

Minutes of the meeting of the
Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 2.00 pm on 22 January 2020
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
- * 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

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

30/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Cllr Haque and Cllr Malcomson. Cllr Kennedy and Cllr Salmon attended as substitutes.

31/19 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes from the meeting held on 4 September 2019 were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

32/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Mr Stephen Cooksey declared two non-pecuniary interests.

1. In relation to Item 5a, Mr Cooksey declared he lived in close proximity to this location.

2. In relation to Item 6, Mr Cooksey declared he chaired the Cabinet Meeting of Mole Valley District Council that had approved the recommendations to go forward to the Local Committee.

a PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM), SCC and Steve Clavey, Senior Parking Engineer (SPE), SCC

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

13 questions were received from members of the public and were taken in the order in which they were received.

Question 1 was submitted by John Moyer. He did not attend nor ask a supplementary question.

Question 2 was submitted by Cllr James Friend. He did not attend but submitted the below supplementary question to the Chairman.

Given the speeds surveyed are quoted as a mean average speed of 36 mph and 85th percentile speed of 41 mph at Surrey Hills School and as a mean average speed of 30 mph and 85th percentile speeds of 34 mph at the Village Green Bus Stop, I am grateful that County council officers are meeting with police colleagues on 29 January 2020 to discuss the speed management plan, and that they will request an update and consideration of potential options for speed management and enforcement. Following the meeting, please can I and the Westcott Village Association be involved in identifying and agreeing those potential options in order to truly incorporate the reality of the local situation?

The AHM confirmed there was a meeting of the Road Safety Working Group on 6 February for which a local input would be greatly appreciated. She noted that although they might not be able to incorporate the suggestions with the Police priorities at least the local priorities would be heard and put forward.

Question 3 was submitted by Ron Billard who attended and asked the following supplementary question:

Thank you for the response. It is largely positive. Previously signage to deter cyclists from cycling on the pavement had been funded by the Local Committee. Is there any funding to fund any more of these. We are talking in the region of £800?

In relation to the sweeping of the multi-use track this is an environmentally friendly option for people travelling and should be considered a quick win.

Has this improvement scheme been added to the forward programme to be done in the future? If yes then the Cycling Forum would like to be consulted

on the formation of any scheme. CIL funding from the nearby Kuoni site is very much welcomed.

The AHM responded. She started by stating there was no longer a small revenue funding stream for signs but the Local Committee had a small budget for funding safety schemes.

As for the cycle facility, this was an expensive scheme; costing several hundred thousand pounds and as such would be included on the Local Transport Strategy (LTS) list if the Local Committee agreed the forward programme (as detailed in item 9). It was suggested also that Mr Billard may wish to make comment on the Mole Valley Local Plan that was to shortly be out for consultation.

Question 4 was submitted by Eric Palmer. He attended and asked the following supplementary question:

Is there no longer a dedicated cycling officer at SCC? I often use the road and do not agree that it is safe nor wide enough and therefore don't think the response is justified. I would very much like to speak to the officer who provided the response, directly to discuss.

The AHM noted that although there was no longer a dedicated cycling officer there was a Safer Travel Team that looked at such things and had provided the response. She added she would take the query back and see if a meeting could be arranged with the questioner, officers and local councillors to discuss the requests.

Question 5 was submitted by Peter Seaward. He was present at the meeting and asked the below supplementary question:

Thank you for the work that is going on. What are the minor improvements works planned for 2021.

The AHM said she didn't know the exact details but would come back outside the meeting with more detail.

Question 6 was submitted by Jon Favell. He did not attend the meeting nor submit a supplementary question. Although members did raise concern over roads in the area where patching work had been completed. They felt after the work the road had become worse and members had often been told by officers that the road was fine and without issue. The AHM agreed to take these comments back to the relevant team to investigate.

Question 7 was submitted by Roger Troughton, who did not attend the meeting although a question was asked about the timing, given there was no budget to do anything at this time.

It was confirmed that it was SCC's intention to support borough and district councils to produce a plan. This was currently being trialled in Woking to see what the outcome was before rolling it out more widely.

Question 8 was submitted by Mike Giles. He attended and asked the following:

So, does SCC agree with the government that noise pollution of the type under discussion, experienced by a much larger number of residents than perpetrators, is a hazard to health, and since this problem is common to other areas of the county, whilst the officers say they cannot comment on SCC's future plans for noise control, in the interests of efficiency, would not SCC coordinate future measures amongst its constituent districts and boroughs, and can the officers comment on an apparent discrepancy between their answer and a statement by the Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner, David Munro, at a recent presentation at Dorking Halls, to the effect that SCC is by no means averse to expanding the coverage of average speed cameras in the county, and that, contrary to the implication in the answer, rather than being seen by the general public as a generator of income, average speed control is in the main understood and complied with by motorists of all types, thus potentially reducing income from speeding fines, whilst increasing safety, improving air quality and decreasing, if not entirely eliminating, levels of exhaust noise once the vehicles in question have achieved the monitored speed limit, as already demonstrated by the camera controlled section between Burford Bridge and Givons Grove roundabouts?

The AHM confirmed that average speed cameras were used in areas where there had been a history of problems or collisions. The A24, where the average speed cameras were, was not suitable for any other form of traffic calming. Those cameras only tackled speed and not noise.

The Police and Crime Commissioner had said he was open to the use of average speed cameras when there was funding for these.

The AHM asked the questioner to leave his question with the Committee Manager. She would provide a full answer to him.

Question 9 was submitted by David Allbeury. He was in attendance but had no supplementary question to ask.

Question 10 was submitted by Martyn Williams. He attended and made comment that the response he received seemed rather negative. He questioned the cost of between £10k-20k to implement and then remove a scheme. He didn't believe this seemed like too great of a cost to save the high street.

It was suggested by officers that much of what was being asked had already been answered within the report in Item 6.

Question 11 was submitted by Susan Leveritt. She was in attendance but it was suggested as her question was in relation to Item 6 also that this would be a more appropriate place to deal with this.

Question 12 was submitted by Cllr Paul Kennedy. He was in attendance and asked the below supplementary question.

In relation to the accident statistics quote in the response there seems to be a few accidents that don't appear to have been included in the statistics.

The AHM confirmed that the statistics only included personal injury claims so vehicle only damage and deaths of pets, although distressing, weren't included in the figures given. She noted that this road was also due to be discussed at the Mole Valley Speed Management Plan meeting on 29 January 2020.

Question 13 was submitted by Andrew Matthews, who was in attendance and asked the following:

If the voluntary payment scheme doesn't work will the payment meters then be removed?

There was no officer present to answer this question. A written response would therefore be provided to Mr Matthews outside the meeting.

b MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM), SCC and Steve Clavey, Senior Parking Engineer (SPE), SCC

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

10 questions were received from members of the local committee and were taken in the order in which they were received.

Question 1 was received from Mrs Hazel Watson, who had no supplementary question to ask.

Questions 2 and 3 were received from Cllr Claire Malcomson, who was not in attendance and had no supplementary questions to ask.

Question 4 was received from Mrs Hazel Watson, who thanked officers for the response but had no supplementary question to add.

Question 5 was received from Mrs Hazel Watson, who had no supplementary question to add.

Question 6 was received from Mrs Hazel Watson, who made the below statement:

I don't believe the question has been answered and doesn't seem too difficult to answer.

The Chairman suggested it would be a good starting point to get a list of all the car parking bays and the number of cars that used them and ask the officer for more clarity on the answer. It was suggested that Dorking High Street would be a good place to start with this.

Question 7 was received from Mr Tim Hall. He had no supplementary question to ask but noted the figures in the answer were for information purposes for the Local Committee.

Question 8 was received from Mr Stephen Cooksey. He commented that he didn't understand the answer provided and would like a site visit to be arranged with officers to discuss in more detail.

Question 9 was received from Mrs Clare Curran. She thanked officers for the response and asked if the AHM could talk through the process theoretically of how the scheme would come about from initiation to delivery.

The AHM gave the following response:

- The process starts with the feasibility. This would include looking at the topography, plants, electrics in the area.
- A traffic order is then required and would need to come back to the Local Committee for permission.
- The next stage is the design stage to see what could physically be put in on the ground
- Then follows consultation. This would include with the local businesses and residents in area and before the traffic order could be implemented any objections would need to be looked at to see if they could be resolved.
- Funding then needs to be available to carry out the work. If there is funding this is then let to the contractor to implement.
- Following implementation, safety audits are conducted before the scheme is given the final sign off.

Question 10 was received from Cllr Nancy Goodacre. A full written response would be provided outside the meeting.

34/19 PETITIONS [Item 5]

Two petitions were received before the deadline. The full wording and officer response were provided within the supplementary agenda.

35/19 PETITION TO: REDUCE THE SPEED LIMIT ON THE A24 SOUTH, UP THE HILL FROM THE COCKEREL ROUNDABOUT UNTIL PAST THE OLD KUONI SITE, FROM THE CURRENT 50MPH TO A SAFER LOWER SPEED REFLECTING THE RESIDENTIAL AREA [Item 5a]

Declarations of Interest: Mr Cooksey declared a non-pecuniary interest that he lived in close proximity to this location.

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

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: The full wording of the petition and officer response was provided within the supplementary agenda.

Mrs Amelia Rahaman attended the meeting and addressed the committee with her concerns. She detailed that there were a lot of concerns over the dangers of the road and that given the old Kuoni site was shortly to be redeveloped this would only lead to more vehicles on the road. She added that in recent years there had been a perception of increased traffic and faster speeds on the road and something needed to be done before any more accidents occurred.

Key points from the discussion:

- Members thanked the petitioners for their petition and for highlighting an important issue.
- It was acknowledged that it appeared as though work was underway and something was going to happen. Questions were asked about how quickly any progress would be seen.
- It was noted that with the redevelopment the demographic of the area would change and that action needed to be taken before there were any more fatalities.
- The AHM added that the Road Safety Working Group was due to meet on 6 February and this would be included in the discussion. She added that the reduction in speed to 40 mph did comply with SCC setting speed limits policy.
- It was concluded that hopefully this was all moving at speed and that more conclusive information would be provided shortly.

Resolution:

The Local Committee noted the officer's comment.

36/19 PETITION TO: WITHDRAW THE IDEA PUT FORWARD IN THE RECENT PARKING STRATEGY UPDATE PAPER THAT THE COUNCIL SHOULD SUPPORT THE INTRODUCTION OF ON-STREET PARKING CHARGES [Item 5b]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: None

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: The full wording of the petition and officer response was provided within the supplementary agenda.

Cllr Caroline Salmon addressed the committee with details of her petition. Noting she started this petition in response to the SCC paper that would be going to Cabinet next week. She added the council had a duty to preserve economic development in towns and villages, improve prosperity and welcome impulse shoppers. Taking away free on-street car parking was not

going to help. She concluded that time-limited parking was essential for the churn in a town/village to ensure different shoppers could come and go as they needed to.

She urged the committee to think about how on-street car parking charges would affect the community and requested they did not introduce on-street car parking charges.

Key points from the discussion:

- Members noted that in areas where there was free parking or time-limited parking there was a good churn and this should continue.
- There was a strong feeling of support from the Local Committee that they did not wish to introduce on-street car parking charges in Mole Valley at this time.
- It was noted by members that the petition response did state there were no plans to introduce on-street car parking charges and the committee should therefore move on to other business.

Resolution:

The Local Committee noted the officer's comment.

37/19 PROPOSALS FOR LEATHERHEAD HIGH STREET [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 6]

Declarations of Interest: Mr Cooksey declared a non-pecuniary interest that he chaired the Cabinet Meeting of Mole Valley District Council that had approved the recommendations to go forward to the Local Committee.

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

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The AHM introduced the report; highlighting that the Local Committee were being asked to support Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) to advertise the Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) as detailed in the report. The scheme had already been approved by MVDC's Cabinet and they believed it was what was needed to support the Transform Leatherhead (TL) Project. She added that work was already underway to declutter and improve the signage around the town centre.

The MVDC Cabinet member for Projects put forward the below points to support the proposal.

- The TL proposals had come about from the petition put forward to the Local Committee by the Leatherhead Residents' Association (LRA) and what was practical to do.
- To remove the parking on the high street would improve the safety, create better access for businesses, allow businesses to extend their table and

chair licences and improve access for people with mobility issues.

- There were plans also to introduce more markets and introduce parklets to make it overall more welcoming.
- MVDC had focussed on better promoting free car parking times and increasing the number of free 30 minute bays.
- She gave examples of other towns that had undergone similar transformations; Coventry, Loughborough and Shoreditch; noting that many other towns had also experienced the same decline in the high street as Leatherhead, and it was therefore essential to create a town centre experience to encourage people to come.

Key points from the discussion:

- Members showed their concern over the risk of removing the car parking from the high street. They felt the parking was essential to keep the evening trade alive. They noted it was dangerous to try and revive the day time economy at the expense of the evening economy.
- It was felt that more needed to be done by TL in terms of improved leisure outlets and activities before a drastic change like this could be implemented.
- It was noted that the decision would be a difficult one for the committee to make as there were good arguments on both sides and there was no easy solution.
- The point was made that Leatherhead High Street was not alone in being dead between 2.30-6pm. This was common of the time, with trends changing and people favouring online shopping instead.
- Support was shown for what TL was hoping to achieve but several members commented that they didn't feel the time was right and in the past many other schemes to improve Leatherhead had not worked. There was belief this would be no different.
- There was lots of new developments in Leatherhead. Many of which did not have adequate parking as it was. Removing another place to park would only lead to further parking issues in the town centre.
- The Leader of MVDC, Mr Cooksey, stated that the proposals that had been put forward had come about to help the economy. MVDC looked at many different options and concluded this was the best thing to do. He added there were many views of people in Leatherhead and the only way to really know what everyone thought was to agree to advertise the TRO and let it go out to public consultation.
- Mrs Clack stated that she felt the local committee's view was that they were not ready to close the high street and spend money on a trial that could have a detrimental effect. She therefore proposed a new recommendation to reject both options 1 & 2 put forward in the report. This was seconded by Cllr David Hawksworth.

Resolution:

The local committee voted on the new recommendation. With 6 votes for and 6 votes against, the Chairman, Tim Hall used his casting vote to vote for the new recommendation.

The Mole Valley Local Committee agreed to:

- iii) Reject both options 1 & 2 put forward in the report.

Reason for decision:

The above decision was made because the Local Committee felt neither option was a solution or was what the residents wanted. Neither option would achieve what Transform Leatherhead was trying to.

38/19 MOLE VALLEY ANNUAL PARKING REVIEW [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 7]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Steve Clavey, Senior Parking Engineer (SPE), SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The SPE introduced the report, adding there was one omission he wanted to add. This was for another allocation of permits from 53 Church Street to Dorking Road, Leatherhead.

Key points from the discussion:

- The divisional member asked the SPE if it was possible to include one other scheme in the review. It was to include some double yellow lines (DYL) in Charlwood at the junction of Chalmers Close and Ifield Road which was needed urgently due to the new pavilion. She added that the Parish Council had funds to pay for this lining.
- Members noted that the Mole Valley Local Plan would need to address parking issues in close proximity to stations as restrictions implemented nearer stations was forcing displacement parking in to other roads. This was a common problem around the district and needed to be addressed.

Resolution:

The Mole Valley Local Committee agreed:

- i) That the county council's intention to introduce the proposals in Annex 1 with a few minor additions is formally advertised, and subject to statutory consultation;
- ii) That if no objections are received when the proposals are advertised, the appropriate traffic regulation orders are made;

- iii) That if objections are received which cannot be resolved, in accordance with the county council's scheme of delegation, the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager considers them, in consultation with the Chairman / Vice Chairman of this committee and the county councillor for the division, and decides whether or not they should be acceded to and therefore whether the order should be made, with or without modifications.

Reason for decisions:

The above decisions were made as it is expected that the implementation of the proposals will both increase the safe passage of vehicles and also ease the parking situation within mainly residential areas.

39/19 HIGHWAYS UPDATE REPORT [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION] [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None

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

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Key points from the discussion:

- A question was asked about the Members Highways Fund and when some pedestrian road signs were to be installed on Mill Lane. The AHM confirmed she didn't have the information to hand but would get the answer and report back.

Resolution:

The Local Committee noted the contents of the report.

40/19 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES FORWARD PROGRAMME 2020-21 AND 2021-22 [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

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

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Resolution:

The Mole Valley Local Committee agreed to:

General

- i) Note that the Local Committee's devolved highways budget for capital works in 2020/21, subject to approval by full Council, £240,400.

- ii) Agree that the devolved capital budget for highway works be used to progress both capital improvement schemes and capital maintenance schemes.
- iii) Note that should there be any changes to the programme of highway works as set out in this report, a report will be taken to a future meeting of Mole Valley Local Committee to inform members of the changes.

Capital Improvement Schemes (ITS)

- iv) Agree that the capital improvement schemes allocation for Mole Valley be used to progress the Integrated Transport Schemes programme set out in Annex 1;
- v) Authorise that the Area Highway Manager, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, be able to vire money between the schemes agreed in Annex 1, if required;
- vi) Agree that the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Area Team Manager, together with the local divisional Member are able to progress any scheme from the Integrated Transport Schemes programme, including consultation and statutory advertisement that may be required under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, for completion of those schemes. Where it is agreed that a scheme will not be progressed, this will be reported back to the next formal meeting of the Local Committee for approval.

Capital Maintenance Schemes (LSR)

- vii) Agree that the capital maintenance schemes allocation for Mole Valley be divided equitably between County Councillors to carry out capital maintenance works in their divisions, and that the schemes to be progressed be identified by divisional members in consultation with the Area Maintenance Engineer.

Revenue Maintenance – Member Local Highways Fund

- viii) Note that members will continue to receive a Member Local Highways Fund allocation of £7,500 per county member to address highway issues in their division; and
- ix) Agree that the Member Local Highways Fund be managed by the Area Maintenance Engineer on behalf of and in consultation with members.

Reason for decisions:

The above decision were made in order to agree a forward programme of highways works in Mole Valley for 2020/21 – 2021/22, funded from the Local Committee's devolved budget.

41/19 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Jess Edmundson, Partnership Committee Officer, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The local committee noted the decision tracker.

42/19 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Jess Edmundson, Partnership Committee Officer, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

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

Meeting ended at: 4.47 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Open Forum Session
Mole Valley Local Committee Meeting – 22 January 2020

1. Question from Mr Adrian Lloyd:

With regards to the parking review and the schemes related to Church Road and Highmans Road, Leatherhead. Will there be a review of the existing allocation of permits and future allocation of permits?

Answer from Steve Clavey: SCC deals with on-street parking permits only. I would suggest you contact MVDC about the resident permits you are referring to.

2. Question from Caroline Brown:

In relation to Leatherhead High Street. Cars are bringing people to the high street. The high street is currently empty 4.30-6pm with no parking allowed when cars can park on the high street on a Sunday the place is buzzing. Please permit parking on the high street in the late afternoon and do not remove it on Sunday.

Answer from Tim Hall: Your comment will be looked at as part of Item 6.

This page is intentionally left blank