

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
 held at 2.00 pm on 6 June 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 David Hawksworth
- \* Cllr Mary Huggins
- \* Cllr Paul Kennedy
- \* Cllr Malcomson
- \* Cllr Vivienne Michael

\* In attendance

---

**12/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies had been received from Mrs Curran.

**13/18 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [AGENDA ITEM ONLY] [Item 2]**

1. The Chairman welcomed two new co-optees, district councillors Claire Malcomson and Paul Kennedy.
2. David Hodge, Leader of Surrey County Council will be coming to talk about the new county council 'vision' at the local committee's informal meeting on 18 July. District councillors will also be invited to attend.
3. County members should have received an email with instructions on the revised application process for member community allocations. The Chairman encouraged colleagues to try and allocate this funding well in advance of the deadline of 31 January 2019.

**14/18 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 3]**

The minutes of the meeting on 14 March 2018 were agreed to be a true record.

**15/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]**

No declarations of interest were received.

## ITEM 2

### **a PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5a]** **Declarations of interest: None**

**Officers present: Zena Curry – Area Highways Manager (AHM)**

1. Elizabeth Daly had submitted written questions and received responses in advance of the meeting (see supplementary papers).
2. As a supplementary question Ms Daly asked whether it was possible to give more details on the timings of any works.
3. The AHM advised that there was no certainty on when any works would take place but that she would provide an update when information became available.

### **b MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 5b]** **Declarations of interest: None**

**Officers present: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM)**

**Also present: Mr Colin Kemp, Cabinet Lead Member for Place (CLMP)**

Mr Hall had submitted written questions and received responses in advance of the meeting (see supplementary papers).

1. As a supplementary he asked what action the county council was taking with regard to those assets that had not been cleaned and whether it was still being charged for work not done.
2. The CLMP explained that assets were cleaned in line with a set schedule that extended over a period of 18 months – 2 years.

(Cllr Hawksworth joined the meeting)

3. The divisional member for Dorking Hills expressed her concern about the issue of gullies not being included on the assets register and would like to be updated when they were added.

(Cllr Michael joined the meeting)

4. The CLMP explained that when there was heavy rain it was not always the case that gullies were blocked but that the system cannot cope with the amount of water.
5. Parked cars were an issue. Parking measures could only be suspended by way of a traffic order and where there were no restrictions, only those vehicles that had no tax or MOT could be removed. They could put out bollards but motorists could still choose to ignore them.
6. (The Chairman welcomed Cllrs Michael and Hawksworth to the meeting).

Mr Townsend had submitted questions and had received responses in advance of the meeting (see supplementary papers).

1. As a supplementary he asked whether any residual funds from the pedestrian crossing scheme on the A24 near Bramley Way could be used to fund the traffic calming measures outside the two schools (question 3).
2. The AHM explained that until they had consulted on the design of the crossing, they would not know the amount of any residual funding. It might be possible to use some the members highways allocation, but it should not exceed £2,500 (maximum limit for a single project).

Mr Cooksey had submitted questions and had received responses in advance of the meeting (see supplementary papers).

1. Mr Cooksey did not think that the response had addressed the issue raised (question one). The trading community in Dorking were very unhappy that there would be another Saturday closure of Ashcombe Road and that they had not been consulted on the scheduling.
2. The AHM explained this was not a planned scheme and that they needed to carry out the surface dressing while the weather was warm and dry.
3. As the work was taking place on a Saturday Mr Cooksey wanted to know who residents should contact to report any problems.
4. Members agreed that the current system of reporting urgent issues did not adequately provide support over the weekend period.
5. With regard to his second question Mr Cooksey highlighted the fact that there had been another similar instance on the previous day causing heaving congestion in Dorking and asked for urgent action to resolve the problems that were adversely affecting the town's trading community.
6. The AHM agreed to pass on this feedback to the relevant teams.

Cllr Kennedy had submitted a written question and had received a response in advance of the meeting (see supplementary papers).

1. Cllr Kennedy appreciated that officers had explained the process but asked how the residents' experience could be improved.
2. The AHM recommended checking details on the roadworks.org website which gives information on permits and re-inspection dates.

Mrs Watson had submitted a written question and received a response in advance of the meeting (see supplementary papers).

