

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 2.00 pm on 17 June 2015
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 Rosemary Dickson
- * Cllr Paul Elderton
- * Cllr Raj Haque
- * Cllr Mary Huggins
- * Cllr Sarah Seed
- Cllr Peter Stanyard

* In attendance

1/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Clare Curran and Cllr Peter Stanyard. The Chairman welcomed the new co-optee members from Mole Valley District Council and acknowledged the attendance of Richard Walsh, the new SCC cabinet member for Localities and Wellbeing.

2/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 04 March 2015 were agreed as a true record.

3/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were received.

a PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

The tabled public questions and responses are set out in the attached document.

Question from Mr Richard Banks

Mr Banks received a written response to his question in advance of the meeting but felt that it had been 'unsatisfactory'. As his supplementary he

wanted to know whether it would have been more appropriate for the safety audits to have been carried out by an independent party. Duncan Knox – SCC Road Safety Team Manager (DK) explained that the safety audit had been carried out by officers from another team and with the police.

.....

Questions from Mr Peter Seaward (on behalf of the Bookham Residents Association)

Mr Seaward was satisfied with the responses received in advance of the meeting and was pleased with progress being made and that SCC had prioritised the areas of concern.

He will contact Stephen Clavey and Clare Curran directly to organise a meeting with regard to parking in the High Street, Bookham.

.....

Question from Mr Clayton Wellman (on behalf of Chart Downs' residents, users of the No.22 Saturday service and the local Liberal Democrat team

Mr Wellman had submitted a written question and received a written response in advance of the meeting. He was not present but Claire Malcolmson asked a supplementary on his behalf. She explained that the feedback they had received indicates a wider use of the service asked whether the proposal could be reconsidered.

In response the Chairman announced that the Mole Valley Demand Responsive Service (DRT) will be extended to operate on Saturdays with effect from Saturday 5th September 2015.

Residents who currently use Metrobus service 22, from areas not served by conventional bus services such as Newdigate, Leigh, Chart Downs, Sutton Abinger, Holmbury St Mary and Abinger Common, will be able to book journeys in advance on the DRT service by phoning the call centre. The service will be operated by East Surrey Rural Transport Partnership who operate the Monday to Friday DRT service in Mole Valley. The service will be open to all Mole Valley residents who don't have access to other bus services and will provide an alternative for the Metrobus service 22 while also providing new transport opportunities to many Mole Valley residents. TH added that he thought some action should be taken to link the services 32 and 22.

b **MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**
Questions from Mrs Helyn Clack (Dorking Rural):

The tabled questions and written responses are set out in the attached document.

Q1. HC referred to the question submitted by Richard Banks and the response received (item 4a). She asked whether the new development in Horley might provide funds to finance a roundabout. John Lawlor (SCC Highways) said a bid to fund a feasibility study would have to come back to the local committee for approval.

Q2. HC wanted to know whether the 526/527 would connect early enough to make a connection to Gatwick for shift workers to get to work. The Chairman suggested arranging a meeting with the Transport Team and the Parish Council.

Q3. HC wanted reassurance that the work would be done without further delay.

Zena Curry (SCC – Area Highways Manager) confirmed that all the permits were in place and that the work is programmed to take place during the schools' summer break.

Q4. HC wanted to know how residents would be informed of the road closures

ZC confirmed there would be a full engagement plan to go out to the parish councils.

Q5. No supplementary

Q6. HC wanted to check that Traffic Management was just replacing what had been there before. ZC confirmed this was the case and that the A29 would reopen on 30 June.

Q7. No supplementary

Q8. HC wanted to know whether it was possible to investigate further as there had been an increase in traffic. ZC explained noise barriers were expensive and therefore normally only installed when a new road is built but could check on the cost of a feasibility study.

.....

Questions from Mr Stephen Cooksey (Dorking South and the Holmwoods)

Q1. SC wanted to know why he had not seen any publicity for work programmed for the first week of July and wanted assurances that the necessary enforcement measures were in place.

Q2. SC wanted clearer news as to when the consultation would take place.

There were no officers present from the SCC Parking team so both supplementary questions were referred to David Curl for a written response.

Q3. No supplementary

Q4. No supplementary

Q5. SC stressed the need to have these dangerous manoeuvres monitored and JL agreed to set up some dates with the police.

.....

Question from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):

The Committee Officer agreed to contact officers for a time frame for a full response.

.....

Question from Cllr Rosemary Dickson (Leatherhead South)

As a supplementary she asked the Highways' officers how priority for the signage works would be decided and when residents could expect the sign to be erected. JL explained that he had asked for this to be given priority and it should be done within 1-2 months.

.....

Verbal Question from Chris Townsend (Ashted) –

He raised the issue that work on the Woodfield Lane project, previously agreed at LC (11/09/13) had been stopped due to the intervention of Cllr Chris Hunt in preventing the transfer of land from MVDC. He felt that this undermined the decision-making process of the LC. JL was not aware of the problem and Tim Hall said he would take it up with the Leader and Chief Executive of MVDC

5/15 PETITIONS [Item 5]

No declarations of interest were received.

