

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 2.00 pm on 10 September 2014
 at Council Chamber, Pippbrook, Reigate Road, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1SJ.

Surrey County Council Members:

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

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Tim Ashton
- * Cllr Howard Jones
- * Cllr Mary Huggins
- * Cllr Valerie Homewood
- * Cllr Raj Haque
- Cllr Simon Ling
- * Cllr Peter Stanyard

* In attendance

OPEN FORUM

Topics covered including flooding damage to roads in Brockham.

16/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mrs Helyn Clack and Cllr Simon Ling with Cllr Peter Stanyard substituting.

17/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record.

18/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were received.

(a) PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

ITEM 2

Five public questions were received, which are attached with the responses as Annex A to these minutes.

Question 1 - Mr Ward

The Committee agreed new speed limits for Hookwood some time ago with one change having to be referred to the relevant Cabinet Member. I understand that the Cabinet Member gave approval some time last autumn. Why have the new limits not yet been implemented and when is it intended that they will be implemented?

Mr Ward received a written response in advance of the meeting and asked how long it takes on average from the date of closure to the completion of works.

The Area Highways Officer confirmed that there is a standard 28 day notice with contractors on work, but confirmed in this case signage needs to be ordered. The hope is that in a couple months all work will be completed and implemented.

Question 2 - Mr Seaward

During the exceptional wet weather through the winter of 2013 and 2014 in Bookham we suffered a series of serious flooding issues. These were at three locations in the Lower Road. One was at the junction of Child's Hall Road and the north western corner of the Lower Road recreation ground. The second at the junction of Lower Road and Manor House Lane where foul and surface water drainage systems failed. Foul water as a result entered local properties. The third was again on the Lower Road between the playing fields of The Howard of Effingham School and the Vineries Nursery causing the main footpath to the school to become impassable. Work between SCC, MVDC and ourselves eventually found ways of alleviating these problems but not permanent solutions. It was agreed that this summer meetings would take place on site with SCC Highways officials to determine ways of rectifying these problems more permanently. These meetings have not taken place. Could the Local Committee provide dates so that these meetings can take place and ways found to avoid a repetition of these problems in the coming winter?

Mr Seaward received a written response in advance of the meeting and asked for clarification on the Manor House Lane foul drain and emphasised that a permanent solution is required for this. Mr Seaward also raised concerns regarding the impact of the flooding on children going to school at the Howard of Effingham and requested a site meeting with officers to look into both these issues.

The divisional member highlighted that adequate drainage must be provided in this area of road, as even without the levels of rain of this winter the gullies are not coping.

The Area Highways Manager suggested a site meeting after the next Bookham flood forum to look into these issues.

Question 3 - Mr Brookes

When the cleaning out of the soakaways in the Dorking Road was done in June only the gullies attached were cleaned out. I was told by the team doing

the work that another gully vehicle would come next week to clean the rest of the gullies. This hasn't happened and now all the gullies that collect the water etc. are blocked or full (some 25 in number). I also asked for the road to be swept at the junction of Admirals Road/ Chapel Lane as both these roads produce at least 75% of the silt, mud and gravel on to the Dorking Road. Admirals Road has mud from lorries using it to turn round and cutting into the banks. Chapel Lane is a single track road with only passing places and cars have and still do cut into the bank and bring silt and shingle into Dorking Road, Proper passing places with kerbs and signs needed here. This problem of silt coming down the Dorking Road causing blocked gullies and subsequent flooding throughout this road has been an issue accepted by SCC as part of their Wet Spot programme for at least 8 years now. Could I be reassured that until the longer term solution is found that these two roads, Chapel Lane and Admirals Road, and the problems they produce be dealt with and the gullies in Dorking Road cleaned out more frequently than only once per annum - 4 times preferably - and so ensure that the system works with the soakaways effectively. An update on the long term solution for the Wet Spot activity would be welcome

Mr Brookes received a written response in advance of the meeting and asked if the soakaway referred to in the answer was an existing soakaway or a new one. He also requested that gully clearing be undertaken 4 times a year instead of 2 and that road sweeping be undertaken regularly to allow for soakaways functioning correctly.

The divisional member expressed concern with the issues of gullies on Dorking road, this is an enormous problem and feels that gully cleaning needs to be addressed.

The Area Highways Manager confirmed that the silt levels are being monitored to feed into the central cleaning contract and would liaise with the rights of way officer to address the issue of the bridleway.

Question 4 - Mr Meudell

For the new Leatherhead to Ashted cycle route:

Will the committee provide an estimate of the extent of work, and the costs, necessary to bring the path up to the requirements for safety of disabled road users?

Will the committee explain why the path as constructed deviates significantly from the proposals in the public consultation, and is of considerably lower standard (and higher cost) than that promised? Furthermore, given the extended period between initial submission of the scheme to the Department of Transport and the consultation (approximately 12 months), why were these deviations not identified and notified to both the public, in that consultation, as well as stakeholder groups beforehand?

Mr Meudell's questions were responded to as part of the Leatherhead to Ashted item on the agenda.

Question 5 - Mr Browne

ITEM 2

The Ashtead to Leatherhead cycle path project, which includes elements for pedestrian safety, was given approval to proceed by this Committee in September 2013 based on a budget of £850k and with a project programme of 18 weeks.

The tender received for the project amounted some £1.5m. After a value engineering exercise reduced the costs by £400k, the project was committed to construction at a cost of £1.1m. The nature and extent to which design changes gave rise to the substantial cost increase to £1.5m, and further changes to reduce the scheme to £1.1m, remain unclear.

The estimated cost of the project, as provided on 5th August in response to FoI request 11229, had risen to £1.225m, representing a 44% increase on the cost of the scheme approved by the Committee. With the DfT contribution now standing at £695k (an increase of £100k) Surrey CC's contribution has more than doubled (by 107%) from the original commitment of £255k to £530k. The cost of 1.225m is also additional to the elements of the scheme provided in 2009/10 at a cost of £625k resulting in overall expenditure on this route of £1.85m. It is not yet clear whether costs will rise further, e.g. in respect of any additional works arising from the safety audit or the disruption of the project due to the delays. As of 4th September the 18 week project has continued into a 29th week awaiting the replacement of road direction signs obstruction the cycle path on the Epsom Road. Only 11% of the cycle path (circa 250 metres between Melvinshaw and Garlands Road) provides segregation between cyclists and pedestrians – including an impracticable and dangerously narrow constriction at the landing point for the pedestrian crossing on the Epsom Road serving Downsends Infants' School. The other 2,050 yards are a shared, sometimes narrow, pathway with no demarcation between cyclists and pedestrians. The safety railings between the raised pathway and the Knoll Roundabout have not been replaced; reprofiled junctions on the Epsom Road have created new hazards for road and pathway users and added to traffic congestion; and the junction at Grange Road where the footbridge was removed has been left in an appallingly bumpy condition. These, and other defects and safety issues, have been highlighted separately to Surrey Highways. The cycle path is being largely ignored by local cyclists who continue to use the road and who are also frequently to be seen on the footpath on the other side of the road. Photographs and comments illustrating some of these issues are on Twitter [@ashleacyclepath](#).

The cost of the 2009/10 and 2014 elements of the cycle path project using the costs so far provided amount to £1.85m. This equates to £804 per linear metre (£533 per metre for the 2014 element alone) based on the stated length for the cycle path of 2,300 metres. By way of comparison, a report was made at the September 2013 meeting of the Committee introducing Project Horizon. This was said to be a £100m project to rebuild 300 miles of the worst roads in Surrey, specifically targeting roads where the sub-base is no longer fit for purpose and full reconstruction is required. This is a cost of £207 per linear metre and involves much more substantial engineering works than for the cycle path and over much wider carriageways, typically some 3 times the width of the foot/cycle path.

Are members of the Local Committee able to say on what basis the expenditure incurred so far on the cycle path could be said to be value for money; and in the light of this can members be confident that the costs estimated for the more substantial highways engineering works and wider

carriageways associated with Project Horizon, administered by the same managing agent as for the 2014 cycle path, can be delivered for £207 per metre?

Mr Browne's questions were also responded to as part of the Leatherhead to Ashted item on the agenda.

ANNEX A

(b) MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

Four member questions were received, which are attached with the responses as Annex B to these minutes.

Question 1 - Mrs Watson

How many cyclist only accidents have take place on the Zig Zag Road between Mickleham and Box Hill since 1 January 2012?

Can KEEP CLEAR be painted on the A25 at the junction with Milton Court Lane leading to Hanover Court to enable vehicles to access Milton Court Lane when eastbound traffic is queuing on the A25 into Dorking?

Was an evaluation of the STAR project carried out and if so what were its findings?

Has a safety audit been carried out on the shared cycle path on the pavement on the east side of the A24 north of the Deepdene roundabout to Dorking railway station and if so what were its findings?

I have twice reported to Surrey lighting services that the streetlight at the junction of the A25 with Balchins Lane in Westcott is permanently lit and both times my request has been acknowledged but not acted upon. Please could you arrange for this streetlight only to be lit when it is dark?

Mrs Watson was surprised that Keep Clear markings were not going to be painted and asked the highways team to reconsider this. The Area Highways Manager suggested a site meeting with the traffic safety team to look into the issue.

Mrs Watson raised that the committee report looking into the STAR project, deemed the project a success and could a blanket 40mph be implemented south of Dorking. The Area Highways Manager will go back to the traffic and road safety team to look into this. At present there is not the funding for the scheme. The Local Committee decides on speed limits; however a blanket speed limit will need further guidance.

Mrs Watson was surprised that a safety audit had not be undertaken on the A24, and requested a safety audit be carried out now. The Area Highways Officer confirmed an audit could be undertaken.

Question 2 - Councillor Haque

ITEM 2

Approximately two to three years ago heavily overgrown hedges and foliage were cut back at Fetcham Lodge in the Street in Fetcham, which helped make the pavement free of all obstructions, caused by overgrown trees and hedges. Pedestrians and School Mums are now able to walk freely. Unfortunately the stumps and roots of those trees were left underneath the pavement, which are now causing further problems by causing large cracks in the pavement. May I therefore request that the Highway Authority extracts those stumps from underneath the pavement? Once this has been done hopefully this will stop further maintenance of the re growth of the trees and foliage within the site.

Rising speeding traffic is causing a great deal of concern amongst many residents in the District. Kennel Lane and The Ridgeway in Fetcham are no exception; residents of both of these areas in Fetcham are living in constant anxiety due to the rising speed. I believe there are chicanes being installed at Ridgeway Fetcham. Unfortunately it is not addressing the underlying problem of speeding and in many instances there have been near misses because of people driving at each other without stopping. Is there anything can be done to bring the speeding traffic under control?

Cllr Haque was happy that the foliage damage to the footpath would be looked into, requested that a long term resolution for this work and timescales be provided.

The Area Highways Manager confirmed this is a long standing issue and that they will try to level out the footpath, though this will require local funding.

Cllr Haque confirmed that speed was an issue regularly raised by resident and that this needs to be addressed.

The divisional member raised concerns that Surrey Police were not enforcing speed limits.

The Community Partnership and Committee Officer confirmed that the informal meeting of the committee on the 5th November will cover local committee highway budgets for 2015-2017 and that the Neighbourhood Insp will also attend with the lead officer for road enforcement.

The divisional member for Ashted suggested that the issue of road enforcement could also be raised at the East Community Safety Partnership.

Question 3 - Councillor Dickson

Last September I asked what could be done on the corner of Dene Road/Rectory Lane to prevent an accident on the very tight blind bend, when crossing into Crampshaw Lane. The listed wall on the corner has been knocked down at least twice since I asked the question and nothing (as far as I can see) has been done to increase safety for drivers.

This morning (26 August) I yet again had a very near miss crossing into Crampshaw Lane. Three other people at the event I was attending had a similar experience. Something must be done and soon. What do you intend to do to make this bend safe and when?

Cllr Dickson was not present but the divisional member confirmed this has become more of an issue since the mirror on a local property has been

removed. He acknowledged that officers have looked to improve this road layout. It was also stated that collision referred to occurred a while ago.

Question 4 - Mr Cooksey

In August 2013 I submitted a request that the Yorkstone paving stones destroyed by various contractors in Dorking High Street and 'temporarily' replaced by tarmac but never subsequently reinstated, should be replaced in the original material and was given an assurance that this would happen. That assurance was repeated in answer to written questions at the Local Committee in December 2013, again in March 2014 and again in June 2014. However no action has yet been taken. Could I be informed when this work will be undertaken?

The Contractors dealing with the flooding issues at the Deepdene Roundabout left the site in February 2014. At the March 2014 meeting I was informed that this was because of an urgent requirement to carry out work in Tandridge but that they would return to deal with the work on the western side of the roundabout where flooding is a serious problem when the emergency work had been completed. I was also assured that the funding for this project had been ring fenced. I understand that there has been exploratory work but I have been given no information about when work to resolve the problem will be undertaken. Could I be informed when this work will take place?

It is almost 4 weeks after the RideLondon cycle race took place and yet there are still signs advertising the road closures littering our streets. This is not an uncommon problem and signs advertising temporary closures and giving other information are often left uncollected for weeks. Why is it more difficult to collect signs and other materials at the end of a project than to erect them before the project takes place?

Mr Cooksey highlighted he was given an assurance that the tarmac on Dorking High Street was going to be solved in December 2013, yet still nothing has happened. He requested this be progressed.

Mr Cooksey also raised that the funding for the Deepdene roundabout was ringfenced and no further work has been undertaken and it has now been a while since the flooding emergency has ended.

Mr Cooksey also raised concerns about the removal of signage after works. The Highways Group Manager confirmed that the delay with Deepdene roundabout is due to getting the streetworks permit. There has been a delay due to the number of works going on in Dorking at the moment. He also said that the removal of signage needs to be improved, and they are about to implement a new process to improve this.

The Area Highways Manager confirmed there was some spare York Stone at the Beare Green depot for this work. To expedite this work it would be best to look at using members allocation funding.

ANNEX B

ITEM 2

19/14 PETITIONS [Item 5]

There were no petitions submitted for this committee.

20/14 LEATHERHEAD TO ASHTEAD CYCLE ROUTE [NON-EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 6]

Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared

Officers attending

Mark Borland, Group Highway Manager,
Lesley Harding, Sustainability Manager

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements

Mr Browne submitted a public question relating to this item and is detailed under item 4a.

Mr Meudell submitted a public question relating to this item and is detailed under item 4a.

Mr Billard asked that the spill out of traffic be looked at during the works. He was told that traffic modelling had been undertaken but could this be improved for the future to aid public consultation.

Mr Meudell raised that models were fine but it depends on the constraints and data put in, and has requested the information on the modelling. He raised concerns over further safety issues, particularly those with disabilities. Officers confirmed this would depend on the findings of the safety audit in October.

Mr Meudell also raised concerns that the scheme is shared space and was it consulted as.

Mr Browne felt the new Grange Road crossing point on the A24 is not safe as pedestrians have their back to oncoming traffic. Headteachers at the local schools have also raised concerns about the safety of the crossing. The resident also highlighted he felt the questions he raised had not been answered satisfactorily. Mr Browne raised concerns about the budget as well as the scheme over running, lack of replacement of railings on the Knoll roundabout and concerns about HGV in Garlands Road due to the narrowing of the junction.

Member discussion – key points

The Chairman of the Committee agreed to allow this item to be considered as urgent business, on the grounds that public questions had been submitted, raising concerns regarding the Leatherhead to Ashted cycle route, including safety concerns. It was felt this should be considered urgently by the Committee before its next scheduled meeting in December 2014.

The Group Highways Manager confirmed this scheme utilised shared space, this is something the County Council have not used a lot as yet but are now implementing this. This aids decluttering of signage and also is designed to improve usage for pedestrians as well as cyclists. Shared space is the current policy direction from Central Government.

The Leatherhead to Ashted scheme was designed to address 10 previous casualties and it is not aimed at professional cyclists, but non-professionals and children. It was noted that the upgrades were to Leret Way Junction, not Leroy Way Junction.

There has been a £33,000 variance in the budget and this was due to some slightly more complicated aspects to the scheme. This included replacing the bus shelters with up to date ones, with real time information. The Department for Transport were happy to support this change. The footbridge was near the end of its life and this would need to be replaced, so this was replaced as part of this scheme rather than at a later date. This was funded through central county council funding. There is a £100k contingency and this will tackle anything coming out of the safety audit.

This project was not comparable with project horizon as project horizon would not include traffic signals and did not have the long lead in time which contributes to the cost saving in project horizon.

For all projects the standard is a 10% variance in budget, this scheme has come in at 4% variance which would be deemed acceptable by project standards. Officers acknowledge that there are lessons to be learnt from this project and they will work with councillors to do this. A full scheme safety audit will be undertaken in October.

The divisional members confirmed there was traffic modelling for the entire area at various times of day had been undertaken.

The Chairman confirmed that it was not put out as segregated or shared space during the consultation. The group manager agreed to look at how consultations can be improved to help public understanding.

The figures provided today are the most up to date. Officers will take concerns back to the road safety team and see if the safety audit is required to be moved forward.

The divisional member for Leatherhead and Fetcham East raised concerns over communication as they had not always been consistent. This has led to confusion amongst residents. Consultation was undertaken with residents along the route, but when the works were underway these were not taken into account.

The divisional member for Ashted highlighted some snagging issues but agreed that the railing issues need to be put into the crossing as a matter of urgency. There is a lessons learned meeting taking place with officers where other issues can be discussed.

It was also raised that some of the work of the subcontractors was not up to the standard of SCC.

The Group Manager highlighted the speed of delivery of this programme – this would normally be done within two years but due to it being a DfT bid it had to be done in 12 months. This led to some of the confusion around communication.

The ward member for Ashted Park raised that the notices were not clear so there was confusion amongst residents as to what work was being undertaken.

ITEM 2

Resolution

The Local Committee AGREED to note the item.

21/14 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [Item 7]

The Local Committee noted the recommendation tracker.

22/14 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared

Officers attending

John Lawlor, Area Highways Manager

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements

There was no public participation for this item.

Member discussion – key points

The divisional member for Ashted requested that the double yellow lines in Ottoways Lane be looked into.

Resolutions

The Local Committee AGREED to note this item.

23/14 HIGH STREET, EAST STREET BOOKHAM TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SCHEME [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared

Officers attending

John Lawlor, Area Highways Manager

Peter Shimrady, Area Highways Engineer

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements

Mr Seaward, Chairman of the Bookham Resident Association supported the advisory HGV signs but do not want HGVs banned. They are adamant against one way and welcome cross over points.

Bookham Residents Association asked that the MV planning policy be regarded not allowing the retail centre to be harmed. They acknowledge the issue with HGVs and would support the shortening of the double yellow lines and the introduction of crossovers. BRA would also support a phase 3 for Church Road. They would also request long term improvements to be made to the south north movement of traffic on Rectory Lane.

Member discussion – key points

The divisional member for Bookham and Fetcham West introduced the report. This came from Bookham Vision who consulted with residents and 68% of all residents had confirmed that traffic management on the High Street was of

concern and for some put them off using the High Street. Work has been undertaken since 2010 to address this, looking at High St, East St, Lower Shott and Church Road to encourage better links between the areas to improve the shopping experience for pedestrians and motorists.

The divisional member proposed an additional recommendation. It was proposed that two cross overs be put in by the Royal Oak and by the 33 High Street. There are currently double yellow lines in these locations. These will be shrunk to 10m in each case, this would recoup 3 parking spaces in the High Street. This would allow for passing places of vehicles. It was also requested that an advisory unsuitable for HGV signage be installed and consideration be given to a third phase for a similar design in Church Road.

Cllr Haque thanked the divisional member and echoed concerns about HGVs using the High St. Cllr Haque seconded the proposal of the divisional member.

The Area Highways Manager supported the new recommendation.

Resolutions

The new recommendation was proposed, seconded and AGREED by the Local Committee.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED to:

- (i) Note the results of the public consultation as set out in this report, particularly that there is no overwhelming level of support for the proposals presented for public consultation although there are degrees of support for some of the proposed measures;
- (ii) Agree not to proceed with the proposals as presented for public consultation;

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED to add an amended recommendation that:

- (iii) Two crossovers be put in by the Royal Oak and by the Number 33 High Street. Then reduce the double yellow lines in these locations by 10 meters in each area, to create vehicle passing places. Installation of advisory unsuitable for HGV signage. Officers to give consideration to be given to a third phase for a similar design in Church Road**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED to:

- (iv) Carry out further consultation with the divisional Member, the Bookham Residents' Association, Surrey Police and the businesses and residents directly affected by the future proposals.

24/14 20 MPH OUTSIDE SCHOOLS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared

Officers attending

John Lawlor, Area Highways Manager

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements

There was no public participation for this item.

Member discussion – key points

The divisional member for Ashted expressed disappointment on the report as speed surveys weren't done in Ashted and the wig wag lines in Park Lane had not been working for some time. 20mph written on the road is very effective and he would support the introduction of this, however understands this can only be done if it is legally enforceable.

Members expressed concern as enforceable 20mph are now only being considered outside the few pilot schools as there is a demand from other schools. The divisional member for Dorking Hills moved to alter recommendation iv to include it to cover all schools.

It was noted that schemes would require funding and 20mph may not be the best solution for each school. It was agreed that removing the current schemes would send a detrimental message. Members felt the existing schemes should be made enforceable. Officers agreed with this and would add it to the list of future schemes.

The Committee asked that future schemes be looked into to improve the road safety outside of schools and that the current pilots be amended to reduce speeds further.

Resolutions

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED to:

- (i) Note the results of the advisory 20mph speed limits outside schools pilot scheme and that the impact of the advisory 20mph signs on traffic speeds has been minimal;
- (ii) Agree that, in the light of the results of the pilot scheme, a programme of introducing advisory 20mph speed limits outside schools in Mole Valley is not progressed;
- (iii) Agree to retain the flashing wig-wag signals and 20mph advisory sign plates at the pilot scheme sites; and
- (iv) Agree to investigate the provision of enforceable 20mph speed limits or zones outside the pilot scheme

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED to an additional recommendation to:

(v) Look at further schemes to improve the road safety outside schools.

**25/14 EARLY YEARS SERVICES OVERVIEW [NON EXECUTIVE FUNCTION]
[Item 11]**

Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared

Officers attending

Phil Osborne, Head of Early Years

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements

There was no public participation for this item.

Member discussion – key points

Members noted that all 3 and 4 year olds have access to 15 hours of free education and that take up of this is very good in Mole Valley. In general terms Mole Valley children do better than the Surrey average.

The officers updated that children centres work in partnership with other agencies for better outcomes, this includes Circle Housing Mole Valley and the Family Support Team. Advice and support to settings is provided to improve flexibility. There is also about to be a new scheme to financially support these settings.

The divisional member for Ashted raised that one of the issues is parental choice, and there is a concern in Ashted about lack of provision. Officers commented that there can be some discrepancies between data and how it plays out with parental choice.

Resolutions

The Local Committee AGREED to note this item.

**26/14 MOLE VALLEY LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION]
[Item 12]**

Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared

Officers attending

Paul Fishwick

Caroline Tuttle

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements

There was no public participation for this item.

Member discussion – key points

Local transport strategy has been developed with the committee and Mole Valley District Council. The document provides a chance to bid for the Local Enterprise Partnership. It is a live document and will be updated.

ITEM 2

Members highlighted the importance of the growth of school places and the impact on the transport system. The implications of Gatwick airport on the district and the extra vehicles were noted. The issue of parking with the airport is significant and this needs to be looked into.

The ward member for Beare Green raised concerns about closing the gaps on the A24, south of Holmwood and the impact this would have on communities.

The committee acknowledged this is a living document and that the task group should continue to look at this.

Resolutions

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED to

- (i) Approve the Mole Valley Local Transport Strategy and its suggested objectives
- (ii) Approve the list of schemes provided in the Forward Programme (Annex to the Local Transport Strategy)

Reason for Decision

The committee noted that the Local Transport Strategy was a living document and that it would need to be updated. It was appreciated that the data included was the most up to date available, and felt a working group would aid the future development of the strategy.

27/14 MOLE VALLEY LOCAL CYCLING PLAN [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 13]

Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared

Officers attending

Lesley Harding, Sustainability Manager
Graeme Kane, Strategic Leadership Team Manager, MVDC

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements

There was no public participation for this item.

Member discussion – key points

The divisional member for Dorking Hills welcomed the cycling plan and that the fact there are many different types of cyclists was acknowledged. There needs to be a balance of rights between other road users and those who wish to enjoy cycling. Given the importance of the plan locally it is felt that the actions need to be brought forward. Officers confirmed that the dates in the plan were end dates not start dates.

Officers highlighted the changes to the report, including the inclusion of comments from the Local Committee, Mole Valley District Council working group and the Mole Valley Cycling Forum.

Resolutions

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED that

- (i) The Mole Valley local cycling plan be adopted by the Local Committee subject to adoption by Mole Valley District Council's (MVDC) Executive
- (ii) The Local Committee recommend MVDC's Executive adopt the plan
- (iii) The Local Committee will undertake to hold a cycling infrastructure workshop to identify future improvements and developments of the cycling infrastructure in Mole Valley
- (iv) Should MVDC Executive wish to make amendments to the plan, MVDC Chief Executive/ SCC Director for Customers and Communities in consultation with the Chair of the Local Committee be authorised to implement the amendments.

Reason for Decision

The Local Committee felt that their recommendations had been included in the report and that it addressed the needs of the different range of cyclists in Mole Valley.

28/14 MEMBERS ALLOCATION [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 14]**Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared

Officers attending

Victoria Jeffrey, Community Partnership and Committee Officer – Mole Valley

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements

There was no public participation for this item.

Member discussion – key points

Members had no comments on this item.

Resolutions

The Local Committee AGREED to note this item.

The meeting was closed at 16.54

Meeting ended at: 16.54

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank