

Agenda

Mole Valley
Local Committee

Discussion

- Surrey Wildlife Trust Presentation
- Petition –Make it safer for our children to cross the Guildford Rd in Bookham between Groveside and Hawkwood Rise
- Appointments to task groups and external bodies for 2019/20

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



Venue

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

Date: Wednesday, 12 June
2019

Time: 2.00 pm

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.

Get involved

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: jessica.edmundson@surreycc.gov.uk

Tel: 01932 794079 (text or phone)

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



Follow @MoleValleyLC on Twitter

This is a meeting in public.

Please contact **Jess Edmundson, 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, Ashtead
Mrs Clare Curran, Bookham and Fetcham West
Mrs Helyn Clack, Dorking Rural
Mr Stephen Cooksey, Dorking and the Holmwoods (Vice-Chairman)
Mrs Hazel Watson, Dorking Hills

District Council Appointed Members

Cllr Nancy Goodacre, Bookham South
Cllr Rosemary Dickson, Leatherhead South
Cllr Raj Haque, Fetcham West
Cllr Mary Huggins, Capel, Leigh and Newdigate
Cllr David Hawksworth, Ashtead Common
Cllr Claire Malcomson, Holmwoods

Chief Executive
Joanna Killian

District Council Substitutes 2019/20

Cllr Lesley Bushnell, Capel, Leigh and Newdigate
Cllr Paul Kennedy, Fetcham West
Cllr Caroline Salmon, Beare Green
Cllr Tim Ashton, Leatherhead South
Cllr David Harper, Ashtead Park
Cllr Alan Reilly, Ashtead Village
Cllr Charles Yarwood, Charlwood

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, wifi is available for visitors – please ask 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 the Community Partnerships Team 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 APPOINTMENT OF DISTRICT COUNCIL SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION]

Under the County Council's Constitution (Part 4. Standing Orders, Part 3 40 (f)) no substitutes are permitted for 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 2019/20. Mole Valley District Council has nominated District Councillors and substitutes to serve on the Local Committee for the municipal year 2019-2020. Joanna Killian, Chief Executive, has now confirmed these appointments as follows, subject to the agreement by the Committee to permit substitutes:

District Councillor Lesley Bushnell
District Councillor Paul Kennedy
District Councillor Caroline Salmon
District Councillor Charles Yarwood
District Councillor Tim Ashton
District Councillor Alan Reilly
District Councillor David Harper

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

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

3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

(Pages 1 - 10)

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

5 a PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

b 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.

One petition has been received before the deadline.

a PETITION TO: MAKE IT SAFER FOR OUR CHILDREN TO CROSS THE GUILDFORD ROAD IN BOOKHAM BETWEEN GROVESIDE AND HAWKWOOD RISE

The full wording of this petition along with the officer response will be provided within the supplementary agenda.

7 PRESENTATION FROM SURREY WILDLIFE TRUST [AGENDA ITEM ONLY]

Zoe Channon, Liaison Officer for the Surrey Wildlife Trust, will be providing a short presentation on the work the Trust do more widely, linked to the overall management of Norbury Park. It will cover topics such as how the trust is managed, our grazing operation, the grassland under management at Norbury Park and where we are with woodland management.

8 APPOINTMENTS TO LOCAL COMMITTEE TASK GROUPS AND EXTERNAL BODIES 2019/20 [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION]

(Pages 11 - 20)

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to review and agree the terms of reference and membership of task groups set by the Committee.

9 LOCAL COMMITTEE COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION]

(Pages 21 - 26)

The local committee has a delegated budget of £3,000 for community safety projects in 2019/20. This report sets out the process by which this funding should be allocated to the Community Safety Partnership and/or other local community organisations that promote the safety and wellbeing of residents. The report also provides a progress update regarding last year's funding

10 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION]

(Pages 27 - 44)

To inform the Local Committee on the progress of the 2019/20 Integrated Transport Programme, the capital maintenance programme, the Members Highway Fund highways maintenance programmes, Transform Leatherhead and other highways and transport projects being carried out in Mole Valley.

11 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION]

(Pages 45 - 48)

The tracker monitors the progress of the decisions and recommendations that the Local Committee has agreed.

The Local Committee is asked to note the progress made and agree to remove from the tracker any items marked 'complete highlighted in grey'.

12 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION]

(Pages 49 - 50)

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) will note the contents of the forward plan.

This page is intentionally left blank

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.

48/19 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.

49/19 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.

50/19 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 Bookham's 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.

52/19 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.

**53/19 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.

54/19 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:

- i. To note the contents of this report.
- ii. To note the decreased capital budget for 2019/20; and
- iii. 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.
- iv. 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.

**55/19 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

ITEM 3

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.

56/19 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.

57/19 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

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

DATE: 12 JUNE 2019



LEAD OFFICER: JESS EDMUNDSON, PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE OFFICER

SUBJECT: APPOINTMENTS TO LOCAL COMMITTEE TASK GROUPS 2019/20

DIVISION: ALL

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to review and agree the terms of reference and membership of task groups set by the Committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- (i) The terms of reference for the Property Task Group and the membership of this task group as set out in Annex 1.
- (ii) The terms of reference for the Parking Task Group and the membership of this task group as set out in Annex 1.
- (iii) The terms of reference for the Leatherhead Major Schemes Task Group and the membership of this task group as set out in Annex 1.
- (iv) The terms of reference for the Dorking Major Schemes Task Group and the membership of this task group as set out in Annex 1.
- (v) The nominations to outside bodies (Community Safety Partnership) as set out in Annex 1.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to note:

- (vi) That the representatives nominated by the committee in June 2018 (Chris Townsend and Mary Huggins) will remain as the local committee representatives on the Early Help Advisory Board pending review of this board (Paragraphs 2.11 – 2.12 of this report).

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The report contains an updated list of representatives on Task Groups and nominations to outside bodies.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 The Local Committee (Mole Valley) has four current task groups. This report sets out the members who will sit on the groups.
- 1.2 The Local Committee (Mole Valley) can appoint members of the Committee to Outside Bodies and there is one such group which requires nominations for the current year.

2. ANALYSIS:

Task Groups

- 2.1 Each year the Committee is asked to consider the work that would be considered at formal meetings and the relevant task groups that should be established to support the Committee in its work.

Property Task Group

- 2.2 The Committee is asked to re-establish the Property Task Group, agree the membership and agree the terms of reference as set out in Annex 1.
- 2.3 The membership of the Property Task Group last year was: Mr Hall, Mrs Watson, Mr Cooksey and Cllr Kennedy.

Parking Task Group

- 2.4 The Committee is asked to re-establish the Parking Task Group, agree the membership and agree the terms of reference as set out in Annex 1.
- 2.5 Membership of the Parking task group last year was: Mr Hall, Mrs Watson, Cllr Dickson and Cllr Hawksworth.

Leatherhead Major Schemes Task Group

- 2.6 The Committee is asked to re-establish the Leatherhead Major Schemes Task Group, agree the membership and agree the terms of reference as set out in Annex 1.
- 2.7 Membership of the Leatherhead Major Schemes Task Group last year was: Mr Hall, Mr Townsend, Cllr Kennedy and Cllr Dickson

Dorking Major Schemes Task Group

- 2.8 The Committee is asked to re-establish the Dorking Major Schemes Task Group, agree the membership and agree the terms of reference as set out in Annex 1.
- 2.9 Membership of the Dorking Major Schemes Task Group last year was: Mr Hall, Mrs Watson, Mr Cooksey, Cllr Malcomson and Cllr Huggins.

Membership to Outside Bodies

- 2.10 The Local Committee can make appointments to various outside bodies. Members are asked to act as the Local Committee ambassador on the group, ensure that the local committee is informed of activities relevant to the work of the committee and report back on the achievements of the group on an annual basis.

Early Help Advisory Board

- 2.11 Early Help Advisory Boards (EHAB) were set up in 2017, as part of the county council's Early Help offer and at that two members of the area Local/Joint Committee were appointed to each local board. Membership of the EHAB was previously reviewed on an annual basis along with LC/JC member representation on task groups and other external bodies.
- 2.12 In February 2019 the county council replaced Early Help with its new Family Resilience practice model and consequently the role of the EHABs is currently under review. No changes are proposed for the local committee appointments to the EHABs until after this review has been completed.

East Community Safety Partnership (ECSP)

- 2.13 Mole Valley is part of the ECSP which also includes Reigate & Banstead, Epsom & Ewell and Tandridge and meets four times per year, once in each area. An overview of its responsibilities is attached as Annex 1.
- 2.14 Community Safety Partnerships are a statutory requirement under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 which established the principle that tackling crime should be a partnership matter and not solely the responsibility of the Police. They are required to work in partnership with a range of other local public, private, community and voluntary groups, and with the community itself. This approach recognises that opportunities to address the causes of crime and disorder and pursue the interventions required to deliver safe and secure communities lie with a range of organisations, groups and individuals working in partnership.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The local committee can confirm the task groups and nominations to outside bodies as set out above.
- 3.2 The local committee can make amendments to any of the recommendations in this report.
- 3.3 The appointment of non-committee members, for example parish councillors, to any task group can be delegated to the chairman of the local committee and the chairman of the particular task group with which the non-committee member wishes to be appointed to.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Task Groups have been proposed in response to requests from Members in relation to the workload of the Committee.
- 4.2 The nominations set out above have been volunteered or been selected from amongst their peers to sit on the relevant groups.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

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

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

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

7. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

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

8. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 8.1 The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to agree the terms of reference for the Parking Task Group and the membership of this task group as set out in Annex 1.
- 8.2 The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to agree the terms of reference for the Greater Redhill Sustainable Transport Task Group and the membership of this task group as set out in Annex 1.
- 8.3 The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to agree the nominations to outside bodies (Community Safety Partnership) as set out in Annex 1.
- 8.4 The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to note that the representatives nominated by the committee in June 2018 (Chris Townsend and Mary Huggins) will remain as the local committee representative on the Early Help Advisory Board pending review of this board.

9. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

9.1 Task groups will be established.

Contact Officer: Jess Edmundson, Partnership Committee Officer (Reigate & Banstead), 01932 794079

Consulted: Members and Surrey County Council officers have been consulted.

Annexes: Terms of Reference for Mole Valley Local Committee Task Groups 2019-20.

Sources/background papers: None

This page is intentionally left blank

**SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)
TASK GROUPS AND MEMBERSHIP OF EXTERNAL BODIES**

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.

Proposed membership of this task group for 2019/20 is:

- Mrs Hazel Watson

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.
4. 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 action.
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.

Proposed membership of this task group for 2019/20 is:

- Mrs Hazel Watson
- Cllr Rosemary Dickson
- Mr Chris Townsend

**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.

Proposed membership of this task group for 2019/20 is:

- Cllr Rosemary Dickson
- Mr Chris Townsend

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

1. The Group's principle purpose is to consider major transport schemes at key decision milestones to provide recommendations to the Local Committee to appropriately inform the committee's decisions.]
2. The scope of the Task Group will be:
 - i. The Dorking Transport Package Phase 1 - overseeing the completion of the project and the recommendations set out in the Coast to Capital Action Plan, along with annual scheme monitoring; and
 - ii. Any subsequent similar scale scheme proposals.
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 three county councillors, (Chairman and two further county members) and two district councillors.
5. As an advisory group to the Local Committee, Task Group members will act in the interests of Dorking 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.

Proposed membership of this task group for 2019/20 is:

- Mrs Hazel Watson

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

DATE: 12 JUNE 2019



LEAD OFFICER: GORDON FALCONER, COMMUNITY SAFETY MANAGER

SUBJECT: LOCAL COMMITTEE COMMUNITY FUNDING UPDATE

DIVISION: ALL

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

The local committee has a delegated budget of £3,000 for community safety projects in 2019/20. This report sets out the process by which this funding should be allocated to the Community Safety Partnership and/or other local community organisations that promote the safety and wellbeing of residents. The report also provides a progress update regarding last year's funding.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- (i) The committee's delegated community safety budget of £3,000 for 2019/20 be retained by the Community Safety Team, on behalf of the local committee, and that the Community Safety Partnership and/or other local organisations be invited to submit proposals for funding that meet the criteria and principles set out at section 3 of this report.
- (ii) Authority be delegated to the Community Safety Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the local committee and divisional members as appropriate, to authorise the expenditure of the community safety budget in accordance with the criteria and principles stated in section 3 of this report.
- (iii) The committee receives updates on the project(s) that are funded, the outcomes and the impact it has achieved.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to note:

- (iv) The update from the North Leatherhead Street Talk Project regarding the use of the funds in 2018-19.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The report sets out a process for allocating the committee's delegated community safety budget of £3,000 to local organisations to achieve the recommendations outlined above.

There is also an update on how last year's funding was used in order to provide visibility and promote accountability within the Community Safety Partnership.

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 In 2018/19, the committee awarded £3,000 to the North Leatherhead Street Talk Project.

2. ANALYSIS:

Update on the funding awarded to the North Leatherhead Street Talk Project for 2018/19 (applied for by Mole Valley District Council)

- 2.1 The Community Safety funding in 2018/19 was awarded to the North Leatherhead Street Talk Project (£3000). The local committee received a report in December 2018 to confirm the awarding of the Community Safety funding. It included that a full update on how the funding from 2018/19 was spent would be received in the new financial year.
- 2.2 The details below include the updated information on how the funding was spent and the subsequent outcomes of the project.
- 2.3 Street Talk is a detached youth work programme focusing in the deprived areas of East Surrey. The intended outcomes from the project were for youth workers to familiarise themselves with the area around Bridge Youth Centre and build a rapport with the young people. This then allowed the youth workers to determine what provisions were available for the young people and what activities could be included at the youth centre.
- 2.4 YMCA youth workers made sure they were highly visible to young people for the first few sessions without being invasive and initial rapport was built by saying hello to the young people, nodding or waving at them and then walking on. Young people started to show an interest in who the YMCA youth workers were and why they were there at the start of the third session.
- 2.5 Following the third session the youth workers began engaging with the young people to undertake a consultation to establish young peoples' desire for a Bridge based youth club, the best time and date for this to take place, and what type of activities should be available.
- 2.6 Following this initial consultation the focus is now on undertaking further consultation and opening a Bridge based youth club in the near future.

2.7 The impacts of this project have been as follows:

- YMCA youth workers have been able to demonstrate credibility when talking to local young people and residents in terms of their knowledge of the area.
- Young people's voices are being heard through conversations with YMCA youth workers. YMCA workers are forming a clear idea of what is currently available from youth provision perspective.
- Young people have the ability to make informed choices.

2.8 The following benefits have been identified from the project:

- YMCA youth workers have improved confidence and credibility when speaking to local young people.
- Young people have gained trust in the youth workers and this has enabled them to make informed choices

2.9 The £3,000 awarded has been spent by the YMCA to fund this project and a further £600 spent on a skateboarding and BMX event at Kingston Road Recreation ground. Additional funding to continue work has come from Clarion Futures (£3500), MVDC (£1100) and Active Surrey (£5,000).

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 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.
- 3.2 Local CSPs will be invited to submit a brief outline of the projects that they would like to put the committee's funding towards, on a simple template designed for this purpose.
- 3.3 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 coordinated across all CSPs)
- 3.4 To ensure funds can be utilised within the current financial year, it is suggested that a deadline, yet to be confirmed, 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.
- 3.5 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, along with the relevant divisional member, to authorise the expenditure of the

ITEM 9

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.

- 3.6 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.
- 3.7 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.
- 3.8 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.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Local committee chairmen were collectively consulted about this process for allocating community safety funding as recommended in this report, before its implementation last year.

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.

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.

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

- 9.2 The committee's delegated community safety budget of £3,000 for 2019/20 be retained by the Community Partnership Team, on behalf of the local committee, and that the Community Safety Partnership and/or other local organisations be invited to submit proposals for funding that meet the criteria and principles set out at section 3 of this report.
- 9.3 Authority be delegated to the Community Safety Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the local committee and divisional members as appropriate, to authorise the expenditure of the community safety budget in accordance with the criteria and principles stated in section 3 of this report.
- 9.4 The committee receives updates on the project(s) that are funded, the outcomes and the impact it has achieved.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to note:

- 9.5 The update from the North Leatherhead Street Talk Project regarding the use of the funds in 2018-19.

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:

Gordon Falconer, Community Safety Manager

Consulted:

Surrey's local committee chairmen and local committee members.

Annexes: None

Sources/background papers:

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

ITEM 9

- Mole Valley Local Committee, September 2016. Local Committee funding of Community Safety Projects
- Mole Valley Local Committee, June 2018, Local Committee Community Safety Funding and Task Group and External Bodies Appointments report

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)****DATE:****12 JUNE 2019****LEAD****ZENA CURRY, AREA HIGHWAY MANAGER****OFFICER:****HIGHWAY SCHEMES UPDATE****DIVISION:****ALL****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To inform the Local Committee on the progress of the 2019/20 Integrated Transport Programme, the capital maintenance programme, the Members Highway Fund highways maintenance programmes, Transform Leatherhead and other highways and transport projects being carried out 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, capital maintenance programme and Members Highways fund. As well as work that is being carried out on the large scale, centrally funded maintenance and improvement schemes.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 On 12 December 2018, subject to final approval of Full Council in February 2019, the Mole Valley Local Committee agreed a programme of capital works for the 2019/20 financial year.
- 1.2 Following the meeting held on 12 December 2018, the capital budget was subsequently amended, with each Local Committee receiving £100,000 and a further amount based on a formula which includes factors such as road length and population. As a result Mole Valley received a reduced capital budget of £166,667 from the previous amount of £181,818. This budget was approved by Full Council on 5 February 2019.
- 1.3 It was agreed at the Local Committee meeting held on 13 March 2019, that £85,667 of the capital budget be allocated to fund the ITS programme approved by the Local Committee in December 2018. It was also agreed that the balance of £81,000 be used to fund capital maintenance schemes, divided equitably between divisional members, as agreed by the Maintenance Engineer in consultation with each divisional member.

- 1.4 Members were further advised that they would continue to receive a Member Highways Fund allocation of £7,500 per divisional member. It was agreed that the Member Highways Fund would be managed by the Maintenance Engineer on their behalf. The Cabinet Member for Highways has subsequently issued guidance to members on how the allocation can be used, including putting in place a number of constraints to avoid creating longer term problems.
- 1.5 In addition to the Local Committee's devolved budget, countywide budgets are also used 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.
- 1.6 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 has delegated highway budgets for the current Financial Year 2019-20 as follows:

- Capital (ITS): £85,667
- Capital Maintenance: £81,000
- Member Highway Fund: £45,000
- **Total: £211,667**

In addition to the delegated highway budgets above, highway officers are continuing to look for other sources of potential funding for schemes. As a result the Local Area Team has secured developer funding for the construction of a pedestrian crossing on the A24 in Ashtead in the vicinity of The Greville School, as well as traffic calming measures on roads outside Oakfield Junior and Fetcham Village Infant 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, road safety schemes and the Parking Review.

2.3 Local Committee capital maintenance works programme

The Mole Valley Maintenance Engineer is contacting members to discuss what capital maintenance works they wish to promote in their divisions. A full update on works being progressed will be provided at the September Local Committee meeting.

2.4 Member Highway Fund

Five of the six county members have agreed to allocate £6,000 of their Member Highway Fund towards the provision of a Revenue Maintenance Gang in Mole Valley. This funding will provide each member with the gang for 4 weeks and 4 days in their division. Additional funding has been identified to enable a gang to be procured for 42 weeks.

The gang started work on 7 May 2019 and will be used to respond to requests for work raised by residents both directly to members and also to the local area team. The gang will also be used to proactively react to issues identified by members and the local area team. It should be noted that priority is given to safety issues.

The gang's workload will be spread equitably between the five divisions and monitored by the Maintenance Engineer. The only work to be issued to the gang in the remaining division will be to resolve safety issues eg. obstruction of sightlines by overgrown vegetation. An update of the work carried out by the gang in the first four months will be provided at the September Local Committee meeting.

The Maintenance Engineer will be working with members to agree what additional highway works they wish to carry out in their divisions with their remaining Member Highway Fund allocation.

2.5 Parking

An update on the 2017 parking review is provided in **Annex 1**.

Other highway related matters

2.6 Customer services

Table 1 below shows the number of enquiries received between January and March 2019 compared to the number received during the same period in 2018.

Table 1: Customer enquiries

Period	Surrey Highways: Total enquiries (no.)	Mole Valley: Total enquiries (no.)	Local Area Office: Total enquiries (no.)
Jan – Mar 2018	45,357	4,107	1,597
Jan – Mar 2019	34,644	3,060	1,199

The table above shows that for Mole Valley specifically, 3,060 enquiries have been received between January and March 2019 of which 1,199 were directed to the local area office for action, of these 96% have been resolved. This response rate is slightly higher than the countywide average of 95%.

Between January and March 2019, Highways & Transport received 62 Stage 1 complaints of which 5 were for the Mole Valley area, two of which were escalated to stage 2 of complaints process. Of these 2 complaints that were escalated to stage 2, one was partially upheld following independent investigation.

2.7 Major Schemes

Dorking Sustainable Transport Package (STP)

The Dorking STP is a transport project to improve connections between Dorking Deepdene and Dorking Main railway stations and to improve the passenger facilities at Dorking Deepdene Station. Works completed have provided more accurate travel information for passengers, more space for pedestrians and cyclists on the route between the two stations and better wayfinding across Dorking.

The Dorking STP is now complete following installation of a final real time information screen at Bus Stop A opposite Dorking Main.

The £0.8 million project was focused on improving connections between Dorking Deepdene and Dorking Main railway stations and the passenger facilities at Dorking Deepdene Station. Works completed have provided better passenger waiting facilities, more space for pedestrians and cyclists on the route between the two stations, and better wayfinding information across Dorking.

Further information can be found on the project web page and in the latest newsletter (May 2019), both available from:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/policies-plans-consultations/major-transport-projects/mole-valley-major-transport-schemes>

Wider Network Benefits Scheme

Work on the Coast to Capital LEP funded “Wider Network Benefits” Intelligent Transport Systems Project across Epsom & Ewell, Mole Valley, Reigate & Banstead and Tandridge areas is now complete.

Dorking Transport Study

An update on the Dorking Transport Study is provided in **Annex 1**.

Transform Leatherhead

An update on Transform Leatherhead is provided in **Annex 1**.

2.8 Centrally funded maintenance

Operation Horizon

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

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

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

Severe weather recovery program

A list of roads included within the severe weather recovery programme has been published on Surrey County Council's website. This lists consists of over 200 roads across the county and can be found here;

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

This list is updated every month and includes information regarding when work is programmed to be carried out on each roads listed, as well as which roads have been completed. Information is also provided on those roads which have been added to the programme. All of these roads have been put forward by local members or the local highway teams.

Winter gritting routes update

The Cold Weather Plan sets out the Winter Service for treating the highway in order to prevent ice from forming (precautionary salting), melt ice and snow that has already formed (post salting), and removal of snow in a snow event.

The Cold Weather Plan is now on Surrey County Council's website and can be found at the following location;

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/salting-and-gritting>

Salting Routes can also be seen on a map on Surrey County Council's website at the following location;

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/salting-and-gritting/salting-routes-in-surrey>

County Councillors can request and pay for new grit bins, or extension of use of an existing grit bin, by contacting the Maintenance Engineer, who will advise.

2.9 Road safety

The Road Safety Working Group meets every 6 months to review personal injury collision data provided by Surrey Police. The Road Safety Working Group is attended by Surrey County Council Road Safety Engineers, Surrey County Council Highway Engineers and Surrey Police. An update on road safety schemes that have been identified by the Road Safety Working Group is provided in **Annex 1**.

2.10 Passenger Transport

A number of schemes within Mole Valley are being carried out to support passenger transport, including the installation of Real Time Passenger Information infrastructure at bus stops in Westcott. There is also an

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

Integrated Transport Scheme to carry out some design work to improve access to a bus stop on the A25 in Buckland for the mobility impaired during this financial year.

2.11 Other key information, strategy and policy development

No additional information at present.

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 Consultation has been carried out with residents and other consultees identified within the Surrey County Council's "Consultation for Local Highway Improvement Schemes – Officer Good Practice Guide", on proposals to install traffic calming measures in Bell Lane and School Lane. The aim of these traffic calming measures is to support the introduction of a mandatory 20mph speed limit outside Oakfield Junior and Fetcham Village Infant Schools.

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 – 2.4 of this report.
- 5.2 The key objective with regard to the 2019/20 budgets will be managed to a neutral position.

6. WIDER IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 The Integrated Transport Scheme programme, the capital maintenance programme and the Local Member Fund does not significantly impact on any of the areas identified on the table below. The Integrated Transport Schemes capital maintenance and Local Member Fund 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
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

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 7.1 Progress on the programme of local committee capital highway works in Mole Valley is set out in **Annex 1**.
- 7.2 Progress on the capital works programme is set out under section 2.3 of this report.
- 7.3 Progress on the Members Highway Fund is set out under section 2.4 of this report.
- 7.4 Information regarding the severe weather recovery programme, Transform Leatherhead, Operation Horizon and Road Safety schemes is also included within this report.
- 7.5 The Local Committee is asked to note the contents of this report.

8. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 8.1 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:

Consultation has been carried out on the proposed traffic calming scheme outside Oakfield Junior and Fetcham Village Infants School as set out under section 4.1 above.

Annexes:

Annex 1: Summary of approved Local Committee capital works programme progress

Sources/background papers:

- Report to Mole Valley Local Committee, 12th December 2018 – Highways Forward Programme 2019/20 – 2020/21.

This page is intentionally left blank

ANNEX 1

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 try to prevent driving behind a pedestrian crossing and parking on the footway. Work is complete.			
Project: Rectory Lane/Lower Road/Little Bookham Street			
Detail: Pedestrian Crossing improvements	Division: Bookham & Fetcham West	Allocation: £5,000 (2018/19) £30,000 (2019/20)	
Progress: Work is complete on the feasibility design for this scheme which consists of providing a raised table on Lower Road (on the western arm of this junction), which will also have an informal crossing facility on it, similar to the existing facility on the eastern arm of this junction. Consultation on this proposal is to be carried out shortly.			
Project: Eastwick Drive/Eastwick Park Avenue			
Detail: Improvement to provide safer crossing point.	Division: Bookham and Fetcham West	Allocation: £15,000. (2018/19)	
Progress: Work to construct a kerb build out to provide an informal pedestrian crossing on Eastwick Drive outside the entrance to the Eastwick Schools is complete.			
Remaining developer funding is insufficient to carry out pedestrian crossing improvements on Eastwick Park Avenue, discussion ongoing with divisional member regarding possible other improvements. £10,000 still available from developer.			

CAPITAL ITS IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES			
Project: Dene Road, St. Giles School – traffic calming			
Detail: Traffic calming measures	Division: Ashtead	Allocation: £35,000 (2019/20).	
Progress: Initial design work on this scheme was carried out during the 2016/17 financial year. Traffic calming measures are proposed in order to support a mandatory 20mph speed limit on Dene Road outside St. Giles Infant School. Design work on this scheme is continuing, for construction before the end of March 2020.			
Project: Blackbrook Road, North Holmwood			
Detail: Measures to reduce speeds	Division: Dorking South & the Holmwoods	Allocation: £7,000 (2019/20)	
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 marker posts and edge of carriageway markings 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 needed 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. The work to the existing embankments and barriers is now complete and therefore the works to encourage drivers to reduce their speed is to be constructed during this financial year.			
Project: A25 Reigate Road, Buckland			
Detail: Measures to improve access to existing bus stop.	Division: Dorking Rural	Allocation: £5,000	

CAPITAL ITS IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES

Progress:

Design work is to be carried out during this financial year on measures to improve access to the existing bus stops outside Squire's Garden Centre.

Project: Small Safety and Improvement Schemes

Detail: To be carried out as appropriate	Division: All	Allocation: £6,667 (2019/20)
---	----------------------	--

Progress:

Schemes to be identified during the year.

Project: Signs and Road Markings

Detail: To fund new signs and road markings.	Division: All	Allocation: £2,000 (2019/20).
---	----------------------	---

Progress:

Signs to be installed, identified from the list of additional signs requested, currently includes the following;

Lower Road/East Street, Bookham – “Unsuitable for HGVs” signs

Park Rise, Leatherhead – “Unsuitable for HGVs” signs

Additional signs to be installed during the year from the list of additional signs requested.