1. She had no supplementary but would contact the maintenance engineer with her concerns.

## **17/18 PETITIONS [Item 6]**

Declarations of interest: None

Officer present: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

## ITEM 2

1. Mr Patrick Keeble presented the petition (45 signatures) which called for a residents' parking scheme in Arundel and Howard Roads, Dorking (see supplementary papers for officer response).
2. Main highlights of his presentation:
  - a. Parking situation had worsened over the three years he had been living there.
  - b. In the day the streets were used by shop workers, shoppers and parents going to the nearby nursery. In the evening by residents of nearby streets and visitors to local pubs.
  - c. Shift workers returning late had nowhere to park.
  - d. A similar proposal had been made three years ago but had not been approved; residents had not been aware they needed to express support through the public consultation.
  - e. Suggested timings for the scheme had been submitted to the parking team through the Partnership Committee Officer.
3. Members generally supported the scheme although they did highlight that the introduction of any new parking measures were likely to have a knock on effect on other streets nearby.
4. A local business owner (Mr Moreve) raised the issue of the lack of parking for workers. The ward member for Okewood (also Leader of MVDC) informed the committee that the district council were aware, that with the exception of the one at the station, Dorking's car parks were underused and that a parking panel would be looking at the issue of permits.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) noted the officer response.

### **18/18 DORKING TRANSPORT STUDY UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR INFORMATION] [Item 8]**

**Declarations of interest: None**

**Officers present:**

**Steve Howard, Project Manager – Transport Policy (PMTP)**

**Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM)**

**Also present:**

**Mr Colin Kemp, Cabinet Lead Member for Place (CLMP)**

**Public questions: Mr A Moreve (as part of the discussion below)**

**Public written statement: Mr Reynolds Hardiman (see supplementary papers)**

Due to the presence of members of the public for items 8 and 9 on the agenda the Chairman decided to take these two reports ahead of item 7.

Member discussion highlights:

1. The PMTP advised the committee he would be meeting in the following week with the consultants. After that they would meet with stakeholders and agree the recommendations to be taken forward.

- The project tied in with the new local plan being drafted by the district council.
2. Mr Moreve made the following points about the traffic signals at Pump Corner
    - a. HGVs hit the traffic lights on a weekly basis
    - b. When the temporary lights went down the traffic flow improved and vehicles stopped for pedestrians to cross
    - c. The county and district councils needed to work together to find solutions as congestion is severely impacting the town's businesses.
    - d. HGVs should not be allowed to turn up South Street
  3. The PMTP acknowledged that Pump Corner was a pinch point but that there was no easy solution. Signals had already been 'tweaked' to improve traffic flow.
  4. The Chairman acknowledged the validity of the points made by Mr Moreve and questioned whether highways had looked at the vulnerability of the equipment at that location.
  5. The ward member for Okewood (MVDC Leader) expressed her surprise at the level of detail in the report; she had expected another stakeholder meeting to have taken place before the publication of any further reports.
  6. The CLMP agreed to meet with the MVDC Leader (and local divisional members) to walk round the town to see the issues first hand.
  7. He reminded members that the councils would have to engage in a competitive bidding process to secure any funding.
  8. The divisional member for Dorking Hills suggested the removal of the right turn cycle lane at pump corner.
  9. The divisional member for Dorking and the Holmwoods expressed disappointment that the report did not set out any positive recommendations.
  10. The Chairman acknowledged the receipt of the statement submitted by Mr Hardiman.(see supplementary papers)
  11. Members discussed other ideas such as preferred delivery times (some had been set but not enforced); re-directing HGVs away from the town unless delivering; intelligent pedestrian lights.
  12. The CLMP cautioned against a move to turn off the lights at Pump Corner; in the beginning drivers were likely to be careful but were unlikely to sustain that level of attention.
  13. He also stressed the need for all boroughs and districts to unlock sources of funding through housing development.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS:

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 as previously presented.
- (ii) Note the assessment of further potential options analysed in Stage 3 Option Testing & Developing Strategy and note that a package of

sustainable transport measures is likely to emerge as the most favourable approach to receive funding support, but this will be confirmed following the conclusion of the Stage 3 and the issue of the final report for the current Dorking Transport Study. Work on finalising the final Stage 3 report is still ongoing and is expected to be completed by the end of June 2018.

**(iii) Note the comments, ideas and points raised**

**(iv) Note the short, medium and long-term ideas**

**(v) Note there will be stakeholder's meeting; Cabinet Lead Member for Place (SCC) to meet with the Leader of Mole Valley District Council and the two local divisional members.**

**19/18 DORKING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT PACKAGE PHASE ONE  
[EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 9]**

**Declarations of interest: None**

**Officers present:**

**Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM)**

**Lyndon Mendes, Transport Policy Team Manager (TPTM)**

**Also present:**

**Mr Colin Kemp, Cabinet Lead Member for Place (CLMP)**

**Public questions, petitions or statements:**

**District Councillor M Cooksey and Mr J Meudell representing Dorking Town Forum (as part of the discussion below).**

**Member discussion highlights:**

1. Representing the Dorking Town Forum (DTF) Margaret Cooksey highlighted the group's concerns over value for money, transparency, the safety and vitality of the town centre. She welcomed the inclusion of the third recommendation.
2. DTF had submitted FOIs to obtain information and believed more issues had arisen since the investigation was carried out at the end of last year.
3. The CLMP explained that major schemes funded by the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) often took years to complete and that not all works would have been part of the original business case.
4. The report in response to the complaint had been carried out by an independent body.
5. Officers had worked hard to secure funding and to deliver what was possible.
6. The local divisional member for Dorking Hills supported the recommendations. The complaint response had been thorough and

reflected some of the changes that she had proposed following feedback from local residents.

7. There were however still a number of outstanding issues that needed to be addressed including disabled access to the station, the hatchings on Lincoln Road, the need for an acoustic barrier and a designated crossing route for cyclists.
8. Members also agreed that signage was confusing and that the new ticket machines were not easy for the public to use.
9. Of particular concern was the projected increase in expenditure on the design element of the project.
10. The Chairman reminded members that much of the scheme was on railway land which meant the coordination of works was much more complex.
11. The divisional member for Dorking and the Holmwoods was disappointed that there would be nothing else delivered in addition to the works already set out in the report and asked that the signage be looked at as a priority.
12. He supported the involvement of the DTF and stressed that more transparency and better communication was needed in the event that stages 2 and 3 of the project were taken forward.
13. Representing DTF Mr Meudell made the following points:
  - a. There had been a conflict of interests in that the investigative body Local Partnerships (LP) was part owned by the Local Government Association.
  - b. The original programme of works had been agreed by the local committee (Mole Valley) but changes to the scheme had not be communicated to it or to Coast to Capital.
  - c. Processes had not been duly followed
  - d. As a result of the works pedestrians and cyclists were less safe.
14. The Chairman highlighted that the recommendations included the establishment of a task group as being a step in the right direction but that progress was largely reliant on being able to successfully engage with representatives of the relevant rail companies.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

1. Support the findings of the complaint investigation completed by Local Partnerships on behalf of the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership.
2. Support the recommended improvement actions, with progress on their implementation to be monitored by the Members Task Group appointed to oversee the Dorking Transport Package.
3. Propose that the Members Task Group appointed to oversee the Dorking Transport Package meet with representatives of the Dorking Town Forum, to see what, if any, further lessons can be learned.

## ITEM 2

**Declarations of interest: None**

**Officers present: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM)**

**Public questions, petitions or statements: None**

Member discussion highlights:

1. Members welcomed the change of scheduling for the works on Young Street bridge although there were some concerns about the impact they would have on bus services in the area.
2. Re. 20mph speed limit outside the City of London Freemans School the divisional member for Ashted advised that he would be speaking to the bursar about the possibility of funding from the school.
3. Members discussed further the merits of implementing 20mph speed limits given the diverse expert views on whether they actually improved road safety.
4. The issue is covered in the county council's speed limit policy which is currently under review.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to :

- (i) Note the contents of this report

### **21/18 LOCAL COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTES [AGENDA ITEM ONLY] [Item 10]**

Members of the Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed to allow co-opted substitutes for 2018/19.

### **22/18 COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING AND APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO TASK GROUPS AND EXTERNAL BODIES [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 11]**

**Declarations of interest: None**

**Officers present: Sarah J Smith – Partnership Committee Officer**

**Petitions, public questions or statements: None**

1. In addition to the proposed appointments set out in 2.8 it was agreed that district council members would be appointed as follows:
  - a. Parking task group – Cllrs Rosemary Dickson and David Hawksworth
  - b. Property task group – Cllr Paul Kennedy
  - c. Leatherhead major schemes – Cllr Paul Kennedy
2. Following on from the discussion on item 9 (agenda) the Chairman proposed the establishment of a Dorking major schemes task group and it was seconded by Mrs Clack (for Terms of Reference refer to supplementary papers).

3. The membership of this new task group was confirmed as Mr Hall, Mr Cooksey and Mrs Watson, Cllrs Malcomson and Huggins.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- (i) The committee's delegated community safety budget of £3,000 for 2018/19 be retained by the Community Partnership Team, on behalf of the Local Committee, and that the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership and/or other local organisations be invited to submit proposals for funding that meet the criteria and principles set out at paragraph 2.4 of this report.
- (ii) Authority be delegated to the Community Safety Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the local committee, to authorise the expenditure of the community safety budget in accordance with the criteria and principles stated at paragraph 2.4 of this report.
- (iii) The committee receives updates on the project(s) funded, the outcomes and the impact it has achieved.
- (iv) The committee approves the membership of the task groups and appointments to outside bodies, as detailed at paragraph 2.8 and annex 1 of this report.

### **23/18 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 12]**

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) noted the progress made and agreed to remove from the tracker those items marked 'complete'.

Meeting ended at: 4.20 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank