

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 2.00 pm on 13 March 2019  
at Council Chamber, Pippbrook, Reigate Road, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1SJ.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

**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 David Hawksworth
- \* Cllr Mary Huggins
- \* Cllr Paul Kennedy
- \* Cllr Claire Malcomson
- Cllr Vivienne Michael

\* In attendance

---

**OPEN FORUM SESSION**

The questions and responses from the open forum session are included as an annex to these minutes.

**1/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mr Cooksey, Mrs Clack, Cllr Michael who was substituted by Cllr Yarwood and Cllr Hawksworth who was substituted by Cllr Reilly.

**2/19 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes from the previous meeting on 12 December 2018 were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

**3/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

Cllr Kennedy declared that he had signed the petition regarding parking in Bookham that was up for discussion at today's meeting.

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

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highway Manager, SCC

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** The questions and officer responses were published in the supplementary agenda. Each questioner was invited to ask one supplementary question on the topic of their original question. Questions were taken in the order in which they were received.

1. Mr Jerry Maxwell-Timmins attended and put forward the following comment. He acknowledged the response he had received from officers but added to his point that the entrance to Ashcombe School, accessed from Mowbray Gardens had no indication it was a school entrance and drivers along the A24 had no signage to indicate there was a school entrance near where they were driving.

**Key points from the discussion:**

- The Area Highway Manager (AHM) responded by saying as the entrance was not a full formal entrance, only a back entrance that full signage wasn't appropriate but she would look at the possibility to include signage in an appropriate place so as to not distract drivers travelling along the A24.
  - Members questioned whether the Governors of Ashcombe School had looked at this at all. Mrs Watson, as a Governor of the school confirmed this had not been raised previously but would look in to what could be done.
  - Members suggested a joined up approach with the school and Surrey County Council (SCC) was required to progress matters.
2. No representative from Bookhams' Residents Association (BRA) attended the meeting. Members however had a brief discussion on the points raised in the question.

**Key points from the discussion:**

- The questions and concerns raised by BRA were not dissimilar to those of any other village in Mole Valley with regards to the local plan. The question put forward highlighted the concerns and priorities that BRA had for MVDC and SCC to take in to account when MVDC finalised their local plan.
3. Cllr Irvine was unable to attend the meeting but the AHM did show the committee an image of the proposed signage to be included on the underpass by the Burford Bridge. The signage was for dual pedestrian and cyclist use. It was requested that additional signage could be included to remind cyclists to dismount as the underpass was shared with pedestrians.
  4. Ms Caroline Salmon was unable to attend the meeting and did not submit a supplementary question.
  5. Mrs Nancy Goodacre attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary question in relation to her second question. She asked

what the expected timing was for repairing the road as there was little clarity on this. She asked also for confirmation on the prioritisation of the scoring. The AHM confirmed that the scheme was on a list to be completed but this wouldn't be in 2019/20 and would be some time after 2020/21. Priorities were ranked across the county and across the district. The closer to one a score was the higher the priority of that scheme.

6. Cllr Daly attended and asked the following supplementary questions for each of her questions.
  - a) She asked what the timing was for adding the scheme to the Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) list and how to go about getting a feasibility study arranged. The AHM confirmed there were a large number of requests to add schemes to the ITS list and it wasn't possible to add everything. She added that a feasibility study would cost approximately £5000 of revenue funding. Given that in 2019/20 financial year the local committee had no revenue budget, other sources of funding would need to be sought for such work. These included looking at Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or developer funding.
  - b) Cllr Daly asked whether there was a way for residents to telephone somebody regarding the bin collection without having to log on to a website to report it. She was advised that bin collection was the responsibility of the district council and that residents could be advised to contact officers by telephone at the district council to report any problems. Cllr Daly could also do this to help residents, as a district councillor herself.

**b MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highway Manager, SCC

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** The questions and officer responses were published in the supplementary agenda. Each questioner was invited to ask one supplementary question on the topic of their original question. Questions were taken in the order in which they were received.

1. Mr Tim Hall raised the following points in relation to the two questions he submitted.
  - a) He stated that the barrier on the Kingston Road bridge was coming away from the bridge and appeared to be very unsafe. He asked whether it would be possible for this to be looked at. The AHM confirmed that the bridge inspectors would take a look.
  - b) Mr Hall noted he had taken this up with the Cabinet Member for Highways as didn't feel that a drainage asset cleaning rate of 72% since April 2018 was a good statistic.
2. Mrs Hazel Watson thanked officers for the response and had no supplementary question.

3. Cllr Kennedy noted that the NHS statistic was shocking and anything that could be done would be greatly appreciated.

The following member questions were asked, although not submitted in advance. The Chairman reminded members that questions should be submitted in writing in advance and not raised informally in such a way.

4. Mr Chris Townsend and Cllr Dickson asked for information on the progress of a previously asked question about flooding. The AHM confirmed that this had been passed to the Capital Drainage Team and any data received would be passed on when available.
5. Cllr Huggins raised the following question in relation to grass cutting on behalf of Mrs Clack. She stated there had been complaints about the litter along the A24 and with grass cutting due to take place in June queried whether there would be coordination between MVDC and SCC to ensure litter picking occurred before the grass cutting. The AHM confirmed that coordination took place to carry out the litter picking before the grass cutting and alongside the drainage and sign cleaning.

#### **5/19 PETITIONS [Item 5]**

**Declarations of Interest:** Cllr Kennedy declared he had signed the petition.

**Officers attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highway Manager, SCC

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** The petition and officer response was published in the supplementary agenda. The lead petitioner, Mr Ryan Pannell was unable to attend the meeting.

**Key points from the discussion:**

- The divisional member noted that the problem with parking on Church Road was both during the day and at night. She added she had been in conversations with the Residents' Association to ensure the request was submitted for consideration in the next Parking Review.

**Resolution:**

The Local Committee noted the officer's comment.

#### **6/19 A24 MICKLEHAM BYPASS AVERAGE SPEED CAMERA SCHEME EVALUATION [SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN] [Item 6]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Duncan Knox, Road Safety & Active Travel Team Manager, SCC

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** The Road Safety & Active Travel Team Manager introduced the report noting that the results following the implementation of the average speed cameras was positive so far, although the period of results was too short for robust statistical analysis. He added

that speed assessments had also been undertaken on the main road through Mickleham village to check for negative effects on the alternative route. So far this had shown no negative effects. It was noted that there has been good compliance with the speed limit, adding that approximately 70 offences a month had been recorded.

**Key points from the discussion:**

- The members praised the successes of the scheme, noting it was good for improved road safety. Thanks went to officers and the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) for pursuing and funding the scheme.
- It was questioned whether the scheme could be extended on the A24, south of Dorking towards Beare Green, as this was an area of concern for speeding and had a high accident rate. It was confirmed that there were other sites being looked at around the county for such schemes and officers were working with the Police to identify those sites most in need.
- The Chairman noted that if the A24 south of Dorking was to be considered as a suitable road for average speed cameras, it would be well supported by the members of the local committee.

**Resolution:**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) noted:

- i. The average speed camera system had improved compliance with the speed limit on the A24 Mickleham Bypass over a longer length of road.
- ii. It was too early to draw any strong conclusions over the effect on collisions, but the emerging results were encouraging.
- iii. There had not been any increase in speeds or traffic on the parallel Old London Road in Mickleham.

**7/19 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES 2018/19 - END OF YEAR UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 7]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highway Manager, SCC

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** The AHM introduced the report noting there had been a large amount of work completed on the network. She drew members attention to the decreased Capital budget the local committee had following the redistribution of funds based on member numbers in each district/borough.

**Key points from the discussion:**

- The AHM put forward an amendment to recommendation iii) in order to widen the scope of what members could use the capital maintenance budget to fund.
- Members welcomed the amendment, noting it would enable them to not be so limited in how the funds could be spent.
- A question was raised over the £7500 Member Highways Fund and why the local committee wasn't taking a decision on that. It was confirmed that the decision was for each divisional member to make, and then confirm to the AHM their intentions. The decision was not within the local committee's power to decide.

### **Resolution:**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed:

- To note the contents of this report.
- To note the decreased capital budget for 2019/20; and
- That the capital maintenance budget for 2019/20 is used to fund ~~either local footway works or to match fund schemes on the existing centrally delivered wetspots programme~~ improvements schemes as agreed by the Maintenance Engineer in consultation with each divisional member.
- That the capital improvement schemes allocation for Mole Valley be used to progress the Integrated Transport Schemes programme set out in Annex 3;

### **Reason for decisions:**

The above decisions were made to update the Local Committee on the outcome of the 2018/19 highway works programme in Mole Valley, and amendments to the 2019/20 Local Committee capital budget.

## **8/19 LOCAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY FORWARD PROGRAMME UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 8]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Stacey Capewell, Transport Strategy Project Manager (Joint Post MVDC/SCC)

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** The Transport Strategy Project Manager introduced the report noting the Forward Programme list in Annex 1 was an aspirational list of schemes. The document was a living document and the full update for the Local Transport Strategy Schemes would be completed in line with the Mole Valley Local Plan.

**Key points from the discussion:**

- Members raised the following points about specific schemes detailed on the list:
  - DW2 – a request was made for signage for the cycle track to be included at the entrance to Thorncroft Drive. Many people didn't know the cycle track was there and if they did would use it rather than cycling down Dorking Road, holding up traffic. Officers noted they would take this request back to look at.
  - SRN1 – It was commented that this scheme would be expensive and indeed aspirational as finding the funds could be hard.
  - LBC2 - In light of the recent news regarding the 479 bus route, members questioned whether this was still to be considered. Officers confirmed the report had been written prior to the Buses Excetera liquidation and despite this they were hopeful they could bring a quality bus corridor to Mole Valley.
  - BF3 – It was noted there was no cost estimate for the scheme to create a formal cycling route between Fetcham and Bookham and asked if an approximate figure could be provided for this. Officers stated the figure would be hard to calculate without looking at the specifics of the scheme in question. Rough figures could be provided based on similar schemes elsewhere in the county.
  - ASH3 – The current delivery stage of the scheme was indicated as Scheme Identification when it should be Design. This was noted and would be changed by the Transport Strategy Project Manager before the list was published.
  - DW6 – Queries were raised over whether the promotion of the lift share and car clubs needed to be part of the local plan. Members asked where they should refer residents to if they wished to start their own car club. Officers confirmed information could be found on the SCC website about how to go about doing this.
  - AR9 – It was requested that the cycling route from Ockley village up to the station be extended down to Capel as many people from Capel travelled up to Ockley station. The extension would create a safer route for them too.

The Transport Strategy Project Manager noted all the comments made and confirmed she would make any necessary changes before publishing the updated list.

**Resolution:**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed:

- i. To note the timeframes and approach for updating the District's Local Transport Strategy and for future updates to the Committee regarding the Forward Programme.

- ii. The revised version of the Forward Programme (Annex 1)

Reason for decisions:

The above decisions were made to:

- i. Provide a confirmed timeline and process for working with the Local Committee to develop and maintain future Local Transport Strategies and Forward Programmes to ensure the Local Committee and officers were well positioned to work together.
- ii. Allow Members and officers to progress with a common understanding of proposed transport schemes for the district (based upon the existing Local Transport Strategy, and ahead of decisions relating to a new Local Plan).
- iii. Allow the Forward Programme to be published online, giving members of the public sight of the latest proposals and progress.

**9/19 DECISION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Jess Edmundson, Partnership Committee Officer, SCC

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** none

**Key points from the discussion:**

- Members raised questions about the length of time that some items had been on the decision tracker; querying whether items had actually taken so long to complete. With regards to on street parking implementation, it was noted that delays had occurred due to obstructions in the road when lines were being marked and therefore officers had to return at a later date to fill in the gaps.
- With regards to Pippbrook Mill Path it was requested that the detailed timescales be provided for the completion of the action.

Resolution:

The local committee noted the decision tracker.

**10/19 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Jess Edmundson, Partnership Committee Officer, SCC

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** none

Resolution:

The local committee noted the forward plan of items expected to be received at future meetings.