DEVELOPER FUNDED SCHEMES		
Project: Transform Leatherhead		
Detail: Town centre improvements		Division: Leatherhead and Fetcham East
Progress: Leatherhead High Street Improvement Study		
<p>A second focus group is being held in June, led by Mole Valley District Council officers and their consultants Arcadis, to update stakeholders on the study. A public consultation for the proposed short and long term options for the High Street, is being planned for 1st – 22nd July 2019, with an online survey available on the Transform Leatherhead website to capture feedback on the options. Mole Valley District Council and their consultants Arcadis will be available at two exhibitions to answer any questions about the options on Thursday 4th July 2-8pm at the Leatherhead Institute and Saturday 6th July 10am – 4pm in the Swan Centre. Following the public consultation and exhibitions, Arcadis will prepare a report which will include a preferred short and long term option.</p> <p>It is currently planned to share the information on the preferred options to the September Local Committee. The preferred options will also be taken to Mole Valley District Council Cabinet in September 2019 for approval.</p>		
Leatherhead Highway Improvement Package		
<p>Mole Valley District Council commissioned traffic modelling for the Leatherhead gyratory and this was completed in March 2019. The modelling tested various options for changes to the gyratory and improvements to the network. An update on the Phase 1 traffic modelling and the planned next stage of detailed feasibility, will be provided at the two exhibitions on Thursday 4th July 2-8pm at the Leatherhead Institute and Saturday 6th July 10am-4pm in the Swan Centre.</p>		
Project: 20 mph Speed Limits Outside Schools		

Detail:	20mph speed limits outside: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.
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.		
<p>City of London Freemans School, Ashtead – there is no funding currently identified for this scheme.</p> <p>St. Giles C of E Infant School, Ashtead – an allocation for the construction of the traffic calming scheme that was designed in the 2016/17 financial year has been included within the Integrated Transport Scheme programme for this financial year. Please see above for further information.</p> <p>Fetcham Village Infant School and Oakfield Junior School, Fetcham – developer funding has been allocated to complete the design, carry out safety audits and construct the traffic calming measures to support a permanent 20mph speed limit outside Fetcham Village Infant School and Oakfield Junior Schools. Consultation has been carried out. Subject to the results of this consultation, work to construct the traffic calming measures is programmed to be carried out during the school summer holidays.</p> <p>Newdigate C of E Infant School, Newdigate – there is no funding currently identified for this scheme.</p>		
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.

A small amount of developer funding has been secured within the Charlwood ward, however it is not sufficient to enable all of the works previously discussed with the Parish Council to be carried out.

Discussions with the local divisional member are ongoing to establish the best use of this small amount of funding.

The Local Area Team continues to work to secure funding for Brockham and Capel.

Project: Eastwick Park Avenue

Detail: Pedestrian improvements	Division: Bookham and Fetcham West	Allocation: £10,000
--	---	----------------------------

Progress:

Remaining developer funding is insufficient to carry out pedestrian crossing improvements on Eastwick Park Avenue, discussion ongoing with divisional member regarding possible other improvements

Project: A25 Guildford Road, Westcott

Detail: Improvements to pedestrian crossings	Division: Dorking Hills	Allocation: £30,356.05
---	--------------------------------	-------------------------------

Progress:

The following funding has been allocated to the following schemes;

- £2,113.58 – signal improvements to pelican crossing outside Bertrum Bees, which is on the route to Surrey Hills C of E Primary School.
- £6,006.94 – installation of “Halo” beacons on existing zebra crossing outside Westcott green, in order to make this zebra crossing more visible.
- £22,235.53 – for installation of Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI). The Passenger Transport Team is currently in discussions with the local divisional member regarding where it is most feasible to install the RTPI signs, and possible additional locations.

Should any funding be left over this will be spent on replacing some of the old street lights with heritage lighting.

Project: Okewood Hill/Walliswood, Dorking Hills	Detail: Speed limit reduction/"Unsuitable for HGVs" signs	Division: Dorking Hills	Allocation: £7,516.62
--	--	--------------------------------	------------------------------

Progress:

The results of speed surveys carried out in the villages of Okewood Hill and Walliswood show that the mean speeds in Horsham Road and Froggetts Lane in Walliswood comply with Surrey County Council's speed limit policy for a 30mph speed limit. However the results of the speed surveys also showed that the roads within Oakwood Hill did not comply with Surrey County Council's speed limit policy for a 30mph speed limit.

Work to install a 30mph speed limit in Horsham Road and Froggetts Lane within the village of Walliswood will be carried out by the end of March 2020.

Project: A24 Epsom Road/Bramley Way, Ashtead

Detail: Pedestrian crossing	Division: Ashtead	Allocation: £190,000 (2019/20)
Progress: The design team is progressing the design of the scheme, which is being funded through developer contributions, as well as the necessary safety audits. Consultation regarding this scheme is to be carried out shortly.		

ROAD SAFETY TEAM SCHEMES		
Project: Red Lane, South Holmwood		
Detail: Signs and road markings	Division: Dorking South and The Holmwoods	
Progress: Provision of bends and chevron signs, and the refresh of existing road markings between the junction with Blackbrook Road and the railway line. This scheme is complete.		
Project: A25 Guildford Road, Wotton		
Detail: Speed limit reduction	Division: Dorking Hills	
Progress: The existing speed limit is to be reduced from 50mph to 40mph. The design of this scheme is complete, the Traffic Regulation Order has been drawn up and signs have been ordered, work is to be completed on this scheme by the end of September.		
Project: Smalls Hill Road, Leigh		

Detail: Haunching repairs and road centre line remarking.	Division: Dorking Rural
Progress: Design work is currently being carried out and works are to be carried out before the end of March 2020.	
Project: A24 Capel By-Pass, Capel	
Detail: 5 no. Hazard Marker Posts	Division: Dorking Rural
Progress: Proposals are to install 5no. Hazard Marker Posts on southbound exit of Beare Green roundabout, using traffic management for programmed maintenance work. The Road Safety Team are currently in discussion with the maintenance team, to see if it is possible to use their traffic management to carry out this work.	

PARKING
Progress: The final decisions on the 2018 parking review proposals have been made and the lining and signing orders have been placed, with implementation expected to start this month.

DORKING TRANSPORT STUDY

Progress:

The Dorking Transport Study is completed, and the study's conclusions and report including the baseline travel survey data is available here;

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/policies-plans-consultations/major-transport-projects/mole-valley-major-transport-schemes#dorking transport>

Note: Information correct at time of writing (28/05/2019)

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. *Information correct as of 04/06/2019*

- 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	Traffic order is now in place as well as correct signs to enforce the order. Scheme complete. COMPLETE
22/06/17	10	To advertise TRO of agreed changes to on street parking.	Closed	Senior Engineer (Parking)	There are still a couple of areas that require finishing off. We have been out to temporarily fill some of the gaps, but we do have some persistent parkers who will not move - unfortunately we do not have any means to remove vehicles, so will continue to monitor the areas concerned. The contractors have been given additional works to try to complete those areas that have been temporarily filled. This is now COMPLETE
05/09/18	5	Officers to work with Chairman and petitioners to look again at	Open	AHM/Transport	Update report was provided to the local committee at the meeting on

		the possibility of implementing an experimental Traffic Regulation Order on the High Street, Leatherhead		Strategy Projects Manager	12 December 2018. Work is still ongoing. Nothing further to report to the local committee at this stage.
05/09/18	8	To advertise changes to on Street parking measures.	Open	Senior Engineer (Parking)	The advertising is complete, decisions have been made and signing and lining is starting to be implemented. The TRO came into force on 1st June, so any yellow lines that go in (and associated signs), will become enforceable immediately. The Resident Permit Zone (RPZ) signs will be covered until 1st July as MVDC are letter dropping residents, asking them to apply for permits (this will take a few weeks) - the permits should be allocated by 1st July.
12/12/18	4a	To organise a meeting with the appropriate councillors and officers and Dorking Town Forum to resolve long-running issues	Open	Area Highways Manager	A meeting took place on 10 January with a representative of Dorking Town Forum. No further update provided at time of publishing.
12/12/18	4b	Pippbrook Mill Path – to hold discussions with district council over costs to repair and maintain the weir to ensure footpath remains open	Open	Area Highways Manager/ Countryside Access Team	SCC officers are progressing this issue on the basis that rather than adopting or entering into an agreement with MVDC, highways rights would best be recorded over the route following an application made by residents, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to add the path to the Definitive Map and Statement. This process will overcome the issue of MVDC not owning the entirety of the path and would provide the County Council

					with better protection against future risks and maintenance liabilities. Residents will need to submit an application in the appropriate format.
12/12/18	13	SCC and MVDC to work together to put forward proposals for new car park signage and directional signage around Leatherhead.	Open	Area Highways Manager	Proposals have been put forward and new signage to be implemented in the 2019/20 financial year.
12/12/18	6	To reduce the speed limit from 50 mph down to 40mph along the A25 in Wotton	Open	Road Safety & Active Travel Team Manager	The Speed limit order has been advertised in the local paper. It is expected that the lower speed limit will be implemented in the coming weeks (June 2019)

This page is intentionally left blank

Local Committee (Mole Valley) - Forward Programme 2019/20

Details of future meetings			
Dates for the Mole Valley Local Committee 2019/20: Wednesday 4 September 2019, Wednesday 11 December 2019, Wednesday 11 March 2020			
Topic	Purpose	Contact Officer	Proposed date
Highways Update	Standing item for all Mole Valley formal Local Committee meetings	SCC Area Highway Manager	ALL
Decision Tracker	For information	Partnership Committee Officer	ALL
Forward Programme	Review the Forward Programme and consider further themes for Member briefings	Partnership Committee Officer	ALL
Cabinet Member for Highways Update	To update the local committee on any SCC highways updates	Partnership Committee Officer	tbc
Leatherhead High Street Feasibility Study	To agree any changes to the highways that falls under the committee's remit	Transport Strategy Projects Manager	September 2019
Parking Review	To consider the recommendations of the annual on-street parking review	Parking Engineer	December 2019

This page is intentionally left blank