

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)**



**DATE:** 14 MARCH 2018  
**LEAD OFFICER:** SARAH J SMITH, PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE OFFICER

**SUBJECT:** QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

**DIVISION:** ALL DIVISIONS

Question from Mr Jon Favell

**Re: A245 By Pass Road, Leatherhead.**

By Pass Road (A245 / KT22) experiences in excess of 1.3 million speeding offences in the 30mph section each year, with all offences above 35mph. These go untackled by The Police, because the County Council include restricted/slow moving/static traffic in an average speed calculation for the road, resulting in an a mean speed not accurately representative of behaviours when traffic is free flowing. The DfT do not recommend the inclusion of restricted traffic in an average speed calculation. This is a conscious decision made by the County Council and it's masking the true extent of the problem.

What action will be taken to share the true extent of the speeding problem with The Police?

“With regard to By Pass Road (A245 – KT22), what action will be taken to create a road surface that is fit to support the volume and weight of transit that uses it.”

**Response:**

Surrey County Council work closely with Surrey Police regarding the prioritisation of roads for speed enforcement. A 24 hours a day, 7days a week speed survey was carried out in October 2015 which recorded average mean speeds of 31.3mph (eastbound) and 30.1mph (westbound).

The full results of the speed survey were sent to Surrey Police. Surrey Police have evaluated the results and confirmed that the A245 By Pass Road, Leatherhead does not meet the criteria for prioritisation for Police enforcement. This is because the average vehicle speeds show good compliance with the existing speed limit and there is a low personal injury collision history on the A245 By-Pass Road (1 personal injury collision from 01/12/14 to 30/11/17, the most recent 3 year period for which data is available).

The use of average speed data by Surrey Police, is based on Surrey County Council's policy “Setting Local speed limits” 2013, which was approved by the

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)

County Council's Cabinet on 24 June 2014 and became effective on 3 July 2014. It is also based on national policy issued by the Association of Chief Police Officers, "Speed Enforcement Policy Guidelines 2011 to 2015: Joining Forces for Safer Roads".

To target limited resources on roads where mean speeds and personal injury collisions are low could result in resources being removed from priority locations where serious, excess speed related injury collisions are being sustained. Therefore the A245 By-Pass Road Leatherhead is not a priority for Police enforcement.

Surrey County Council is working against a backdrop of increased demand and reductions in funding. To maximise funding from central government Surrey prioritises schemes on its planned maintenance programme (Horizon 2) in accordance with best practice guidance on asset management.

All roads on the planned maintenance programme have been prioritised in accordance with the cabinet approved process. This process takes account of criteria including: condition; network priority; risk and network management.

The A245 Leatherhead By-pass Road does not currently prioritise as a major maintenance scheme when compared with other locations across the county. The road will continue to be inspected and any safety defects that meet the intervention level will be repaired.

#### Question from Ron Billard (Mole Valley Cycle Forum)

##### **Re: A24 Horsham Road, Beare Green**

Work on the multi user path on the A24 south of Dorking was curtailed before completion. This was due to withdrawal of funding by SCC and nugatory work on the underpass at Beare Green.

What work was left incomplete? Should funding be found, what work would you prioritise?

Mole Valley Cycling Forum (MVCF) has some issues with signage, particularly where the cycle route passes through the underpass. There are also some safety issues where the path is particularly damaged by the ingress of vegetation and where it narrows just north of the bus stop on the western side just north of Beare Green.

Would you also consider reinstating our regular meetings with Highways that in the past couple of years have ceased? At these meetings, we were able to discuss planned infrastructure projects and provide a cycling perspective.

We were, at these meetings able to suggest improvements at little or no extra cost and sometimes with significant savings.

##### **Response:**

Surrey County Council has carried out works to install a shared footway/cycleway along the A24 Horsham Road from the northern extent of the Old Horsham Road in Beare Green to the underpass in South Holmwood. These works included the introduction of railings at the bottom of the ramp into the underpass to encourage cyclists to reduce their speed as they enter the underpass. However, following complaints from a mobility scooter user who was unable to use the underpass as a result of these barriers, they were removed.

During the 2016/17 financial year Surrey County Council carried out works to extend the existing footway/cycleway along the eastern side of the A24 Horsham Road, between the underpass in South Holmwood and the junction with Spook Hill. These works included widening the existing footway by removing over grown vegetation, and installing shared footway/cycleway signs.

There is no funding currently available within the Integrated Transport Scheme Programme for the next 2 financial years (2018/19 and 2019/20) to extend or carry out improvements to the existing cycle route on the A24. However should funding become available Surrey County Council will consult with the Mole Valley Cycling Forum regarding improvements/extensions to the existing cycle route, as well as any other Integrated Transport Schemes within Mole Valley.

#### Question from Roger Troughton

At the Mole Valley Development Control Committee meeting on Wed 10 January 2018 it was stated by Gemma Fitzpatrick (MVDC Officer) with regard to the Kuoni House planning application that:

"The County when they considered it (the scheme) on Highways or Parking grounds, didn't raise any objections and requested, if the Council (MVDC) is minded to approve the scheme, they would be seeking a contribution of £22,000 and the intention was that that money would go into the pot for real-time information for bus stops in the wider area, principally in the town centre."

My question is related to the "pot" for s106 and CIL contributions as allocated to the County Council as the Highways Authority:

How does Surrey Highways decide what to spend such contributions on? Is there a list of schemes and is this list in the public domain, how are "items" added to this list, who decides this, and who prioritises the list. Would this list include "schemes" such as that proposed by the petition, which I understand will be brought before the Local Committee at the March meeting, to improve routes across Meadowbank (proposals which have been previously identified and published in the 2015 Mole Valley District Council - Local Cycling Plan: [https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/75639/Cycling-Action-Plan-update-November-2015.pdf](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/75639/Cycling-Action-Plan-update-November-2015.pdf) - search on Meadowbank).

Similarly, would yet to be completed schemes, such as the improvement to the shared pedestrian/cycle path (Spook Hill to Beare Green) for which funding was withdrawn, be eligible for inclusion?

#### **Response:**

Surrey County Council's Transport Development Planning team formally respond to all planning applications in Surrey where any highway and transport impacts arising from proposed development requires mitigation. When deciding what transport impact a development will have on the highway network, consideration is given to the size of the development in question, as well as the level of traffic/transport that was generated from the previous development on the site.

The intended purpose of the £22,000 contribution from the Kuoni housing development was not for a “pot” for s106 and CIL contributions, but to fund the installation of Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) signs at the two bus stops on Reigate Road closest to the roundabout connecting to Deepdene Avenue. The RTPI signs cost approximately £11,000 per display, and were considered a good improvement for encouraging both existing and future residents of the proposed development to utilise the bus service as a mode of sustainable travel. The signs would have provided arrival times for bus routes 21/22/32/93/465, serving key destinations of Crawley, Leatherhead, Epsom, Kingston, Reigate and Redhill. However because the planning application for 125 houses on the Kuoni site was not approved by Mole Valley District Council the £22,000 contribution from the development is no longer available. The previous application for this site (of 85 properties) was a Prior Approval application for conversion of office to residential, which was approved. It being permitted development, and once that would reduce overall trips when compared to its existing use, SCC’s Transport Development Planning team did not have any scope to request contributions for any highway schemes.

Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) adopted Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2017. As a result schemes that have been identified to mitigate the transport impacts of a development are now intended to be funded through CIL receipts, rather than being funded by s106. S106 will now only be sought where very major residential applications are proposed that require such contributions to mitigate specific impacts in order to make an application acceptable in planning terms.

Decisions on how Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is allocated is the responsibility of MVDC as the statutory CIL collection authority for the area. CIL is divided into two broad parts: a strategic element of between 75%-85% which is allocated by MVDC to help infrastructure (such as libraries, schools and transport) to support new development; and a neighbourhood element of between 15% - 25% which is for use by local communities to help fund local infrastructure projects. Spending decisions on the neighbourhood element are the responsibility of the relevant parish council, or for unparished areas, the local authority in consultation with the relevant community.

As expected, since MVDC began collecting CIL in January 2017, receipts have been slow to accumulate in the early period and MVDC has not yet allocated any CIL money either at a strategic or neighbourhood level. A report to MVDC’s Executive Committee on CIL will be made following the end of the financial year, and will include details of the intended governance arrangements for allocating CIL. This will include opportunities to bid for CIL funding by major infrastructure providers such as the education authority and the highway authority, as well as community groups.

Questions from Claire Malcomson

1. After one year of running the Surrey Sexual Health Clinics CNWL have yet to set up a workable booking system. Patients are told they can book online to only find all the slots apparently booked, but many times this is because there is a computer error and are actually empty. When one speaks to the Call Centre one is greeted by very demoralised staff who don't know when bookings will be released for them to book patients onto and yet in reality local spokes are empty, due to the same poor computer system making it impossible to book appointments. This is an impossible situation. What immediate measures can be implemented to sort out this mess?

**Response:**

The number that the patient called is the central booking office. Commissioners have asked the CNWL team to look at training for the phone operators and to improve the script that they are using. Residents can book spoke appointments online themselves. The website has been checked and there are appointments available at both the Epsom clinic at Derby Medical Centre and the Leatherhead Clinic at Leatherhead Hospital each week from the week commencing 12<sup>th</sup> March 2018.

2. From informal reports and discussions there appears to be a clear indication that terminations have risen drastically in the past 11 months. The Marie Stopes clinic is having to turn girls away. Please can Surrey County Council urgently instruct CNWL to re-open local clinics so young people can get the contraceptives they need to prevent these unwanted pregnancies?

**Response:**

The latest validated teenage conception and termination data is for 2015 and 2016 respectively. Due to the way the data is collected this is always 18 months 'behind.' This is collected nationally by Public Health England (PHE) and is the same for all localities. This link below details the current sexual health data including teenage conceptions and terminations for Surrey <http://fingertips.phe.org.uk/profile/sexualhealth>

The PHE data doesn't cover the period since CNWL began delivering services in Surrey. The Clinical Commissioning Groups commission termination services. Surrey County Council Commissioners have asked Surrey Downs CCG to provide termination activity for 2017. The information received does not indicate an increase in termination rates.

3. Has Surrey County Council considered supplying a free quota of condoms for young people that are accessible from venues other than clinics in ever town eg pharmacies?

**Response:**

CNWL provide free condoms via the condom distribution scheme. Details of the scheme and the participating venues can be found on the Healthy Surrey website <https://www.healthysurrey.org.uk/your-health/sexual-health/get-it-on-condom-distribution-scheme>

Questions from Peter Seaward (Bookham Residents Association)**Re: Dorking Road and East Street/Lower Road, Bookham – drainage**

Two significant “Wet Spots” accepted as such by SCC in Bookham are still awaiting resolution even though both have been discussed over many years now.

The first is at the Dorking Road. We understand a solution has now been agreed and should be implemented in November 2018. Is this still likely to happen please?

The second is the junction of East Street and Lower Road where heavy flooding occurs regularly after rain. Not only has this caused problems to pedestrians because of cars driving inconsiderately through deep water but also the carriageway at the junction is now badly deformed. When might the investigations to the problem be finished and solutions implemented? Is there any alternative shorter term remedial measures that might be taken whilst the longer term solutions are being determined?

**Response:**Dorking Road, Bookham.

We can confirm that the scheme forms a part of our forward plan for drainage works for November 2018.

Lower Road at the junction of East Street.

This location will be reviewed by officers as a part of the Mole Valley “wet spots” review during March 2018 in light of the works carried out so far and the continuing issues at this location. The review will help to prioritise which “wet spot” schemes countywide to progress, taking account of the limited funding available. Unfortunately no effective alternative shorter term remedial measures have been identified that could be taken whilst the longer term solutions are being determined.

The Bookham Flood Group will be kept informed along with The Bookham Residents Association with any updates on the prioritisation process.

Questions from Ian Anderson

1 Does the committee agree that Guildford Road, Leatherhead B2122 Hawk Hill between Cobham Road and the Ridgeway is in a very poor and hazardous condition and is especially dangerous to cyclists? Will the committee recommend the most urgent priority is given to re-surfacing the carriageway?

**Response:**

Surrey County Council is working against a backdrop of increased demand and reductions in funding. To maximise funding from central government Surrey prioritises schemes on its planned maintenance programme (Horizon 2) in accordance with best practice guidance on asset management.

All roads on the planned maintenance programme have been prioritised in accordance with the cabinet approved process. This process takes account of criteria including: condition; network priority; risk and network management.

The B2122 Guildford Road 'Hawks Hill' does not currently prioritise as a major maintenance scheme when compared with other locations across the county. The road will continue to be inspected and any safety defects that meet the intervention level will be fixed.

2. Will the Committee explain, regarding the section of Guildford Road, in south Leatherhead, beneath the railway bridge, what action is being taken in conjunction with Network Rail to prevent pigeon droppings fouling the pavement and creating a hazard for pedestrians?

**Response:**

Network Rail have agreed that additional pigeon proofing work needs to be carried out to the bridge over Guildford Road. Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) is working together with Network Rail to arrange the necessary works and are currently awaiting quotes for the work. In the meantime, MVDC will maintain the contract for additional cleansing of the pavements under the bridge to keep any fouling to a minimum.

Question from Yolynnda Delugar (Oakfield Junior)

A question has been submitted regarding works to maintain the condition of a boundary fence and path at Oakfield Junior School, Bell Lane, Fetcham (see attached).

**Response:**

Oakfield School is a community school whose red line boundary includes the pathway leading up to the school buildings, a wire mesh fence abutting and a long narrow patch of wooded area to one side of the fence.

The school do not wish to upkeep the wooded area and have confirmed that they have no use for it, so over time it has been fenced off and its management has passed onto Property services. The only access to this landlocked wooded area currently is entering the school grounds, cutting through the mesh fence thus to survey the trees and cut back overgrowth.

This wooded area abuts the ends of residential gardens and some residents (with our agreement) have taken out garden licences to extend their gardens and use (and therefore maintain) the space. We have had a few complaints from residents who do not want the trees cut down in the wooded area and growth cut back as this provides more of a vista on the school and generally more noise.

The pathway, being in close proximity to the fence and the trees, has deteriorated over time and is sloped and uneven on in particular the part closest to the far end school buildings. It is best described as having dropped its foundations and needs rebuilding. There is no evidence that this is tree damage and it has been in a deteriorating condition for a number of years.

The school do not buy back Surrey County Council (SCC) maintenance or property services therefore as the fence and the pathway fall clearly within their usable demise, they should be repairing this at their cost and as part of their cycle of maintenance. However, as SCC surveyors currently cut through the fence to gain access to the wooded area to undertake cyclical inspection of the trees, SCC have made a fair offer to the school to renew/repair the fence and cover 50% of this cost - and we will be installing a gate to allow future ease of access. However, the school still needs to undertake the repair to the pathway on their site.

There has been involvement in this matter by the SCC Arboriculturalist and Estates Surveyor; we are however unaware of the involvement of any other parties although Babcock may have been brought in on the request of the school, as they do provide various costed and commissioned services to Surrey schools.

Therefore, in summary, we would agree that both the fence and path need replacement or repair, however this responsibility resides with the school and they have been advised of this.

#### Question from Martin David

#### **Re: Cannon Grove, Fetcham**

Given Surrey County Council's responsibility for maintaining a stretch of Fetcham Grove as a public footpath, providing a strategic walking route between Fetcham & Leatherhead, while also being used for wider community access including vehicles using this route to access community facilities including Leatherhead Tennis Club and the Guide Hut, what steps is the Council taking to ensure that Mole Valley District Council takes a reasonable attitude in meeting its waste collection obligations to residents and not refusing to collecting waste on the grounds that the stretch is 'unsuitable' for vehicles?

**Response:**

The section of Cannon Grove, Fetcham in front of property numbers 45 to 55 is a private road, therefore property owners along this section of Cannon Grove are responsible for maintaining it. Surrey County Council recognises that Footpath 16 runs over this private road, however SCC only has a responsibility for its upkeep to a standard adequate for public footpath use.

“Unsuitable for motor vehicles” signs have been installed at either end of the privately maintained section of Cannon Grove, these signs are advisory only.

Mole Valley District Council wrote to residents on the private section of Cannon Grove on 27<sup>th</sup> February 2018 explaining that the current condition of the private road could cause damage to their waste collection vehicles, and as a result asked residents to take action to improve the condition of their road. The letter also stated that if improvement work was not carried out it may result in the waste collection point for the properties along the private section of Cannon Grove being relocated to an area where the vehicle would not have to navigate the poor road conditions. It is for Mole Valley District Council Waste Services to decide whether or not they consider it suitable for their vehicles to access this section of Cannon Grove to collect waste. It can be confirmed that the private section of Cannon Grove is not maintainable at public expense for vehicular traffic.

**Questions from Elizabeth Daly**

1. I understand the Council is considering proposals for a further 40% reduction in funding for Mole Valley's Children's Centres. In my experience a common response to funding cuts is to withdraw services from satellite centres such as Bookham, which has already seen a significant reduction in support for local families. So what assessment has the Council made of the impact of its proposals for Mole Valley's Children's Centres, and what guarantees can it give that much-needed services will be maintained for families in Bookham and Fetcham?

**Response from Surrey Family Services:**

We are reviewing the current status and financial position of our children centre delivery pending a full consultation in the summer. The financial situation is reflected through the cabinet decision for children services to make savings.

We are in pre-consultation discussion with children centres as to how we may remodel provision going forward. Alongside this we are looking to transform early help in the borough and are involved in working in the community in order to identify opportunities and gaps in provision.

These will all inform proposals that we will set out for the public to consult on and challenge and as such, only at the end of the consultation, will we be able to determine the impact on individual communities.

We will ensure that we consult on the needs of individual communities as part of the consultation

2. Residents of Leatherhead Road in Great Bookham have suffered for a number of years from flooding and lack of controls over lorry parking outside their homes, speeding, and the absence of safe crossings for pedestrians. What action is Surrey County Council taking to address these issues, and fund the cost of necessary drainage and repairs to the highways and kerbsides? If the Council is unable to take effective action, will it write to the Valuation Office Agency to invite them to review the Council Tax bands for affected properties with a view to making allowance for the resulting diminution in their value and amenity?

**Response:**

The A246 Leatherhead Road in Bookham runs between the junction with Walnut Tree Close and the junction with High Street. This road is part of the A246 which runs between the A24 at Givons Grove roundabout and the A25 at Clandon, and it forms part of the strategic road network.

The question response is in parts as asked:

Flooding

Officers are aware of a localised drainage issue on the A246 Leatherhead Road Bookham just east of the road Gilmais. There is currently no funding identified for a minor maintenance scheme to resolve this issue. The existing drainage system in the vicinity has been checked and found to be working correctly.

Lorry Parking

Officers can confirm that there are no parking restrictions on the A246 Leatherhead Road. Therefore vehicles, including HGVs, can park on the road.

Businesses wishing to operate goods vehicles over 3.5 tonnes gross weight on the public highway in connection with a trade or business must obtain an Operators' Licence from the Vehicle Operating Service Agency (VOSA). Every operator must have an operating centre where the vehicles are kept when not in use. The operating centre needs to meet certain conditions, one of which is where and how vehicles will park.

England, Scotland and Wales are divided into eight areas, each with a Traffic Commissioner appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport. The Traffic Commissioners determine applications for licences in their area and take action against operators' who break the law. Surrey is in the South Eastern and Metropolitan Traffic Area.

Surrey County Council's role in this process is commenting on and/or objecting to Operator Licence applications. It does not have a role in enforcement of conditions relating to licences. Officers suggest that Ms Daly reports HGVs that are persistently parking on the A246 Leatherhead road to the South Eastern and Metropolitan Traffic Commissioner.

### Speeding

The eastern section of Leatherhead Road closest to Young Street has a speed limit of 40mph. The speed limit changes to 30mph just to the west of Lyngarth Close. The Police are responsible for enforcing these speed limits.

Speeding and anti-social driving have been recorded as a prime concern of Surrey residents. Consequently Surrey County Council and Surrey Police work closely together as part of the DriveSMART initiative. As part of this initiative, speed management plans have been compiled for every District and Borough to identify with Police colleagues those sites that require the most enforcement attention to reduce speeds. Officers will raise concerns about traffic speeds on the A246 Leatherhead Road with the Police.

### Safe crossings for pedestrians

There is an existing signalised pedestrian crossing on Leatherhead Road immediately east of the junction with High Street. There is a pedestrian phase on the traffic signals at the junction of Leatherhead Road with Eastwick Road and Crabtree Lane. Pedestrians are able to cross Leatherhead Road, Eastwick Road and Crabtree Lane whilst the traffic signals are at red. However there are no formal or informal pedestrian crossings on Leatherhead Road east of this junction.

Along the section of Leatherhead Road between Walnut Tree Close and Norbury Way, there is a footway on the north side of the road only. West of Norbury Way there is a footway on both sides of Leatherhead Road. Pedestrian crossing points are usually installed where there is a footway on both sides of the road, so that pedestrians have a safe place to wait to cross the road.

The South East Area Highway Team receives large numbers of requests for road safety measures on the public highway network, and has very limited funding for such measures. Officers regret that your request for additional pedestrian crossing points in Leatherhead Road are unlikely to be prioritised

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)

against other requests for schemes in the Mole Valley area given the limited funding available. For this reason a scheme to introduce additional pedestrian crossing points in Leatherhead Road will not be progressed at the present time.

The County Council has no data to support the assertion that property prices have been adversely affected by the local highway amenity. For this reason there are no plans to write to the Valuation Office Agency to invite them to review the Council Tax bands as is suggested.