum, Surrey Police, and the local divisional member.

### **Question from Linda Glynn, Dorking Rural Resident**

Following the question I raised at the Local Committee on the 6th March 2013 regarding extending the existing 30mph limit along Parkgate Road as far as The Surrey Oaks pub. A speed survey was carried on 9th October, but at lunchtime when the road is considerably quieter. At my request the speed survey was repeated which took place from around 8.00am onwards and as with the previous survey from the end of my driveway which is just north of the turning to Hogspudding Lane. I was told the results were broadly similar on the 2 occasions, the difference would be that in the morning rush they did not take long to collate due to the high volume of traffic at that time of day.

The mean speed of vehicles travelling south to north was 35.0mph and from north to south 37.9mph. These speeds were measured going into and coming out of a 20mph advisory sharp bend. Parkgate Road is a residential road. There are houses on both sides. There is a pavement on one side only and it's not necessarily where there are houses. The road is narrow with blind corners on which driveways are situated. Why should the residents of Newdigate have to put up with drivers going at 40mph past our driveways, which are not safe, while our neighbours in Brockham and Leigh, living on roads which that are substantially straighter and wider, with far better visibility, enjoy a 30mph limit? We just want equality with our Mole Valley neighbours and to be treated with the same consideration. When I mentioned this at a local Parish Council meeting there was a loud "Hear, hear".

### **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 point 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.

Following Mrs Glynn's question to Mole Valley Local Committee on 6 March 2013 Officers agreed to carry out speed surveys to measure the speed of traffic on Parkgate Road. Speed surveys that complied with both Department for Transport guidance and Surrey County Council's speed limit policy were carried out to measure the free flow traffic speeds on Parkgate Road.

The first survey was carried out on 9 October 2013. The results of that survey recorded that the mean speed of vehicles travelling south to north was 34.3mph, and the mean speed of vehicles travelling north to south was 37.4mph. Mrs Glynn was unhappy with the time of day that the survey was carried out, and following consultation with the Area Team Manager it was agreed to repeat the survey during the morning peak traffic flow. The survey was repeated on 7 April 2014, and the results of the survey recorded that the mean speed of vehicles travelling south to north was 35.0mph and the mean speed of vehicles travelling north to south was 37.9mph.

A reduction in the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph on this section of Parkgate Road would not comply with Surrey County Council's speed limit policy. It should be noted that under the policy, Local Committee may decide, exceptionally, to implement a new speed limit which does not comply with the policy and against officer advice. In this instance, the decision should be endorsed by the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Flooding Recovery.

*MVLC 18 June 2014*



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)**

**DATE:** 18 JUNE 2014  
**LEAD OFFICER:** VICTORIA JEFFREY, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP AND COMMITTEE OFFICER  
**SUBJECT:** MEMBERS QUESTIONS  
**DIVISION:** MOLE VALLEY



**Question from Hazel Watson, Member for Dorking Hills**

1. In the Ashcombe Road in Dorking between Chalkpit Lane and Ranmore Road, opposite Fraser Gardens the road, pavement and private property is regularly flooded and this has severely damaged the road surface. I welcome the fact that the County Council has investigated the flooding and has sought to use a jetter to clear the drains. This has identified that there are major blockages in the drainage system. When will the funding be identified to investigate the flooding further and carry out the necessary work, including repairing the road?
2. When will action be taken to resolve the regular flooding that occurs near the junction of Chalkpit Lane with Ranmore Road outside Triangle Stores?
3. Given the success of the blanket 40 mph speed limit introduced in the 1990's in the rural area south of the A25 and east of the A24, can a similar blanket 40 mph speed limit be investigated and considered south of the A25 and west of the A24 excluding the A29?

**Response from SCC Highways Team:**

1. Following the initial investigations the Maintenance Engineer can confirm that further works have been instructed to clear the previously identified blockages. The site issues are quite complex and it is hoped that the next phase of work will ascertain if there are any other issues contributing the flooding problem at this location. We are currently awaiting a confirmed programme date however the work should be carried out within the next three months along with other similar sites throughout the district.

The site is included in the County Councils wet spots list (currently being updated). Should the site require a significant drainage scheme in addition to the planned work mentioned above, then this will need to be promoted through the County Councils capital drainage works process.

2. Initial investigations have been carried out by colleagues to check the county councils road gully network and associated connections in this area. This investigation has identified potential issues within the Thames Water surface water pipe. This has been reported to Thames Water for follow up action. As yet

we are not aware of any remedial action. Local colleagues will continue to press Thames Water for an update on progress.

3. Surrey County Council is not currently considering any blanket speed limit reductions. The order to reduce the speed limits on roads in the rural area south of the A25 and east of the A24 was made in 1997 as part of the STAR initiative, a national demonstration project jointly developed by Surrey County Council and the Countryside Commission.

### **Question from Stephen Cooksey, Member for Dorking South and the Holmwoods**

1. In August 2013 I submitted a request that the yorkstone paving stones destroyed by various contractors in Dorking High Street and 'temporarily' replaced by tarmac but never subsequently reinstated, should be replaced in the original material and was given an assurance that this would happen. That assurance was repeated in answer to written questions at the Local Committee in December 2013 and again in March 2014 when I was also promised a report on progress. However no action has yet been taken and no report has been forthcoming. Could I be informed when this work will be undertaken?
2. The Contractors dealing with the flooding issues at the Deepdene Roundabout left the site in February 2014. At the March 2014 meeting I was informed that this was because of an urgent requirement to carry out work in Tandridge but that they would return to deal with the work on the western side of the roundabout where flooding is a serious problem when the emergency work had been completed. I was also assured that I would be informed about when the work, for which funding had been ring fenced, would be undertaken. Since then I have heard nothing. Could I be informed when work to resolve these problems will take place?

### **Response from SCC Highways Team:**

1. The scheme to carry out repairs to the yorkstone paving on the South Side of Dorking High Street between Dene Street and Lyons Court (approximately) was unfortunately delayed due to other priorities in the county as a result of the winter storms and associated flooding and recovery work. The scheme is now being progressed by the local Maintenance Engineer who is able to confirm that the order for the work has been issued and a programmed start date is awaited from our contractor. The Maintenance Engineer will keep the local member informed as soon as the programme date is available. It is anticipated that the work will take place during this summer.
2. Further investigation work has been undertaken by our drainage team on the West Side of the A25 / A24 Roundabout on Reigate Road Dorking and particular issues have now been identified. This part of the scheme is currently undergoing re design to address those issues. Once the solution has been designed the work will be programmed for later this financial year. It is likely that a significant traffic management layout will need to be in place and the options are being considered as a part of the design process at this time.

**Question from Simon Ling, Councillor for Ashtead**

I am receiving many complaints about the way in which the work being done to install a cycle track between Ashtead and Leatherhead is being carried out. Would the relevant officer please tell us whether the contract is being regularly monitored by Council staff; whether it is proceeding in accordance with an agreed timetable; whether the standard of workmanship is considered satisfactory, and whether the contract includes a retention or penalty clause so that the Council has some redress if the contract overruns or is not completed to an acceptable standard?

**Response from SCC Highways Team:**

*MVLC 18 June 2014*

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

DATE: 18 JUNE 2014

LEAD OFFICER: VICTORIA JEFFREY, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP AND COMMITTEE OFFICER

SUBJECT: PETITIONS

DIVISION: MOLE VALLEY



### Installation of Yellow Box Junction on the A24

#### **This petition of 129 signatures was submitted by Mr Strudwick**

We petition Surrey County Council to Install a Yellow Box Junction on A24 at the Junction to Dorking Main Railway Station

The Junction of Station Approach and Lincoln Road in Dorking with the A24 dual carriageway in Dorking is constantly blocked due to inconsiderate Drivers on the A24, usually they have been diverted off the M25 and are not prepared to let anyone cross the Southbound Carriage to go north. I would request that the Highways department take a look at this junction with a view to adding a Yellow Box onto it. They should also look at the slip lane when vehicles want to turn right into Station Approach when travelling North, so many vehicles cross on the wrong side of the keep left signs and are then heading directly into the vehicles turning north from Station Approach.

#### **Response from SCC Highways Team:**

Surrey County Council Officers have inspected London Road and appreciate the difficulties that northbound drivers on the A24 can experience trying to turn into Station Approach when the southbound A24 is blocked by queuing traffic.

The police are responsible for enforcement at yellow box junctions, and therefore new box junctions are not laid without consulting the police. Informal consultation with Surrey Police has indicated that they are in support of the proposal for a yellow box junction on the southbound carriageway of the A24 London Road at the junction with Station Approach.

The A24 London Road is on our forward patching programme, with work due to be carried out later this financial year. Arrangements will be made for a yellow box junction to be laid on the southbound carriageway at the junction with Station Approach during the relining of the road following the patching works.

The petition also raises concerns that northbound vehicles on the A24 turning right into Station Approach often pass the wrong side of the "Keep Left" signs on the

island in the gap in the central reservation, and therefore come into conflict with vehicles turning right out of Station Approach. A road marking arrow will be laid on the road surface in the central reservation gap, as part of the lining works, to reinforce the “Keep Left” sign.

*MVLC 18 June 2014*

## ITEM 9 SPEED LIMIT ASSESSMENT BLACKBROOK ROAD

Comments from Rae Burdon, Blackbrook Road Action Group.,

The report is inadequate in as much as:

- 1) It records in 1.1 Introduction and Background "The Committee resolved to instruct officers to investigate reducing the speed limit on Blackbrook Road from 40mph to 30mph and report the findings to a future meeting of Mole Valley Local Committee." I don't think I saw the minutes, but my clear recollection is that it was the view of the Local Committee that the reduction should be enforced, a decision subsequently overturned by the SCC. It is important that this decision or view is on the record, as it is relevant to the bigger issue of the failure of the SCC to understand the particular circumstances on BB road.
- 2) The report does not provide in Section 2.1 the basis of the speed statistics which are presented. The simple record of average speeds, uninformed by volume, location and time of day, do not address the core issue of the specifically dangerous parts of this road.
- 3) The increase in reported mean speeds from 38.01 to 42.34 are presented as "not supporting a reduction in speed limit." There is no basis for this view and no established criteria made available to us that can explain why an increase in recorded speeds does not support a reduction.
- 4) Similarly, the collision statistics fail to provide perspective on the basic issue that particular parts of this road are very dangerous at 40 mph, let alone at the speeds which we experience on a daily basis. After a positive initial settling-in period the enhanced signage etc has now become familiar and appears to make no difference whatsoever to the real problem - consistently excessive and occasionally ridiculous speeds from a high proportion of drivers at key places and times of day.
- 5) In Conclusions and recommendations 9.1 "Recorded speeds in Blackbrook Road are still too high for a reduction in the speed limit to comply with Surrey's speed limit policy." requires some explanation, please

This page is intentionally left blank



SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)



DATE: 18 JUNE 2014

LEAD OFFICER: VICTORIA JEFFREY, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP AND COMMITTEE OFFICER

SUBJECT: LOCAL COMMITTEE TASK GROUP REPRESENTATION AND NOMINATIONS TO OUTSIDE BODIES 2014-15

DIVISION: MOLE VALLEY

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

The Local Committee is asked to review and agree the terms of reference and membership for the Youth Task Group, the Property Task Group and the Parking Task Group for 2014-15 and the nomination of a representative and deputy to the East Community Safety Partnership.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to agree:**

- (i) The terms of reference for the Youth Task Group, Property Task Group and the Parking Task Group, as set out in Annexes 1, 2 and 3.
- (ii) The membership for these task groups for 2014-15.
- (iii) A representative of the Local Committee and deputy for the East Community Safety Partnership as recommended below in 1.5

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The Local Committee's three task groups enable the Local Committee to carry out its

work in an efficient and expedient manner. The representative on the East Community Safety Partnership will ensure that Mole Valley is represented on this board and the local priorities are taken into account.

## **1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

- 1.1 The Local Committee is asked annually to consider the work that should be considered at formal meetings and the relevant task groups that should be established to support the Committee in its work.
- 1.2 In 2011-12, the Local Committee established a Youth Task Group and a Property Task Group.
- 1.3 The terms of reference were last reviewed and the task groups re-established on 12 June 2013.
- 1.4 For 2013-14 the Local Committee also established a Parking Task Group for which the terms of reference are in Annex 3.
- 1.5 The introduction of the East Community Safety Partnership has been presented to the Local Committee on the 18 June 2014. The recommended representative for the Local Committee is Mr Tim Hall and the recommend deputy is Mr Stephen Cooksey.

## **2. ANALYSIS:**

- 2.1 The task groups enable members to have detailed discussion over complex issues. The Youth Task Group has allowed for the successful procurement process of the Local Prevention Framework. Due to this success, the recommendation is to re-establish the task groups for 2014-15 with the terms of reference set out in **Annex 1**.
- 2.2 The parking and property task groups have also proved to be successful and have aided the progress of work of the Local Committee. It is therefore recommended that these groups be established with the terms of reference set out in **Annexes 2 and 3**.

## **3. OPTIONS:**

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Local Committee agrees to re-establish the task groups, in order to continue the successful work carried out in previous years.

## **4. CONSULTATIONS:**

- 4.1 Consultation has taken place with the Local Committee Chairman and with relevant officers from Services for Young People, Estates, Parking and Community Safety.

**5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:**

5.1 There are no specific financial implications arising from the recommendations. Work to support the recommendations will be undertaken within current resources, and the task groups have no decision making powers.

**6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:**

6.1 There are no specific equalities and diversity implications arising from the recommendations.

**7. LOCALISM:**

7.1 The establishment of task groups enables officers to draw upon the local knowledge of County and District Councillors, ensuring that specific local needs and priorities are considered.

**8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

| Area assessed:   | Direct Implications:                                  |
|--|---|
| Crime and Disorder   | Set out below.  |
| Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)   | No significant implications arising from this report. |
| Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children                        | No significant implications arising from this report. |
| Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults | No significant implications arising from this report. |
| Public Health  | No significant implications arising from this report. |

8.1 Crime and Disorder implications

The Youth Task Group is involved in the commissioning process for the Local Prevention Framework which is aimed at preventing young people from becoming NEETs (not in education or employment) or entering the Youth Justice system.

**9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

9.1 The committee is asked to agree the membership and terms of reference for the three task groups for 2014/15 and the nomination to the outside body.

9.2 The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to agree:

- (i) The terms of reference for the Youth Task Group, Property Task Group and the Parking Task Group, as set out in Annexes 1, 2 and 3.
- (ii) The membership for these task groups for 2014-15
- (iii) A representative of the Local Committee and deputy for the East Community Safety Partnership as recommended in 1.5 of this report.

|                                      |
|--------------------------------------|
| <b><u>10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:</u></b> |
|--------------------------------------|

10.1 The Local Committee will next be asked review the task group terms of reference and membership in June 2015.

---

**Contact Officer:**

Victoria Jeffrey, Community Partnership and Committee Officer, 01372 371662

**Consulted:**

Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman; relevant officers in Services for Young People, Estate, Parking and Community Safety.

**Annexes:**

Annex 1 – Youth Task Group Terms of Reference

Annex 2 – Property Task Group Terms of Reference

Annex 3 – Parking Task Group Terms of Reference

**Sources/background papers:**

---

## **Surrey County Council's Local Committee**

### **(Mole Valley)**

#### **Youth Task Group**

#### **Terms of Reference**

##### **Objective:**

The Local Committee agreed on 8<sup>th</sup> June 2011, that a Youth Services Task Group was established to assist and advise the local committee in relation to Youth Issues and the future delivery of Youth Provision locally.

##### **Membership**

The Task Group will contain four appointees from the Local Committee - two county and two district councillors. For the municipal year 2014/15 the representatives will be Mrs Helyn Clack, Mr Chris Townsend and two district councillors. In addition the Task Group could invite up to 2 members of the Local Strategic Partnership and up to four young people from the district, all with equal status. The Task Group may also consult with other relevant members of the Committee.

##### **General**

1. It is proposed to reconstitute Youth Services Task Group. The Task Group shall exist to advise the Mole Valley Local Committee. It has no formal decision making powers. The Task Group will:
  - A. Unless otherwise agreed meeting in private
  - B. Develop a work programme
  - C. Record actions,
  - D. Report back to the Local Committee as appropriate
2. The Task Group's function is to assist and advise the Local Committee in relation to Youth Issues and the future delivery of Youth Provision locally.
3. Officers supporting the Task Group will consult the Group and will give due consideration to the group's reasoning and recommendations prior to the officer writing their report to the parent local committee.
4. The Task Group can, should it so wish, respond to an officer report and submit its own report to the local committee.
5. The Task Group terms of reference and Membership is to be reviewed and agreed by the local committee annually.

**Surrey County Council's Local Committee  
(Mole Valley)**

**Property Task Group**

**Terms of Reference**

**Objective:**

To support the Local Committee in agreeing a common strategy for the assets collectively owned within Mole Valley by both authorities. This strategy will set out common objectives for service delivery and identify objectives that could be achieved through a coordinated approach to asset use and disposal.

**Membership**

The Task Group will contain four appointees from the Local Committee - three county and one district councillor. For the municipal year 2014/15 the representatives will be Mrs Hazel Watson, Mr Stephen Cooksey, Mr Tim Hall and a district councillor. The property portfolio holder for Mole Valley District Council will also sit on the group, though not a member of the local committee. The Task Group may also consult with other relevant members of the Committee.

**General**

1. It is proposed to reconstitute a Property Task Group under the Mole Valley Localism Pilot. The group will have no formal decision making powers. The Task Group will:
  - A. Unless otherwise agreed meeting in private
  - B. Develop a work programme
  - C. Record actions,
  - D. Report back to the Local Committee as appropriate
2. Officers supporting the Task Group will consult the Group and will give due consideration to the group's reasoning and recommendations prior to the officer writing their report to the parent local committee.
3. The Task Group can, should it so wish, respond to an officer report and submit its own report to the local committee.
4. The Task Group terms of reference and Membership is to be reviewed and agreed by the local committee annually.

**Surrey County Council's Local Committee  
(Mole Valley)**

**Parking Task Group**

**Terms of Reference**

**Membership:** The Parking Task Group will consist of four members, two county councillors and two district councillors. For 2014/15 the task group members will be Mrs Hazel Watson, Mr Tim Hall and two district councillors.

Membership to the group will be through appointment of the Mole Valley Local Committee, members do not need to sit on the committee.

**Role:**

1. To ensure synchronicity to the implementation of both the Mole Valley DC and Surrey CC car parking strategies in Mole Valley.
2. Working together to, consult with communities and residents about options and opportunities for parking (in car parks and on street).
3. Reduce the town centre congestion that currently exists in evenings and on Sundays.
4. Provide an enforcement function that is fair, consistent and in line with an open and transparent enforcement policy.
5. The Parking Task group will advise and make recommendations, is not a decision making body, all decisions will need to be made through the relevant decision making body of either the Mole Valley Local Committee, Mole Valley District Executive or Surrey County Council Cabinet.

**General**

1. The Task Group will meet in private
2. The Task Group will keep a record of its actions
3. The Task Group will make recommendations on any issues with regard to parking controls and civil parking enforcement including the use of surplus income.
4. Officers supporting a Task Group will give due consideration to the Group's reasoning and recommendations prior to the officer writing their report to the Local Committee
5. The Task Group can, should they so wish, respond to an officer report and submit their own report to the Local Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank