

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 2.00 pm on 11 March 2020
at Council Chamber, Pippbrook, Reigate Road, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1SJ.

Surrey County Council Members:

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

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Nancy Goodacre
- * Cllr Rosemary Dickson
- * Cllr Raj Haque
- * Cllr Mary Huggins
- * Cllr David Hawksworth
- * Cllr Claire Malcomson

* In attendance

OPEN FORUM SESSION

The questions and responses from the open forum session are attached as Annex A to these minutes.

1/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Chris Townsend.

2/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes from the previous meeting held on 22 January 2020 were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

3/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

4a/20 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM), SCC

Petitions, Public Statements, Questions: The questions and officer responses were provided within the supplementary agenda.

Five written questions were received before the deadline.

Question 1 was from Roger Troughton. Mr Troughton was present and asked the following supplementary question:

What is the best way to report issues? Is it best to report this to MVDC or SCC?

It was noted that MVDC had previously stopped sweeping footways and the perception of residents was that many of these were dangerous. It was confirmed that MVDC were to reinstate a programme of cleaning across the district. This would also include work on roundabouts but as this would require road closures, was a little more complex. This news was welcomed by members of the committee who were assured they would receive more information on this, when available.

Question 2 was from John Moyer. Mr Moyer was not present to ask a supplementary question. It was noted however that despite works being done, the flooding situation was not getting better and if anything was getting worse. It was confirmed that this location remained a high priority for flood investigation works.

Question 3 was from Stuart McLachlan. Mr McLachlan was not present but the divisional member made the following comments:

It was noted this was a real problem in the area with scramble bikes and 4x4s using the area for recreational purposes and causing many a problem. The refuse collector, Amey, had also refused collections up the lane as they had deemed the road too dangerous.

It was therefore suggested, as this was rather complex, that a site visit be arranged to include officers from the Countryside Access Team, Joint Waste Solutions, divisional Members and Parish Council reps to look at the existing problems and what could be done.

Question 4 was from Cllr Paul Kennedy. Cllr Kennedy was present and asked the following supplementary question:

Thank you for the response I asked this question as I had residents ask about why their requests were not included in the parking review that was presented to the Local Committee in January. Can we include an addendum to future parking review that shows why certain roads were not included in the review?

It was agreed that this would be useful information but it was noted that some of the requests may not have been clear and reasoning for non-inclusion could therefore be confusing. Members noted looking at the list there were several roads that had been put forward for restrictions that were un-adopted private roads and it was therefore not possible for SCC to add any restrictions on these.

Question 5 was from Danielle Armitage. Ms Armitage was not present at the meeting to ask a supplementary question.

4b/20 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were none

5/20 PETITIONS [Item 5]

There were none

**6/20 UNIVERSAL YOUTH OFFER CONSULTATION [AGENDA ITEM ONLY]
[Item 6]**

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nigel Denning, Early Help Transformation Lead, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The slides presented for this agenda item are attached as Annex B to these minutes.

Key points from the discussion:

- Members welcomed the approach of involving the Voluntary Community and Faith Sector (VCFS) but questioned who would be making the final decision over which group would be running each centre. It was confirmed in some cases there had been one main group come forward to lead on the work; supported by others. In other areas where there were several groups that had expressed interest; a competitive commissioning process would take place. The decision would likely be signed off by the Executive Director and Cabinet Member.
- It was reiterated that there was no intention to close any youth centres but to look at alternative uses for the buildings.
- The divisional member pointed out that Bookham Youth Centre was not being included in this consultation and was being treated differently and separately.

7/20 FUTURE MOLE VALLEY LOCAL PLAN - STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE IMPLICATIONS [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 7]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Jane Smith, Interim Planning Policy Manager (PPM), MVDC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

[Cllr Haque left the meeting briefly at 15.33; returning at 15.38]

The PPM introduced the report by saying the Mole Valley Local plan was about planning for new development and concerned all development that was needed. She added the plan included a predominate need for housing but her

report to the Local Committee was to focus on infrastructure needs for the district.

She added she was aware there was much concern about how infrastructure would cope and the new infrastructure that was needed.

She wanted to ensure that the Local Committee was fully engaged in the process and that their views were given as part of the consultation.

Key points from the discussion:

- Members raised concern about infill development. Stating residents had lesser concerns for larger developments as they felt like the infrastructure for these was more considered. Whereas several infill developments of 2-3 properties in an area could have more of a significant impact. That perhaps hadn't been accounted for in the local plan. It was confirmed the local plan considered anticipation of larger developments as well as for smaller infill developments.
- Concerns were raised over the Strategic Highways Assessment that was mentioned in the report. Many members felt figures were inaccurate as they could all recall roads in their divisions that were frequently congested yet did not appear on the list. They queried how the analysis was done. It was confirmed the analysis had come from a team at SCC. It was suggested the officers responsible should be invited to attend a Local Committee informal meeting to run a workshop for the members about traffic modelling. The committee could then understand how the results quoted in the report had been achieved.
- Members commented that they felt highways elements of the local plan were not thought about in the correct way; almost too late. There didn't seem to be much cohesion and joined up working with neighbouring authorities with things that were going on there.
- Members also raised concern about healthcare provision, school places, drainage and transport.
- The MVDC Cabinet Member for Planning attended the meeting. She thanked the Local Committee for their comments and noted many of their concerns had been raised previously. She acknowledged that the biggest difficulties in relation to the Local Plan were difficulties with infrastructure as well as the greenbelt.
- The PPM acknowledged all the concerns made and reiterated the current plan that was out for consultation was still a draft. She added that Central Government had insisted on the housing quota and it was the responsibility of MVDC to ensure this was met.

Resolution:

The Local Committee noted the contents of the report.

8/20 CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS UPDATE TO COUNCIL [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: None

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

It was noted this item was for information only and any questions/comments would be forwarded to the Cabinet Member for a response.

Key points from the discussion:

One concern was raised about the use of plastic mixed with asphalt on road surfaces and whether the plastic used was then making its way in to the ecosystem. The AHM confirmed she would find out from the relevant team and report back.

Resolution:

The Local Committee noted the contents of the briefing.

9/20 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES 2019/20 – END OF YEAR UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION] [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM), SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Resolution:

The Local Committee noted the contents of the report.

10/20 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 10]

The Local Committee noted the contents of the decision tracker.

11/20 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 11]

The Local Committee noted the contents of the forward plan.

Meeting ended at: 4.02 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Open Forum Session

Mole Valley Local Committee Meeting – 11 March 2020

1. Question from Roy Welch:

There are Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) in Beare Green and North Holmwoods that don't work. I have been in touch with local councillors and my MP about this issue and received feedback that these won't be maintained mainly due to lack of funds. These cameras are obviously there for a reason. And since the introduction of the average speed cameras in Mickleham the traffic from there has been displaced down the A24. I recently counted along this stretch, 10 traffic signs that don't work, are broken, or are knocked over. I would like to know what can be done. Is there any existing budget for the repair and upkeep of these signs?

Response from Zena Curry: I have been contacted by your MP Sir Paul Beresford. I have sent his correspondence to another resident, but this can be sent to you as well if you'd like. If I could ask you to put this in writing including details of which signs and I will pass this to the Road Safety & Active Travel Team Manager for a detailed response.

Response from Roy Welch: I raised something at the meeting in September about vandalism to a sign on the corner of my road and there doesn't seem to have been any progress with this. Could I get an update on that too?

Response from Zena Curry: You can report signs that are missing via our website

Response from Claire Malcomson: This road is dangerous and is always being brought up as something of concern. We are always trying to get VAS signs up and running again. This sign has been reported several times to SCC.

2. Question from Jeremy Benham:

Road conditions in Kennel Lane is something I last raised in 2017. Since this time, I had thought this would at least have been looked at. The road surface is sinking and breaking up and there lots of large potholes, that are filled in. However still problems remain. The vibrations along the concrete road caused by buses and due to the poor road condition make it harder for neighbouring properties. This road wasn't built for heavy duty traffic. There have been several roads in the surrounding area that have recently benefited from being resurfaced. Where does this road sit on the priority list?

Response from Clare Curran: This is happening across my division and I agree with what Mr Benham is saying.

Response from Raj Haque: I have put this road forward on many occasions to get something done and as of now nothing has happened.

Response from Zena Curry: SCC operate an asset management led approach to prioritisation of road works. There are lots of similar concrete-based roads across Surrey. I will take this back to the team to take a look at. This is not on the Horizons programme for next year (2020-21). I will ask the Maintenance Engineer to go out and have a look to see what the problem is and what can be done. Your divisional member (Mrs Curran) will also put this forward to the Asset Management team to ask for this to be done.

3. Question from Cllr Caroline Salmon:

The ramps of the Beare Green subway have successfully been topped this weekend.

I was always aware that the ramps to the Beare Green subway were “Highways” responsibility and the base of the subway is “Structures”, but I cannot believe that there really is absolutely no joined up thinking in Surrey County Council on a piece of work which obviously should have been done at the same time!

Thorne Engineering were doing the ramp work working through Keir this weekend and the ramps are now by far the best paths in Beare Green, but the subway base footpath is not done.

I spoke to the supervisor today and he stated that the base was specifically excluded from their quote, although they were happy to do it (actually costed it) and could have done it this weekend whilst the subway was closed using the same workforce and tarmac lorry and equipment.

I am presuming that the subway will be done soon, but it will have to be closed again causing more inconvenience and cost.

Can you confirm if the subway’s base work is on any schedule to be done?

Response from Helyn Clack: We did have a meeting about the subway recently and I wanted to check what had happened following this.

Response from Zena Curry: The work on the ramps were funded by Helyn Clack’s capital funding. There wasn’t enough money to do all the subways and bases at that time. The Structures team have noted that although it didn’t look attractive the surface didn’t need any maintenance at this time. If the base had been resurfaced this would have further restricted the headroom in the subway. There are many other areas across the county that need works doing and unfortunately these have been prioritised as higher need at this time.

Response from Helyn Clack: It would be useful to have a list of the bridges and subways that need work doing including which ones have been prioritised.

4. Helyn Clack on behalf of Buckland Parish Council:

When Buckland Parish Council met this evening (9th March), Council, having reviewed the papers presented to the last meeting of the SCC Mole Valley Local Committee noted:

- i) The SCC Mole Valley Local Committee Integrated Transport Scheme Programme for 2021/2022 allocates £10,000 to fund the implementation of a reduction in the speed limit (from 50mph to 40mph) on a section of the A25 Reigate Road through Betchworth following speed surveys undertaken in 2018;
- ii) SCC Highways had since advised the proposal is to reduce the speed limit to the west of Betchworth roundabout but not to include the short section of A25 with a 50mph speed limit to the east of the roundabout.
- iii) If this proposal is implemented, a 40mph speed limit will apply to the A25 between Dorking and Reigate except for the short section between Betchworth roundabout and the Buckland/Betchworth parish boundary close to Tranquil Dale.

Buckland Parish Council respectfully suggests a 40mph speed limit be applied to the complete length of the A25 between Dorking and Reigate. As the 40mph signs, currently positioned on the parish boundary could be relocated to replace the 50mph signs currently sited on the eastern exit of the roundabout there would not be any requirement for new full-sized signs. The only incremental cost would appear to be the modest cost of installing 40mph repeater signs to emphasise the speed reduction.

Will the Local Committee commit to support this request?

Response from Zena Curry: The Senior Traffic Engineer had raised this issue with road safety working group in February. The Road Safety Team said they would carry out a speed survey to see if this section complied with the SCC policy to reduce speed limit to 40mph. If this section complies then the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) would need to be changed and it could have some cost associated with it.

Response from Helyn Clack: It is felt that this short section of 50mph will cause confusion to drivers and non-compliance of the speed limit.

Response from Zena Curry: There is a concern that if this section is not compliant with the SCC Policy then there may be a need to extend the 50mph zone.

This page is intentionally left blank

Universal Youth Offer Consultation

Consultation Focussed on:

- Proposal to enable the voluntary, community and faith sector to provide services for young people from existing youth centres for little or no cost
- Consulting on whether SCC provides universal open access youth work

Public Consultation 16 December 2019 to 30 April 2020

Local engagement sessions to coproduce the solution for each centre January to April



SURREY

Consultation materials and Engagement Events

<https://www.surreysays.co.uk/csf/universality-youth-work-proposal/>

Expressions of interest mailbox:

youthcentres.reginterest@surreycc.gov.uk



SURREY