

Agenda

Mole Valley
Local Committee

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

Discussion

Dorking Transport Study
Highways Update
Community safety funding



Venue

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

Date: Wednesday, 6 June 2018

Time: 2.00 pm



SURREY

Get involved

You can get involved in the following ways

Ask a question

If there is something you wish know about how your council works or what it is doing in your area, you can ask the local committee a question about it. All local committees provide an opportunity to raise questions, informally, up to 30 minutes before the formal business of the meeting starts. If an answer cannot be given at the meeting, they will make arrangements for you to receive an answer either before or at the next formal meeting.

Write a question

You can also put your question to the local committee in writing. The committee officer must receive it a minimum of 4 working days in advance of the meeting.

When you arrive at the meeting let the committee officer (detailed below) know that you are there for the answer to your question. The committee chairman will decide exactly when your answer will be given and may invite you to ask a further question, if needed, at an appropriate time in the meeting.

Sign a petition

If you live, work or study in Surrey and have a local issue of concern, you can petition the local committee and ask it to consider taking action on your behalf. Petitions should have at least 30 signatures and should be submitted to the committee officer 2 weeks before the meeting. You will be asked if you wish to outline your key concerns to the committee and will be given 3 minutes to address the meeting. Your petition may either be discussed at the meeting or alternatively, at the following meeting.



Attending the Local Committee meeting

Your Partnership officer is here to help.

Email: sarah.smith@surreycc.gov.uk

Tel: 07813 006 544 (text or phone)

Website: <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley>



Follow [@MoleValleyLC](https://twitter.com/MoleValleyLC) on Twitter

This is a meeting in public.

Please contact **Sarah J Smith, Partnership Committee Officer** using the above contact details:

- If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print, Braille, or another language
- If you would like to attend and you have any **additional needs, e.g. access or hearing loop**
- If you would like to talk about something in today's meeting or have a local initiative or concern.



Surrey County Council Appointed Members

Mr Tim Hall, Leatherhead and Fetcham East (Chairman)
Mr Chris Townsend, Ashted (Vice-Chairman)
Mrs Clare Curran, Bookham and Fetcham West
Mrs Helyn Clack, Dorking Rural
Mr Stephen Cooksey, Dorking and the Holmwoods
Mrs Hazel Watson, Dorking Hills

District Council Appointed Members

Cllr Rosemary Dickson, Leatherhead South
Cllr David Hawksworth, Ashted Common
Cllr Mary Huggins, Capel, Leigh and Newdigate
Cllr Paul Kennedy, Fetcham West
Cllr Claire Malcomson, Holmwoods
Cllr Vivienne Michael, Okewood

Chief Executive
Joanna Killian

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. **To support this, County Hall has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.**

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

Thank you for your co-operation

Note: This meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site - at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed. The images and sound recording may be used for training purposes within the Council.

Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.

*If you have any queries regarding this, please contact the representative of **Legal and Democratic Services** at the meeting.*

OPEN FORUM

Before the formal committee session begins, the Chairman will invite questions from members of the public attending the meeting. Where possible questions will receive an answer at the meeting, or a written response will be provided subsequently.

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

To receive any apologies for absence and notices of substitutions from District members under Standing Order 39.

2 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [AGENDA ITEM ONLY]

To receive any announcements from the Chairman.

3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

(Pages 1 - 12)

To approve the Minutes of the previous meeting as a correct record.

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members present are required to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter

- (i) Any disclosable pecuniary interests and / or
- (ii) Other interests arising under the Code of Conduct in respect of any item(s) of business being considered at this meeting

NOTES:

- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest
- As well as an interest of the Member, this includes any interest, of which the Member is aware, that relates to the Member's spouse or civil partner (or any person with whom the Member is living as a spouse or civil partner)
- Members with a significant personal interest may participate in the discussion and vote on that matter unless that interest could be reasonably regarded as prejudicial

5a PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

5b MEMBER QUESTIONS

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

6 PETITIONS

To receive any petitions in accordance with Standing Order 65 or letters of representation in accordance with the Local Protocol. An officer response will be provided to each petition / letter of representation.

1. A petition has been received calling for the implementation of a residents' parking scheme in Howard Road and Arundel Road in Dorking.

7 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] (Pages 13 - 26)

This report informs the Local Committee on the progress of the 2018/19 Integrated Transport and highways maintenance programmes in Mole Valley

8 DORKING TRANSPORT STUDY UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR INFORMATION] (Pages 27 - 36)

This report is to update members on the current status of Stage 3 of the Dorking Transport Study. The study was commissioned to provide evidence to support a potential future funding bid for a transport package for Dorking Town Centre which could be submitted to the C2C LEP to address increasing town centre congestion problems.

9 DORKING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT PACKAGE PHASE ONE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] (Pages 37 - 60)

The Dorking Transport Package Phase 1 is a programme of cycling, walking and public transport improvements funded by the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (C2C LEP). It is the first phase of a wider three phase programme of enhancements planned for Dorking.

This report seeks to respond to the issues raised in a complaint to C2C LEP made by the Dorking Town Forum with respect to this scheme.

10 LOCAL COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTES [AGENDA ITEM ONLY]

Under the County Council's constitution (Part 4, Standing orders, Part 3 40 (f) no substitutes are permitted for a district/borough council co-opted members of local committees, unless a local committee agrees otherwise at its first meeting following the council's annual meeting and in relation to all meetings in the following year, upon which named substitutes will be appointed to the Local Committee on the nomination of the relevant district/borough council.

The Local Committee is therefore asked to decide whether it wishes to co-opt substitutes in the municipal year 2018/19

11 COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING AND APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO TASK GROUPS AND EXTERNAL BODIES [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] (Pages 61 - 70)

The local committee (Mole Valley) has a delegated budget of £3,000 for community safety projects in 2018/19. This report sets out the process by which this funding should be allocated to the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership and/or other local community organisations that promote the safety and wellbeing of residents. The report also seeks the approval of Local Committee task group members and the appointment of representatives to external bodies

12 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] (Pages 71 - 72)

The local committee (Mole Valley) is asked to review the progress made and to agree to remove any schemes that are marked 'complete'.

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 2.00 pm on 14 March 2018
 at Council Chamber, Pippbrook, Reigate Road, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1SJ.

Surrey County Council Members:

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

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Rosemary Dickson
- * Cllr Paul Elderton
- Cllr Raj Haque
- * Cllr Mary Huggins
- * Cllr Peter Stanyard
- * Cllr Vivienne Michael

* In attendance

1/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Cllr Haque.

2/18 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

Correction: item 5 2. Petitions – The divisional member for Dorking **Hills** should read Dorking **Rural**.

Otherwise the minutes were held to be a true record of the meeting held on 30 November 2017.

3/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were received.

a PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers in attendance: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

(For all written questions and responses see the supplementary agenda pack)

ITEM 3

1. Mr Jon Favel had submitted a question and received an answer. He was not present to ask a supplementary.
2. Mr Ron Billard (representing Mole Valley Cycling Forum) had submitted a question and received an answer.

MVCF had forwarded a presentation to highways to be used as a free resource. The group were keen to assist the county council on cycling issues across the district.

The AHM explained that cycling issues were now addressed by a countywide team through the cycling officer.

The cycling strategy team would value the forum's input when Mole Valley's cycling strategy would be updated in the near future.

Highway officers would also be happy to meet with MVCF representatives in the future, in the event funding for a specific scheme was identified.

3. Mr Roger Troughton had submitted a question and received an answer in advance of the meeting.

He asked how it had been decided to allocate the s106 contributions to provide Real Time Passenger Information at bus stops instead of measures for safe access across the A24. It was suggested that this had been considered the best value for the small amount of money that would have been available.

Some members expressed concern that they still had not received up to date information on how developers' funds had been spent and what was still available to be allocated.

The AHM agreed to follow up on this issue with a view to bringing an item to the next informal local committee meeting.

The ward member for Okewood and Leader of Mole Valley District Council agreed to ensure that Community Infrastructure Levy figures were made available to the Committee, but stressed that only very modest sums had been collected so far.

Whether or not the local committee will have a role to play in the CIL decision-making process is still yet to be determined.

4. Claire Malcomson had submitted three questions and received responses in advance of the meeting. She was not present to ask a supplementary.

The Chairman stressed that sexual health clinics across the county were fully functioning but that if members were aware of any issues, they should contact the divisional member for Dorking Rural in her capacity as Cabinet Member for Health. She would be happy to answer any questions on any public health matters but stressed the difficulties in finding the money for preventative work. She was working alongside officers in monitoring CWL.

5. Peter Seaward (Bookham Residents Association) had submitted a question and received a response in advance of the meeting.

With regard to Lower Road, he stressed that the longer the situation was left unresolved, the more money would have to be spent in the long term.

The AHM explained that engineers had considered a new type of gully which might be part of a longer term solution but with only limited funding available, there were no alternative short or medium term measures that could be taken.

Mr Seaward asked why roads in Bookham that had previously been included in Horizon 2 were no longer in the programme of works.

The Cabinet Member for Highways explained that the Horizon project was constantly evolving and being a 5 year plan, revisions have had to be made to allow for emerging issues and changing priorities.

He would be introducing a new process whereby local members would play a greater role in discussing local needs.

Mr Seaward also raised the issue of increased council tax and commented that residents were dissatisfied with what they were getting in the way of services on the highways.

The Cabinet Member explained that over 70% of the council budget is spent on adult social care and looking after vulnerable young people. He acknowledged that residents tended to notice highways issues and for that reason 20% of the council tax increase was going to be reinvested in local communities through the local committees and its members.

6. Mr Ian Anderson had submitted two questions and had received responses in advance of the meeting.

In his absence Cllr Dickson asked what could be done to get Hawk Hill (Guildford Road) included in Horizon 2 programme of works.

The Chairman also expressed his frustration in its omission and had put it forward to be looked at as part of the additional winter works programme.

The Cabinet Member acknowledged the difficulties but reiterated that this was one disadvantage of having a long-term programme. There was a need for flexibility to accommodate changing priorities and for this reason he was encouraging more engagement between officers and local members.

7. The Chair of Governors of Oakfield School had submitted a question and had received a response in advance of the meeting. There was no representative of the school present and the divisional member for

ITEM 3

Bookham and Fetcham West confirmed that the issues raised would be further discussed outside of the meeting.

8. Mr Martin David had submitted a question and received a response in advance of the meeting.

He was not present but had submitted the following supplementary via the Chairman.

“My question is to ask that SCC accept the community asset / benefit of the piece of unmade road in the middle of Cannon Grove, Fetcham in that this unowned piece of land provides a strategic right of way linking the communities of Fetcham and Leatherhead, connects the communities on two sides of the same public road, provides access to community facilities such as a park, guide hut and tennis club as well as access to a number of properties and a business.

I would ask SCC to join an emerging partnership to protect this asset by providing appropriate legal and technical advice whilst also accepting their responsibility to the strategic right of way by bringing the walking route up to a standard suitable for the use by pedestrians including school children, the elderly and mothers with pushchairs to enable the easy pedestrian access between Fetcham & Leatherhead”

This question will be answered outside of the meeting.

9. Elizabeth Daly had submitted two questions and had received responses in advance of the meeting. She was not present to ask a supplementary.

b MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers in attendance: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Questions and responses are included in the supplementary agenda pack.

Mrs Watson (Dorking Hills) had submitted written questions in advance of the meeting and asked no supplementaries.

5/18 PETITIONS [Item 5]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers in attendance: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Petition wording and officer response are included in the supplementary agenda pack.

1. The petition presented by District Cllr David Draper had attracted over 200 signatures.
2. He was pleased that Mole Valley District Council had been able to take action to improve Footpaths 66 and 70 as part of the development of the Meadow bank site.
3. Footpath 71 remained in urgent need of repair; the surface had been eroded due to flooding; there were drainage difficulties and raw sewerage had been detected. A resolution would need the cooperation of Thames Water, the Environment Agency as well as funding from the county council.
4. The AHM stressed that no further funding had been identified for additional works and that paths only needed to be maintained to the standard required for footpaths. However she had not previously been made aware of the sewerage problem and would speak outside of the meeting with a view to assisting with communication with the utility companies.
5. Members discussed the previous difficulties in engaging with Thames Water and encouraged everyone to individually report an issue. The higher the number of calls received about a problem, the greater weight would be attributed to it. As a private company Thames Water was not obliged to respond to the county council.

The local committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:

- (i) Note the officer's comment

6/18 UPDATE FROM CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION] [Item 6]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers in attendance: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Public Questions, Petitions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key highlights

ITEM 3

1. The Cabinet Member for Highways would also be attending meetings with representatives from Residents Associations and Parish Councils in Mole Valley to give an update on highways matters.
2. The report had three annexes showing where money has and is planned to be spent locally. A revised version of Annex 1 is attached to these minutes.
3. Annex 3 was a new document bringing together information on possible future schemes, so that Members would have advance notice of schemes and would be better placed to respond to queries from residents.
4. Members were asked to consider the schemes planned for 2018/19 and direct any queries or comments to the AHM. She in turn would compile a list of these and the relevant responses to be fed back to the whole local committee.
5. There was still a need to improve how the county council communicates with residents as to the work it is doing. Steps have been taken to improve this but there was still a need for further progress.
6. The additional revenue funding of £1.4 million would be divided evenly between the eleven districts and boroughs.
7. The Cabinet Member would provide members with a list of approximate costs to better enable them to make decisions on how to spend their share of the new Member Highways Fund.
8. The county council had invested an extra £5 million in repairing those roads worst affected by the recent spell of adverse winter weather.
9. This amount was unlikely to cover the final costs and the Cabinet Member had written to the Transport Secretary to ask for match funding.
10. Members raised concerns about drains that were not included on the asset register and therefore not being cleaned.
11. The Cabinet Member reassured the committee that progress had been made, but that the new asset system still needed some updating.
12. There were still issues with cleaning the gullies; sometimes this was down to the presence of parked cars and work was being done with the district council to try and resolve this problem.
13. The grass cutting contract had gone back to the county council with fewer cuts planned; Members could choose to pay for an additional cut from their allocation.
14. The criteria for the Member Highways Fund (£7,500 per county councillor) funding had not yet been finalised but the Cabinet Member was aiming to make it as flexible as possible.
15. The 2018/19 list of centrally funded schemes would be updated online every three months with details of progress and the reasons for any delay or deferment.
16. Members queried the expenditure on traffic signals when there was seemingly no problem with the equipment.
17. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that better information was needed to indicate for example whether the equipment was being serviced/replaced/repared etc.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley)

- (i) Commented on the information

**7/18 HIGHWAYS FORWARD PROGRAMME REVENUE BUDGET 2018/19
[EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 7]**

Declarations of interest: None

Officers in attendance: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Public Questions, Petitions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key highlights

1. The divisional member for Bookham and Fetcham West queried the proposed allocation of £100,00 to the revenue maintenance gang and suggested that the funding should be better balanced with more being given over to 'Minor Maintenance Works'.
2. This would allow local members to be able to react to requests from residents for minor patching works. Many of the roads in Mole Valley (mostly C and D roads) were unlikely to be prioritised for Horizon 2.
3. The Chair and Vice-Chair already had delegated authority to move funds between different revenue budgets.
4. There were various countywide maintenance programmes so it was important to ensure that the local committee budget was not being used to maintain roads already included in one of the centrally funded programmes.
5. It was also important to keep sufficient funds for other works such as for trees, grass cutting etc.
6. Some Members expressed concern that the proposal would reduce the work of the community gang, especially in rural areas where their work was particularly valued for cutting back vegetation etc
7. Members agreed to move forward with the recommendation as it stood but elected to review how the budgets were being spent and the work of the revenue maintenance gang in the summer.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:

- (i) Approve the revised allocation of the Local Committee's devolved revenue maintenance budget as set out in para. 2.2 of this report;
- (ii) Note the Members Local Highways Fund as detailed in para. 2.7 and 2.8 of this report; and

Resolved to:

- (iii) Agree that the revenue maintenance budget and the Members Local Highways Fund be managed by the Mole Valley Maintenance Engineer on members' behalf.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

To agree the allocation of the Mole Valley Local Committee's devolved revenue maintenance budget and how works are going to be managed on members' behalf.

8/18 HIGHWAY SCHEMES 2017/18 - END OF YEAR UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION] [Item 8]

ITEM 3

Declarations of interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Public questions, petitions, statements: None

The Local Committee (Mole Valley)

- (i) Noted the contents of the report

9/18 DORKING TRANSPORT STUDY RESULTS (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 9]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers in attendance: Steve Howard, Transport Strategy Project Manager

Public Questions, Petitions, Statements: None

Member discussion: key highlights

1. Officers would present the final report on the study at the local committee's meeting in June.
2. Members recognised the difficulties in securing LEP funding for future works and the need for any scheme to compete with others from the catchment area.
3. The LEP would focus on deliverable outcomes regarding the provision of housing and education and those to reduce congestion.
4. Members discussed the need for new housing around existing transport links and in particular in the vicinity of Dorking main station.
5. The station currently had an inadequate parking capacity and the addition of a mezzanine floor would significantly increase that provision.
6. Mole Valley District Council had already commissioned a draft master plan for the regeneration of East Dorking which included the Pippbrook site and the Reigate Road car park.
7. Members agreed that increased working from home and walking to school were options that should be promoted to reduce congestion. However there were currently obstacles that would deter people from undertaking these.
8. Fast and reliable broadband was needed particularly in rural areas; some schools needed additional crossings, but there was no available money to fund these.
9. Some members suggested that changes to the loading and unloading of vehicles on the High Street still needed to be considered as well as the level of enforcement of the existing double yellow lines.
10. The divisional member for Dorking South and the Holmwoods expressed his concern over the lack of recommendations to improve traffic flow around the Deepdene roundabout.
11. Officers explained that options such as installing traffic lights on the roundabout had been considered but discounted. Although at peak

times traffic flow was at its capacity, outside of these hours it had remained largely unchanged from previous studies.

12. Members generally agreed that any changes needed to be more radical than was suggested in the report, firstly to secure LEP funding and secondly to make any significant impact on congestion. They drew a comparison with Leatherhead where work to implement its own masterplan was already underway.
13. Members further discussed the possibility of having a further study focusing on the area around Dorking main station with a view to finding a way to attract the interest of the train operators to get involved in any development.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:

- (i) Note the current status and emerging themes of the Dorking Transport Study Stages 1 & 2 Data Collection and Issues & Opportunities made to date.
- (ii) Note the potential options proposed as stated in Paragraph 9.1 for further analysis in Stage 3 Option Testing & Developing Strategy **subject to the additional suggestions made by members during the meeting.**

10/18 EARLY HELP PRIORITIES FOR MOLE VALLEY [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 10]

Declarations of interest: Tim Hall: Trustee of Leatherhead Youth Project;
Co-chair of Governing Body of Leatherhead Trinity
School and Children's Centre

Officers in attendance: Natalie Howe, Families Service Manager (FSM)

Public Questions, Petitions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key highlights

1. Members generally welcomed the new approach but expressed concern that any aspirations would be at risk due to possible cuts to services as a result of the county council's difficult financial position.
2. The FSM agreed it was a challenging situation but that it was also an opportunity to work differently with partners. The priority was to ensure that families were looked after; early intervention would reduce costs in the long run.
3. Members raised concerns over the consultation on potential changes to children's centre services. In particular they considered the deadline for partner organisations to submit comments to be too tight.
4. The FSM explained that the reason for this was to bring forward the public consultation, so as to avoid the period over the summer holidays. These were still very early discussions but officers had wanted to engage with partners at the outset.

ITEM 3

5. The divisional member for Ashted expressed some mixed views about the work thus far of the Early Help Advisory Board (EHAB). He expressed concerns that the membership might be too large to be effective and that there was no representation by the police.
6. The FSM explained that in developing the EHAB and the Local Family Partnerships (LFP) in tandem, it was possible that the balance of the membership of each was not yet quite right. The EHAB should have strategic oversight of early help delivery; the LFPs were operational and the police might be better placed sending a representative to their meetings.
7. In declaring his personal interests (above) the Chairman highlighted the fact the funding formula for the children's centres had not been made available at the start of the process. However this would be an opportunity to review whether the former youth centre buildings were in the right places to deliver services in the future.
8. The Chairman also highlighted that accessibility to mental health services was key and that young people from Trinity School used those provided outside the district in Redhill.
9. Furthermore he expressed concerns that drug abuse issues in Leatherhead were not sufficiently prioritised and needed to be monitored carefully.
10. The FSM agreed that the figures for Mole Valley were particularly challenging. She agreed that the Children and Adolescent's Mental Health Services (CAMHS) offer still needed to be improved but commented that the Leatherhead Youth Project (LYP) was working very well with the older age groups across the district.
11. Officers needed to further interrogate the drug abuse figures with the police to see if there were pockets of issues where they could focus their work.
12. The divisional member for Bookham & Fetcham East (Cabinet Member for Children) stressed that the new model of delivery was needed to meet OFSTED requirements but that the investment in early help would reduce costs in the long-term.
13. Work on the children's centres consultation was just beginning and there would be a briefing for members in April.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:

- (i) Provide feedback on the latest early help developments in Mole Valley, including proposed early help priorities for re-commissioning and the location of Local Family Partnerships
- (ii) Endorse the Local Committee representatives to the local Early Help Advisory Board, for the remainder of 2017/18 and 2018/19 (subject to continued membership of the Local Committee)

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

We want Local Members to be informed about the proposals that we have been developing in partnership for the early help system in Surrey. We believe these proposals will help us realise better outcomes for children and young people within the early help resources we have available. We also know however that early help is most effective when it is planned and

delivered locally, so we are seeking the advice of the Local Committee to inform our identified local priorities.

11/18 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [Item 11]

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) noted the progress of schemes indicated on the tracker and to remove any items marked as complete.

Meeting ended at: 5.16 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)**

DATE: 6th JUNE 2018
LEAD OFFICER: ZENA CURRY, AREA HIGHWAY MANAGER
SUBJECT: HIGHWAY SCHEMES UPDATE
DIVISION: ALL

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To inform the Local Committee on the progress of the 2018/19 Integrated Transport and highways maintenance programmes in Mole Valley.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to note the contents of this report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Programmes of work have been agreed in consultation with the Committee, and the Committee is asked to note the progress of the Integrated Transport Scheme programme and revenue maintenance expenditure. As well as work that is being carried out on the large scale, centrally funded maintenance schemes.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 In November 2017, Mole Valley Local Committee agreed a programme of capital Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS) and revenue maintenance expenditure for 2018/19 to be funded from the Local Committee's devolved budget.
- 1.2 In addition to the Local Committee's devolved budget, countywide budgets have been used over the past year to fund major maintenance (Operation Horizon), drainage works and other capital highway schemes. Countywide revenue budgets are used to carry out both reactive and routine planned maintenance works.
- 1.3 Developer contributions are also used in Mole Valley to fund either wholly or in part, highway improvement schemes to mitigate the impact of developments on the highway network.

2. ANALYSIS:

2.1 Local Committee finance

The Mole Valley Local Committee had delegated highway budgets for the current Financial Year 2018-19 as follows:

- Capital: £36,000
- Revenue: £168,182
- **Total: £204,182**

In addition to the delegated highway budgets above, highway officers are continuing to look for other sources of funding for schemes. As a result Surrey County Council's Safety Engineering Team secured funding to reduce the speed limit on Hollow Lane, Leith Hill Road and Ockley Road. The Local Area Team also secured developer funding for the construction of a pedestrian crossing on the A24 in Ashted in the vicinity of The Greville school.

The budgets delegated to Local Committee outlined above were also in addition to budgets allocated at County level to cover various major highway maintenance and improvement schemes, including footway/carriageway resurfacing, the maintenance of highway structures including bridges and culverts and major drainage schemes.

2.2 Local Committee capital works programme

Progress on the approved Local Committee funded capital programme of highway works in Mole Valley is set out in **Annex 1**. It also provides an update on schemes being progressed using developer contributions, and the Parking Review.

2.3 Local Committee revenue works programme

Under the "Highways Forward Programme 2018/19 – 2019/20" report presented to the Local Committee on 30 November 2017, the Local Committee agreed that the Area Highway Manager, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, be able to vire the revenue maintenance budget between the revenue maintenance headings shown in **Table 1**.

Table 1 shows the agreed revenue maintenance allocation for 2018/19.

Item	Allocation
Parking	£5,000
Signs and road markings	£1,500
Speed Limit Assessments	£1,000
Minor Maintenance Works	£60,682
Revenue Maintenance Gang	£100,000
TOTAL	£168,182

2.4 Parking

An update on the parking review is provided in **Annex 1**.

Other highway related matters

2.5 Customer services

The total number of enquiries received in the first quarter of 2018, is 45,357, an average of 15,119 per month, this is a significant increase from the same period in the past 3 years.

For Mole Valley specifically, 4,107 enquiries were received between January and March 2018 of which 1,597 were directed to the local area office for action, of this 92% have been resolved. This response rate is in line with the countywide average.

In January to March 2018, 85 stage 1 complaints were received by Highways. For Mole Valley specifically there were 5 stage 1 complaints, one of which was escalated to stage 2 of the complaints process. The service was not found to be at fault following independent investigation.

2.6 Winter recovery program

The leader has announced, and this has been approved by Cabinet, that SCC is investing an additional £5m in highways to combat the effects of the winter weather on the highway condition. This work will be carried out on the B & C class roads. Members have had the opportunity to provide local priorities to assist in developing the program.

ITEM 7

2.7 Dorking Transport Study

A separate report on the Dorking Transport Study is being brought to this meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee.

2.8 Young Street Bridge Works

Maintenance works on the Young Street bridge over the River Mole are currently programmed to start in early August. The works consist of carriageway waterproofing, resurfacing, maintenance of the bridge bearings and the provision of new bridge joints and new kerbs. There will be a full road closure whilst these works take place, and the estimated duration of the works is five weeks. The diversion route for vehicles is along the A24, Ashcombe Road, Chalkpit Lane, the A25 and the A246. Once these works have been completed the road will be reopened with a reduced speed limit of 40mph, and works to refurbish the bridge parapets will be carried out.

2.9 Dorking STP

The majority of the works that form the Dorking Sustainable Transport Package (STP) have been delivered.

The following remaining elements are due to be completed over the summer of 2018:

- Replacement of both on-platform shelters at Dorking Deepdene Station (due end of June 2018). CCTV at Dorking Deepdene was installed during March.
- One final wayfinding totem sign is awaiting installation outside Dorking Deepdene Station (Platform 1 side, expected by end of June 2018). All other fingerposts and totems that make up the project's wayfinding improvements across Dorking have been installed.
- An additional element of the project being taken forwards is improvements to the access area outside the entrance to Platform 2 of Dorking Deepdene Station. This may include resurfacing, revising the tactile paving at the toucan crossing, removal of some of the guard railing and surplus signs, and relocation of a lamp column.

The Dorking STP is a transport project to improve connections between Dorking Deepdene and Dorking Main railway stations and the passenger facilities at Dorking Deepdene Station. Works completed have provided more accurate travel information, more space for pedestrians and cyclists on the route between the two stations and better wayfinding information across Dorking. Updates are provided via the newsletters on the Mole Valley Major Transport Schemes web page: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/policies-plans-consultations/major-transport-projects/mole-valley-major-transport-schemes>

2.10 Centrally funded maintenance

The Operation Horizon Team programmes of major maintenance works for 2018-19 for the Reigate and Banstead area are now published on Surrey County Council's website here:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/horizon-highway-maintenance-investment-programme>

2.11 Other key information, strategy and policy development

LED street light conversion

The County Council's Street Lighting engineers are currently investigating the potential of converting all of the current streetlights to LEDs. A detailed report will be taken to the County Council's Cabinet in the autumn for a final decision.

3. OPTIONS:

3.1 No options to consider at this stage. Officers will revert to the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member or indeed the Committee as appropriate, whenever preferred options need to be identified.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

4.1 Not applicable at this stage. Officers will consult the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional members as appropriate in the delivery of work programmes.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

5.1 The financial implications of the Local Committee's delegated budget is detailed in sections 2.1 – 2.3 of this report.

The key objective with regard to the 2018/19 budgets will be managed to a neutral position.

6. WIDER IMPLICATIONS:

6.1 The Integrated Transport Scheme programme and the revenue maintenance programme does not significantly impact on any of the areas identified on the table below. The Integrated Transport Schemes and maintenance work is carried out in order to improve the road network for all users.

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications
Equality and Diversity	No significant implications
Localism (including community involvement and impact)	No significant implications

ITEM 7

Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

9.1 Progress on the programme capital highway works in Mole Valley is set out in Annex 1. Local Committee is asked to note the contents of this report.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

10.1 Delivery of the highway works programme will continue and a further update report will be presented to the next meeting of the Local Committee.

Contact Officers:

Anne-Marie Hannam, Senior Traffic Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

Consulted:

Not applicable

Annexes:

Annex 1: Summary of Progress

Sources/background papers:

- Report to Mole Valley Local Committee, 30th November 2017 – Highways Forward Programme 2018/19-2019/20
-

CAPITAL ITS IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES		
Project: St Paul's Road West/Horsham Road		
Detail: Safety measures	Division: Dorking South and the Holmwoods	Allocation: £5,000 (2018/19)
Progress: Measures to prevent driving behind a pedestrian crossing and parking on the footway. Work is ongoing to progress this scheme.		
Project: Rectory Lane/Lower Road/Little Bookham Street		
Detail: Pedestrian Crossing improvements	Division: Bookham & Fetcham West	Allocation: £5,000 (2018/19)
Progress: A feasibility study is being carried out to assess what improvements may be possible to improve this junction for pedestrians.		
Project: Dene Street, Dorking		
Detail: One-way working	Division: Dorking South & the Holmwoods	Allocation: £4,000 (2017/18)
Progress: The permanent TRO for the Dene Street one-way working is in place, final electrical connections to the one-way signs have been completed. The contractors are due to return to site to paint the posts black.		

CAPITAL ITS IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES		
Project: St. John's Road/Poplar Road/Leatherhead Community Hospital		
Detail: Junction Improvement	Division: Leatherhead and Fetcham East	Allocation: £13,363 (2017/18)
Progress: Construction work on raised table at the end of St. John's Road to highlight to drivers the existing crossroads junction. Work to construct this scheme is complete. A Stage 3 Road Safety Audit has been carried out, and no snagging works were identified as a result of this audit.		
Project: Buckland Lane, Buckland		
Detail: No Motor Vehicles Restriction	Division: Dorking Rural	Allocation: £5,000 (2017/18)
Progress: The traffic order to close Buckland Lane to all motor and horse drawn vehicles with an overall width of 1.5m has been advertised. The period of objections to this order ended on 24 November, no objections were received. The TRO has been made, and the signs/bollards and gate to support the TRO have been ordered. The signs, bollards and gate will be installed out once they have been received by the contractor.		
Project: Small Safety and Improvement Schemes		
Detail: To be carried out as appropriate	Division: All	Allocation: £5,363 (2018/19)
Progress: Schemes to be identified during the year		

DEVELOPER FUNDED SCHEMES

Project: Transform Leatherhead

Detail: Town centre improvements

Division: Leatherhead and Fetcham East

Progress:

Phase 1 - jointly funded scheme (Surrey County Council, Mole Valley District Council, Developer contributions) to improve area around Leatherhead Theatre in Church Street to provide improved accessibility and streetscape. Works complete.

Further phases, led by Mole Valley District Council, are being developed.

Project: Pebble Hill Road, Betchworth

Detail: Safety scheme

Division: Dorking Rural

Progress:

Design work on improvements to the road markings is complete, some road markings have been laid and the contractor is due to return to Pebble Hill Road to complete the scheme. Work to lay road markings is weather dependent and it has not yet proved possible to complete these works.

Project: 20 mph Speed Limits Outside Schools

Detail: 20mph speed limits outside:

- City of London Freemans School and St Giles C of E Infant School, Ashtead
- Fetcham Village Infant School and Oakfield Junior School, Fetcham
- Newdigate C of E Infant School, Newdigate

Division: Ashtead, Bookham & Fetcham West, Dorking Rural.

DEVELOPER FUNDED SCHEMES

Progress:

Initial design of measures to support mandatory 20mph speed limits outside several schools where advisory 20mph speed limits were introduced as pilot schemes are complete.

City of London Freemans School, Ashtead – there is no funding currently identified for this scheme.

St. Giles C of E Infant School, Ashtead – developer funding within the Ashtead division has initially been allocated for a signalised pedestrian crossing on the A24 Epsom Road near the junction with Bramley Way. A feasibility study is currently being produced to assess the feasibility of installing a signalised crossing at this location and whether or not there is sufficient developer funding available for such a crossing. If, following the outcome of the feasibility study, it is found that it is not feasible to construct a crossing at this location or there is insufficient developer funding available for a crossing, then the developer funding will be reallocated to provide a traffic calming scheme outside St. Giles C of E Infant School.

Fetcham Village Infant School and Oakfield Junior School, Fetcham – there is no funding currently identified for this scheme.

Newdigate C of E Infant School, Newdigate – there is no funding currently identified for this scheme.

Project: Brockham, Capel & Charlwood

Detail: Measures to improve road safety in villages | **Division:** Dorking Rural

Progress:

Initial meetings with the Parish Councils have been held to discuss what measures they would like to see installed to try to improve road safety in these villages. Work is progressing to find available developer funding to progress these schemes.

DEVELOPER FUNDED SCHEMES

Project: Eastwick Drive/Eastwick Park Avenue

Detail: Improvements to provide safer crossing points

Division: Bookham and Fetcham West

Allocation: £15,000

Progress:

Meeting held in October 2016 with the school and Divisional Member regarding possible crossing improvements. A feasibility design for a build out in Eastwick Drive outside the school has been completed. Developer funding has been identified to progress this scheme. A stage 1 & 2 Road Safety Audit has been carried out, and some issues have been raised which are currently being considered.

Project: Blackbrook Road, North Holmwood

Detail: Measures to reduce speeds

Division: Dorking South & the Holmwoods

Allocation: £5,000
(2016/17)

Progress:

A meeting was held with Divisional Member and residents in September 2016 to discuss measures to be designed in the 2016/17 financial year. Feasibility design is complete, and includes measures to be installed in the vicinity of the culverts under the road, in order to visually reduce the road width, to encourage drivers to reduce their speed and to protect the barriers which continue to be hit. However, work needs to be carried out on the existing embankments supporting the road around the culverts prior to the barriers being replaced and measures to reduce speed being carried out. Therefore an allocation for these works is currently within the Draft Integrated Transport Scheme Programme for 2019/20.

Project: A24 Epsom Road/Bramley Way, Ashtead

Detail: Pedestrian crossing feasibility study

Division: Ashtead

Allocation: £5,000
(2017/18)

Progress:

A feasibility study is currently being progressed looking at suitable locations for a pedestrian crossing on the A24 Epsom Road, in close proximity to the junction with Bramley Way.

ROAD SAFETY TEAM SCHEMES

Project: A24 Leatherhead By-Pass/M25 J9A, Leatherhead

Detail: Road Markings at roundabout

Division: Leatherhead and Fetcham East

Progress:

Provision of spiral road markings on the A243/M25 J9A circulatory carriageway together with associated changes to the road markings on the approaches to the roundabout. This will require consultation with Highways England and possible modelling. This scheme is not currently being progressed. It requires involvement with Highways England and is beyond the scope of the resources available to the Road Safety Team.

Project: Red Lane, South Holmwood

Detail: Signs and road markings

Division: Dorking South and The Holmwoods

Progress:

Provision bend and chevron signs, and the refresh of existing road markings between the junction with Blackbrook Road and the railway line. This scheme has been designed with a view to implementation this financial year.

PARKING

Progress:

The restrictions that form part of the 2017 parking review became enforceable on 1st April 2018. The majority of the signs and lines have been put in place, but there are still a few locations where the contractors are having problems with parked cars. It is planned to arrange for the remaining lines to be completed as soon as possible.

DORKING TRANSPORT STUDY

Progress:

An update on the Dorking Transport Study is presented in a separate report to this Local Committee.

Note: Information correct at time of writing (17/05/18)

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

DATE: 6 June 2018
LEAD OFFICER: Zena Curry
 Area Highways Manager,



SUBJECT: UPDATE ON DORKING TRANSPORT STUDY

DIVISION: DORKING HILLS, DORKING SOUTH & HOLMWOODS

SUMMARY OF ISSUES:

<p>This item is to update members on the current status of Stage 3 of the Dorking Transport Study, the study was commissioned to provide evidence to support a potential future funding bid for a transport package for Dorking Town Centre which could be submitted to the C2C LEP to address increasing town centre congestion problems.</p>
--

RECOMMENDATIONS:

<p>The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to:</p>
--

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Note the current status and emerging themes of the Dorking Transport Study Stages 1 & 2 Data Collection and Issues & Opportunities made to date as previously presented. (ii) Note the assessment of further potential options analysed in Stage 3 Option Testing & Developing Strategy and note that a package of sustainable transport measures is likely to emerge as the most favourable approach to receive funding support, but this will be confirmed following the conclusion of the Stage 3 and the issue of the final report for the current Dorking Transport Study. Work on finalising the final Stage 3 report is still ongoing and is expected to be completed by the end of June 2018. |
|--|

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) To ensure that the Local Committee is kept informed, the Local Committee is asked to note the current status and emerging themes of the current Dorking Transport Study and potential options proposed for further analysis in Stage 3 Option Testing & Developing Strategy. |
|--|

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 Historically, there have been concerns over delays to traffic and the impact of congestion within Dorking Town Centre.
- 1.2 Since the mid 1990s Dorking Movement Study there have been numerous well documented studies and investigations including extensive data collection exercises and option testing using sophisticated traffic models in order to find suitable, sustainable and deliverable solutions to tackle Dorking's traffic related problems.
- 1.3 Following the last 'Update on Dorking Town Centre 'Local Committee Report 2 March 2016, recommendations were agreed to undertake a further Dorking Transport Study in order to provide evidence that would support a potential future Business Case bid to fund a sustainable transport package for Dorking Town Centre which could be submitted to the C2C LEP to address Dorking's traffic problems.
- 1.4 The study concluded that there was no small scale engineering solution to the congestion problems of Dorking that is both deliverable within available funding limits and environmentally acceptable.
- 1.5 Peter Brett Associates were commissioned jointly by Surrey County Council and Mole Valley District Council in September 2017 to undertake a further Dorking Transport Study to provide evidence to support the potential future funding Business Case.
- 1.6 The study was structured into 3 Stages:
 - Stage 1: Data Collection;
 - Stage 2: Issues & Opportunities &
 - **Stage 3: Option Testing & Development Strategy.**
- 1.7 This report describes the progress made in Stage 3 to further assess options from the emerging themes of the Dorking Transport Study Stages 1 & 2 Data Collection and Issues & Opportunities made to date.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 A Dorking Transport Study draft report has been written to summarise the findings of the Stage 1 the Baseline information and data collection. Both county and district officers are currently reviewing and scrutinising the draft report before publication.
- 2.2 Stage 1 has been presented to the Local Committee at the previous meeting but to recap the desktop review revealed the following:
 - Surrounding the town (excluding the south) lies within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (ANOB);
 - Protecting the built heritage of the town and the quality of the surrounding Surrey Hills is essential, which discounts any large scale infrastructure;
 - The area is served by 2 Secondary Schools & 7 Primary schools, with previous data showing high % of younger children being driven to school;

- 60% of residents within walking distance of the Town Centre (within 1.2km) and hence access the town centre with 10 minutes;
- Narrow streets with Historic centre constrains pedestrian access;
- There is a reasonable cycle network, with town centre access by pedal cycle within 5-10 minutes;
- SCC have undertaken recent improvement for cycle provision in Dorking, including a cycle hub at the station;
- Cycle path provision within Dorking town centre is mainly located to the north, with limited provision south of West Street for use by the residential areas. There are parts of the existing cycle way which are not of a sufficient width within guidance (DfT Manual for Streets).
- Adequate bus stop provision will 99% of population within 400m of a bus stop, but recognise that the local bus service frequency inhibits more bus journeys as alternative to the private car;
- The town is well served with 3 rail stations , including a radial route into London \ South Coast and orbitally via North Downs Line;
- The narrow one way roads within the town centre create a gyratory system with a number of traffic signal junctions, as a consequence, frequent queues and delays occur in both am and pm peak periods;
- Site observations revealed loading and deliveries along the A25 can cause 'immediate short term gridlock' due to the narrow lanes;
- SCC have undertaken recent works to manage peak period congestion by improving the operational efficiency of some traffic signal junctions;
- Accident records show that there were 147 accidents resulting in 167, with no fatalities;
- There is adequate car park provision within Dorking, with only the High Street Public car park at capacity for most of the day, the others appear to be under-utilised, (comparison data not available for Waitrose or Lidl car parks);
- Dorking Railway Station car park is at capacity before the network peak hour (08:00-09:00).
- Census data analysis shows that 55% of Dorking Residents travel to work by car, whilst over 20% use the train to commute and 19% commute by foot.

2.3 The traffic survey data collection included the following surveys:

Car Park Accumulation and Occupancy surveys at four car parks in the centre of Dorking.

Manual Classified Traffic Counts (MCTC) at six of the key junctions, including queue length surveys.

Automatic Traffic Counts (ATC) at four key locations to understand the daily traffic flow, profiles and speed along the road.

An Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) survey covering both an inner and outer cordon around the town, with an additional survey at Dorking Station.

2.4 Initial analysis of the different survey methods and data has revealed the following:

- There is adequate car park provision within Dorking, with only the High Street Public car park at capacity for most of the day, the others appear to be under-utilised;

ITEM 8

- The largest volume of traffic in the AM and PM peak hours utilise the A24;
- Over 90% of vehicles travelling between the north and the south in the AM and PM peak hours use the A24 and do not go through the centre;
- For vehicles travelling along the east-west corridor, 90% and 84% use the High Street in the AM and PM peak hours respectively.
- Ashcombe Road is utilised by vehicles travelling on the west-north corridor;
- Of the vehicles going through the centre of Dorking, HGV percentages are considered low between 1-3%.

2.5 In summary the traffic data indicates that the highway network is at capacity during the am and pm peak hours but that the peak hour has extended into a peak period longer than 60 minutes, and that small incidents such as poor on-street parking or loading \ unloading can lead to short intense periods of congestion or “gridlock”.

3. OPTIONS:

3.1 Along with previously proposed and tested options a number of other initiative solutions have been considered but discounted on due to feasibility , deliverability and unlikely to receive funding support and hence have not been put forward to Stage 3. These included:

- i. Installation of guard rails and removal of pedestrian crossings at pump corner
- ii. Vincent Lane re-engineered to two way traffic
- iii. South Street re-engineered to two way traffic

3.2 Feedback from the previous Local Committee requested further investigation into other **Options for Car Travel** including:

- i) A24 \ A25 Deepdene Roundabout
- ii) Improvements to Pump Corner
- iii) Western Bypass

3.3 The feasibility assessment of these options will be included within the Stage 3 final report. Previous studies have evaluated many different options for key junctions and traffic management arrangements within Dorking, which resulted in little or even dis-benefits to traffic, including improvements to Deepdene Roundabout.

3.4 However, a further capacity review has been undertaken as part of Stage 3 to understand if a signalised junction improvement could provide increased capacity over the existing roundabout layout. Which would also offer enhanced pedestrian and cycle facilities across the junction.

3.5 An existing capacity model, validated against the traffic queue surveys undertaken in October 2017, has been produced using Junctions 9 (industry standard software) in order to understand the current operation of the roundabout. The results are summarised in the Table 1 & 2 below for both the AM and PM peak hours respectively. (values shown are the highest over the modelled time periods).

Approach Arm	Queue (PCU)	Delay (s/pcu)	Flow:Capacity (RFC)
A24 London Rd	20.4	67.24	99%
A25 Reigate Rd E	21.3	76.89	100%
A24 Deepdene Rd	36.3	99.27	104%
A25 Reigate Rd W	20.1	133.16	103%

Table 1 Deepdene Roundabout Capacity Assessment – AM Peak

Approach Arm	Queue (PCU)	Delay (s/pcu)	Flow:Capacity (RFC)
A24 London Rd	36.3	89.95	103%
A25 Reigate Rd E	27.1	113.24	104%
A24 Deepdene Rd	16.5	56.31	97%
A25 Reigate Rd W	20.1	133.16	103%

Table 2 Deepdene Roundabout Capacity Assessment – PM Peak

- 3.6 The assessment shows that the roundabout is **currently operating over operating capacity during both peak hours**. The A25 Reigate Rd W currently experiences the highest delays per vehicle in both AM and PM periods. As a general rule RFC values over 90% indicate the approach arm is over capacity resulting in queues and delays.
- 3.7 However, improvements to the existing roundabout are not considered achievable at this stage due to land constraints, housing fronting the majority of approaches, therefore Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO) would be required to enlarge and increase capacity at the roundabout, which would incur significant cost.
- 3.8 A conceptual signalised junction has been assessed for a preliminary feasibility design. A capacity model has been produced in LinSigv3 (industry standard software). Traffic flows from the October 2017 surveys have been input into the model to understand the potential capacity a signalised junction may have in this location.
- 3.9 The results are summarised in the Table 1 & 2 below for both the AM and PM peak hours respectively. (values shown are the highest over the modelled time periods).

Approach Arm	Queue (PCU)	Delay (s/pcu)	Flow:Capacity (RFC)
A24 London Rd	164.9	830.1	162.8%
A25 Reigate Rd E	224.3	831.5	161.8%
A24 Deepdene Rd	122.6	655.7	142.5%
A25 Reigate Rd W	97.1	857.3	166.5%

Table 3 Deepdene Traffic Signal Capacity Assessment – AM Peak

Approach Arm	Queue (PCU)	Delay (s/pcu)	Flow:Capacity (RFC)
A24 London Rd	141.5	715.6	149.2%
A25 Reigate Rd E	190.9	856	164.6%
A24 Deepdene Rd	171.9	844.1	164.7%
A25 Reigate Rd W	136.5	857.3	166.5%

Table 4 Deepdene Traffic Signal Capacity Assessment – PM Peak

3.10 The model results predict that all arms of the **signalised junction would operate over operational capacity with excessive queues and delays on all approaches.**

3.11 Although better for pedestrians and cyclists due to the implementation of signalised crossings and advance cycle stop lines, a signalised cross roads (with pedestrian/cycle facilities and right turn lanes on the A24) would provide less capacity for vehicles than the current roundabout design, therefore this option has not been progressed further at this stage.

Improvements to Pump Corner

3.12 Pump Corner is a major highway network pinch point that is located to the centre of Dorking town centre connecting the A25 West Street and A25 High Street as well as North and South Street.

3.13 In 2007 it was converted into a signalised junction with the primary aim to allow pedestrian mobility around Pump Corner ('Dorking Congestion Study', 2004, SCC). Additional aims included improving throughput capacity as well as 'decluttering' the junction and introducing a controlled right turn facility for cyclists. The conversion was part of the Pump Corner signalisation scheme conducted by SCC. Since the signals were implemented, they now run on MOVA.

3.14 The objectives of the current scheme were as follows:

- To reduce delays in West Street which may improve flows at the junction of Vincent Lane and Westcott Road;
- To assist pedestrian and cyclist movements; and
- To formalise traffic movements with possible safety benefits.

3.15 Peak hour approach flows from 2003 to 2007 show a decrease on all arms suggesting the signalisation improved the congestion. However PM flows between 2007 and 2017 show a marginal increase of 147 vehicles using the junction.

3.16 The current operation results in queues along West Street due to the conflict with westbound traffic along the High Street. This congestion is locally perceived to be intensified by the pedestrian crossing facilities that are provided at the junction. The congestion and queuing has been seen to be worse in the PM.

3.17 The provision of pedestrian crossings and the cycle stop line are perceived as contributing factors towards congestion at the junction.

3.18 Removing the crossings and installing guard railings along the edge of the carriageway could be an option to remove all pedestrian conflict with traffic at the junction and potentially slightly ease congestion. However, this scheme would lengthen the pedestrian route from approx. 40m to 250m+, as pedestrians would be forced to cross at existing crossings away from the junction and away from desire lines. There is potential for an increase in accidents as pedestrians would likely attempt to cross the road where there are no pedestrian facilities, or worse still, scale the guard railings to meet their desire lines.

- 3.19 Removing the cycle right turn stop line would lead to cyclists waiting on the carriageway to give way to eastbound traffic. This could increase the potential for collisions between vehicles and cyclists.
- 3.20 This scheme also goes against the key aim of installing the signals initially, which was to allow pedestrian mobility.
- 3.21 A potential solution to decrease congestion at the junction would be to remove the conflict between traffic travelling from West Street and High Street into South Street, by removing the Give-way and Stop lines. However, initial swept path analysis shows that a vehicle would not be able to run unopposed from High Street into South Street if a larger vehicle were manoeuvring from West Street to South Street.
- 3.22 Finally, an option was considered to ban the right turn from West St into South St, to reduce congestion along West St. However this would increase traffic flows and congestion at Deepdene Roundabout and along the High Street with vehicles doubling back along the High Street.
- 3.23 It is considered unlikely that these improvements at Pump Corner will provide any positive improvements and are unlikely to be taken forward for further consideration.

Dorking Western Bypass

- 3.24 Finally, a more radical option was considered to reduce traffic through the centre of Dorking by providing a North West Dorking Bypass via Ranmore Common, which highlighted a number of key issues including:
- Potential adverse impact to AONB a SSSI.
 - Potential high engineering costs affecting viability as a result of the crossing over Ranmore Common and the railway.
 - Limited demand based on ANPR surveys.
 - Potential Compulsory Purchase Order of land required to accommodate link.
- 3.25 On the basis that there is currently not enough demand for a north west Dorking Bypass Road based on the ANPR analysis, the requirement for a road to go through key ecological and environmental areas and the likely significant cost of such a scheme, including CPO and engineering costs, this option is highly unlikely to be a viable option.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 A Steering group of local county and district members along with key town holder stakeholders have been informally consulted on the purpose and preliminary finding of Stages 1 and 2.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 Any detailed business case for a the scheme submitted will require, as part of the business case, a value for money statement, derived through the calculation of the benefit cost ratio (BCR). Any large major scheme greater than £10m will need to demonstrate a BCR of 2-4 , ie will need to demonstrate either transport or economic benefits in the order of £20-£40m,

ITEM 8

and it is considered unlikely that these can be achieved without significant increases in the number of homes or employment opportunities within the Dorking area to support the economic case of any such scheme given the competitive nature to secure C2C LEP funding against schemes from other Local Authorities.

- 5.2. Any Business Case submitted to the C2C LEP will need to demonstrate the ability to provide as least 20% local contributions from either Local Authorities allocations or other 3rd Parties such as developers or other public sector organisations.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 It is the objective of Surrey Highways to treat all users of the public highway equally and with understanding. An Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA's) will be carried out for any Major scheme LEP funded bid as part of the detailed design process.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 Dorking Town Centre residents and business primarily impacted along with motorists travelling through the town centre. Any proposed recommendation should provide improvements to those affected by current traffic volumes and other associated other issues of air quality. A package of sustainable transport measures will help provide alternatives to car use.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

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

8.1 Sustainability and Public Health implications

Potential reduction in Carbon Emissions associated with any reduction in traffic congestion

Increased walking and cycling has a positive impact on the health of a person. The NHS identifies cycling as an activity which provides significant health benefits.

It is also expected that increased levels of walking and cycling to and around the town centre will have a positive effect on Dorking's retail economy with recent studies suggesting that pedestrians and cyclists actually spend more on a trip into a town than a motorist.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 As previously concluded following the outcomes of the previous studies and further Option feasibility work undertaken in Stage 3 summarised above is that the current Dorking Transport Study is unlikely to promote 'one large solution' and it more likely that a package of measures of sustainable transport will emerge as the most favourable approach to receive funding support, but this will be confirmed following Stage 3 and the issue of the final report of the current Dorking Transport Study, which is now expected by end of June 2018.
- 9.2 Hence the following options are likely to be recommended for inclusion in a package of measures to if a future potential business cases (***bold** indicates previous Member acknowledgement of options to be included)

Reduce the Need to Travel

- Click & collect points at Dorking railway stations;
- **Encourage commitments to provide superfast broadband;**

Walking

- Develop and promote an integrated walk / cycle network;
- Update school travel plans;

Cycling

- Develop and promote an integrated walk / cycle network;
- Proposals for quiet road routing;

Bus Travel

- Increased provision of RTPi;

Rail Travel

- Expansion of car parking spaces at Dorking rail station ****(Members to consider via a separate review or through the Local Plan process and discussions with Network Rail and Operator GTR)***
- **Season ticket & (reserved) car parking combination**
- Electric car charging & electric buses serving the station

Car Travel

- Option 1 - removal of some of the parking bays on south street following pump corner
- Option 2 - Safeguarding land along Vincent lane
- Option 3 - Junction proposals for Priory School link road on to the A25

Servicing & Delivery

- **Freight activity survey with local businesses**
- **Redesign and improve the provision of delivery bays and loading bays**

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 The emerging options taken forward from Stage 2 of the Dorking Transport Study and additional options are being developed and assessed further during Stage 3 to ensure that any options recommended are feasible and deliverable and adequately evidenced to be included in a Business Case for a package of Transport Measures for Dorking.
 - 10.2 Subject to the approval of this Local Committee, a full Final Report of the Dorking Transport Study will be reported back to the Local Area Committee, upon receipt of the Final Stage 3 Report at the end of June 2018.
 - 10.3 Subject to the approval of this Local Committee any recommendations from the Stage 3 Final Report will be considered for inclusion in any potential business case to be submitted to the C2C LEP to support the District Council's Future Mole Valley Local Plan and reduce congestion within Dorking Town Centre.
-

Contact Officers:

Zena Curry

Job title: Area Highways Manager, Surrey Highways

Contact number: 03456 009 009

Steve Howard

Job title: Project Manager, Transport Policy

Contact number: 03456 009 009

Consulted:

Annexes:

Sources/background papers:

Dorking Movement Study 1998 Committee Report 14/04/99

Dorking Decongestion Committee Report 26/04/04

Pump Corner Committee Report 12/03/08

Update on Dorking Town Centre (Traffic Signals) Committee Report 2/03/16

Update on Dorking Transport Study Local Area Committee 14/03/18

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

DATE: 6 June 2018



LEAD OFFICER: Paul Fishwick, Local Transport Programmes Manager, Transport Policy

SUBJECT: Dorking Transport Package Phase 1

DIVISION: Dorking Hills

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

The Dorking Transport Package Phase 1 is a programme of cycling, walking and public transport improvements funded by the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (C2C LEP). It is the first phase of a wider three phase programme of enhancements planned for Dorking.

The C2C LEP received a complaint from the Dorking Town Forum (DTF) about the phase 1 programme relating to:

- The quality of the works undertaken
- The alleged failure to complete contracted works
- Allegations of financial mismanagement by Surrey County Council in their role as the delivery body

To appropriately manage the DTF's complaint, the C2C LEP appointed Local Partnerships to carry out an investigation. This is an independent body jointly owned by the Local Government Association and the HM Treasury meaning the investigation would be independent and transparent ensuring any learning points or improvements could be identified, understood and implemented.

Local Partnerships have concluded their investigation and a report has been presented to the C2C LEP, including a schedule of recommended actions to which the County Council has responded to where appropriate.

In understanding and learning from the complaint and recommended actions the County Council's values as set out below will be drawn upon, as this is what helps us to make a difference for Surrey residents:

- Listen - We actively listen to others and expect to be listened to.
- Responsibility - We take responsibility in all that we do at work.
- Trust - We work to inspire trust and we trust in others.
- Respect - We are supportive and inclusive and committed to learning from others.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to:

1. Support the findings of the complaint investigation completed by Local Partnerships on behalf of the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership.

ITEM 9

2. Support the recommended improvement actions, with progress on their implementation to be monitored by the Members Task Group appointed to oversee the Dorking Transport Package.
3. Propose that the Members Task Group appointed to oversee the Dorking Transport Package meet with representatives of the Dorking Town Forum, to see what, if any, further lessons can be learned.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 The Dorking Transport Package was included within the Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme for Mole Valley approved by the Local Committee on 10 September 2014 (minute 27/14 refers).
- 1.2 A Business case submission was made in partnership with train operating company First Great Western Railway and Mole Valley District Council to the C2C LEP on 12 December 2014.
- 1.3 The project has a budget of £832,000, making it one of the smaller major schemes within the County Council's £56M of highway improvements that have been completed or are currently being delivered across the county using Local Growth Fund provided by the C2C and Enterprise M3 LEPs.
- 1.4 The Dorking Transport Package (Phase 1) is close to being completed with the final areas of work expected to be conclude this summer.
- 1.5 The Local Committee has been kept updated with progress at each committee meeting, whilst regular Newsletters have been issued and will continue until the project fully complete.
- 1.6 Once complete, a 3-year monitoring and evaluation programme will be undertaken and the Local Committee will be updated on an annual basis.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 The DTF raised a complaint with the C2C LEP on 2 October 2017. According to the published information displayed on the DTF's web site (www.dorkingtownforum.co.uk), they are formed of community representatives, business groups and local organisations based in and around Dorking.
- 2.2 The DTF complaint and the investigation of it focused on:
 - The quality of the works undertaken
 - The alleged failure to complete contracted works
 - Allegations of financial mismanagement by Surrey County Council in their role as the delivery body.

- 2.3 To appropriately manage the DTF's complaint, the C2C LEP appointed Local Partnerships to carry out an investigation, reporting back to the LEP. The aim was to ensure transparency and that any lessons to be learnt or improvements needed could be identified, understood and implemented.
- 2.4 The investigation included interviews by the Local Partnerships of County Council officers Paul Fishwick (Local Transport Programmes Manager) and Love Bhabuta (Business Change Manager), along with a separate interview with members of the DTF, namely Councillor Margaret Cooksey, John Meudell and Chris Heaps.
- 2.5 Following the interviews, all parties attended a site visit led by the complaint investigation team.
- 2.6 The Local Partnerships concluded their investigation and submitted a report and findings to the C2C LEP in January 2018. This can be read in full in Annex A, with a summary of their findings given below:

The quality of the works undertaken

The complaint investigation found that the finished works, particularly to highway surfaces, are to a good standard.

The alleged failure to complete contracted works

The complaint investigation found that there was a major slippage on the project, significant work at Dorking Deepdene remains to be completed including replacement shelters (now being installed) and CCTV (now completed). The investigation team also had a concern about the medium and longer term viability of further substantial investment at Dorking Deepdene station especially in light of the structural problems uncovered by the removal of the old passenger shelters.

Allegations of financial mismanagement by Surrey County Council in their role as the delivery body

The complaint investigation team found no evidence to support this element of the complaint. The financial management of the project and the way in which claims for payment have been compiled, submitted and approved has been set out for us in some detail and we find the arrangements to be sound. They did, however, have a concern about the level of charges for design fees and supervision and we make a recommendation on that matter.

- 2.7 On 10 May 2018, the Local Partnerships chaired a meeting with representatives of the C2C LEP comprising the Chief Executive, Chief Operating Officer, Commercial Manager and Project Administrator. It was attended by Surrey County Council Officers Paul Fishwick and Love Bhabuta, along with DTF representatives, Councillor Margaret Cooksey and John Meudell.
- 2.8 Following a review of the draft report and recommended improvement actions the County Council was tasked with updating a response to the actions taking into account of points raised by Local Partnerships. A copy of the updated response to the recommended actions from a County Council perspective is attached as Annex B.

ITEM 9

- 2.9 When the investigation report was drafted the Dorking Transport Package had not been completed. It is, however, expected to be completed during the summer of 2018.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The Local Partnerships Review Team set out 10 recommended action points that involve the County Council, First Great Western, C2C LEP and West Sussex County Council as the Accountable Body.
- 3.2 As noted above, as requested by the LEP the County Council has reviewed the recommendations and an updated version is attached as Annex B.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 The C2C LEP appointed Local Partnerships to investigate the DTF complaint to ensure transparency and that any lessons to be learnt could be readily identified and actions taken. The investigation included input from the complainant - the DTF - and the County Council as the delivery body.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 The business case for the Dorking Transport Package was subject to an Independent Assurance review and included a value for money assessment.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 An Equality Impact Assessment was undertaken for the Dorking Transport Package.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The Dorking Transport Package Phase 1 provides improved directional signing for pedestrians and cyclists between the two railway stations, noting that Dorking Deepdene and Dorking Main are on separate rail lines and the bus/rail interchange is located at Dorking Main Station. Improved pedestrian and cycle signage from these stations to the town centre was also included in the package.
- 7.2 Real Time Passenger Information displays have been installed at the entrance points to Dorking Deepdene station, enabling passengers to view train times without having to access the stairs to the platforms.
- 7.3 Passengers egressing Dorking Deepdene station can view the rail and bus times at Dorking Main and local bus stop 'A' and at the bus/rail interchange.
- 7.4 New ticket machines have been installed at Dorking Deepdene, along with additional cycle parking, new lighting and CCTV.
- 7.5 An acoustic fence has been installed adjacent to Brook Close where trees were removed on the access area to the Dorking Deepdene station.

- 7.6 A new island has been introduced at the junction of Station Approach and the A24 that facilitates improved and safer access for pedestrians proceeding north of Station Approach, along with a widened shared footway/cycleway to Dorking Main station with a revised junction and road table at Lincoln Road junction with Station Approach and the A24.
- 7.7 It is the intention to install Real Time Passenger Information at bus stop 'A' (A24 northbound) as soon as practicable, once a bus shelter contract issue has been resolved.
- 7.8 First Great Western are currently installing the replacement passenger shelters on platforms 1 and 2 at Dorking Deepdene. Once complete the final works at Dorking Deepdene will be undertaken during the summer of 2018.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

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

8.1 Sustainability implications

Increasing levels of walking, cycling, rail and bus usage can have a positive impact in congestion reduction and a consequent reduction in carbon emissions.

The creation of these improvements for both stations connecting residential, business and retail areas with key destinations will encourage modal shift which has implications for health, improved mobility, accessibility and reduced dependency on private vehicles.

8.2 Public Health implications

Active travel (walking and cycling), particularly for utility trips such as travelling to work, school and shopping, is considered a key deliverable against public health priorities such as obesity and air quality. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Guidance – Physical Activity: walking and cycling states that walking and cycling reduces the risk of heart disease, stroke, cancer, obesity and type 2 diabetes. It can help keep the musculoskeletal system healthy and promote mental wellbeing.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 The team leading partnership improvement projects such as this endeavour to engage with and develop schemes alongside key partners, whilst also seeking the views of residents and. It is disappointing therefore that the DTF determined a need to make a formal complaint to the C2C LEP. However, it is obvious that the DTF had concerns which they believed were serious enough to warrant this action, something that requires reflection and learning.
- 9.2 The Local Partnerships investigation has been completed, a report issued and a schedule of recommended actions set out, which Surrey County Council has responded to.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 The Dorking Transport Package is expected to be finalised by the end of the summer 2018. A 3-year monitoring and evaluation programme will follow and the Local Committee will be kept informed.
- 10.2 Working under the oversight of the Members Task Group it is proposed to act upon the recommended improvements, review the responses made by County Council Officers, whilst to also meet with the DTF. This meeting is not to reopen the complaint; that has been dealt with. It is to see what if any further lessons can be learned to help improve outcomes for residents.

Contact Officer:

Paul Fishwick, Local Transport Programme Manager

Annexes:

Annex A: Local Partnerships Draft Report to C2C LEP

Annex B: Revised Recommendations for Action

Sources/background papers:

Dorking Transport Package Phase 1 – Business case (December 2014)

Local Partnerships Draft Report to C2C LEP



Local Partnerships is jointly owned by



Investigation Review

Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership
Dorking Sustainable Transport Package

ITEM 9

Project Title: Dorking Sustainable Transport Package

Local Partnerships Reference Number: LP539G000

Version number: FINAL

Date of issue to PO: 16 January 2018

Project Owner: Paul Castle, Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership

Review dates: 10/01/2018 to 16/01/2018

Review Team:

Austin Hogger

Martin Sachs

This report is an evidence-based snapshot of the project's status at the time of the review. It reflects the views of the independent review team, based on information evaluated over the review period, and is delivered to the Project Owner at the conclusion of the review.

Gateway reviews has been derived from OGC's Successful Delivery Toolkit which is a Crown Copyright Value Added product developed, owned and published by the Office of Government Commerce. It is subject to Crown copyright protection and is reproduced under licence with the kind permission of the Controller of HMSO and the Office of Government Commerce.

Conclusion

This independent investigation review has been commissioned by Coast to Capital Local Enterprise partnership (C2C) in order to evaluate the validity of the complaint raised by Dorking Town Forum with regard to:-

- the quality of the works undertaken
- the alleged failure to complete contracted works
- allegations of financial mismanagement by Surrey County Council in their role as the delivery body

The Review Team understands that this scheme is Phase 1 of a proposed 3 phase improvement in and around Deepdene Station; however, the scheme business case does state that the aims of the phase 1 investment includes (inter alia):-

- providing a seamless rail to rail connection between the two stations in a similar way to changing platforms at a large station
- improving the accessibility of the Dorking Deepdene station

It would be our view that neither of these aims have been fully realised by the phase 1 investment. The implementation of the recommendations set out in the table on the following page may go some way to addressing the first of the above aims ie the realisation of a seamless rail to rail connection between the two stations. However, for significant improvements to the accessibility of Deepdene, it seems to us inevitable that the proposed later phases of the Dorking Transport Package will be required.

Taking each of the elements of the complaint set out above, we would summarise our findings as follows:-

- quality of the works undertaken: our concerns here relate to the following and are reflected in our recommendations:-
 - signage
 - RTP1 in bus stops
 - The 3-way junction of the A24/station approach/Lincoln Road

However, we consider the finished works, particularly to highway surfaces, are to a good standard.

- alleged failure to complete contracted works: with the major slippage on the project, significant work at Deepdene station remains to be completed including replacement shelters and CCTV. We also have a concern about the medium and longer term viability of further substantial investment at Deepdene station especially in the light of the structural problems uncovered by the removal of the old passenger shelters.
- allegations of financial mismanagement by Surrey County Council: we have found no evidence to support this element of the complaint. The financial management of the project and the way in which claims for payment have been compiled, submitted and approved has been set out for us in some detail and we find the arrangements to be sound. We do, however, have a concern about the level of charges for design fees and supervision and we make a recommendation on that matter.

ITEM 9

Project Title: Dorking Sustainable Transport Package

Local Partnerships Reference Number: LP539G000

Summary of Report Recommendations

The Review Team makes the following recommendations.

Ref. No.	Recommendation	Action
1.	To ensure that design changes made during the implementation of traffic schemes be reflected in communications materials and the reasons for them be fully explained.	SCC
2.	To reconsider the provision of RTPI at all bus stops close to Main and Deepdene stations, particularly in the light of funds remaining available to the Dorking STP.	SCC
3.	To ensure that in the event that it is decided to provide RTPI at the A24 bus stops, a realistic delivery plan be developed, taking into account the uncertainty over the bus shelter contracts.	SCC
4.	To audit the wayfinding signage within the Dorking STP area (pre-existing and newly introduced) against the STP terms of reference (including identifying opportunities to minimise or mitigate street clutter).	SCC
5.	To explore whether there are other means (e.g. signage) to draw attention of cyclists and pedestrians to the possibility of unseen traffic emerging from Lincoln Road.	SCC
6.	To explore whether the road hatchings be amended so that a "lane" is provided for vehicles entering Lincoln Road from the A24.	SCC
7.	To revisit the medium/longer term viability of major investment at Deepdene station.	SCC/FGW
8.	To ensure that business case delivery timescales are robust and realistic.	SCC/FGW
9.	To obtain a detailed breakdown of the design and supervision element of the latest cost estimates together with reasons for the variance in costs.	C2C/WSCC
10.	To develop active stakeholder management with DTF so that an open channel of communication exists, particularly to underpin the completion of Dorking STP (Ph 1) and also the development of future phases.	SCC

Background

The aims and objectives of the project:

Extract from Business Case:-

As well as being the first phase of the Dorking Transport Package, the scheme is both a catalyst to delivering an accessible station at Dorking Deepdene with full customer facilities and a key step in delivering a fully integrated and accessible sustainable transport network in Dorking that provides a real alternative to the private car, enabling sustainable economic growth. An exercise has been undertaken to identify current barriers to using Dorking Deepdene station and to interchanging between the station and other transport modes. The results of this work has identified a number of improvements that will have a significant impact in improving the attractiveness of travelling to, from and through Dorking by sustainable means.

Dorking Deepdene (approximately 636,500 passengers per annum) is a key station on the North Downs line (Reading via Guildford to Redhill/Gatwick Airport), but currently offers a poor customer proposition, being accessed only by steps, creating major difficulties for certain people, and lacking what passengers now expect to be the norm, such as CCTV and good cycle and waiting facilities.

The Dorking Transport package (phase 1) scheme is seen as a 'gateway' to facilitate interconnectivity between two key rail lines, the Horsham to London via Dorking main station (approximately 1,346,700 passengers per annum) and the Reading to Redhill/Gatwick line via Dorking Deepdene station. This scheme will provide a seamless rail to rail connection between the two stations in a similar way to changing platforms at a large station, and with different destinations, will open up new destination opportunities.

The long term vision for the station is to deliver a fully accessible, secure and manned facility, with a station building including toilets and retail facilities and lifts to both platforms. Dorking Deepdene is in close proximity to Dorking Main station but a lack of signage and information is a barrier to interchange opportunities. The link between the two stations would also be improved to allow easy interchange between bus/rail and rail/rail, building upon the recently completed enhancement scheme at Dorking Main station.

The aims of the scheme (phase 1) are to improve the accessibility of the Dorking Deepdene station, the attractiveness of travelling by rail and the ease of making door to door journeys by sustainable means. These in turn would deliver:-

- modal shift away from the private car*
- reduce congestion and carbon emissions*
- improve public health through an increase in active travel*
- increased social inclusion by opening up new journey opportunities for certain people*
- improve safety and security and reduce fear of crime*
- an increase in the attractiveness of Dorking town centre as a destination through improved*
- connectivity and the delivery of a better gateway for the town.*

ITEM 9

Project Title: Dorking Sustainable Transport Package

Local Partnerships Reference Number: LP539G000

The procurement/delivery status:

The project is still in its construction works stage but is due for completion later in 2018. Dependent on the outcome of the structural survey work beneath the now removed shelters on the two Deepdene station platforms, the replacement shelters are still outstanding. Installation of RTPI at bus stop A is also outstanding.

Purposes of this Investigation Review:

Appendix A gives the terms of reference and the methodology for this investigation review.

Scope of this Investigation Review:

This independent investigation review has been commissioned by Coast to Capital Local Enterprise partnership (C2C) in order to evaluate the validity of the complaint raised by Dorking Town Forum with regard to:-

- the quality of the works undertaken
- the alleged failure to complete contracted works
- allegations of financial mismanagement by Surrey County Council in their role as the delivery body

During the review period additional hard copy and electronic copy material (documents, spreadsheets, diagrams and photos) have been made available to the review team with hard copies handed over by SCC and by DTF on 10 January, electronic copies submitted by email the following day, 11 January (from SCC and DTF) and with further emails from DTF on 13 and 15 January. Material submitted by SCC was directly relevant to DTF's complaint; however, the material submitted by DTF was much more wide ranging, covered a considerable period and dealt with many matters which were beyond the scope of the original complaint and the review's terms of reference. For instance, one of the attachments to DTF's email of 13 January was a response to an FoI request from Network Rail and comprised 180 pages of spreadsheets and text.

We have limited our work in line with the review's terms of reference.

Conduct of the Local Partnerships Investigation Review:

This investigation review was carried out from 10 to 16 January 2018. The review team were based in the Christian Centre, Dorking on 10 January and made a site visit during the day accompanied by officers from Surrey CC and members of the Dorking Town Forum.

The investigation review team members are listed on page 2 of this report.

The people interviewed are listed in Appendix B.

Findings and recommendations

These findings follow each of the heads of complaint made by Dorking Town Forum.

Footpath widening

The core outputs of the Dorking Sustainable Transport Package (Ph 1) included improvement of provision for pedestrians and cyclists travelling in both directions between Dorking Main and Dorking Deepdene railway stations. A major feature of this is a shared pedestrian/cycleway along the eastern footway of London Road (A24) north of the railway overbridge and the south eastern footway of Station Road, aimed at providing a safe and uncongested route for pedestrians and cyclists between the two stations. Provision of this shared route relied on widening the footways by moving the kerblines into space occupied by the existing carriageway.

The extent of this widening is shown as 1.5 m (London Road) and 1.0 m (Station Road) on the SCC progress newsletters issued between April 2016 and January 2017. However in the case of London Road, although a new kerblines has been laid, its alignment appears to be along, or very close to, the original kerblines. In the case of Station Road, the widening has been reduced to 0.5 m. Along both sections of the shared route, a width of 3.0 m has been provided.

DTF has suggested that the London Road section of the shared footway/cycleway is not acceptable as such under local design guidance due to its 3.0 m width. However, we were told by SCC that the 3.0 m wide route is acceptable within both national and SCC design guidance for a shared pedestrian and cycle route. The wider alignments originally envisaged would have been desirable but could not be achieved because the narrower carriageways were unacceptable through impact on traffic congestion and safety. DTF remain unhappy with the narrower pedestrian/cycle route because of

- Roadside - vehicle doors being opened across the shared pedestrian / cycleway
- Property side - people / vehicles emerging directly from properties onto the shared pedestrian / cycleway

We note that there is direct egress from the Lincoln Arms site onto the pedestrian/cycleway. However, this results from constraints intrinsic to the site and appears unavoidable. We note also that there was a DTF proposal to use the pedestrian subway Station Approach / Croft Avenue also for general cycle movements. However, this idea was controversial within the cycling community and opposed by SCC road safety team.

DTF also told us that during construction there appeared to be a lack of co-ordination between the footway works carried out by SCC and Southern Rail respectively. Namely the works carried out by SCC were completed a month before the SR works. During this interval, a kerbway protruded into the carriageway of Station Approach, and we were told several road traffic accidents resulted from this protrusion. We were also shown a photograph indicating, at least on the day the photo was taken, signing/guarding of this protrusion was limited to a single traffic cone. A single traffic cone is unlikely to have been effective in highways safety terms and accordingly we have concerns about this issue; we would suggest that it may indicate the need for better planning and co-ordination when different clients are carrying out improvements on the same stretch of roadway.

On the substantive issue of the finished width of the footway/cycleway, however, the review team conclude that the shared pedestrian/cycle route along London Road (A24) and Station Road is

ITEM 9

Project Title: Dorking Sustainable Transport Package

Local Partnerships Reference Number: LP539G000

acceptable from a design point of view. Nevertheless, the design changes were not communicated effectively and we therefore recommend as follows:-

Recommendation 1

To ensure that design changes made during the implementation of traffic schemes be reflected in communications materials and the reasons for them be fully explained.

Bus stop improvements

One of the key aims of the Dorking Sustainable Transport Package is improved connectivity between modes of transport and buses are one of these. Improved bus stops feature as important deliverables within DSTP, measure principally comprising improved wayfinding and better real time information.

Issues on wayfinding are addressed in our section on signs and lines below.

Measures on real time information are electronic signs which have been placed on station platforms, station entrances, in bus shelters and at other locations (including within Dorking Town Centre). Some of these are innovative signs, containing both train and bus departure information.

While it appears to have been the original intention to have placed RTPI signs within most, if not all of the bus stop shelters within the area in and around Main and Deepdene stations, this has not so far been achieved. Notably the main bus stops (A, B and E) on London Road (A24) have no RTPI provided, although those on the Main Station forecourt do have such.

It appears that the issue with the A24 bus shelters (stops A, B and E) is that the contract for their provision and maintenance (let by Mole Valley District Council) has expired and it is therefore very difficult for SCC to arrange the RTPI provision. It also appears that the local SCC Mole Valley committee monitoring the Dorking STP has agreed to delete the proposal for RTPI at Bus Stop E and approved on 2/3/16 the transfer of £30K funds for RTPI from bus stop E to bus stops at Main station. However the local information newsletters (as per SCC website) show no reference to these decisions. There is also no reference to RTPI at Bus Stop B in any of the newsletters. There is no reference to the outstanding provision at Bus Stop A in newsletters from August 2017 onwards.

The review team considers that RTPI at bus stops is a provision that provides real value to many actual and potential bus passengers. Although real time bus information is available to people with modern smart phones, bus usage is characterised by less advantaged sections of the population. The Review Team therefore recommends as follows:-

Recommendation 2

To reconsider the provision of RTPI at all bus stops close to Main and Deepdene stations, particularly in the light of funds remaining available to the Dorking STP.

Recommendation 3

To ensure that in the event that it is decided to provide RTPI at the A24 bus stops, a realistic delivery plan be developed, taking into account the uncertainty over the bus shelter contracts.

It is also important that any decisions relating to onward provision of RTPI be clearly communicated to stakeholders.

Signs and Lines

Signs and lines form a key part of highway infrastructure and have bearing on highway based schemes such as Dorking STP in the following areas:-

- Wayfinding
- Regulatory, e.g. yellow lines
- Non-regulatory traffic control, e.g. hatch markings
- Part of “street furniture”, making a contribution to the “look and feel” of the physical environment

Wayfinding signage in the vicinity of Main and Deepdene stations comprised both pre-existing signage and new signs provided through the Dorking STP (Ph 1). Indeed, this part of the package is incomplete and further signage remains to be erected outside the northern entrance to Deepdene station. DTF have raised concern about the coherency, consistency and correctness of some of the wayfinding signage. The Review Team accept the validity of some of these concerns (e.g. directions to Bus Stop “E” on the white signs over both exits from Deepdene station are incorrect). We also saw a plethora of signs of many different styles, ages and relevance which may mitigate against the “seamless rail to rail transfer between stations” that the project aspires to. We therefore recommend as follows:-

Recommendation 4

To audit the wayfinding signage within the Dorking STP area (pre-existing and newly introduced) against the STP terms of reference (including identifying opportunities to minimise or mitigate street clutter).

DTF drew our attention to “give way” lines alongside the edge of tactile paving leading to the dropped crossing with Lincoln Road (from A24). The location of these is such as to deny a clear sight line of traffic approaching from Lincoln Road (which we verified on site). SCC told us that the “give way” lines cannot be painted on the tactiles. We therefore recommend as follows:-

Recommendation 5

To explore whether there are other means (e.g. signage) to draw attention of cyclists and pedestrians to the possibility of unseen traffic emerging from Lincoln Road.

We also identified that traffic entering Lincoln Road from the A24 via the east side of the extended traffic island near Main Station had to cross road hatchings.

Recommendation 6

To explore whether the road hatchings be amended so that a “lane” is provided for vehicles entering Lincoln Road from the A24.

ITEM 9

Project Title: Dorking Sustainable Transport Package

Local Partnerships Reference Number: LP539G000

Safety and Quality

We have referred to issues on signage, RTPI provision and the layout of the A24 / Station Approach / Lincoln Road junction detracting from the “output” quality of Dorking STP (Ph 1). On the matter of construction quality, we base our opinions on our observations on site; we consider the works carried out by contractors on behalf of SCC, GWR and SR to be of good standard. There appear to be no obvious needs for reconstruction, remedial or snagging work. We have referred above to our concerns over the co-ordination of work by SCC and SR at the Station Approach footway widening although limited evidence has prevented us from investigating this further.

Scope of contracted and completed works

With the major time slippage on the project, significant work at Deepdene station remains to be completed including replacement shelters and CCTV. We also have a concern about the medium and longer term viability of further substantial investment at Deepdene especially in the light of the structural problems uncovered by the removal of the old passenger shelters. We understand that later phases of DSTP will include investment at Deepdene to improve access, including staircase improvements, lifts, etc but may not currently include a wider consideration of the structural life of the platforms themselves.

Recommendation 7

To revisit the medium/longer term viability of major investment at Deepdene station.

Project and financial management and accounting

When the project’s business case was approved in March 2015, project expenditure, for both on-highways and on-station expenditure, was forecast to occur wholly within the 2015/16 financial year. In the event, because of a delay in the finalisation of the funding agreement, the project did not start until early 2016 and consequently there was minimal spend in 2015/16. For the on-highways works, there were further construction delays during 2016/17 and forecast completion was re-set for the end of 2017/18. However, in December 2017, SCC further revised the project completion date to Q1 2018/19 for on-highways works and Q2/3 2018/19 for on-station works.

These are very significant slippages in timescale and expenditure. Whilst the various causes of the slippage have been explained to us, we remain concerned that the original forecast timescales at business case approval stage were overly optimistic. We understand that processes are being put in place to ensure that timescales are better forecasted and better adhered to on future schemes.

Recommendation 8

To ensure that business case delivery timescales are robust and realistic.

Project Title: Dorking Sustainable Transport Package
Local Partnerships Reference Number: LP539G000

DTF have been particularly critical of the cost management on the project. DTF's own summary of the likely outturn costs of the scheme compared with the original estimated cost shows an approximate £150k cost overrun set out as follows.

	Original cost estimate £	Projected final cost £	Variance £
On-station works	403 750	475 000	71 250
On-highways works	276 250	346 318	70 068
Total	680 000	821 318	141 318

Source: DTF

The shaded boxes shown above are given by DTF to be £829 132 and £149 132 respectively but these figures appear to be an error.

One immediate observation on the above figures is that the "original cost estimate" column does not include the 15% contingency allowance set out in the funding agreement.

The original funding agreement makes no allowance for works price inflation. Whilst this was a reasonable assumption based on the original delivery programme, with the significant slippage referred to above, works price inflation is bound to have played some part in outturn costs. As a guide, the ONS works cost index (repair and maintenance 9/17 bulletin) gives the following:-

- 9/15 (mid-point of business case delivery programme) 100.1
- 5/17 (mid-point of Q1 2017/18) 102.5

Based on these assumptions, works cost inflation would account for an uplift of 2.4% of the original estimate ie some £20k.

Therefore, after adding the contingency allowance of 15% and taking into account the effects of inflation, even using DTF's own "Projected final cost" figures from the table above, there has been no significant cost overrun on the project. SCC's position, on the contrary, is that there is likely to be a small cost underspend overall once the project is finally completed. However, the latest iteration of Schedule 2, dated September 2017, shows a total outturn forecast of £832 000, with the excess match funding over and above the original £200k being met by SCC. This latest Schedule 2 also includes 5% contingency (reduced because of course the project is nearing completion) and an inflation allowance of 5% of total costs. A 5% allowance for inflation applied to total costs appears to us to be on the high side but actual costs will show the true outturn over the next few months.

ITEM 9

Project Title: Dorking Sustainable Transport Package

Local Partnerships Reference Number: LP539G000

Looking in more detail at the 9/17 Schedule 2 and comparing each element with the original schedule, shows a number of variances on the on-highways work:-

	Original cost estimate £	Latest cost estimate £	Variance £
Station approach – widen footway/island	27 600	30 000	2 400
Lincoln Road – install road table	29 750	25 600	(4150)
Signing between both stations/town centre	28 750	40 000	11 250
Bus stop improvements	103 500	112 000	8 500
Design preparation & supervision	40 250	94 250	54 000

Only one of the above variances is particularly significant in our view ie the Design & Supervision element. We would suggest that a detailed breakdown is sought from SCC for the variance together with reasons why it has arisen.

Recommendation 9

To obtain a detailed breakdown of the design and supervision element of the latest cost estimates together with reasons for the variance in costs.

During the review we have been made aware of the methodology used to submit claims for payment on the project. We understand that all claims made by SCC (including those originating from FGW acting as sub-contractor to SCC) are verified by the Accountable Body, WSCC, prior to be paid by C2C. Payments relate to work done with supporting invoices provided where necessary as well as proof of payment. Internal SCC costs are supported where necessary by ledger transfers or similar.

It is certainly the case that forecast expenditure in a given financial year (or quarter) has not equated to actual expenditure either against particular heads of expenditure or indeed against the overall project – this being due to the effects of the substantial slippage referred to above. However, regarding the allegations of financial mismanagement by Surrey County Council, we have found no evidence to support this element of the complaint. The financial management of the project and the way in which claims for payment have been compiled, submitted and approved has been set out for us in some detail and we find the arrangements to be sound.

Stakeholder Management

We have looked carefully at the issues raised by DTF and have found some of their complaints to be justified and others not. Whilst we recognise that the zeal with which some members of DTF conduct their enquiries is challenging, we consider DTF to be an active representative body representing the views of many Dorking residents. SCC is a well resourced local authority with dedicated, enthusiastic and professional officers. We are concerned that a relatively modest transport package has become the centre of some acrimony (although our interviews reflected calm and restrained presentation on the part of all participants without exception.)

It is our view that, in general, there need to be open channels of communication between scheme promoters and all key stakeholders. For whatever reason, these do not appear to exist at the moment between SCC and DTF. In particular it is better in all cases for information flow to follow discussion rather than recourse to freedom of information legislation. Whilst recognising the difficulties, we therefore recommend as follows:-

Recommendation 10

To develop active stakeholder management with DTF so that an open channel of communication exists, particularly to underpin the completion of Dorking STP (Ph 1) and also the development of future phases.

ITEM 9

Project Title: Dorking Sustainable Transport Package

Local Partnerships Reference Number: LP539G000

APPENDIX A

Terms of reference

1. To review the effectiveness of the project
2. To evaluate the validity of the complaint raised by Dorking Town Forum with regard to:-
 - a. the quality of the works undertaken
 - b. the alleged failure to complete contracted works
 - c. allegations of financial mismanagement by Surrey County Council in their role as the delivery body
3. To report findings to Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership in their role as the funding body

Methodology

1. To undertake a desk study of available documentation.
2. To carry out a short site visit to view the completed works.
3. To interview, either face to face or by telephone, relevant stakeholders.
4. To produce a short, focussed report giving findings, conclusions and, if appropriate, recommendations for further action.
5. To submit the report to Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership.

APPENDIX B

Interviewees

Name	Organisation
Paul Fishwick	Surrey County Council, Environment & Infrastructure Directorate
Love Bhabuta	Surrey County Council, Environment & Infrastructure Directorate
Cnllr Margaret Cooksey	Chair of Dorking Town Forum
John Meudell	Dorking Town Forum
Chris Heaps	Dorking Town Forum
Andi Guinea*	West Sussex County Council (Accountable Body)

* Indicates telephone interview

This page is intentionally left blank

Re: Dorking STP – Ph.1 scheme - Action Plan relating to recommendations made by the C2C commissioned Investigators

Preface:

This document relates to the ‘*Dorking STP – Phase 1 scheme*’, which has been the subject of a C2C commissioned independent investigation, following complaints lodged by Dorking Town Forum [DTF] in late 2017. The investigators in the main did not find in favour of the complaints and instead made a several recommendations for SCC and C2C to consider.

At a meeting held on 10 May 2018, to review the recommendations and response by SCC, the investigators requested an Action Plan to be documented, with the aim of seeking closure on the matter. SCC agreed to issue the Action Plan to C2C LEP by the end of May 18.

The Actions are presented against the original Recommendations, with notes on their current status.

Action Plan for Dorking STP scheme – Phase 1:

Ref. No.	Recommendation	Action [and status]
1	To ensure that design changes made during the implementation of traffic schemes be reflected in communications materials and the reasons for them be fully explained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed via updated Newsletters, published on the project website. • Recent Newsletter updated in March 18 and May18. • Upon the conclusion of the project in September-October 18, a final Newsletter will be published.
2	To reconsider the provision of RTPI at all bus stops close to Main and Deepdene stations, particularly in the light of funds remaining available to the Dorking STP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTPI installed at the 3 bus-stops at Dorking Main Station • RTPI to be installed at bus stop A [on the A24], as and when the contract for <i>this</i> bus shelter is transferred from Mole Valley DC to Surrey CC. Equipment for installation has been obtained and held in storage. • No plans to install RTPI at Stops B & E, due to low patronage and also out of scope. •
3	To ensure that in the event that it is decided to provide RTPI at the A24 bus stops, a realistic delivery plan be developed, taking into account the uncertainty over the bus shelter contracts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per above.
4	To audit the wayfinding signage within the Dorking STP area (pre-existing and newly introduced) against the STP terms of reference (including identifying opportunities to minimise or mitigate street clutter).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A remaining Way-finding sign to be installed at Dorking Deepdene station – <i>by end Jun 2018</i>. • Rationalisation of existing signage around Dorking Deepdene station, to minimise clutter and remove any confusion – <i>by end July 18</i>. • Removal of the outdated A4 sign on the guardrail [opposite entrance to Dorking Deepdene station, on north-side of railway-bridge]. To be done when contractors complete the works to the south of the Dorking Deepdene station – <i>anticipated by September 18</i>. • GWR to amend the directional arrow on the grey-backed sign above the pedestrian entrance to the Dorking

ITEM 9

		Deepdene station, as the arrow leading to the bus stops is misleading - <i>anticipated by September 18.</i>
5	To explore whether there are other means (e.g. signage) to draw attention of cyclists and pedestrians to the possibility of unseen traffic emerging from Lincoln Road.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further action - The independent road safety audit (RSA) did not find it necessary for any additional signing at this location.
6	To explore whether the road hatchings be amended so that a “lane” is provided for vehicles entering Lincoln Road from the A24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No immediate further action - The independent road safety audit (RSA) did not find it necessary for road hatchings to be amended. • However, this option to be considered, when the road markings become worn and require refreshing in future years. • This point was referenced by the Investigators [Martin Sachs] at the meeting on 10 May 18.
7	To revisit the medium/longer term viability of major investment at Deepdene station.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further action planned, as these aspects fall outside the scope of the project and relate better to Network Rail strategic plans. •
8	To ensure that business case delivery timescales are robust and realistic.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed via updated Newsletters, published on the project website.
9	To obtain a detailed breakdown of the design and supervision element of the latest cost estimates together with reasons for the variance in costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upon completion of the project, C2C to be updated on the details of the design & supervision costs. <i>Anticipated by October-November 18.</i>
10	To develop active stakeholder management with DTF so that an open channel of communication exists, particularly to underpin the completion of Dorking STP (Ph 1) and also the development of future phases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All project updates to be via the Newsletter, available to all stake-holders. • No further engagement envisaged, as the project is nearing conclusion.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

DATE: 06 JUNE 2018



SURREY

LEAD OFFICER: SARAH SMITH, PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE OFFICER

SUBJECT: LOCAL COMMITTEE COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING AND REPRESENTATION ON TASK GROUPS AND EXTERNAL BODIES

DIVISION: All

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

The local committee (Mole Valley) has a delegated budget of £3,000 for community safety projects in 2018/19. This report sets out the process by which this funding should be allocated to the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership and/or other local community organisations that promote the safety and wellbeing of residents. The report also seeks the approval of Local Committee task group members and the appointment of representatives to external bodies.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- (i) The committee's delegated community safety budget of £3,000 for 2018/19 be retained by the Community Partnership Team, on behalf of the Local Committee, and that the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership and/or other local organisations be invited to submit proposals for funding that meet the criteria and principles set out at paragraph 2.4 of this report.
- (ii) Authority be delegated to the Community Safety Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the local committee, to authorise the expenditure of the community safety budget in accordance with the criteria and principles stated at paragraph 2.4 of this report.
- (iii) The committee receives updates on the project(s) funded, the outcomes and the impact it has achieved.
- (iv) The committee approves the membership of the task groups and appointments to outside bodies, as detailed at paragraph 2.8 and annex 1 of this report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The report sets out a process for allocating the committee's delegated community safety budget of £3,000 to local organisations. It also proposes local committee task group membership for the forthcoming year to enable the provision of informed advice and recommendations to the committee. The appointment of councillors of the Local Committee to external bodies enables the committee's representation on and input to such bodies

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 Prior to 2016, the local committee had historically chosen to passport its delegated community safety funding to the local Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to assist in their efforts to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour on behalf of residents.
- 1.2 Following countywide analysis of the projects that were funded through CSPs and the outcomes achieved, the local committee agreed that its local CSP should firstly be invited to provide an outline of any prospective projects that could be supported from the committee's funding for approval. This aimed to provide greater oversight of the committee's expenditure. In the context of the County's Medium Term Financial Plan and the requirement upon all county services to contribute to significant savings, the process would also help to achieve better value for money from projects in support of the County Council's wider community safety priorities.
- 1.3 Local committee task groups are established at the start of each municipal year. Membership of each task group is nominated and decided by councillors of the local committee. Representation on external bodies is similarly decided and is reviewed and agreed by local committee members annually. The proposed membership and terms of reference for the committee's task groups are contained in Annex 1 of this report. The committee is requested to make appointments to the external bodies and task groups, as detailed in paragraph 2.8 of this report.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 In 2017/18, the committee awarded:

Surrey Fire and Rescue Service: £900 for Safe Drive Stay Alive

Mole Valley District Council: £2100 for CCTV at Meadowbank

A further update on the project's outcomes and achievements will be provided to the committee in December 2018.

- 2.2 As in the previous year, a clear and simple process designed to support CSPs will be adopted in order that funds can be processed efficiently this year.

- 2.3 Local CSPs will be invited to submit a brief outline of the projects that they would like to put the committee's funding towards, using a simple template designed for this purpose.
- 2.4 To assist CSPs in identifying suitable projects, the following criteria will be provided as a guide:
- (a) Results in residents feeling safer
 - (b) Has clear outcomes that align with the priorities of the Local Committee and/or the CSP
 - (c) Is non recurrent expenditure
 - (d) Does not fund routine CSP activities (e.g. salaries, training)
 - (e) Is not subsumed into generalised or non-descript funding pots
 - (f) Does not duplicate funding already provided (e.g. domestic abuse services, youth work, transport costs, literature which could be co-ordinated across all CSPs)
- 2.5 To ensure funds can be utilised within the current financial year, it is suggested that a deadline of 14 **September 2018** is imposed for the submission of outline projects by CSPs and/or local organisations. This deadline will be communicated widely to local CSPs and partner organisations.
- 2.6 To ensure that funds can be distributed speedily and efficiently, it is recommended that authority is delegated to the Community Safety Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee, to authorise the expenditure of the committee's funds outside the formal quarterly committee meeting cycle. This should allow local organisations to obtain approval, initiate and implement projects with the minimum of delay.
- 2.7 Once implemented, the CSP and any other recipients of this funding will be required to provide the local committee with a short update on each project, outlining how the funding was used and the difference and impact it has made in the local community.
- 2.8 The Local Committee is also asked to agree the appointment of Member representatives of the following bodies and task groups, and to review and confirm the task group terms of reference set out in Annex 1:
- (i) East Surrey Community Safety Partnership – proposed representative is Tim Hall and deputy Stephen Cooksey
 - (ii) Parking Task Group - proposed members are Tim Hall, Hazel Watson, and two district councillors tbc
 - (iii) Property Task Group – proposed members are Tim Hall, Stephen Cooksey, Hazel Watson and one district councillor tbc
 - (iv) Leatherhead Major Schemes Task Group – proposed members are Tim Hall, Chris Townsend and Cllr Rosemary Dickson

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 All viable options were considered and appraised when forming the recommendations to the Local committee. The previous arrangement, whereby the committee transferred both its funding and the decision-making about how the funding could be used to the CSP was not considered to provide sufficient information on the impact that the funding or the outcomes it had achieved.
- 3.2 The recommended funding arrangements will employ a simple process for the commitment of funds by the committee to enable greater scrutiny over the use of this funding.
- 3.3 The committee can confirm the task groups and the corresponding terms of reference as set out in the report. Alternatively, it can establish new task groups, or dispense with previous task groups. If a new task group is established, provisional terms of reference should be agreed.
- 3.4 The committee can either make the appointments to external bodies, as set out within the report, or amend these appointments.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Local committee chairmen were collectively consulted about the process for allocating community safety funding, as recommended in this report.
- 4.2 Local committee member views are being sought on the nominations for representatives on external bodies and on the membership of local committee task groups.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 The costs of the recommendations in this report are contained within existing revenue budgets. Early scrutiny of proposed projects by CSPs and local organisations will help to achieve better value for money for the Committee's funding.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 There are no direct equalities or diversity implications. However, through its membership of the local CSP and external bodies, the County Council can help to ensure that local services are accessible to harder to reach groups. The CSP also maintains ongoing monitoring of hate and domestic abuse crimes.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The proposals contained in this report will enable CSPs and/or other suitable local organisations to submit projects that support the County Council's strategic goal of enhancing resident experience. Membership of task groups and representation on external bodies allows local councillors to consider,

recommend and influence policies and services in response to local residents' needs.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

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

8.1 Crime and Disorder implications

The county council's membership of local CSPs helps ensure the achievement of its community safety priorities. The committee's funding for local community safety projects enables the CSP and/or other local organisations to help to promote safety, reduce crime, and tackle antisocial behaviour and raise awareness of safer practices and behaviours.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

9.1 The recommendations contained in this report are intended to secure greater oversight of the committee's community safety expenditure and achieve better value for money through projects that help to achieve the County's community safety priorities.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

10.1 The CSP will be advised of the funding process agreed by the Local Committee and invited to access this funding.

Contact Officer:

Sarah Smith, Partnership Committee Officer, Telephone 01372 371662

Consulted:

Surrey's local committee chairmen and local committee members.

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Task Groups and Membership of External Bodies

Annex 2 – Details of Funded Projects

Sources/background papers:

Not applicable.

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

TASK GROUPS AND MEMBERSHIP OF EXTERNAL BODIES

ANNEX 1

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

**Property Task Group
Terms of Reference**

Objective:

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

Membership

The Task Group will consist of four appointees from the Local Committee - three county and one district councillor. The property portfolio holder for Mole Valley District Council will also sit on the group, though not a member of the local committee. The Task Group may also consult with other relevant members of the Committee.

General

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

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

**Parking Task Group
Terms of Reference**

Membership: The Parking Task Group will consist of four members, two county councillors and two district councillors.

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

Role:

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

General

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

**Surrey County Council's Local Committee
(Mole Valley)
Leatherhead Major Schemes Task Group
Terms of Reference**

1. The Group's principle purpose is to consider major transport schemes and transport issues arising from Transform Leatherhead, at key decision milestones, in order to provide recommendations to the Local Committee to appropriately inform the committee's decisions.
2. The scope of the Task Group will be:
 - i. Leatherhead Sustainable Transport Package and/or any subsequent similar scale scheme proposals
 - ii. Highways & wider Transport aspects of 'Transform Leatherhead' developments
3. Officers supporting this Task Group will consult that Group and will give due consideration to the Group's reasoning and recommendations prior to reporting to the Local Committee.
4. The Task Group will comprise two county councillors, (Chairman and a further divisional county member) and two district councillors, including the Transform Leatherhead councillor sponsor in a co-opted capacity and a district councillor from the local committee.
5. As an advisory group to the Local Committee, Task Group members will act in the interests of Leatherhead as a whole, rather than representing the interests of their divisions or wards.
6. Recommendations to the Local Committee will be supported by a summary of the reasoning behind the Task Group's position and reflect any professional advice from officers.
7. The Task Group will meet in private, at appropriate times during the year and actions from the meetings will be recorded and made available to the Local Committee.

Annex 2

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

DETAIL OF FUNDED ORGANISATIONS

Name of Organisation:	Surrey Fire and Rescue Service
Amount Awarded:	£900
Project Aims & Purpose of Funding:	Safe Drive, Stay Alive is an emotionally engaging and thought provoking theatre based education production, coordinated by Surrey Fire & Rescue Service, working with emergency services partners and members of the public, which aims to raise road safety awareness amongst young people and positively influence their attitudes to driving. Performances are designed to engage an audience of new and novice young drivers who are a high risk group on the UK's roads. Safe Drive Stay Alive aims to make young people aware of their responsibilities as road users and the wide ranging and potentially devastating consequences should these not be taken seriously. The ultimate aim is to reduce the number of road traffic collisions involving young people and the number of deaths and injuries amongst this at risk driver group
Outcomes to Date:	<p>This funding helped provide places for over 1000 pupils and their teachers from secondary schools across the district to attend the production in 2017.</p> <p>Box Hill – 69 places City of London Freemans – 118 places Hurtwood House – 203 places St Andrews Catholic School – 116 places St Johns – 137 places Ashcombe School – 266 places Priory School – 26 places Therfield School – 73 places</p> <p>Total = 1008 places</p>

Name of Organisation:	Mole Valley District Council
Amount Awarded:	£2100
Project Aims & Purpose of Funding:	<p>To expand and upgrade the CCTV system at Meadowbank Recreation Ground in Dorking (total cost of installing CCTV to cover the pavilion, skate park and children's play area is £15,300)</p> <p>Key features are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Live 24/7 streaming back to Reigate Police. 2. Compatibility with existing Reigate Police monitoring equipment. 3. 30 days storage of all images in line with police requirements. 4. Smart cameras capable of generating an alert from cross line detection. 5. Low light colour, vandal resistant, high resolution cameras (3MP) with smart IR. Much better night images than current PTZ cameras in the park. 6. PTZ autotracking camera coverage on the Pavilion roof, protecting the roof and giving much better overall coverage of the park and using a "star-light camera". 7. Camera coverage to the children's play area and skate park. 8. Ability to record images from existing 2 park cameras on existing columns.
Outcomes to Date:	<p>A funding contribution from the Community Safety Fund has enabled the upgrade and expansion of the CCTV system at Meadowbank Recreation Ground. The work, which was completed in February 2018, included the installation of six new CCTV cameras on the Meadowbank Pavilion and the replacement of an existing low specification camera. In addition, the installation of a server and radio link has enabled live viewing from the CCTV Control Room at Reigate Police Station. Since the installation, no further reports of anti-social behaviour around the pavilion have been received by MVDC to date.</p>

Local Committee Decision Tracker

This tracker monitors progress against the decisions that the Local Committee (Mole Valley) has made. It is updated before each committee meeting. (*Update provided at 25/05/2018*).

- Decisions will be marked as 'open', where work to implement the decision is ongoing.
- When decisions are reported to the committee as **complete**, they will also be marked as 'closed'. The Committee will then be asked to agree to remove these items from the tracker.
- Decisions may also be 'closed' if further progress is not possible at this time, even though the action is not yet complete. An explanation will be included in the comment section. In this case, the action will stay on the tracker unless the Committee decides to remove it.

Meeting Date	Item	Decision	Status (Open / Closed)	Officer	Comment or Update
16/11/16	9	To implement a Traffic Regulation Order in Buckland Lane	Open	Area Highways Manager	Consultation for the TRO is complete and no formal objections have been received. The contractor has ordered the bollards and gates once the contractor has received these they will be installed.
22/6/17	5	To commission the Dorking Transport Study	Open	Area Highways Manager	A separate report is included as an agenda item at this meeting.

22/6/17	10	To advertise TRO of agreed changes to on street parking.	Open	Senior Engineer (Parking)	TRO was introduced on 01 April. There have been delays in completing the lining work across the county due to the bad weather but should be completed soon.
13/09/17	8	To install an average speed camera system on A24 between Givon's Grove Roundabout and Burford Bridge Roundabout.	Open	Road Safety Manager	The work has been delayed slightly due to the contractors needing to provide more information on how the works were being undertaken to ensure that this was done safely and with minimal disruption to road users. We are also coordinating with Ryka's café who have agreed for a storage unit to be stored on their grounds, and due to the need to temporarily shut the Ryka's cafe A24 entrance. Therefore the work is currently scheduled to begin on 4 June to avoid the bank holiday week, which is a busier period for Ryka's Café.
13/09/17	9	To submit a bid to the DfT Safer Roads Fund for highway Safety improvements on A217 Reigate – Horley (Hookwood)	Open	Road Safety Manager	The bid was submitted before the deadline of 30 September. There is no date given as to when the outcome will be made known.
30/11/2017	8	To introduce a reduction of speed limits from 60mph to 40mph on specified roads in Leith Hill and Ockley.	Closed	Area Highways Manager	These speed limit reductions have now been implemented. Complete