

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 2.00 pm on 2 December 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]

No apologies and no notification of substitutions were received.

2/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes from 09 September were approved as a true record of the meeting.

3/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were received.

a PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Anita Guy (AG), Principal Engineer
Zena Curry (ZC), Area Highway Manager
Peter Shimadry (PS), Engineer

All written questions and responses can be found in the attached tabled papers under item 4a.

Mr Jim Howley was not present but received written responses to his questions in advance of the meeting.

.....

Mr Mike Giles (on behalf of Westhumble Residents' Association) received a written response in advance of the meeting and asked the following supplementary (text supplied by email)

“In view of the assurances recently given that the monitoring of the bridge condition suggests no imminent danger of a reduced weight limit and width restriction, and since Network Rail and WRA alike can have little or no confidence in the ability of Surrey Police or Trading Standards to enforce the restriction in the face of reduced manpower and the unpredictable timing of infringements, making coincidence of transgressors and enforcers unlikely in the extreme, is there any prospect of the police acting on information from residents, without the stipulation of unattainable photographic evidence? Such evidence requires a timed photograph, giving clear sight of the transgressing vehicle on the bridge, with the weight limit sign included in the same shot.”

The Chairman advised that he would take up the matter of the timed photo evidence with the police.

.....

Mr Roger Troughton (on behalf of Mole Valley Cycling Forum) was not present but had received a written response to his question in advance of the meeting. AG advised that she had received a further update from the contractor and that the lines had been overlooked; she will be following this up to ensure the work is done.

Mr Ron Billard (MVCF) asked a supplementary and wanted to know whether the policy on 'rights of way' could be looked at again as cyclists are using the A24 rather than the cycle paths as these are not continuous. AG noted the comments but stressed that at the moment the contractor was only replacing like for like.

.....

Mr Bob Bull (on behalf of Sustrans) raised the following as an informal question (text provided by email):

Route 22 of the National Cycle Network runs through Dorking to Westcott. The section between the A25 and Westcott village is virtually traffic free. Much of it constructed in recent times. This section is for all non motorised users and proven very successful in its ok - usage.

We have two outstanding issues that have been presented to Surrey County Council on a number of occasions with no remedy so far.

1) From the A25 down Milton Court Lane the route becomes unmetalled. Our

understanding is that the legal position of the eastern half of this track is that of an unmetalled road, so it is the responsibility of Surrey Highways. Nevertheless, as part of the Dorking Westcott route, the Countryside Access budget funded the surfacing of the whole length with Fittleworth sandstone. Two years ago, statutory undertakers dug a trench at the start of the unmetalled section that has never been reinstated satisfactorily. Cyclists, including NT workers, have complained that the surface is dangerous, particularly in poor light as there is no distinct difference in the appearance of the original and reinstated trench. However, there is a big difference in the quality of the surface that could easily result in a cyclist losing control or a pedestrian falling or twisting their ankle. On behalf of Sustrans and the National Cycle Network this section is now classed as dangerous to users and Sustrans have been advised accordingly.

2) The new build Westcott link from just beyond UNUM to the village has been a big success in terms of usage by all forms of users. We are now receiving regular complaints that the maintenance is poor. Serious encroachment has had the effect of reducing the width of the path. In places so bad with stinging nettles that parents were concerned for their children. We are concerned that years of campaigning resulting in a public inquiry and significant investment could be wasted if the path is damaged by such encroachment and lack of maintenance.

There are also regular complaints of dog fouling. I met some dog walkers this morning. Dog bins are provided at each end of the link. They complained that the path was now too narrow to pass horses, wheelchairs, bicycles coming in the opposite direction. The original concept that formed an important feature of the submission to the public inquiry was the available width. This to allow all users including horses and including the soft verge up to the fence. That verge is now unusable due to uncontrolled vegetation including swathes of stinging nettles.

In response ZC agreed to meet on site to go through the issues raised.

.....

District Councillor Chris Hunt asked an informal question around what action SCC could take in response to the blocking of a private road that the public have had unfettered access to for 20years. Although signs state that it is a private road, no parking and no through-road but do not make reference to s.31 Highway Act (1980) in general and do not state that there is no public right of way.

In response AG advised that he should have already received an email reply from a member of the Highways team setting out the status of the road and that he should correspond directly with that officer, as he would be able to provide the relevant information.

.....

District Councillor Hunt also whether SCC could either confirm or investigate who owns the land in front of Ashtead youth centre and also confirm that the advertising signs in the grass verge have the necessary permits or consents.

AG confirmed that the area in question is common land and therefore he would need to contact Mole Valley District Council.

.....

b MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]
No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Zena Curry (ZC), Area Highway Manager
Anita Guy (AG), Principal Engineer
Peter Shimadry (PS), Engineer

All written questions and responses can be found in the attached tabled documents under item 4b.

Questions received from Mrs Hazel Watson (HW) (Dorking Hills):

Supplementary questions and comments:

Q2 HW was not happy with the response she had received. PS insisted that schemes had to be prioritised based on location as well as traffic and accident data and that there was no collision history. It would however still be noted for future consideration.

Q3 HW advised that she still thought that this white-lining needed to be done and that she would take the issue up with Highways outside of the meeting.

Q4 HW asked officers if the condition of the road was 'an embarrassment' to Surrey County Council but the Chairman stressed that it was not appropriate to put this to officers.

Q5 ZC commented that due to the change in drainage contractors it will take time to work through all the assets on the list that need to be done and that A roads and country lanes are given priority.

.....

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

Supplementary questions and comments:

Q1 SC found the response unacceptable and wanted to know why Local Committee members had not been involved in the meeting between John Furey and Cllr James Friend. ZC explained that this had been about submitting an expression of interest for funding and that the outcome of any bid would not be known until October 2016. The Chairman stressed that current discussions were purely around finance.

Q3 SC asked whether the experimental cleaning had been successful but AG confirmed that the results were not yet known.

Question (verbal) from Mrs Helyn Clack (HC)(Dorking Rural)

HC requested an update on Flanchard Bridge. ZC confirmed that she had requested an update but that it is unlikely that work would start until the new financial year; she will forward on the full response once received.

5/15 PETITIONS [Item 5]

No declarations of interest received

Officers present:

Peter Shimadry (PS), Engineer

Christopher Heath Thomas presented his petition which had received 80 online signatories.

“Many children use Little Bookham St as part of their journey to school and many families live on Little Bookham St. However, the street is also extensively used by commuters, lorries and buses. Speeding is all too common. Despite this, Little Bookham St does not currently have any traffic calming features. We fear it is only a matter of time before a child is seriously injured or killed.”

Mr Thomas received a response (attached) in advance of the meeting.

Petitioner's comments:

He was encouraged that a speed survey will be carried out but hoped that other factors would be considered such as the road layout, narrow pavements and the types of vehicles that use it.

PS confirmed that he would talk to the sustainable travel team about education for children and commented that problems might be being caused by inappropriate driving or particular types of vehicles.

The Chairman welcomed back Clare Curran after a period of absence. She pointed out that a VAS camera had been installed on the Little Bookham Street junction with Selfarm Road and that signage on the roundabouts had been refreshed. She asked whether it might be possible to use the signatories to the petition to set up a community speed watch.

6/15 WOODFIELD LANE, ASHTEAD [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 6]

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Anita Guy (AG), Principal Engineer

Zena Curry (ZC), Area Highway Manager

Paul Anderson (PA), Strategic Parks and Parking Manager

Member discussion:

The Chairman advised committee members that he had received varied correspondence on this item, some of which had been inaccurate or misleading.

AG outlined report highlights that addressed the queries raised at the September meeting around a commitment from SCC to the replacement of trees, parking and enforcement issues and funding for the scheme.

Cllr Rosemary Dickson asked whether the webbing would protect exposed roots and if the cost of re-surfacing the path because of roots pushing through had been taken into account; she also requested clarification (s 2.7 main report) on what test would be used to determine whether any damage was attributable to the tree works.

AG explained that the methods being used were accepted as 'best practice' and that they had been assured by the contractors that the resin bound material should guard against roots pushing through. The tree survey informs of the condition of each tree, so if any damage occurs after the works they will talk to MVDC about what action is to be taken.

Cllr Mary Huggins (MH) asked how many vehicles would be able to park in the new lay-by and this was confirmed to be around 24.

Mrs Helyn Clack (HC) commented that the independent tree survey had been particularly useful and expressed concern over the diseased trees. PA confirmed that it would be up to MVDC to replace any that fell over due to this in the future.

Chris Hunt (CH) (Mole Valley District Councillor) expressed his view that the deferment from the September meeting had resulted in the commitment by SCC to replace damaged trees. Chris Townsend (CT) raised a point of order that this undertaking had been included in the September report with which the Chairman agreed. CH voiced further objections including the use of s106 money, one hour parking limit not being to the benefit of commuters or shop-workers, insufficient enforcement officers, 25% reduction of trees not in line with BS standard and shorter pavement life.

The Chairman reminded members that the scheme would be paid for using PIC money rather than s106 funds.

CT apologised for his earlier interruption but insisted there was nothing new in today's report and addressed the following points:

- a) The one hour parking limit is there to assist residents using the common, shopping in Craddocks parade or using St Stephens doctor's surgery.
- b) The independent tree survey is excellent and at s 3.9 states that no health and safety work needs to be done.
- c) The bollards are already there to deter travellers and have so far not damaged the trees
- d) The aim of the scheme was not to reduce car usage and double yellow lines would have the same effect as to spread traffic across Ashtead village.
- e) With regard to funding there was still £100,000 available for use on projects in the area and some were already being discussed.

CT proposed the recommendations and this was seconded by Cllr Paul Stanyard.

Mrs Clare Curran (CC) recalled that consultation had taken place under her chairmanship of the Local Committee and had been exemplary. The fact that the Ashtead RA supported the scheme was significant.

HC commented that it was regrettable that there had been no discussions 'round the table' to allow parties to come to a consensus on the issue.

A vote was taken and the recommendation was agreed by 8 votes to 2.

Chris Townsend left the room.

Cllr Dickson left the room.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) resolved to agree that :

- (i) The proposal for a parking lay-by in Woodfield Lane, Ashtead, as shown in Annex 2 to this report, is approved for construction;
- (ii) The intention of the County Council to make a Traffic Regulation Order under the relevant part of the Traffic Regulation Act 1984 is advertised, the effect of which will be to implement a No Right Turn from the northern end of the Woodfield Lane service road into the main carriageway of Woodfield Lane, and that if no objections are maintained, the Order is made;
- (iii) The intention of the County Council to make a Traffic Regulation Order under the relevant part of the Traffic Regulation Act 1984 is advertised, the effect of which will be to implement no waiting restrictions in the parking lay-by to operate Mondays to Saturdays between the hours of 8am and 6pm, restricting parking to 1 hour with no return within 1 hour, and to revoke any existing traffic orders as

necessary, and that if no objections are maintained, the Order is made; and

- (iv) Authority be delegated to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee, and the relevant local Divisional Member to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals.

Reason for recommendations:

To enable construction of the parking lay-by proposal in Woodfield Lane, Ashted to proceed.

**7/15 RIGHT OF WAY, MICKLEHAM [OTHER COUNTY COUNCIL FUNCTIONS]
[Item 7]**

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Daniel Williams (DW), Countryside Access Officer

Statements from members of the public were included in the tabled papers and are attached.

The Chairman reminded members of the 'rights of way' process and pointed out that a letter from Longshot had been circulated with the agenda papers.

Mrs Juliet Lowes read out her statement.

Cllr Raj Haque left the room.

Members' discussion:

Divisional member Hazel Watson commented that the committee had been presented with a thorough report and agreed that the evidence supported the existence of a public footpath.

The committee agreed unanimously with the officer's recommendation.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) resolved to agree that:

- (i) Public footpath rights are recognised over A-B-C on Drg. No. 3/1/40/H4 and that this application for a MMO under sections 53 and 57 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to modify the Definitive Map and Statement by the addition of a footpath is approved. The route will be known as Public Footpath No. 597 (Mickleham).

And agreed that:

- (ii) A MMO should be made and advertised to implement these changes. If objections are maintained to such an order, it will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for confirmation

Reasons for recommendations:

The County Council has a duty under Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (WCA 1981) to modify the Definitive Map and Statement (DMS) if it discovers evidence which on balance supports a modification. In this instance the evidence of long use supports the making of an MMO.

8/15 DORKING TRAFFIC SIGNALS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 8]

No declarations of interest received:

Officers present:

Anita Guy (AG), Principal Engineer
Zena Curry (ZC), Area Highway Manager

(Chris Townsend returned)

Members' discussion:

Stephen Cooksey commented that they had held a very constructive meeting on this issue, but was concerned how it would be taken forward and asked whether the local committee budget would cover what was required.

(Cllr Haque returned)

AG confirmed that there was no committee funding allocated at the current time but that there was a small allocation available for safety improvements and suggested that potentially developer funding could be used for capital improvements.

Helyn Clack was pleased with the progress and questioned whether the fact that John Furey and Cllr James Friend had met would lead to the possibility of joint funding.

Cllr Elderton welcomed the report but enquired whether there would be data collecting. ZC confirmed that the traffic models they have are out of date. They do have a base model they can use because a full study would be likely to take a further 1 -2 years. Instead they were looking to achieve some 'quick wins' such as by making changes to routes.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to note the report.

**9/15 BUS STOP CLEARWAY, GUILDFORD ROAD, ABINGER HAMMER
[EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 9]**

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Zena Curry (ZC), Area Highway Manager

Members' comments:

Divisional member Hazel Watson expressed her full support for the scheme.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) resolved to agree that:

- (i) A Clearway is introduced at the existing bus stop on Guildford Road Abinger Hammer (at Marsh View). The restriction to be no stopping 7 until 7 except buses Mon-Sat.

Reason for recommendations:

- (i) Buses require parallel alignment with the kerb to deploy ramping and kneeling equipment to allow access for wheelchair users and those with mobility problems.
- (ii) Parked vehicles within bus stops prevent this access.
- (iii) Bus stop clearways enable Borough and District enforcement officers to issue penalty charge notices on offending vehicles thereby discouraging inconsiderate parking.

10/15 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 10]

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Zena Curry (ZC) Area Highway Manager

Anita Guy (AG), Principal Engineer

Members' discussion:

Chris Townsend commented that he welcomed the 20mph outside schools (p.85 officer's report) although the Chairman reminded him that this work was still to be done and in any event, traffic models indicate that these do not affect speed.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to note the report.

Reasons for recommendations:

To update the Local Committee on the progress of the highway works programme in Mole Valley.

11/15 HIGHWAYS FORWARD PROGRAMME [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 11]

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Zena Curry (ZC), Area Highway Manager

Anita Guy (AG), Principal Engineer

Peter Shimadry (PS), Engineer

A change to the recommendation (v) was required due to an error in the original report.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:

General

- (v) Note that the Local Committee's devolved highways budget for capital works has been reduced as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan, to £322,582 in 2016/17 and to £276,500 in 2017/18, and that it has been assumed that the revenue budget for 2016/17 remains the same as for 2015/16, at £196,810;
- (vi) Note that a further report will be presented to the March 2016 meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee to agree a revised programme should the devolved budget vary from these amounts;

And resolved to:

Capital Improvement Schemes (ITS)

- (vii) Agree that the capital improvement schemes allocation for Mole Valley be used to progress the Integrated Transport Schemes programme set out in Annex 2;
- (viii) Authorise that the Area Highway Manager, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, be able to vire money between the schemes agreed in Annex 2, if required;

Capital Maintenance Schemes (LSR)

- (ix) **Agree that the capital maintenance schemes allocation for Mole Valley be divided equitably between County Councillors to carry out Local Structural Repair, and that the schemes to be progressed be agreed by the Area Maintenance Engineer in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local divisional Members;**

Revenue Maintenance

- (x) Authorise the Area Maintenance Engineer, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant local divisional Member, to use £66,810 of the revenue maintenance budget for 2016/17 as detailed in Table 2 of this report;
- (xi) Agree that £5,000 per County Councillor be allocated from the revenue maintenance budget for Highways Localism Initiative works, and that if bids for this funding have not been received by the end of May 2016, the monies revert to the relevant Member to use to fund Community Enhancement works;
- (xii) Agree that Members should contact the Area Maintenance Engineer to discuss their specific requirements with regard to any Community Enhancement allocation and arrange for the work activities to be managed by the Area Maintenance Engineer on their behalf;
- (xiii) Agree that the remaining £100,000 of the revenue maintenance budget be used to fund a gang to carry out minor maintenance works throughout Mole Valley, managed on Members' behalf by the Area Maintenance Engineer.

Reasons for recommendations: To agree a forward programme of highways works in Mole Valley for 2016/17 – 2017/18, funded from the Local Committee's devolved budget.

12/15 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS ASSESSMENT FOR MOLE VALLEY [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 12]

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Guy Davies (GD), Principal Planning Officer, Mole Valley District Council

Members' discussion:

GD explained that responses already received naturally showed that 'highways' was performing strongly and that he would like to come back to the Local Committee in the future to discuss the issues raised further.

There was a suggestion that there may have been some confusion between the communications on this campaign and those for the Transform Leatherhead project and queried whether they could have been separated out. GD explained that the two campaigns are connected and doing that would have risked Bookham, Ashted and other areas in the north of the district being left out.

HW wanted to know how county councillors could contribute their input and GD advised that they should use the online questionnaire. Several members asked how the information collected would be taken forward.

GD stressed that the responses would flag up those issues of most importance to residents and would be used to feed into the new local plan and Mole Valley District Council's priorities with regard to future use of CIL money. They would also use it as a basis to lobby those bodies who provide infrastructure.

There was some discussion about the possibility of Crossrail 2 coming to Epsom and the effect it might have on Mole Valley district, but GD stressed that the campaign was about identifying current needs rather than those possibly in the future.

(Cllr Stanyard left the room).

13/15 LOCAL CYCLING PLAN [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 13]

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Marc Woodall (MC), Sustainable Transport Manager
Lucy O'Connell, Strategic Leadership Manager MVDC

(Cllr Stanyard returned)

Members' discussion:

MW emphasised the change in approach by using an online map to facilitate continuous improvements and advised that his team will bring further updates on the plan to future local committee meetings.

Hazel Watson (HW) was pleased that the action plan showed only one 'red item' but commented that the access portal this referred to was of utmost importance to allow the authorities to know when 'sportive' events are taking place. MW explained that the events calendar, which is not just for cycling, would be going live imminently on the SCC website and that the county council is developing a code for organisers which will go to the Board for approval in the new year.

HW suggested that residents would like the route of the Prudential RideLondon event to be varied. The Chairman asked Helyn Clack (HC) about the process for possibly changing the route. She explained that it was a 5 year programme and that a change of London Mayor in 2017 will have a bearing on what happens in the future, but that it would be worth mentioning to the Cycling Board to start that dialogue.

Chris Townsend asked whether in the long-term the possibility of joining up the cycle paths in Epsom to Ashted and on to Dorking was being pursued. MW explained that the A24 presented challenges through Ashted itself but that there were other options in the north. They are working on proposals for a bid for funding from Coast to Capital funding for the Ashted to Epsom route.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:

- (i) Note the progress in implementation of the Action Plan

And resolved to agree to:

- (ii) establishing the Cycling Plan online, including the mapping of existing and potential cycle facilities.

and

- (iii) have an ongoing community engagement for the Plan, facilitated through the online resource, to be regularly reported back to the Local Committee.

Reason for recommendations:

- (i) The Action Plan was approved last year and is being implemented.
- (ii) An online resource will help to facilitate further community engagement.

**14/15 RECOMMENDATION AND DECISION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION]
[Item 14]**

Officer Present:

Sarah J Smith, Community Partnership and Committee Officer

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) noted the recommendation and decision tracker.

15/15 MEMBERS' ALLOCATIONS [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 15]

Officer present:

Sandra Brown, Community Partnership Team Leader – East

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to note the report.

Meeting ended at: 4.14 pm

Chairman

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)



DATE: 02 DECEMBER 2015
LEAD SARAH SMITH, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP AND
OFFICER: COMMITTEE OFFICER

SUBJECT: WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

DIVISION: ALL

Questions received from Mr Jim Howley

1.The appalling traffic delays on the A25, on both East & West of Dorking that have resulted from the ill conceived traffic lights arrangements, as above MUST be addressed. We have now had 10 months of purgatory & trade in the town must be suffering also as a result of this bureaucratically introduced hell. The previous Zebra pedestrian crossing was both adequate & safe. Vehicles emerging from Waitrose’s car park in Junction Rd. do not need a traffic light at all, but should take their chance when a gap permits but there should be another Zebra pedestrian crossing across Junction road from Waitrose entrance to Cummings side.

Response from SCC Highways:

A question was asked by the divisional Member for Dorking South and the Holmwoods at the September Mole Valley Local Committee meeting regarding the operation of the traffic signals in Dorking and the current levels of congestion. A meeting has subsequently been held to discuss the issue and forms the subject of a report on the agenda of this meeting.

The introduction of traffic signals at the South Street/Junction Road junction was part of the highway works associated with the planning permission for the new Waitrose store. The view of Members at the meeting referred to above was that the signals at the South Street/Junction Road signals were not contributing to the congestion in Dorking. Officers concur with this view and would comment that the signalised crossing facility provides pedestrians with a dedicated phase to cross the road when traffic is stopped.

.....

2. Vincent Lane, Dorking

The arrangements here are not working well, causing extensive holdups again particularly at the Guildford Road end. Any heavy vehicle & buses in either lane prevents the flow of vehicles in the other lane, due to the narrow nature of the road, at that end.

A C.P.O. taking just a few feet from the ends of the gardens at that end would make a world of difference and help to reduce the gridlocking which occurs with the present arrangements.

Response from SCC Highways:

As reported in the separate paper on this agenda regarding the traffic signals in Dorking, the operation of all the junction signals in Dorking will be reviewed. The data set used to operate the signals at the Westcott Road/Vincent Lane junction will be assessed and revalidated to see if any changes can be made to improve their operation.

The use of compulsory purchase to acquire land is a lengthy and costly process. Officers would advise that there is no intention to follow this course of action.

Questions received from Mike Giles (on behalf of the Westhumble Residents' Association)

In October, a petition presented at County Hall by Westhumble Residents' Association to Councillor Furey, Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding, sought provision of funds to overcome the presently intractable problem of Westhumble Bridge.

Could the Mole Valley Highways Officers please advise us on progress since that meeting in the search for options alternate to the obvious solution of replacing supports to the bridge deck with modern materials?

In responding, would they please include the following:

- 1) full details of the plans for camera, or other enforcement, and, most importantly, an assessment of outcomes, including advice from the emergency services as to the impact on attendance times for vehicles unable to cross the bridge.

