

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
 held at 2.00 pm on 14 March 2018  
 at Council Chamber, Pippbrook, Reigate Road, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1SJ.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

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

**Borough / District Members:**

- \* Cllr Rosemary Dickson
- \* Cllr Paul Elderton
- Cllr Raj Haque
- \* Cllr Mary Huggins
- \* Cllr Peter Stanyard
- \* Cllr Vivienne Michael

\* In attendance

---

**1/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Cllr Haque.

**2/18 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

Correction: item 5 2. Petitions – The divisional member for Dorking **Hills** should read Dorking **Rural**.

Otherwise the minutes were held to be a true record of the meeting held on 30 November 2017.

**3/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

No declarations of interest were received.

**a PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]**

Declarations of interest: None

Officers in attendance: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

(For all written questions and responses see the supplementary agenda pack)

### ITEM 3

1. Mr Jon Favel had submitted a question and received an answer. He was not present to ask a supplementary.
2. Mr Ron Billard (representing Mole Valley Cycling Forum) had submitted a question and received an answer.

MVCF had forwarded a presentation to highways to be used as a free resource. The group were keen to assist the county council on cycling issues across the district.

The AHM explained that cycling issues were now addressed by a countywide team through the cycling officer.

The cycling strategy team would value the forum's input when Mole Valley's cycling strategy would be updated in the near future.

Highway officers would also be happy to meet with MVCF representatives in the future, in the event funding for a specific scheme was identified.

3. Mr Roger Troughton had submitted a question and received an answer in advance of the meeting.

He asked how it had been decided to allocate the s106 contributions to provide Real Time Passenger Information at bus stops instead of measures for safe access across the A24. It was suggested that this had been considered the best value for the small amount of money that would have been available.

Some members expressed concern that they still had not received up to date information on how developers' funds had been spent and what was still available to be allocated.

The AHM agreed to follow up on this issue with a view to bringing an item to the next informal local committee meeting.

The ward member for Okewood and Leader of Mole Valley District Council agreed to ensure that Community Infrastructure Levy figures were made available to the Committee, but stressed that only very modest sums had been collected so far.

Whether or not the local committee will have a role to play in the CIL decision-making process is still yet to be determined.

4. Claire Malcomson had submitted three questions and received responses in advance of the meeting. She was not present to ask a supplementary.

The Chairman stressed that sexual health clinics across the county were fully functioning but that if members were aware of any issues, they should contact the divisional member for Dorking Rural in her capacity as Cabinet Member for Health. She would be happy to answer any questions on any public health matters but stressed the difficulties in finding the money for preventative work. She was working alongside officers in monitoring CWL.

5. Peter Seaward (Bookham Residents Association) had submitted a question and received a response in advance of the meeting.

With regard to Lower Road, he stressed that the longer the situation was left unresolved, the more money would have to be spent in the long term.

The AHM explained that engineers had considered a new type of gully which might be part of a longer term solution but with only limited funding available, there were no alternative short or medium term measures that could be taken.

Mr Seaward asked why roads in Bookham that had previously been included in Horizon 2 were no longer in the programme of works.

The Cabinet Member for Highways explained that the Horizon project was constantly evolving and being a 5 year plan, revisions have had to be made to allow for emerging issues and changing priorities.

He would be introducing a new process whereby local members would play a greater role in discussing local needs.

Mr Seaward also raised the issue of increased council tax and commented that residents were dissatisfied with what they were getting in the way of services on the highways.

The Cabinet Member explained that over 70% of the council budget is spent on adult social care and looking after vulnerable young people. He acknowledged that residents tended to notice highways issues and for that reason 20% of the council tax increase was going to be reinvested in local communities through the local committees and its members.

6. Mr Ian Anderson had submitted two questions and had received responses in advance of the meeting.

In his absence Cllr Dickson asked what could be done to get Hawk Hill (Guildford Road) included in Horizon 2 programme of works.

The Chairman also expressed his frustration in its omission and had put it forward to be looked at as part of the additional winter works programme.

The Cabinet Member acknowledged the difficulties but reiterated that this was one disadvantage of having a long-term programme. There was a need for flexibility to accommodate changing priorities and for this reason he was encouraging more engagement between officers and local members.

7. The Chair of Governors of Oakfield School had submitted a question and had received a response in advance of the meeting. There was no representative of the school present and the divisional member for

## ITEM 3

Bookham and Fetcham West confirmed that the issues raised would be further discussed outside of the meeting.

8. Mr Martin David had submitted a question and received a response in advance of the meeting.

He was not present but had submitted the following supplementary via the Chairman.

“My question is to ask that SCC accept the community asset / benefit of the piece of unmade road in the middle of Cannon Grove, Fetcham in that this unowned piece of land provides a strategic right of way linking the communities of Fetcham and Leatherhead, connects the communities on two sides of the same public road, provides access to community facilities such as a park, guide hut and tennis club as well as access to a number of properties and a business.

I would ask SCC to join an emerging partnership to protect this asset by providing appropriate legal and technical advice whilst also accepting their responsibility to the strategic right of way by bringing the walking route up to a standard suitable for the use by pedestrians including school children, the elderly and mothers with pushchairs to enable the easy pedestrian access between Fetcham & Leatherhead”

This question will be answered outside of the meeting.

9. Elizabeth Daly had submitted two questions and had received responses in advance of the meeting. She was not present to ask a supplementary.

### **b MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

Declarations of interest: None

Officers in attendance: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Questions and responses are included in the supplementary agenda pack.

Mrs Watson (Dorking Hills) had submitted written questions in advance of the meeting and asked no supplementaries.

**5/18 PETITIONS [Item 5]**

Declarations of interest: None

Officers in attendance: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Petition wording and officer response are included in the supplementary agenda pack.

1. The petition presented by District Cllr David Draper had attracted over 200 signatures.
2. He was pleased that Mole Valley District Council had been able to take action to improve Footpaths 66 and 70 as part of the development of the Meadow bank site.
3. Footpath 71 remained in urgent need of repair; the surface had been eroded due to flooding; there were drainage difficulties and raw sewerage had been detected. A resolution would need the cooperation of Thames Water, the Environment Agency as well as funding from the county council.
4. The AHM stressed that no further funding had been identified for additional works and that paths only needed to be maintained to the standard required for footpaths. However she had not previously been made aware of the sewerage problem and would speak outside of the meeting with a view to assisting with communication with the utility companies.
5. Members discussed the previous difficulties in engaging with Thames Water and encouraged everyone to individually report an issue. The higher the number of calls received about a problem, the greater weight would be attributed to it. As a private company Thames Water was not obliged to respond to the county council.

The local committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:

- (i) Note the officer's comment

**6/18 UPDATE FROM CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION] [Item 6]**

Declarations of interest: None

Officers in attendance: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Public Questions, Petitions, Statements: None

**Member discussion – key highlights**

### ITEM 3

1. The Cabinet Member for Highways would also be attending meetings with representatives from Residents Associations and Parish Councils in Mole Valley to give an update on highways matters.
2. The report had three annexes showing where money has and is planned to be spent locally. A revised version of Annex 1 is attached to these minutes.
3. Annex 3 was a new document bringing together information on possible future schemes, so that Members would have advance notice of schemes and would be better placed to respond to queries from residents.
4. Members were asked to consider the schemes planned for 2018/19 and direct any queries or comments to the AHM. She in turn would compile a list of these and the relevant responses to be fed back to the whole local committee.
5. There was still a need to improve how the county council communicates with residents as to the work it is doing. Steps have been taken to improve this but there was still a need for further progress.
6. The additional revenue funding of £1.4 million would be divided evenly between the eleven districts and boroughs.
7. The Cabinet Member would provide members with a list of approximate costs to better enable them to make decisions on how to spend their share of the new Member Highways Fund.
8. The county council had invested an extra £5 million in repairing those roads worst affected by the recent spell of adverse winter weather.
9. This amount was unlikely to cover the final costs and the Cabinet Member had written to the Transport Secretary to ask for match funding.
10. Members raised concerns about drains that were not included on the asset register and therefore not being cleaned.
11. The Cabinet Member reassured the committee that progress had been made, but that the new asset system still needed some updating.
12. There were still issues with cleaning the gullies; sometimes this was down to the presence of parked cars and work was being done with the district council to try and resolve this problem.
13. The grass cutting contract had gone back to the county council with fewer cuts planned; Members could choose to pay for an additional cut from their allocation.
14. The criteria for the Member Highways Fund (£7,500 per county councillor) funding had not yet been finalised but the Cabinet Member was aiming to make it as flexible as possible.
15. The 2018/19 list of centrally funded schemes would be updated online every three months with details of progress and the reasons for any delay or deferment.
16. Members queried the expenditure on traffic signals when there was seemingly no problem with the equipment.
17. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that better information was needed to indicate for example whether the equipment was being serviced/replaced/repared etc.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley)

- (i) Commented on the information

**7/18 HIGHWAYS FORWARD PROGRAMME REVENUE BUDGET 2018/19  
[EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 7]**

Declarations of interest: None

Officers in attendance: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Public Questions, Petitions, Statements: None

### **Member discussion – key highlights**

1. The divisional member for Bookham and Fetcham West queried the proposed allocation of £100,00 to the revenue maintenance gang and suggested that the funding should be better balanced with more being given over to 'Minor Maintenance Works'.
2. This would allow local members to be able to react to requests from residents for minor patching works. Many of the roads in Mole Valley (mostly C and D roads) were unlikely to be prioritised for Horizon 2.
3. The Chair and Vice-Chair already had delegated authority to move funds between different revenue budgets.
4. There were various countywide maintenance programmes so it was important to ensure that the local committee budget was not being used to maintain roads already included in one of the centrally funded programmes.
5. It was also important to keep sufficient funds for other works such as for trees, grass cutting etc.
6. Some Members expressed concern that the proposal would reduce the work of the community gang, especially in rural areas where their work was particularly valued for cutting back vegetation etc
7. Members agreed to move forward with the recommendation as it stood but elected to review how the budgets were being spent and the work of the revenue maintenance gang in the summer.

### **The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:**

- (i) Approve the revised allocation of the Local Committee's devolved revenue maintenance budget as set out in para. 2.2 of this report;
- (ii) Note the Members Local Highways Fund as detailed in para. 2.7 and 2.8 of this report; and

### **Resolved to:**

- (iii) Agree that the revenue maintenance budget and the Members Local Highways Fund be managed by the Mole Valley Maintenance Engineer on members' behalf.

### **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

To agree the allocation of the Mole Valley Local Committee's devolved revenue maintenance budget and how works are going to be managed on members' behalf.

**8/18 HIGHWAY SCHEMES 2017/18 - END OF YEAR UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION] [Item 8]**

## ITEM 3

Declarations of interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Public questions, petitions, statements: None

The Local Committee (Mole Valley)

- (i) Noted the contents of the report

### **9/18 DORKING TRANSPORT STUDY RESULTS (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 9]**

Declarations of interest: None

Officers in attendance: Steve Howard, Transport Strategy Project Manager

Public Questions, Petitions, Statements: None

#### **Member discussion: key highlights**

1. Officers would present the final report on the study at the local committee's meeting in June.
2. Members recognised the difficulties in securing LEP funding for future works and the need for any scheme to compete with others from the catchment area.
3. The LEP would focus on deliverable outcomes regarding the provision of housing and education and those to reduce congestion.
4. Members discussed the need for new housing around existing transport links and in particular in the vicinity of Dorking main station.
5. The station currently had an inadequate parking capacity and the addition of a mezzanine floor would significantly increase that provision.
6. Mole Valley District Council had already commissioned a draft master plan for the regeneration of East Dorking which included the Pippbrook site and the Reigate Road car park.
7. Members agreed that increased working from home and walking to school were options that should be promoted to reduce congestion. However there were currently obstacles that would deter people from undertaking these.
8. Fast and reliable broadband was needed particularly in rural areas; some schools needed additional crossings, but there was no available money to fund these.
9. Some members suggested that changes to the loading and unloading of vehicles on the High Street still needed to be considered as well as the level of enforcement of the existing double yellow lines.
10. The divisional member for Dorking South and the Holmwoods expressed his concern over the lack of recommendations to improve traffic flow around the Deepdene roundabout.
11. Officers explained that options such as installing traffic lights on the roundabout had been considered but discounted. Although at peak

times traffic flow was at its capacity, outside of these hours it had remained largely unchanged from previous studies.

12. Members generally agreed that any changes needed to be more radical than was suggested in the report, firstly to secure LEP funding and secondly to make any significant impact on congestion. They drew a comparison with Leatherhead where work to implement its own masterplan was already underway.
13. Members further discussed the possibility of having a further study focusing on the area around Dorking main station with a view to finding a way to attract the interest of the train operators to get involved in any development.

**The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:**

- (i) Note the current status and emerging themes of the Dorking Transport Study Stages 1 & 2 Data Collection and Issues & Opportunities made to date.
- (ii) Note the potential options proposed as stated in Paragraph 9.1 for further analysis in Stage 3 Option Testing & Developing Strategy **subject to the additional suggestions made by members during the meeting.**

**10/18 EARLY HELP PRIORITIES FOR MOLE VALLEY [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 10]**

Declarations of interest: Tim Hall: Trustee of Leatherhead Youth Project;  
Co-chair of Governing Body of Leatherhead Trinity  
School and Children's Centre

Officers in attendance: Natalie Howe, Families Service Manager (FSM)

Public Questions, Petitions, Statements: None

**Member discussion – key highlights**

1. Members generally welcomed the new approach but expressed concern that any aspirations would be at risk due to possible cuts to services as a result of the county council's difficult financial position.
2. The FSM agreed it was a challenging situation but that it was also an opportunity to work differently with partners. The priority was to ensure that families were looked after; early intervention would reduce costs in the long run.
3. Members raised concerns over the consultation on potential changes to children's centre services. In particular they considered the deadline for partner organisations to submit comments to be too tight.
4. The FSM explained that the reason for this was to bring forward the public consultation, so as to avoid the period over the summer holidays. These were still very early discussions but officers had wanted to engage with partners at the outset.

## ITEM 3

5. The divisional member for Ashted expressed some mixed views about the work thus far of the Early Help Advisory Board (EHAB). He expressed concerns that the membership might be too large to be effective and that there was no representation by the police.
6. The FSM explained that in developing the EHAB and the Local Family Partnerships (LFP) in tandem, it was possible that the balance of the membership of each was not yet quite right. The EHAB should have strategic oversight of early help delivery; the LFPs were operational and the police might be better placed sending a representative to their meetings.
7. In declaring his personal interests (above) the Chairman highlighted the fact the funding formula for the children's centres had not been made available at the start of the process. However this would be an opportunity to review whether the former youth centre buildings were in the right places to deliver services in the future.
8. The Chairman also highlighted that accessibility to mental health services was key and that young people from Trinity School used those provided outside the district in Redhill.
9. Furthermore he expressed concerns that drug abuse issues in Leatherhead were not sufficiently prioritised and needed to be monitored carefully.
10. The FSM agreed that the figures for Mole Valley were particularly challenging. She agreed that the Children and Adolescent's Mental Health Services (CAMHS) offer still needed to be improved but commented that the Leatherhead Youth Project (LYP) was working very well with the older age groups across the district.
11. Officers needed to further interrogate the drug abuse figures with the police to see if there were pockets of issues where they could focus their work.
12. The divisional member for Bookham & Fetcham East (Cabinet Member for Children) stressed that the new model of delivery was needed to meet OFSTED requirements but that the investment in early help would reduce costs in the long-term.
13. Work on the children's centres consultation was just beginning and there would be a briefing for members in April.

### **The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to:**

- (i) Provide feedback on the latest early help developments in Mole Valley, including proposed early help priorities for re-commissioning and the location of Local Family Partnerships
- (ii) Endorse the Local Committee representatives to the local Early Help Advisory Board, for the remainder of 2017/18 and 2018/19 (subject to continued membership of the Local Committee)

### **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

We want Local Members to be informed about the proposals that we have been developing in partnership for the early help system in Surrey. We believe these proposals will help us realise better outcomes for children and young people within the early help resources we have available. We also know however that early help is most effective when it is planned and

delivered locally, so we are seeking the advice of the Local Committee to inform our identified local priorities.

**11/18 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [Item 11]**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) noted the progress of schemes indicated on the tracker and to remove any items marked as complete.

Meeting ended at: 5.16 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank