

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 2.00 pm on 2 December 2015
 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 Rosemary Dickson
- * Cllr Paul Elderton
- * Cllr Raj Haque
- * Cllr Mary Huggins
- * Cllr Sarah Seed
- * Cllr Peter Stanyard

* In attendance

1/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

No apologies and no notification of substitutions were received.

2/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes from 09 September were approved as a true record of the meeting.

3/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were received.

a PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Anita Guy (AG), Principal Engineer
 Zena Curry (ZC), Area Highway Manager
 Peter Shimadry (PS), Engineer

All written questions and responses can be found in the attached tabled papers under item 4a.

ITEM 2

Mr Jim Howley was not present but received written responses to his questions in advance of the meeting.

.....

Mr Mike Giles (on behalf of Westhumble Residents' Association) received a written response in advance of the meeting and asked the following supplementary (text supplied by email)

“In view of the assurances recently given that the monitoring of the bridge condition suggests no imminent danger of a reduced weight limit and width restriction, and since Network Rail and WRA alike can have little or no confidence in the ability of Surrey Police or Trading Standards to enforce the restriction in the face of reduced manpower and the unpredictable timing of infringements, making coincidence of transgressors and enforcers unlikely in the extreme, is there any prospect of the police acting on information from residents, without the stipulation of unattainable photographic evidence? Such evidence requires a timed photograph, giving clear sight of the transgressing vehicle on the bridge, with the weight limit sign included in the same shot.”

The Chairman advised that he would take up the matter of the timed photo evidence with the police.

.....

Mr Roger Troughton (on behalf of Mole Valley Cycling Forum) was not present but had received a written response to his question in advance of the meeting. AG advised that she had received a further update from the contractor and that the lines had been overlooked; she will be following this up to ensure the work is done.

Mr Ron Billard (MVCF) asked a supplementary and wanted to know whether the policy on 'rights of way' could be looked at again as cyclists are using the A24 rather than the cycle paths as these are not continuous. AG noted the comments but stressed that at the moment the contractor was only replacing like for like.

.....

Mr Bob Bull (on behalf of Sustrans) raised the following as an informal question (text provided by email):

Route 22 of the National Cycle Network runs through Dorking to Westcott. The section between the A25 and Westcott village is virtually traffic free. Much of it constructed in recent times. This section is for all non motorised users and proven very successful in its ok - usage.

We have two outstanding issues that have been presented to Surrey County Council on a number of occasions with no remedy so far.
1) From the A25 down Milton Court Lane the route becomes unmetalled. Our

understanding is that the legal position of the eastern half of this track is that of an unmetalled road, so it is the responsibility of Surrey Highways. Nevertheless, as part of the Dorking Westcott route, the Countryside Access budget funded the surfacing of the whole length with Fittleworth sandstone. Two years ago, statutory undertakers dug a trench at the start of the unmetalled section that has never been reinstated satisfactorily. Cyclists, including NT workers, have complained that the surface is dangerous, particularly in poor light as there is no distinct difference in the appearance of the original and reinstated trench. However, there is a big difference in the quality of the surface that could easily result in a cyclist losing control or a pedestrian falling or twisting their ankle. On behalf of Sustrans and the National Cycle Network this section is now classed as dangerous to users and Sustrans have been advised accordingly.

2) The new build Westcott link from just beyond UNUM to the village has been a big success in terms of usage by all forms of users. We are now receiving regular complaints that the maintenance is poor. Serious encroachment has had the effect of reducing the width of the path. In places so bad with stinging nettles that parents were concerned for their children. We are concerned that years of campaigning resulting in a public inquiry and significant investment could be wasted if the path is damaged by such encroachment and lack of maintenance.

There are also regular complaints of dog fouling. I met some dog walkers this morning. Dog bins are provided at each end of the link. They complained that the path was now too narrow to pass horses, wheelchairs, bicycles coming in the opposite direction. The original concept that formed an important feature of the submission to the public inquiry was the available width. This to allow all users including horses and including the soft verge up to the fence. That verge is now unusable due to uncontrolled vegetation including swathes of stinging nettles.

In response ZC agreed to meet on site to go through the issues raised.

.....

District Councillor Chris Hunt asked an informal question around what action SCC could take in response to the blocking of a private road that the public have had unfettered access to for 20years. Although signs state that it is a private road, no parking and no through-road but do not make reference to s.31 Highway Act (1980) in general and do not state that there is no public right of way.

In response AG advised that he should have already received an email reply from a member of the Highways team setting out the status of the road and that he should correspond directly with that officer, as he would be able to provide the relevant information.

.....

District Councillor Hunt also whether SCC could either confirm or investigate who owns the land in front of Ashtead youth centre and also confirm that the advertising signs in the grass verge have the necessary permits or consents.

ITEM 2

AG confirmed that the area in question is common land and therefore he would need to contact Mole Valley District Council.

.....

b MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]
No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Zena Curry (ZC), Area Highway Manager
Anita Guy (AG), Principal Engineer
Peter Shimadry (PS), Engineer

All written questions and responses can be found in the attached tabled documents under item 4b.

Questions received from Mrs Hazel Watson (HW) (Dorking Hills):

Supplementary questions and comments:

Q2 HW was not happy with the response she had received. PS insisted that schemes had to be prioritised based on location as well as traffic and accident data and that there was no collision history. It would however still be noted for future consideration.

Q3 HW advised that she still thought that this white-lining needed to be done and that she would take the issue up with Highways outside of the meeting.

Q4 HW asked officers if the condition of the road was 'an embarrassment' to Surrey County Council but the Chairman stressed that it was not appropriate to put this to officers.

Q5 ZC commented that due to the change in drainage contractors it will take time to work through all the assets on the list that need to be done and that A roads and country lanes are given priority.

.....

Questions received from Mr Stephen Cooksey (SC) (Dorking and the Holmwoods)

Supplementary questions and comments:

Q1 SC found the response unacceptable and wanted to know why Local Committee members had not been involved in the meeting between John Furey and Cllr James Friend. ZC explained that this had been about submitting an expression of interest for funding and that the outcome of any bid would not be known until October 2016. The Chairman stressed that current discussions were purely around finance.

Q3 SC asked whether the experimental cleaning had been successful but AG confirmed that the results were not yet known.

Question (verbal) from Mrs Helyn Clack (HC)(Dorking Rural)

HC requested an update on Flanchard Bridge. ZC confirmed that she had requested an update but that it is unlikely that work would start until the new financial year; she will forward on the full response once received.

5/15 PETITIONS [Item 5]

No declarations of interest received

Officers present:

Peter Shimadry (PS), Engineer

Christopher Heath Thomas presented his petition which had received 80 online signatories.

“Many children use Little Bookham St as part of their journey to school and many families live on Little Bookham St. However, the street is also extensively used by commuters, lorries and buses. Speeding is all too common. Despite this, Little Bookham St does not currently have any traffic calming features. We fear it is only a matter of time before a child is seriously injured or killed.”

Mr Thomas received a response (attached) in advance of the meeting.

Petitioner’s comments:

He was encouraged that a speed survey will be carried out but hoped that other factors would be considered such as the road layout, narrow pavements and the types of vehicles that use it.

PS confirmed that he would talk to the sustainable travel team about education for children and commented that problems might be being caused by inappropriate driving or particular types of vehicles.

The Chairman welcomed back Clare Curran after a period of absence. She pointed out that a VAS camera had been installed on the Little Bookham Street junction with Selfarm Road and that signage on the roundabouts had been refreshed. She asked whether it might be possible to use the signatories to the petition to set up a community speed watch.

6/15 WOODFIELD LANE, ASHTEAD [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 6]

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Anita Guy (AG), Principal Engineer

Zena Curry (ZC), Area Highway Manager

Paul Anderson (PA), Strategic Parks and Parking Manager

Member discussion:

The Chairman advised committee members that he had received varied correspondence on this item, some of which had been inaccurate or misleading.

AG outlined report highlights that addressed the queries raised at the September meeting around a commitment from SCC to the replacement of trees, parking and enforcement issues and funding for the scheme.

Cllr Rosemary Dickson asked whether the webbing would protect exposed roots and if the cost of re-surfacing the path because of roots pushing through had been taken into account; she also requested clarification (s 2.7 main report) on what test would be used to determine whether any damage was attributable to the tree works.

AG explained that the methods being used were accepted as 'best practice' and that they had been assured by the contractors that the resin bound material should guard against roots pushing through. The tree survey informs of the condition of each tree, so if any damage occurs after the works they will talk to MVDC about what action is to be taken.

Cllr Mary Huggins (MH) asked how many vehicles would be able to park in the new lay-by and this was confirmed to be around 24.

Mrs Helyn Clack (HC) commented that the independent tree survey had been particularly useful and expressed concern over the diseased trees. PA confirmed that it would be up to MVDC to replace any that fell over due to this in the future.

Chris Hunt (CH) (Mole Valley District Councillor) expressed his view that the deferment from the September meeting had resulted in the commitment by SCC to replace damaged trees. Chris Townsend (CT) raised a point of order that this undertaking had been included in the September report with which the Chairman agreed. CH voiced further objections including the use of s106 money, one hour parking limit not being to the benefit of commuters or shop-workers, insufficient enforcement officers, 25% reduction of trees not in line with BS standard and shorter pavement life.

The Chairman reminded members that the scheme would be paid for using PIC money rather than s106 funds.

CT apologised for his earlier interruption but insisted there was nothing new in today's report and addressed the following points:

- a) The one hour parking limit is there to assist residents using the common, shopping in Craddocks parade or using St Stephens doctor's surgery.
- b) The independent tree survey is excellent and at s 3.9 states that no health and safety work needs to be done.
- c) The bollards are already there to deter travellers and have so far not damaged the trees
- d) The aim of the scheme was not to reduce car usage and double yellow lines would have the same effect as to spread traffic across Ashted village.
- e) With regard to funding there was still £100,000 available for use on projects in the area and some were already being discussed.

CT proposed the recommendations and this was seconded by Cllr Paul Stanyard.

Mrs Clare Curran (CC) recalled that consultation had taken place under her chairmanship of the Local Committee and had been exemplary. The fact that the Ashted RA supported the scheme was significant.

HC commented that it was regrettable that there had been no discussions 'round the table' to allow parties to come to a consensus on the issue.

A vote was taken and the recommendation was agreed by 8 votes to 2.

Chris Townsend left the room.

Cllr Dickson left the room.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) resolved to agree that :

- (i) The proposal for a parking lay-by in Woodfield Lane, Ashted, as shown in Annex 2 to this report, is approved for construction;
- (ii) The intention of the County Council to make a Traffic Regulation Order under the relevant part of the Traffic Regulation Act 1984 is advertised, the effect of which will be to implement a No Right Turn from the northern end of the Woodfield Lane service road into the main carriageway of Woodfield Lane, and that if no objections are maintained, the Order is made;
- (iii) The intention of the County Council to make a Traffic Regulation Order under the relevant part of the Traffic Regulation Act 1984 is advertised, the effect of which will be to implement no waiting restrictions in the parking lay-by to operate Mondays to Saturdays between the hours of 8am and 6pm, restricting parking to 1 hour with no return within 1 hour, and to revoke any existing traffic orders as

ITEM 2

necessary, and that if no objections are maintained, the Order is made; and

- (iv) Authority be delegated to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee, and the relevant local Divisional Member to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals.

Reason for recommendations:

To enable construction of the parking lay-by proposal in Woodfield Lane, Ashted to proceed.

7/15 RIGHT OF WAY, MICKLEHAM [OTHER COUNTY COUNCIL FUNCTIONS] [Item 7]

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Daniel Williams (DW), Countryside Access Officer

Statements from members of the public were included in the tabled papers and are attached.

The Chairman reminded members of the 'rights of way' process and pointed out that a letter from Longshot had been circulated with the agenda papers.

Mrs Juliet Lowes read out her statement.

Cllr Raj Haque left the room.

Members' discussion:

Divisional member Hazel Watson commented that the committee had been presented with a thorough report and agreed that the evidence supported the existence of a public footpath.

The committee agreed unanimously with the officer's recommendation.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) resolved to agree that:

- (i) Public footpath rights are recognised over A-B-C on Drg. No. 3/1/40/H4 and that this application for a MMO under sections 53 and 57 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to modify the Definitive Map and Statement by the addition of a footpath is approved. The route will be known as Public Footpath No. 597 (Mickleham).

And agreed that:

- (ii) A MMO should be made and advertised to implement these changes. If objections are maintained to such an order, it will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for confirmation

Reasons for recommendations:

The County Council has a duty under Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (WCA 1981) to modify the Definitive Map and Statement (DMS) if it discovers evidence which on balance supports a modification. In this instance the evidence of long use supports the making of an MMO.

8/15 DORKING TRAFFIC SIGNALS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 8]

No declarations of interest received:

Officers present:

Anita Guy (AG), Principal Engineer
Zena Curry (ZC), Area Highway Manager

(Chris Townsend returned)

Members' discussion:

Stephen Cooksey commented that they had held a very constructive meeting on this issue, but was concerned how it would be taken forward and asked whether the local committee budget would cover what was required.

(Cllr Haque returned)

AG confirmed that there was no committee funding allocated at the current time but that there was a small allocation available for safety improvements and suggested that potentially developer funding could be used for capital improvements.

Helyn Clack was pleased with the progress and questioned whether the fact that John Furey and Cllr James Friend had met would lead to the possibility of joint funding.

Cllr Elderton welcomed the report but enquired whether there would be data collecting. ZC confirmed that the traffic models they have are out of date. They do have a base model they can use because a full study would be likely to take a further 1 -2 years. Instead they were looking to achieve some 'quick wins' such as by making changes to routes.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to note the report.

ITEM 2

9/15 BUS STOP CLEARWAY, GUILDFORD ROAD, ABINGER HAMMER [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 9]

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Zena Curry (ZC), Area Highway Manager

Members' comments:

Divisional member Hazel Watson expressed her full support for the scheme.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) resolved to agree that:

- (i) A Clearway is introduced at the existing bus stop on Guildford Road Abinger Hammer (at Marsh View). The restriction to be no stopping 7 until 7 except buses Mon-Sat.

Reason for recommendations:

- (i) Buses require parallel alignment with the kerb to deploy ramping and kneeling equipment to allow access for wheelchair users and those with mobility problems.
- (ii) Parked vehicles within bus stops prevent this access.
- (iii) Bus stop clearways enable Borough and District enforcement officers to issue penalty charge notices on offending vehicles thereby discouraging inconsiderate parking.

10/15 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 10]

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Zena Curry (ZC) Area Highway Manager

Anita Guy (AG), Principal Engineer

Members' discussion:

Chris Townsend commented that he welcomed the 20mph outside schools (p.85 officer's report) although the Chairman reminded him that this work was still to be done and in any event, traffic models indicate that these do not affect speed.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to note the report.

Reasons for recommendations:

To update the Local Committee on the progress of the highway works programme in Mole Valley.

11/15 HIGHWAYS FORWARD PROGRAMME [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 11]

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Zena Curry (ZC), Area Highway Manager

Anita Guy (AG), Principal Engineer

Peter Shimadry (PS), Engineer

A change to the recommendation (v) was required due to an error in the original report.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:

General

- (v) Note that the Local Committee's devolved highways budget for capital works has been reduced as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan, to £322,582 in 2016/17 and to £276,500 in 2017/18, and that it has been assumed that the revenue budget for 2016/17 remains the same as for 2015/16, at £196,810;
- (vi) Note that a further report will be presented to the March 2016 meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee to agree a revised programme should the devolved budget vary from these amounts;

And resolved to:

Capital Improvement Schemes (ITS)

- (vii) Agree that the capital improvement schemes allocation for Mole Valley be used to progress the Integrated Transport Schemes programme set out in Annex 2;
- (viii) 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 2, if required;

Capital Maintenance Schemes (LSR)

- (ix) **Agree that the capital maintenance schemes allocation for Mole Valley be divided equitably between County Councillors to carry out Local Structural Repair, and that the schemes to be progressed be agreed by the Area Maintenance Engineer in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local divisional Members;**

Revenue Maintenance

ITEM 2

- (x) Authorise the Area Maintenance Engineer, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant local divisional Member, to use £66,810 of the revenue maintenance budget for 2016/17 as detailed in Table 2 of this report;
- (xi) Agree that £5,000 per County Councillor be allocated from the revenue maintenance budget for Highways Localism Initiative works, and that if bids for this funding have not been received by the end of May 2016, the monies revert to the relevant Member to use to fund Community Enhancement works;
- (xii) Agree that Members should contact the Area Maintenance Engineer to discuss their specific requirements with regard to any Community Enhancement allocation and arrange for the work activities to be managed by the Area Maintenance Engineer on their behalf;
- (xiii) Agree that the remaining £100,000 of the revenue maintenance budget be used to fund a gang to carry out minor maintenance works throughout Mole Valley, managed on Members' behalf by the Area Maintenance Engineer.

Reasons for recommendations: To agree a forward programme of highways works in Mole Valley for 2016/17 – 2017/18, funded from the Local Committee's devolved budget.

12/15 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS ASSESSMENT FOR MOLE VALLEY [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 12]

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Guy Davies (GD), Principal Planning Officer, Mole Valley District Council

Members' discussion:

GD explained that responses already received naturally showed that 'highways' was performing strongly and that he would like to come back to the Local Committee in the future to discuss the issues raised further.

There was a suggestion that there may have been some confusion between the communications on this campaign and those for the Transform Leatherhead project and queried whether they could have been separated out. GD explained that the two campaigns are connected and doing that would have risked Bookham, Ashted and other areas in the north of the district being left out.

HW wanted to know how county councillors could contribute their input and GD advised that they should use the online questionnaire. Several members asked how the information collected would be taken forward.

GD stressed that the responses would flag up those issues of most importance to residents and would be used to feed into the new local plan and Mole Valley District Council's priorities with regard to future use of CIL money. They would also use it as a basis to lobby those bodies who provide infrastructure.

There was some discussion about the possibility of Crossrail 2 coming to Epsom and the effect it might have on Mole Valley district, but GD stressed that the campaign was about identifying current needs rather than those possibly in the future.

(Cllr Stanyard left the room).

13/15 LOCAL CYCLING PLAN [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 13]

No declarations of interest received.

Officers present:

Marc Woodall (MC), Sustainable Transport Manager
Lucy O'Connell, Strategic Leadership Manager MVDC

(Cllr Stanyard returned)

Members' discussion:

MW emphasised the change in approach by using an online map to facilitate continuous improvements and advised that his team will bring further updates on the plan to future local committee meetings.

Hazel Watson (HW) was pleased that the action plan showed only one 'red item' but commented that the access portal this referred to was of utmost importance to allow the authorities to know when 'sportive' events are taking place. MW explained that the events calendar, which is not just for cycling, would be going live imminently on the SCC website and that the county council is developing a code for organisers which will go to the Board for approval in the new year.

HW suggested that residents would like the route of the Prudential RideLondon event to be varied. The Chairman asked Helyn Clack (HC) about the process for possibly changing the route. She explained that it was a 5 year programme and that a change of London Mayor in 2017 will have a bearing on what happens in the future, but that it would be worth mentioning to the Cycling Board to start that dialogue.

Chris Townsend asked whether in the long-term the possibility of joining up the cycle paths in Epsom to Ashted and on to Dorking was being pursued. MW explained that the A24 presented challenges through Ashted itself but that there were other options in the north. They are working on proposals for a bid for funding from Coast to Capital funding for the Ashted to Epsom route.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:

ITEM 2

- (i) Note the progress in implementation of the Action Plan

And resolved to agree to:

- (ii) establishing the Cycling Plan online, including the mapping of existing and potential cycle facilities.

and

- (iii) have an ongoing community engagement for the Plan, facilitated through the online resource, to be regularly reported back to the Local Committee.

Reason for recommendations:

- (i) The Action Plan was approved last year and is being implemented.
- (ii) An online resource will help to facilitate further community engagement.

14/15 RECOMMENDATION AND DECISION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 14]

Officer Present:

Sarah J Smith, Community Partnership and Committee Officer

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) noted the recommendation and decision tracker.

15/15 MEMBERS' ALLOCATIONS [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 15]

Officer present:

Sandra Brown, Community Partnership Team Leader – East

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to note the report.

Meeting ended at: 4.14 pm

Chairman