Westhumble Residents' Association has already advised that there is no room for a turning space below the bridge, so we see no benefit in expending further time and money in considering that option, but there would be need for significantly enhanced signage on the A24, since inadvertent transgressors would not have benefit of avoiding prosecution by turning round before the bridge;

- 2) an update on progress in persuading satnav companies to indicate both the weight restriction on the bridge and the total unsuitability of the lanes to the west of the village for HGV's, in particular, commenting on the incompatibility between the prevention of overweight vehicles using the bridge and the proper discouragement of such vehicles from using the alternative routes;
- 3) reaction to our concern that consideration of approaches other than the proper reconciliation of this matter will consume funds better directed towards the final solution;
- 4) since the local Mole Valley Highways Officers will be familiar with the only alternatives for vehicles over 7.5 tonnes,

justification for the consequential increase in the use of these lanes by

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

vehicles totally unsuited to their narrow and twisting nature, with significant hills; routes which are formally acknowledged as "quiet lanes" which HGV's should already avoid, and which they are to be further discouraged from using, as in 2) above;

- 5) we are mindful of the realities of budget constraints, but can only view the proposed enforcement of the weight limit as a temporary and potentially expensive solution. Sooner, rather than later, the deck of the bridge must be replaced and monies devoted to interim schemes will prove to have been expensive and wasteful distractions. The argument that it is inappropriate to use public funds for structural alteration of a third party asset is unconvincing in this case, since the sole outcome will be the provision of a highway suited to modern requirements, where no other alternative exists, which is the council's responsibility ~ no benefit will accrue to the owners of the bridge.

Please assure us that at the earliest opportunity the Westhumble Bridge will be given due consideration for upgrade and that we will not have further to take up the valuable time of Councillors and Officials in pressing an irrefutable case.

Response from SCC Highways:

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding considered the West Humble Residents Association petition for funding of £750,000, to strengthen the Network Rail owned West Humble Railway Bridge, on 9th October, and approved the response attached.

The Local Committee has very limited funding, under increasing pressures, and there is not the level of funding available to fund works of this scale, and on a third party asset. There is also very limited CIL and other developer funding available, and this is generally only available to fund specific infrastructure measures to mitigate for the development. However, the Local Committee will discuss this issue at the informal Local Committee Meeting in February 2016.

The priority of strengthening of this Network Rail bridge is low as the bridge is not on a strategic route and is not a link road to villages, towns, areas of interest/economic activity and is therefore unlikely to be a priority for other funding sources such as bids to the Local Enterprise Partnership.

Although the decision is disappointing to you, this Network Rail bridge will continue to be monitored through safety inspections.

.....

Question received from Roger Troughton (on behalf of the Mole Valley Cycling Forum)

Earlier this year Surrey Highways refreshed the white-lining on the A24 and A25 roads. Could they confirm when they are going to complete the refresh of the white-lining and symbols on the cycle routes alongside these roads?

Only a few were refreshed at the time – eg. at the end of Ashcombe Road (which weren't that old anyway). To assist Surrey Highways, back in May I provided them with a pilot survey which I carried out on behalf of Mole Valley Cycling Forum and which identified many of these issues in the Dorking area. In my most recent correspondence with Peter Shimadry back in September, he was unable to provide any information as to when this refresh would be carried out.

Nevertheless, recently it was possible for a brand new white line and symbol to be painted on the pavement alongside the A24 between Deepdene Station and Deepdene roundabout (effectively creating a segregated route) whilst many of the other cycle symbols in the area are now worn beyond recognition.

Response from SCC Highways:

Refreshing road markings on the main road network, defined as Surrey Priority Network (SPN) 1, 2 and 3 roads, is carried out Countywide on a three year rolling programme. Mole Valley was one of four Districts/Boroughs where the SPN 1, 2 and 3 network road markings were refreshed in 2015/16. As part of this refresh, the cycle markings on the path alongside the carriageway should have been refreshed.

Officers have raised the omission to refresh the road markings on the cycle route alongside the A24 and A25 with the contractor. The contractor is investigating this issue and it is hoped that a verbal update can be provided at the meeting. Officers would be pleased to continue to work with the Mole Valley Cycle Forum to ensure that the road markings identified as being on the SPN 1, 2 and 3 network are refreshed as part of this year's programme.

It should be noted that refreshing road markings is a revenue function whereas the new road markings provided on the footway alongside the A24 between Deepdene Station and Deepdene roundabout were funded from a separate capital budget.

Ah y

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

DATE: 02 DECEMBER 2015

LEAD OFFICER: SARAH SMITH, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP AND COMMITTEE OFFICER

SUBJECT: LC MEMBERS' WRITTEN QUESTIONS

DIVISION: ALL



Questions received from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)

1. When will the recommendations of the Road Safety Outside School report be implemented, including the extended safety barrier near the crossing on the A25 at Westcott to help children walking to Surrey Hills School do so safely?

Response from SCC Highways:

The Road Safety Outside School report of January 2015 recorded on-site observations relating to existing infrastructure, road user behaviour, pedestrian behaviour and potential conflicts. It also made a number of recommendations. The recommendations are listed below, with commentary on the current status.

- **Yellow back the school signs in both directions:** An order has been raised to SCC's contractor to replace the existing warning signs. These types of works are programmed in batches to maximise value for money from the contractor. It is anticipated that these works will be complete before the end of the current financial year.
- **Data for speed of vehicles:** This was obtained and showed average speeds of 28 mph eastbound and 32 mph westbound. The section of road is included within the Mole Valley speed management plan as a high priority for the consideration of police enforcement attention.
- **Investigate the guard railing at the bottom of the footway with the possibility to extend:** Land ownership issues have been resolved. An order has been raised to SCC's contractor for the additional pedestrian guardrailing approaching the signalised crossing plus the removal of the wooden post in the footway. This has been escalated as a high priority order and it is anticipated that these works will be complete before the end of the current calendar year.
- **Advise school of what could be done at the bottom of school lane:** SCC's Sustainable Travel Team has been in contact with the school to arrange a meeting whereby training can be delivered to teaching assistants for passing onto the pupils.
- **Advise school to cut back any vegetation that obscures sight line:** The school has received a copy of the Road Safety Outside Schools Assessment, which includes this recommendation.

2. When will a pedestrian crossing on Chalkpit Lane in Dorking near Triangle Stores be provided to enable children to safely walk to St Martin's School as this is urgently needed?

Response from SCC Highways:

A safety meeting was held at the site in February 2014, attended by the local divisional member, officers from SCC's Sustainable Travel Team and Local Highways Team, the Headteacher of St Martin's School and parents of pupils from St Martin's School. Following discussions, the Sustainable Travel Team worked with the school to investigate the potential recruitment of a school crossing patrol and also to deliver pedestrian training to teaching assistants for passing on to the pupils. The Sustainable Travel Team would be happy to assist in any further initiatives to improve safety education. Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team was advised of the findings and outcome of the meeting.

The provision of a pedestrian crossing was included on the list of schemes to be considered for progression by Mole Valley Local Committee. The Highways Forward Programme is included as a separate item on the agenda of this committee meeting (2 December 2015). The provision of a pedestrian crossing on Chalkpit Lane is retained on the list of schemes for future consideration by Mole Valley Local Committee. Progression will be subject to agreement by the Local Committee, available funding and prioritisation alongside other schemes.

.....

3. Some of the recommendations of the Safety Audit Report relating to the shared cycle path on the pavement on the east side of the A24 between the Deepdene roundabout and the Dorking Deepdene Railway Station have been implemented. However, the white line to segregate the cyclists from the pedestrians stops short and does not continue far enough north towards the station, give way markings for cyclists at the junctions with Brook Close and Deepdene Avenue Road are missing and reflective material has not been put on the posts on the pavement to warn cyclists. When will this further work be completed? In addition, can signs be provided to warn pedestrians and cyclists that there are driveways crossing the pavement as residents have poor sight lines from their properties when driving across the pavement onto the A24?

Response from SCC Highways:

Following the safety audit the recommendations were considered for design of improvements. The white line segregating pedestrians and cyclists extends from a point close to property No. 7 to a point near to property No. 29. It is not intended to extend this line further north towards Deepdene Station across the junctions with Brook Close and Deepdene Avenue Road, due to the constraints of available footway/cycleway width and street furniture. The local area highways team is coordinating the additional works, including appropriate reflective material for the posts and additional warning signs. It will not be possible to provide signs to warn of driveways crossing the pavement as only signs prescribed by the traffic signs legislation are permitted.

.....

4. The condition of Lyefield Lane is extremely poor. In view of this, can the resurfacing of Lyefield Lane under Operation Horizon be brought forward to be implemented at the earliest opportunity?

Response from SCC Highways:

It is appreciated that the divisional Member considers the condition of Lyefield Lane to be poor. Engineering assessments of roads are carried out in accordance with asset prioritisation criteria which include condition, usage, etc. There are around 300 roads still to be resurfaced under Operation Horizon, and the Major Maintenance team are currently carrying out these assessments, with a provisional programme for Year 4 (April 2016 - March 2017) of Operation Horizon expected in February 2016. A programme date for Lyefield Lane will be known at that time.

.....

5. I requested a row of 4 blocked gullies in Tot Hill in Headley to be unblocked and cleared to help prevent ice on the carriageway, which is on a slope near a sharp bend, to reduce the risk of accidents. The response I received from Highways was that the lids of these gullies were jammed but that the jammed lid program is currently suspended pending an internal investigation. When will the jammed lid program be resumed so that the 4 gullies on Tot Hill in Headley can be unblocked as a matter of urgency?

Response from SCC Highways:

A new computer based system has been introduced which enables the drainage asset to be logged, including jammed gully lids, missing assets and dates of cleaning. A search of the system has identified two jammed lids in Tot Hill. There is also one gully that has been logged as missing from the original asset register and so has not been cleaned. All the other gullies in Tot Hill were cleaned on 19 October 2015.

Officers are currently in discussion with Kier and Conway regarding raising a works order which will set out a programme of un-jamming and cleaning as many of the gullies which have been identified as having jammed lids as possible before the end of this financial year.

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

1. At the September meeting of the Local Committee, following a question that I raised about dealing with traffic congestion in Dorking, it was agreed that a meeting to discuss traffic signal phasing would be organised and in addition the Chairman was asked to facilitate a 'summit' meeting involving both Surrey County Councillors and officers and Mole Valley District Council members and officers, as a matter of urgency, to address the general issue of traffic congestion in Dorking. The traffic signals' meeting has been held and is reported on the agenda. Could members be informed about why the 'urgent' summit meeting has not yet been organised and when it will take place?

Response from SCC Highways:

The congestion in Dorking is a large and complex issue that would require substantial funding to address, and beyond the budget for the Local Committee. Historic traffic models would require updating, in order to inform collective discussions on feasible options. A potential Expression of Interest for the required funding could be part of the Growth Fund 3 bids to the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership. It is, unfortunately, too soon in the process to hold a meeting of the nature described. However, the Local Committee will be kept updated, as part of the update on the traffic signals in Dorking town centre, at the February 2016 informal meeting.

.....

2. At the September meeting of the Local Committee members were informed that plans for the proposed trial one-way system for the narrow part of Dene Street, Dorking leading to the High Street, were expected to be made available shortly and that the scheme was expected to come into operation in February 2016. Since no plans have yet been made available could members be informed about when this will happen and whether the delay will affect the implementation of the scheme, which is reported as being late January/ early February in the report set out under item 10 on the agenda.

Response from SCC Highways:

As advised at the September meeting, details of the scheme were to be shared with the divisional Member once finalised. Copies of the drawing have now been provided to both the divisional Member and the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman. The proposal is currently being priced and officers are working with the contractor to programme the works for early February, once the Christmas and January sales period is over. Officers will also be liaising with Members to agree the most appropriate method of informing and consulting with local residents and businesses.

.....

3. Could a progress report be made on the cleaning of the numerous tar footprints from the yorkstone paving in West Street, Dorking, left by the contractors undertaking the road resurfacing work in September and October?

Response from SCC Highways:

A specialist contractor is organising remedial work to remove the tar from the yorkstone paving in West Street. The process that will be used was trialled last week, and assuming it produced the required result, officers will be updated with potential dates for the remedial work to be carried out.

Officers will update the divisional Member once the outcome of the trial and programme dates are known.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)



DATE: 02 December 2015

SUBJECT: **PETITION** – to introduce traffic calming measures on Little Bookham St, Little Bookham

DIVISION: **BOOKHAM AND FETCHAM WEST**

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

To consider a petition containing 80 signatures – by Christopher Heath Thomas.

Details of petition:

Many children use Little Bookham St as part of their journey to school and many families live on Little Bookham St. However, the street is also extensively used by commuters, lorries and buses. Speeding is all too common. Despite this, Little Bookham St does not currently have any traffic calming features. We fear it is only a matter of time before a child is seriously injured or killed.

RESPONSE:

Little Bookham Street (D2525) is a single carriageway road which provides a route from Lower Road (D265) to Bookham railway station. Little Bookham Street has residential property accesses as well as connecting to other residential roads. It is currently subject to a 30mph speed limit.

The assessment process requires an understanding of speeds at this location. This would require an automatic continuous 7 day speed survey to be carried out. These works have been added to the list of sites for assessment in the current financial year (2015-16). It should be noted that at the current time of year it may not be appropriate to carry out speed surveys due to the impact that cold and wet weather can have on traffic speeds. Therefore the survey may need to be delayed until the spring.

The results of the survey will be analysed in accordance with Surrey County Council's policy 'Setting Local Speed Limits'. The results will also be shared and discussed with Surrey's Road Safety Team and Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team. Surrey Highways, in partnership with the police and travel advisors, identify locations with a poor safety record by analysing collision data and trends. Locations of community concern are also considered, when residents, elected members or community surveys have highlighted problem locations. Assessment potentially leads to the development of measures such as physical changes, enforcement, or educational campaigns.

The findings will be reported to the local divisional member. Should traffic calming measures be deemed appropriate, the progression of a scheme will be considered for inclusion on the Mole Valley Forward Programme of highways schemes. A scheme may then be taken forward for feasibility, design and implementation, subject to approval by Mole Valley Local Committee and the level of funding

available.

Contact Officer:

Peter Shimadry, Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

Alleged public footpath between BOAT No. 15 (Stane Street) and Bridleway No. 16 (Mickleham)

I wish to respond to the letter from Ollie Vigors a director of Longshot Cherkley Court Limited the London based company that bought Cherkley Estate in April 2011 with the express intention of turning over all the farmland to a golf course.

He wishes his letter to be put forward to the Mole Valley Local Committee meeting on 2nd December that will decide whether or not to make a Map Modification Order (MMO) to add a public footpath to the Surrey County Council Definitive Map and Statement.

In his letter he expresses outrage and anger at the attempts of local people to assert their right to continue to walk over this remote and wild part of the Cherkley Estate. The application was made by persons unconnected to any campaign to object to the golf course proposals, and pre-dates the incorporation of Cherkley Campaign Ltd in October 2012, a company formed for the purpose of taking forward judicial review proceedings on behalf of the Surrey Branch of the Campaign to Protect Rural England.

The existence of the public right of way was raised in a letter of representation (see below) to the Council from Mickleham residents during the consultation period on Longshot's planning application in late 2011. The application for a MMO was, in fact, initiated by residents in Mickleham together with the late Alan Lewis (Ramblers Association).

For Mr. Vigors to say that the claim is "both unnecessary and unreasonable and to us appears to be vindictive" is an extraordinary statement to make in public.

However, it illustrates the level of antipathy felt by the developers towards local people who have walked these paths for as long as living memory and feel that this Bronze Age landscape in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty 'belongs' to everyone. The question of who actually owns land, over which rights of way are exercised, rarely concerns people enjoying a walk on a path from which you can see for miles and miles.

The Forty Acre field was re-fenced after the Beaverbrook Foundation bought the Cherkley Estate in 1998. This was done, as we understood, in part to thwart any attempts to claim a right to roam across the paths that ran over this field of open chalk grassland. By fencing it off they also could put livestock into the field and indeed there were cattle in there right up until 30th January 2013.

The fence line at the southern end followed the line of the path being claimed as a public right of way. The then landowners appear to have acknowledged that the path was the natural boundary for the grazing land. Interestingly, the fence has been used by the golf course builders to inform the public as follows: "Warning Construction Site – Keep Out." Longshot are aware that people have been continuing to enjoy using the path running alongside their construction site despite their 'Don't Trespass' signs on the rusty gates at either end.

It is hard to understand Longshot's objection to an order being made because they anticipate potential conflict between golfers and walkers. There already is a bridleway running right through the golf course, and Stane Street bisects the estate and separates Tyrrell's Wood golf course from the new Beaverbrook course. Why this footpath is any more likely to cause conflict between walkers and golfers is unclear and unspecified.

We trust that Longshot^[1] will be required to keep the hedgerows in check so that views are once more afforded across the estate from all the existing public rights of way. Some of these have become substantially overgrown since 2011.

The hostility, not to say paranoia, expressed in Mr. Vigors' letter is not, in any event, a legal basis for refusal of this claim for a Map Modification Order. If anything it emphasises the importance of recognising prior overriding interests in the land regardless of the current legal ownership of the Estate.

We hope that the committee will respect the efforts of local residents to ensure the continued public access to this special area of the North Downs and Surrey Hills AONB.

Yours sincerely,

Jonathan and Kristina Kenworthy

^[1] In its "Proposals for Cherkley Court" brochure produced during the planning application process, Longshot stated: "Existing Rights of Way (Footpaths and Bridleways) are retained and these have informed the siting of the golf holes to avoid conflict between users....Existing distant views from paths on high ground will be retained."

Alleged Public Footpath between Byway No. 15 and Bridleway No. 16, Mickleham

I am one of those who submitted evidence for the use of the above path, having walked along it unchallenged from 1967 to date. I wish it to be noted that at no time, during the long period that I have used the path, have I damaged any fencing, gate or notice. I have not seen or heard of anyone who has committed the offences alleged by Longshot Cherkley Court Ltd.

The fence to the north of the footpath was put up in about 1998 so that the large field it enclosed could be grazed by cattle. I propose that this fence be retained. It will serve to keep the public off the golf course, which is something the landowner desires. Its presence has protected the remaining BSP Priority Habitat of unimproved chalk grassland, the rest having been destroyed by the construction of the golf course.

I am aware that Longshot are proposing to make another path to the south but as can be seen from satellite images, this route would go through woodland. For the most part, this is mainly mixed deciduous/beechness and yew woodland, itself a BAP Priority Habitat. This proposed route would be unsatisfactory in many ways, for example there would be no views and no access to the Churchill Yew. In addition, it is known that *Cynoglossum germanicum* Green Hound's-tongue occurs in this woodland. This plant is a BAP Species of Principle Importance and is protected under Schedule 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act.

Longshot state that they wish to avoid conflict between walkers and golfers. The course to the north is already crossed by Byway No. 15 and another bridleway and footpath. The additional path will make very little difference. There are many golf courses on common land where the public have right of access at all times. A nearby example is the prestigious Walton Heath Golf Club. I am not aware of any conflict here between golfers and the public.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs A Sankey

Mickleham resident since 1967

Recorder for Surrey Botanical Society
and
Botanical Society of Britain and Ireland

This page is intentionally left blank

Public footpath between BOAT No 15 and Bridleway No. 16 (Mickleham)

I am pleased to note that the Access Officer has decided in favour of this claim.

I am concerned, however, about both the detail and the tone of the letter from Ollie Vigors on behalf of Longshot Cherkley Court Ltd (“Longshot”). He states that the claim is both unnecessary and unreasonable and “appears to be vindictive”.

I am a resident of Mickleham and a parish councillor. At an early stage in the planning process I pointed out to both Longshot and Mole Valley District Council that two of the proposed golf holes crossed the existing footpath, and that the plans for those two holes should therefore be changed. Neither body replied. Accordingly, when my wife and I learned that other Mickleham residents were preparing the footpath claim we gave evidence in favour.

We welcome Longshot’s proposal to put in place a new footpath to the south of the existing one, but it should be in addition to, and not in substitution for, the existing footpath. We have seen no plans of the proposed new footpath but, if it runs to the south as Mr Vigors suggests, it will be through the woodland and below the ridge of the hill that the existing footpath follows. As such, walkers on it will not be able to see the view all the way to Windsor and Wembley that is one of the great pleasures of the existing footpath that locals have used for so many years. Also, as the golf course appears now to have been completed, I am at a loss as to why Longshot still oppose the footpath claim, as presumably they no longer have any plans to extend the golf holes across the footpath. I should be happy to meet you or Mr Vigors, or any other interested party, at the site to discuss all this.

Nor do we see any reason why, as Mr Vigors suggests, there should be any conflict between golfers and walkers on the existing footpath. While the dispute between Longshot, various local residents and MVDC has been at times heated, it has never to my knowledge been abusive or violent. There are other footpaths running through the Cherkley Court estate and it is not suggested by Mr Vigors that they be moved for this reason.

Lastly we are given to understand that the gates were there originally to stop horses from using the path as a short cut up to the Gallops and damaging the very special turf and anthills that make up the chalk grassland, maintained by rabbits, in this section of the estate.

Accordingly, our supporting this footpath claim cannot be described as unnecessary or unreasonable, and certainly not as vindictive. Mr Vigors should withdraw that potentially defamatory allegation.

We look forward to the December 2nd meeting confirming that a public footpath can reasonably be alleged to subsist over the route and that, as such, a legal order to modify the definitive map and statement should be made. Unfortunately I cannot be at the meeting, but my wife Annie Dennis will be there, together with Juliet Lowes and the Reverend David Ireland (Chair, Mickleham Parish Council). I am happy to authorise any of these three to

speak on my behalf, and for this statement to be read out at the meeting. I am also happy for this statement to be circulated to Local Committee Members to help inform their decision and for it to be included in your tabled papers for the meeting.

As stated I am a parish councillor but please note that this statement is sent in my personal capacity, though I have shared it in draft with my fellow councillors. There was, unfortunately, insufficient time between our learning of this matter (24 November) and the Local Committee meeting (2 December) to convene and hold a council meeting to form a collective view.

Kind regards

Cllr Will Dennis

Mr Daniel Williams
Countryside Access Officer
Surrey County Council

Ms Sarah Smith
Community Partnership and Committee Officer - Mole Valley
Surrey County Council

Dear Mr Williams and Ms Smith

We are glad to see that our application to confirm the public footpath on Mickleham Downs is finally coming before the Council on December 2nd.

We are the original couple who initiated the process of application in 2011. Juliet Hornby is the maiden name of Juliet Lowes and she submitted a user evidence form under the name of Juliet Lowes.

We are concerned about both the detail and tone of the letter from Ollie Vigors on behalf of Longshot Cherkley. He claims that the claim is both unnecessary and unreasonable and appears to be vindictive.

We would like to point out that our claim was precipitated by the notices that were put up by Longshot Cherkley in May 2011, prior to which there had been open access to the footpath. We submitted both our claims in September 2011. This was some time before Longshot Cherkley announced their plans for the development of the estate. (November 2011). We would have had therefore not had any prior knowledge when we made our claim and this action cannot be construed as vindictive.

The evidence put forward by Mr Daniel Williams is lengthy and detailed. It confirms that the foot path has been in continuous use for a very long period of time.

We look forward to the December 2nd meeting confirming that a public footpath can reasonably be alleged to subsist over the route and that, as such, a legal order to modify the definitive map and statement should be made .

Yours sincerely

Dr John Lowes
Juliet Lowes (Juliet Hornby)

This page is intentionally left blank