6/15 REVIEW OF COLD WEATHER PLAN AND WINTER SERVICE ARRANGEMENTS (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 7]

Declarations of Interest:
None

Officers attending: John Lawlor - SCC Highways (JL)

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements:
None

Member discussion – key points

It was highlighted by Hazel Watson that the winter arrangements had not been tested due to last winter being mild.

Cllr Seed raised concerns about the gritting of some of the roads around the schools in Fetcham. JL confirmed that The Street, Bell Lane and Cobham Road were definitely on the list to be treated but he would have to check about School Lane. Treatment depends on whether the road in question is on the primary or secondary network.

The Local Committee agreed to:

- i. Consider the current highways cold weather provision and operations in their area and provide feedback, via their Local Committee Chairman, on any change requests.

7/15 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 6]

Declarations of Interest:
None

Officer attending:
Sarah J Smith, Community Partnership and Committee Officer (Mole Valley)

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements:
None

It was agreed that any items where actions were shown as being completed, should be removed from the tracker.

8/15 DORKING TRANSPORT PACKAGE (PHASE 1) DEEPDENE STATION IMPROVEMENTS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest:
None

Officer attending: Paul Fishwick, Project Manager, Transport Policy (PF)

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements:
None

Paul Fishwick confirmed that an exhibition would take place Friday and Saturday 25 and 26 June regarding the proposal. Feedback from the whole consultation would be fed back to the LC in September.

Member discussion – key points

Hazel Watson queried why the consultation only covered phase 1 and questioned the reasons for removing the vegetation. She would have preferred priority to be given to measures to improve accessibility by either a lift or ramp and was disappointed these were not included in the phase 1 proposals. She also questioned whether the pavements were wide enough for shared use and suggested that priority should be given to providing 'real time' information at Dorking main station and would like to have seen the cycle path between Deepdene roundabout and the station moved to the west side of A24.

Helyn Clack suggested that what residents needed most was more car parking as cycling was not an option for those living further out of Dorking.

PF explained that the aim was to encourage residents to walk or cycle and thereby free up spaces so that motorists would not park on the street. The benefits of removing the vegetation will be assessed as part of the consultation and that the trees were on Network Rail land. Ramps and lifts would be considered as part of any phase 2 although at the moment this and phase 3 are only aspirations and there are no funds currently available.

The 1m widening of Station Approach will be subject to a safety audit but there is sufficient room and the local highways team will be segregating the A24 cycle route using a small pot of money it has available. Moving it to the west side would cause difficulties for people having to cross the main road.

PE supported retaining the vegetation providing there were no security concerns at the station and it was well lit. This would likely to be of benefit to future residents of Federated House, once developed.

Cllr Huggins agreed with the comments on commuter parking and was disappointed that phase 1 did not include a ramp to make travelling easier for all passengers. Tim Hall conceded that commuter parking was a district wide issue that needed to be taken up with the rail companies. Stephen Cooksey agreed with these comments and asked whether there was evidence that the changes would increase cycling to the station. He did not feel that the proposals were clear and would have preferred to see a long-term plan; he was disappointed that there had been no progress towards making Deepdene DDA compliant and was concerned that funding could be wasted.

PF stressed that the focus was on joining the two stations and that there was evidence to support the fact that people do convert from using the car to cycling or walking. He is waiting for a response from the Passenger Transport Group with regard to RTP1.

Ron Billard (Mole Valley Cycling Forum) refuted that there was evidence of increased cycle use. He felt that the enhancements were a step forward but stressed the need for a joined up approach e.g. tying in with the development of the Meadowbank site in Dorking and asked whether the cycling officer and

representatives of the Access group had been consulted – PF confirmed that they had.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) resolved:

- i. To note the project content
- ii. To agree that the project be the subject of consultation between 19 June and 31 July 2015.

And resolved to agree:

- iii. That the Area Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, Local Divisional Member and Project Manager (Transport Policy) view and agree the consultation material.
- iv. The feedback from the consultation is reported to a later meeting of this committee.

Reasons for decision:

The Local Committee is to be kept informed of the progress of the Dorking Transport Package (Phase 1).

It is a requirement of the C2C LEP to carry out a public consultation as a condition of the grant funding award however the county council also wishes to engage residents in the development of the project.

The timing for June/July is to enable the local contribution being provided by First Great Western to be spent before its available 'end' date (30 September 2015).

9/15 WESTHUMBLE BRIDGE (NETWORK RAIL) - WEIGHT RESTRICTIONS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION) [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest:
None

Officers attending:
Maureen Robson – SCC Highways (MR)

Hazel Watson expressed concern that the time frame might be too short to identify the full extent of the issue and that it was expecting much of residents to ask them to monitor vehicles. She stressed that a long term solution was required and asked if reinforcement of the structure could be prioritised.

Cllr Elderton pointed out the worst possible consequences of an incident but MR explained that such considerations were outside the remit of the report and that Network Rail was only concerned here with the weight restrictions.

The Local Committee agreed to note:

- i. A traffic count with both video (1 day) and automatic counting (7 days) has been commissioned to record all traffic using the bridge and determine the extent to which the weight restriction is being disregarded.
- ii. Structures Team will also request assistance from the local parish council/residents to safeguard the bridge by reporting any incidences of vehicles which appear to be overweight that are using the bridge.
- iii. The details of offending vehicles will be passed onto the police/SCC Trading Standards for enforcement action.

10/15 LIBRARY SERVICE REVIEW 2015 (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 10]

The Chairman brought forward Item 10 of the agenda to accommodate questions from members of the public.

Declarations of Interest:
None

Officers attending: Simon Harding – SCC Library Service (SH)

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements:

Jean Bradley from the Ashted Residents' Association raised the issue of evening opening hours. If the proposals went ahead, the library would be losing both late evenings (Tuesday and Thursday) and questioned the survey of usage on which the proposals were based.

Cllr Northcott, queried the fact that there had been no consultation on the changes and challenged the premise for the standardisation of opening hours.

Peter Seaward (Bookham Residents' Association) also objected to the loss of evening opening hours at the Bookham library.

Members' discussion – key points

SH explained that the aim was to concentrate on the core opening hours and that both Dorking and Epsom libraries would be open during the evening.

Chris Townsend doubted that residents would travel to other locations in the evening and asked the Library Service to provide the evening visitor figures for Epsom and Dorking for comparison. An amended recommendation was proposed by Chris Townsend, seconded by the Chairman and subsequently agreed by Members.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) resolved to agree:

- i. to change the opening hours for Ashtead and Bookham libraries as set out in Annex 2 and paragraphs 3 and 9 of this paper subject to review with further information being provided to the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member for Ashtead, to finalise opening hours.

Reasons for decision:

Members were concerned about the loss of later opening hours on Tuesday and Thursday at both libraries. Information was requested regarding the number of evening visitors to those local libraries which still offer later opening hours.

11/15 DECISION ON LOCAL COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 11]

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) resolved to agree:

- I. Under the County Council's constitution (Part 4, Standing Orders, Part 3 40 (f) to allow substitutes for district/borough council co-opted members for the municipal year 2015-2016.

Reason for decision:

Local Committee members wished to continue the practice of allowing substitutes for co-optees from the District Council.

12/15 LOCAL COMMITTEE AND MEMBERS' ALLOCATION FUNDING - UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION) [Item 12]

The Local Committee agreed to note:

- i. The amounts that have been spent from the Members' Allocation budget, as set out in Annex 1 of the report.

13/15 REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES AND TASK GROUPS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY BUDGET (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 13]

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) resolved to agree:

- i. The amended terms of reference for the Youth Task Group as set out in Annex 1
- ii. The terms of reference for the Property Task Group and the Parking Task Group as set out in Annexes 2 and 3 respectively.
- iii. Membership of the Youth Task Group as Chris Townsend, Helyn Clack, Cllr Mary Huggins and Cllr Sarah Seed.

- iv. Membership of the Parking Task Group as Hazel Watson, Tim Hall, Cllr Raj Haque and Cllr Rosemary Dickson.
- v. Membership of the Property Task Group as Tim Hall, Stephen Cooksey, Hazel Watson and Cllr Paul Elderton.
- vi. Representative and deputy for the East Surrey Community and Safety Partnership as Tim Hall and Stephen Cooksey respectively.
- vii. That the community safety budget of £3.337 that has been delegated to the Local Committee be transferred to the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership.

Reasons for Decisions:

The Local Committee's three task groups make a valuable contribution to its work and should therefore continue in 2015-16.

The revised Terms of Reference for the Youth Task Group will ensure a broader engagement of key stakeholders.

The representative (and deputy) will ensure that the Local Committee is represented on the East Surrey Community Partnership board and that Mole Valley priorities are taken into account.

Transfer of the small budget to the East Surrey Community Partnership will contribute to the funding of local projects in line with its set priorities.

Meeting ended at: 3.54 pm

Chairman

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)



DATE: WEDNESDAY 17 JUNE 2015
LEAD OFFICER: SARAH SMITH, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP AND COMMITTEE OFFICER
SUBJECT: WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC
DIVISION: ALL

Question from Mr Richard Banks

Last year I submitted a complaint (co16461) to Surrey CC. Having gone through all the procedures including the Ombudsman this has still not been resolved.

The complaint was regarding the changes to the road layout at the junction of Mill Lane with the A 217 at Hookwood near the Black Horse Pub. The reason given for the change was to prevent vehicles from doing U turns after turning left. It has failed to do this and vehicles just drive a bit further up the road and use the entrance to the car parking business on the right hand side to do the turn.

This leaves us with a junction that is a potential death trap. Traffic approaches Mill Lane from the right from a slight incline and a bend in the road. Because of the angle of the new junction it is difficult to turn your head to the right to get a safe view of oncoming traffic. The case has been taken up by local MP Crispin Blunt.

My question is – ‘What is being done to improve visibility and safety at this dangerous junction?’

Response from SCC Road Safety Team:

Introduction

The safety of the junction of the A217 Reigate Road and D336 Mill Lane was investigated in 2013 by a team including Surrey Police traffic management and road safety team, the county council’s local area highway engineering colleagues and the county council’s safety engineering team. The junction was investigated due to safety concerns being raised by local people via Hookwood Parish Council and a continuing history of collisions that had been taking place at this site, primarily involving illegal U-turns.

The problem exists because drivers exiting Mill Lane wishing to ultimately travel north (towards Reigate) are directed to travel south instead and circulate the A217 Reigate Road / C62 Reigate Road roundabout. It would appear that some drivers are unwilling to travel the extra distance to perform this manoeuvre and instead were completing illegal U-turns at the southern end of the central traffic island. This had resulted in a number of collisions involving U-turning vehicles and northbound or southbound vehicles on the A217. A number of collision reduction measures had already been installed in the past to try to address this problem, but collisions were still taking place:

- In the early 2000s hatched markings and lane markings and standard “No U-turn” signs were installed.
- Two enhanced “No U-turn” signs (with yellow backing) were installed in 2009.

Proposals

Following the investigation the following suggestions were discounted:

- A substantial junction improvement (such as providing a roundabout), would be prohibitively expensive.
- Extending the central reserve further south would remove right turn access into resident's driveways, and may still not deter the illegal u-turn manoeuvre.
- The police would endeavour to give this site additional enforcement attention. However drivers are unlikely to perform an illegal manoeuvre in front of a visible police presence and it is unlikely that there would be sufficient police resources to be present at this site frequently enough to deter illegal U-turns and so this was not considered a long term solution.

The following suggestions were taken forward:

- The nearside kerbs of the A217 directly to the south of Mill Lane should be re-aligned to reduce the southbound lane width in order to deter illegal U-turn manoeuvres.
- Narrowing the road in this way would also help reduce vehicle speeds through the junction.
- Amending the entry from Mill Lane would remove problems of vehicles exiting Mill Lane and forcing a merge with southbound traffic rather than giving way.
- At the point of the illegal U-turn manoeuvre, double height kerbs could be installed to deter vehicles swinging to the nearside and then across to perform a U-turn.
- A review of the speed limit through the junction to the roundabout would also be undertaken to consider reducing the existing 50 mph limit to 40 mph.

Subsequently the junction improvements were completed in March 2014, and a change in speed limit from 50 mph to 40 mph took place in November 2014.

Evaluation

The following Table 1 summarises the number of collisions resulting in personal injury and recorded by the police in the five year period before compared with the one year period after the scheme was implemented (the most recent data available is to the end of March 2015). Collisions that result in damage only and do not result in injury are not systematically recorded by the police and are not included within this data.

Table 1: Number of personal injury collisions recorded by the police

Period		Number of collisions at junction (those involving illegal u-turns shown in brackets)			
	Dates	Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total
Before	1/4/2009 to 31/03/2014 (5 years)	-	4 (3)	5 (3)	9 (6)
After	1/4/2014 to 31/03/2015 (1 year)	-	-	3 (1)	3 (1)

It can be seen from Table 1 that prior to the scheme there were nine collisions in five years (an average of 1.8 collisions per year), and four of these resulted in serious injury. Six of the nine collisions were thought to involve illegal u-turns (1.2 per year), with three of these resulting in serious injury.

In the one year after the scheme was built there have been three collisions resulting in slight injury. One of these involved an attempted illegal u-turn and the other two involved shunts

between vehicles on Mill Lane queuing to turn onto the A217. This shows that the number and severity of collisions involving illegal u-turns appears to have been reduced, though not completely eradicated. The total number of collisions has not reduced, though an after period of only one year has elapsed so far. It is usual in road safety engineering to consider an after period of at least 3 years.

The following Table 2 summarises speed survey results in the periods before and after the scheme was built.

Table 2: Speed survey results on the A217 in the vicinity of the Mill Lane Junction

Direction	Mean Average Speed (mph)		
	Before	After	Change
Southbound	46	40	-6 mph

It can be seen from Table 2 that the reduction in speed limit from 50 mph to 40 mph along with the narrowing of the road in the southbound direction has resulted in mean average speeds reducing by 6mph (from 46mph to 40 mph) in the southbound direction.

Site observations

A “stage 3” safety audit was undertaken on 23 May 2014. This involved a site visit by road safety engineering and police specialists to review the scheme following construction to identify any potential road safety hazards arising from the changes to the road layout. The colleagues undertaking this audit were made aware of the complaint regarding the changes in visibility for drivers exiting Mill Lane and took care especially to consider this issue. Following investigation no concerns were raised by the auditors regarding this issue.

In light of the question submitted to the local committee above, and in response to a previous request from the local member, a further site visit was undertaken by colleagues in the county council's road safety engineering team and local area highways team on 18 May 2015 to consider again the visibility for vehicles exiting Mill Lane. It is acknowledged that as a result of the new scheme drivers are more likely to need to stop and then turn their head to the right a little more at the give way line rather than proceeding down the slip lane in the old layout and then relying upon their wing mirror to try to merge into the southbound traffic. While this may be considered less convenient by some drivers, this is not considered to be especially hazardous. Indeed one of the serious collisions taking place on the old layout was associated with a vehicle merging out of the slip road into the path of a southbound vehicle. The visibility splay (measured in accordance with TD 42/95 Geometric Design of Major/Minor Priority Junctions) was also checked. This showed that the visibility splay between vehicles at the new give way line and southbound vehicles is approximately 140m, whereas the visibility splay from the old give way line was approximately 95m.

Conclusion

A highway safety scheme to address a history of collisions primarily involving illegal U-turns was implemented at this site in March 2014. There is an insufficient after period to yet be confident of the collision reduction success of the scheme, however data so far shows a reduction in the number and severity of collisions involving illegal U-turns. Speed surveys show that the scheme has also reduced the speed of vehicles travelling through the junction which also helps to reduce the risk of collision and the consequences of any collisions. While it is acknowledged that some drivers may find it less convenient to have to turn their head more to exit Mill Lane rather than using the old slip road layout to merge into the southbound traffic lane, this is not considered more hazardous. Concern that the junction is now much more dangerous as a result of the scheme is not borne out by the number of collisions taking place at the junction after the scheme was introduced. The visibility splay has also been

increased as a result of the new scheme. It is recommended that the county council's road safety team and Surrey police continue to monitor the number of collisions taking place at this site to check whether the scheme is successful in reducing casualties over a longer time period. Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management team have been consulted and support the response presented here.

.....

Questions from Peter Seaward on behalf of the Bookham Residents Association

Could we please have an update from SCC Highways on progress towards solutions for:

- The designated Wet Spot at the south end of Dorking Road, at the junction with the Polesden Lacey access road, Chapel Lane and Admirals Road.
- The flooding issues on Lower Road, Bookham between East Street and the High Street.
- Flood problems at the north western corner of the Lower Road Recreation Ground, where twin culverts pass under Lower Road.

Response from Surrey Highways:

Unfortunately the original proposal, to build a swale to contain surface water in times of heavy rain, is no longer feasible. It is now proposed to construct new soakaways within different 3rd party land which has been agreed in principle. The number of additional soakaways will be determined following tests to determine the suitability of the underlying chalk. It is also proposed to carry out extensive drainage maintenance over 2-3 months which will include cleaning and testing of the existing soakaways to increase capacity further. The works are currently programmed to be undertaken in the spring of next year and to be completed by the end of March, subject to weather and the necessary permits.

The areas where there has been highway flooding are prioritised for inclusion in the capital drainage programme of works. Unfortunately, the two locations on Lower Road, that have had some works in the past, are not on the programme for this financial year. However, these locations will be reviewed for increased routine maintenance.

.....

Displacement parking close to the High Street in Bookham is creating problems in specific roads in the centre of the village, especially in Fife Way. Here inconsiderate parking is inconveniencing the residents.

Would SCC parking officers agree to meet the residents to discuss what options if any could be introduced by SCC Highways to alleviate the issues raised by these people.

The Bookham Retail and Business Association has agreed to join any such meeting to see if they can help, as some of the displacement parking is caused by business and retail staff working in the vicinity.

Response from SCC Parking:

Yes, this is not a problem - we can certainly arrange to meet. Taking into account the fact that the site work for the next review does not take place until December of this year, there is plenty of time to arrange a meeting.

Question from Mr Clayton Wellman on behalf of Chart Downs' residents, users of the No.22 Saturday service and the local Liberal Democrat team.

A local petition calling for the retention of the Saturday bus service on route 22 has been signed by over 140 people from the Chart Downs area alone. Many of the signatories have reported why they find the current service is "difficult to use" – including an irregular timetable, unreliable time-keeping and lack of real-time information on delays. We have previously received similar feedback on other subsidised services, such as the 516 via Box Hill and Headley where passengers have been stranded by the non-appearance of the last service of the day. What standards does the County Council place on its service providers to meet these basic aspects of service provision and how does it monitor the operators' adherence to these requirements?

Response from SCC Travel and Transport:

Recent survey data on Metrobus service 22 indicates an average usage from Chart Downs as being 2 passengers per Saturday. The latest service reliability statistics from Metrobus for May 2015 indicate that journeys on the Saturday service 22 were on average operating 83.5% on time with some journeys operating up to 8 minutes late.

Metrobus service 22 is included on the Surrey real time passenger information (RTPI) system. There has been some recent disruption to the availability of live information for Metrobus services due to issues Metrobus have had with their scheduling software to supply the electronic service data for the Surrey RTPI system. However, scheduled information is still available on electronic signs at stops.

Electronic signs at individual stops are only one means of providing real time bus information to passengers. Real time bus information is also available via mobile phones and the internet using the Traveline Nextbuses service provided in partnership with Surrey County Council. This is particularly convenient for getting the latest service information for your bus without needing to be standing at the bus stop, and will be the same information that would be displayed on any signs installed at the stops. Details of how to use the Nextbuses service are on the Traveline website (www.travelinesoutheast.org.uk).

These web and mobile phone channels present a very cost effective way to provide real time bus information to the public and are used alongside the signs on the street to provide a range of information sources for bus passengers. Further relevant information on current RTPI developments in Surrey can be found on the Surrey County Council website, using this link <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/buses>.

The County Councils conditions of contract set out the operational requirements that all operators must adhere to. These conditions stipulate, that the contractor shall at all times during the contract period perform the services comprehensively with due skill, care and diligence strictly in accordance and in compliance with the scheduled timetable. The Contractor's performance is monitored by the Council and is measured on the level of compliance against the scheduled timetable and service specification. Officers achieve this

by initiating spot checks from Surrey County Council Inspectors, using Operators self declarations of lost mileage, requesting RTPI systems data, analysing operators ticket machine data and also by receiving reports from members of the public. All of these measures are used to assist officers in measuring compliance with the service specification. Service reviews and continuous improvement discussions take place throughout the contract period allowing the opportunity to scrutinise and review all aspects of the activities and performance while developing and agreeing proposals for achieving continuous improvements or for preventing failures. Issues which are outstanding and or require review are discussed to ensure total compliance by the Contractor with any monitoring arrangements.

When contracted services operate unreliably, for reasons deemed within the operator's control, financial deductions can be imposed against the operator.

Complaints regarding unreliable operations should be addressed to the Local Bus Team within the Travel & Transport Group, e-mail passenger.transport@surreycc.gov.uk

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)



DATE: WEDNESDAY 17 JUNE 2015
LEAD OFFICER: SARAH SMITH, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP AND COMMITTEE OFFICER
SUBJECT: WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM LC MEMBERS
DIVISION: ALL

Questions received from Mrs Helyn Clack (Dorking Rural)

The new junction layout at Mill Lane, Hookwood and the A217 is causing some drivers real physical discomfort and difficulty when pulling out of Mill Lane when checking traffic coming southbound on the A217. Is there evidence to prove that the new junction has reduced the amount of U Turns and accidents in comparison with the previous layout? Can residents be assured that the difficulties in seeing on-coming traffic to the right will not become a further safety issue?

Response from SCC Highways: Refer to response provided to Richard Banks (item 4a).

.....

The new bus consultation is looking to reduce the 526/527 bus service in the village of Charlwood from hourly to every ninety minutes. This proposal was put together prior to the withdrawal of the 40/50 service which served shift workers and commuters to Gatwick Airport. Can the changes now be halted to the 526/527 service? Can Surrey Transport advise whether a replacement for the 40/50 route appeal to another bus provider?

Response from SCC Travel and Transport:

The Local Bus Team has been working with operators to re-negotiate contracts and services to achieve savings demanded by the Local Transport Review. The proposal to reduce service 526/7 was made following discussions with operators and research into patronage data on the whole service.

The decision by the operator to withdraw service 40/50 was not known to Surrey County Council prior to finalising the Local Transport Review proposals. Originally, the bus service 40/50 enjoyed funding support from Central Hotels, as primarily it was designed to link their guests with Gatwick Airport. However, latterly this funding was withdrawn and the service has been provided on a non-contracted commercial basis.

All proposed service changes, arising from the Local Transport Review are subject to final consideration subsequent to responses from the public consultation which has now ended. Until June 6th 2015 service 40/50 also served Charlwood but the overall actual usage has been low. The service operated from 04:00 and operated every 45 minutes until 0700 and then an hourly service operated until 20:30, 7 days a week.

Recent survey data on service 40/50 from April 2015 showed the peak journeys for commuters and Airport workers between 04:00 – 08:30 having an average of 6 passengers per day, across the 6 journeys on offer. The busiest of these journeys is the 07:05 from Charlwood to Gatwick, with a daily average of 2.5 passengers. Much of this time relates to a period prior to the start of journeys on service 526/7.

The Local Bus team have been discussing opportunities with operators to provide a peak hour service am and pm to connect Charlwood with the Airport. Initial discussions conclude this could be achieved but at a cost as these journeys would not be commercially viable and subsidy support would be required. For budgetary reasons, Surrey County Council is unable to offer this.

.....

Brockham

Can Surrey Highways advise residents why there has been further delay in the resurfacing of the main road through the village from Kiln Lane to Strood Green? Residents have been expecting the road to be resurfaced for over a year and there has been a series of delays. Can these be explained?

Can residents be assured that the works due at Flanchford Bridge will not further the delay of resurfacing of the Brockham Village road?

Response from SCC Highways:

The Project Horizon scheme, from the junction of Brockham Lane with the A25 to, and including, the cross roads with Leigh Road is in the process of being assessed and programmed. The assessment of the road is underway, and the current programme for the works is to start at the end of July/early August during the school summer holidays, subject to weather and permits. The works will be during the daytime, so that there will not be construction noise at night time in this residential area. Unfortunately, surfacing works of this nature do cause traffic disruption but the works will be phased to keep access through the village.

The carriageway works have to be programmed to start after the extensive water main works are completed on the road. Unfortunately, the water main works had a delayed start but are currently on programme.

The Project Horizon works through Brockham Village are programmed to be completed before the earliest start date for the Flanchford Bridge replacement works.

.....

Flanchford Bridge, Leigh

Can Surrey Structures update residents for proposals and nature of the replacement bridge in Leigh? Can residents also be advised of the proposals for road closures, diversionary routes, communications supporting local businesses, length of time the closure will be and why?

Response from SCC Highways:

The replacement of the damaged Flanchford Bridge has, unfortunately, been delayed from the original programme. It is now programmed to start in mid October, at the earliest, subject to weather and the required permissions. These include for permission from the Environment Agency to carry out the bridge works over the River Mole, and the start date is dependent on favourable river levels. The contractor will be appointed in early autumn, and the works programme will be determined as soon as permissions are granted.

The road closure and diversion route, to carry out the bridge reconstruction, will be the same as the weight restriction diversion that is in place at the moment (via A217, Sidlow and Iron's Bottom). The signing will be comprehensive and the closure will be publicised in advance. The affected residents and businesses will also be informed directly, and additional signs provided as required.

The driving distance from Reigate to Leigh is increased by 1.9 miles (5.4 miles rather than 3.5 miles) when the diversion is in place. The period of the closure is anticipated to be for 6 months but it may be necessary to increase this duration if there is significant flooding during construction. This duration of 6 months is an estimate based on similar schemes however, the contractor will produce a full programme once appointed.

The proposed scheme is to replace the current bridge with a single span, single lane of traffic bridge. The bridge will be slightly widened to reduce the risk of the parapet being damaged, as was the case, and to provide a new footway on one side. The work also includes diversion and support of services. The estimated 6 month duration for these extensive works is a tight programme for all this work to be undertaken, but the disruption will be minimised as far as possible.

.....

Ockley

Please can Surrey Highways advise residents when the subsidence issues in Weare Street will be addressed? Residents report their vehicles sliding on the subsidence and are worried they may leave the road in wet and icy weather if this is left much longer.

Response from SCC Highways:

The project team has been working on the potential solutions to deal with the large scale complex issues at Weare Street. Unfortunately, there is no easy solution.

A thorough inspection of the road and the embankment slopes, at a number of particular locations, has been carried out by our consultant Atkins Ground Engineering. This report has been considered and reviewed by the project team and a potential way forward has now been identified. An extensive scheme, to effectively deal with the road stability issues in the longer term, is being prepared. Preliminary safety works, and a full design solution, will be carried out in the current financial year with the likelihood of major works progressing in the financial year 2016/17.

Preliminary safety works are being programmed, of substantial temporary road repairs, to stabilise the worst areas of the embankment slip where the road is starting to fail. This work has been ordered with our contractor, Kier, and we are currently waiting for all necessary approvals and permits so that the works can be carried out. Although a start date has yet to be confirmed, due to the time required for road space permits, it is currently programmed to begin in July. The road space has to be coordinated with East Sussex to avoid potential conflict with a diversion route. For your information the diversion route is (from the A29 end), A29 Stane Street, Right into Coles Lane and Right into Weare Street. And the reverse from the Coles Lane end. It's the diversion route conflict with Sussex that is the hold up at the moment.

Some of the drainage investigation work has also been carried out and the local team have ordered works to deal with these issues. This work will be carried out over the next three months in conjunction with other minor drainage repair work in the district.

Ockley A29

Can Surrey Highways further update local residents when these works will be completed and the road reopened?

Response from SCC Highways:

Unfortunately the closure of the road was extended until 11th June. This was to enable further safety improvement works to be carried out following a detailed safety audit. The road was opened, under single lane and traffic signals on the 11th June. The lane restriction is programmed to be in place, to complete the safety recommendations, until Monday 30th June.

.....

Beare Green

Can Surrey County Council Advise local residents of the diversionary routes police may use that have been put in place for the A24 at Beare Green? Are these made public? A recent serious accident on the A 24 caused problems on the Old Horsham Road when HGV's were unable to get through after the police diverted them.

Response from SCC Highways:

Surrey Police have some standard diversion routes for the motorway network, for example. However, an incident can occur anywhere on the Surrey Highway network and the Police will close the road without putting a diversion route in place for the immediate response. Diversion routes follow the same classification as the closed road, so the diversion for the A24 would be via "A" roads. Old Horsham Road is a "D" class road and, although local traffic may use this, it would not be signed as a diversion from the A24.

.....

Recently heavier traffic on the A24 alongside Beare Green Village has caused additional noise for residents living alongside. Does Surrey Highways have a programme for installing noise barriers alongside the A24 that can be applied in Beare Green?

Response from SCC Highways:

Noise barriers and bunds require a long uninterrupted length to be effective as noise can leak at the end of the system. New noise barriers and bunds are usually only installed as a planning requirement when new roads are constructed. Unfortunately, there is no programme for installing noise barriers alongside the A24 or Beare Green.

Questions received from Mr Stephen Cooksey (Dorking South and the Holmwoods)

When will the new restrictions to deal with inconsiderate parking in Dorking High Street come into force and what has delayed their introduction?

Response from SCC Parking:

The new restrictions will come into force in Dorking during the first week of July at the latest. The traffic order will be made at the end of June. The delay has been incurred by combining a number of parking schemes in Mole Valley to save resources. One of these (Bridge Street,

Leatherhead) has been delayed following discussions with local businesses but will now be progressed separately allowing the Dorking High Street, Ottways Lane and Lower Shott schemes to go ahead.

When will consultations begin on residents parking proposals in Dorking South and what are the reasons for the delay in this process?

Response from SCC Parking:

The residents parking schemes in Dorking (south) are part of the 2015 parking review. The statutory consultation for this will be carried out through July and includes a number of residents parking schemes as well as other restrictions in the district. The parking traffic orders in Mole Valley are currently 'text based' meaning the description of where the restrictions should go or be amended is described in writing. This can be time consuming to work on and has lead to some delays. This will however be the last time the review is carried out using text based orders. By the 2016 review, they will be converted to a plan based system that uses drawings rather than words to describe restrictions and is quicker to administer. It was also planned to wrap up the schemes described in the previous question, before advertising the parking review.

3. When will no through road proposals for Vincent Road, Dorking, come forward for consultation?

Response from SCC Highways:

A site visit to Vincent Road has been carried out. A plan is being drawn up and a letter is in the process of being drafted. When the Divisional Member is happy with the consultation material it will be delivered to the residents of Vincent Road. The aim is to deliver the material at the beginning of July.

When will proposals to deal with speeding traffic in Punchbowl Lane, Dorking come forward for consultation?

Response from SCC Highways:

Punchbowl Lane was included on the schemes list within the Highways Forward Programme, as discussed at the informal committee meeting of 5 November 2014. The local committee approved funding of the design of improvement measures in this financial year (2015-16) from the 'Small safety and improvement schemes' budget agreed at local committee of 4 March 2015. Surrey's Design Team is currently progressing these works, which are likely to be proposals for road markings to encourage lower speeds and improve visibility for residents. The design works are likely to be complete in the latter part of the current financial year and the local divisional member will be updated when plans are available.

County Highways officers and the police have been aware for some time that some users of the Lidl car park in Vincent Lane, Dorking, ignore the one way status of Vincent Lane and cut across the road to make a left turn into Vincent Road (which is an access only road) in order

to take a short cut to South Street. This is a very dangerous manoeuvre which residents inform me is increasing in frequency. Would County Highways take some action to prevent this activity taking place before a serious accident occurs?

Response from SCC Highways:

The requirement to turn left on exiting the Lidl car park onto Vincent Lane is clearly signed in accordance with the relevant regulations. It was noted that a left turn arrow road marking within the car park as shown on the plans approved as part of the planning application had not been provided. Lidl's have subsequently provided this road marking. There is no scope to amend the kerblines at the access to the Lidl car park to deter vehicles leaving the car park from turning right against the one-way flow of traffic in Vincent Lane. This is because this access is also used by delivery vehicles and any changes would prevent HGVs from entering/leaving the site.

The proposal to prevent access through Vincent Road (see response to further question from Councillor Cooksey above) would remove the ability for drivers who turn right from the Lidl car park and into Vincent Road to then access South Street, thereby resolving this issue. Work is on-going on this proposal.

At the present time, the only option available to address the issue of drivers turning right out of the Lidl car park is enforcement, which is the responsibility of the Police. Officers will raise this issue again with the Police to see what resource they can allocate to enforce the left turn from Lidl car park.

Question received from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)

In September 2014, the Mole Valley Local Committee approved the Mole Valley Cycling Plan including a series of actions with timescales. Which of the actions listed with timescales before June 2015:

a) have been achieved and what was the outcome in relation to each of these actions?

and

b) have not been achieved and what are the reasons for not doing so in relation to each action?

Response from SCC Cycling Team:

The Cycling Plan is jointly produced by the District and County. At the time of writing, a report on progress is being produced by District and County officers. When completed, it will be circulated to members of both the Local Committee as well as the District Executive.

.....
Question received from Cllr Rosemary Dickson (Leatherhead South)

Last year I asked the officers at the Local Committee if a No Through Road sign could go up on a little road just off the A244 and just above the turn off to Tesco on the Kingston Road. This little road has a row of houses one of which is called Fairlands.

The reason these residents want a No Through Road sign is because large vehicles come down this service road, thinking they can cut through to Oaklands Road, which they can't. There is no turning circle and it is making life very difficult for the residents.

Recently a fire engine came down this little road on a blue light with sirens going. They were looking for Rowhurst Wood. It took many valuable minutes for them to get turned and back onto the Oxshott Road.

I was assured last time I asked that this sign would be erected within the financial year. Nothing happened and I was then advised that the deadline was missed but it would be ordered and up within weeks of the new financial year. As of June 8th it is still not up, so I wonder if the Officers could tell me when the sign was ordered and when I can expect it to be erected.

I promised the residents this last year and they have waited patiently all these months. They have asked me several times when they can expect to see it. This sign is not something they just want for themselves. The reason is that vehicles, like the fire engine, are mistaking it for a through road and lives on that occasion could have been lost.

Response from SCC Highways:

The No Through Road sign requested by Councillor Dickson was ordered in early April and is waiting to be programmed by our contractor. Our contractor currently does not have a signing sub-contractor but is in the process of appointing one. Once the new signing sub-contractor is in place they will have a backlog of signing work to clear. Therefore it is unfortunately not possible to give an indicative date for the installation of this sign.

This page is intentionally left blank