Meeting ended at: 3.40 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

**Open Forum Session**  
**Mole Valley Local Committee Meeting – 13 March 2019**

**1. Question from Dr Rita Antonelli:**

Only two schools in Ashted have been selected for a 20mph speed limit reduction. Surrey County Councillor Chris Townsend has already organised for the speed limit to be lowered to 20mph around St Giles School and City of London Freeman's School in Park Lane & Dene Road. It is due for final implementation this year (the signs are already there)", as reported by the Ashted Residents' Association web page. From data publicly available (SCC Report dated September 2014), it appears that these two schools were selected for a pilot 20mph advisory scheme in March 2012. However, the two selected schools have only 942 students in total, making this not the busiest area of the village. On the other side of the village from the A24, four schools (Downsend with 419 pupils, St Andrew's Secondary with 1179 students, St Peter's Primary with 336 pupils and West Ashted Primary with 338), counting a much higher number of pupils and students (2272 vs 942), are in a very congested area, being all within less than a mile from each other and accessible by a warren of narrow lanes with little protection for pedestrians. The streets leading to these four schools are also used as a rat-run by impatient drivers to avoid congestion on the A24. These schools would have been a much better sample to be considered for the pilot scheme. What were the criteria used to select those two schools in first instance, and what are the criteria used recently by the Council to select again the same two schools for a local speed limit reduction to 20mph? Basically, why do the schools in one half of the village have 20mph zones but the schools in the other half not?

**Response from Zena Curry:** I will follow up with a full written answer. The schemes are prioritised using scoring against various criteria and data.

**Response from Chris Townsend:** Previous conversations has been had with the Head Teachers of the other schools not selected for the pilot. The view of many of these Head Teachers was to not do anything, particularly as a 20mph speed limit is hard to enforce. The nature of the roads, with cars parked along it meant drivers struggled to drive over 20mph anyway.

**Response from Tim Hall:** Some of the schools not included currently have planning applications in place and it was therefore decided that as these schools were subject to changes they should not be considered for the pilot scheme.

**Response from Clare Curran:** The schools selected across the district were done so because of the different characteristics. The results of the pilots has shown the change in speed limit didn't have a lasting major impact on the area and advisory signage alone is insufficient to change driver behaviour.

**Response from Zena Curry:** For 20mph to be successful it does require supporting engineering measures as signs alone are insufficient.

## 2. Question from Kate Harper:

The question is in relation to a live petition for a safer crossing on Guildford Road between Groveside and Hawkwood Rise near to Howard of Effingham School. We are trying to encourage our children to walk to school but currently it's difficult with no safe place for them to cross. It has been pointed out that there is a pedestrian crossing 250m away from this point towards Bookham High Street. This is however away from the school and difficult to encourage school pupils to use as it adds to their route to school.

Back in December Cllr Daly asked about previous accidents at this site and was told there had been 2 in the last 3 years. My question is therefore is there any further data that goes back longer than 3 years that shows any more accidents between pedestrians, cyclists and cars, as we believe there must be more accidents.

**Response from Zena Curry:** I will answer this question in more detail for you outside the meeting. I understand there has been a Road Safety outside schools assessment undertaken at this site not too long ago.

### Question from Kate Harper:

We understand there has been a safer route to school plan developed but has Howard of Effingham is in Guildford and many of the children who attend live in Mole Valley we wondered whether this had been taken in to account and whether their might be funds available from other sources to make the route safer.

**Response from Duncan Knox:** I can look out the most recent road safety outside school assessment to find the conclusions for this location. The school could also have their own travel plan and offer road safety training and education to the pupils. If areas in Mole Valley have been missed from the assessment we can ensure these are looked at and included.

**Response from Clare Curran:** I recall that this area has been looked at in the past. A cycling group had looked at the possibility to install an informal island in the centre of the road, allowing pedestrians to cross in two stages. However this area, where Groveside meets Guildford Road is on a bend and causes a problem with sightlines making it a difficult place to cross. It was therefore decided that this location was not a suitable place to encourage pedestrians to cross due to the nature of the road.

## 3. The Chairman gave the following update on the liquidation of Buses Excetera and the effects on the 479 bus route

As of Monday 11 March Buses Excetera ceased operation on all its routes. SCC have been working to find new suppliers for these routes. The company ran two all-day services on Mondays to Saturdays and six public services specifically for various schools and colleges. None of these services were provided under contract to the council, being run on a commercial basis. New suppliers were found for all 6 of the school routes but conversations are still ongoing to find a new supplier for the 479 that runs from Epsom to Guildford via Ashted, Leatherhead, Fetcham and Bookham. This is a major route that needs addressing and updates will be provided when available.