

Minutes of the meeting of the
Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 2.00 pm on 12 June 2019
 at Council Chamber, Pippbrook, Reigate Road, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1SJ.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

Surrey County Council Members:

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

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Nancy Goodacre
- * Cllr Rosemary Dickson
- * Cllr Raj Haque
- * Cllr Mary Huggins
- Cllr David Hawksworth
- * Cllr Claire Malcomson

* In attendance

OPEN FORUM SESSION

The questions and responses from the open forum session are attached as Annex A to these minutes.

**11/19 APPOINTMENT OF DISTRICT COUNCIL SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS
 [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 1]**

Resolution:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed:

To co-opt the substitutes for District Council members for the municipal year 2019/20 as listed in the agenda.

Reason for decision:

The above decision was made in accordance with Standing Order 40(f) that requires the Committee, at its first meeting in the municipal year, to agree whether it wishes District Council members to be permitted to have substitutes.

12/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 2]

ITEM 2

Apologies were received from Mr Chris Townsend and Cllr Hawskworth who was substituted by Cllr Harper.

13/19 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 3]

The minutes of the meeting on 13 March 2019 were agreed as a true record and signed by the chairman.

14/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were none

a PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5a] Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM), SCC

Petitions, Public Statements, Questions: The questions and officer responses were provided within the supplementary agenda.

[2.46pm Cllr Harper arrived]

Question 1 was raised by Mr David Allbeury who attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary question:

1. The answer provided is not totally satisfactory as doesn't cover the issue of sightlines. I would suggest the use of a mobile lane closure vehicle to offer protection to the work force whilst clearing the sightline. The work could be done in short time and offers an option with limited resource.

The Area Highways Manager confirmed that the mobile lane closure vehicle was not appropriate on the type of road in question. She added that if there were concerns over the vegetation growth then the Revenue Maintenance Gang would usually carry out site inspections and undertake any 'ad-hoc' work that was needed when there were concerns over safety. However, as the divisional member hadn't contributed money to fund the Revenue Maintenance Gang for 2019/20 there was only a limited resource to complete this work.

Question 2 was raised by Cllr Caroline Salmon who attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary question:

1. The response was not what I expected. I was looking for long term solutions to the subway problems and would dispute the fact the subway doesn't need anything doing to it. My question is therefore how much paint has to have fallen off and how stained do the walls need to be before it is considered bad enough to go on the programme of repairs and how long before this work will be prioritised?

The AHM advised that the Engineers focus on the structural appearance of the subways and not the aesthetical appearance. In previous years community groups had helped to clean up the subway. The resurfacing of the path would be treated the same as any other footpath and prioritised in the same way by the same criteria.

The divisional member added she had been speaking with youth club leaders in Beare Green about the issue to see if they could take on some of the work of redecorating the subway.

Question 3 was raised by Mrs Jenny Whiting who attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary questions:

1. In relation to a) the map provided to show where the Mount Road starts and Arundel Road ends does not appear to be accurate. Has this map been checked by the land registry?

The AHM confirmed that there was difference between land ownership and highways rights and the map showed the public highway. Land registry had nothing to do with it.

2. In relation to question c) I am concerned whether any consideration has been given to Mount Street being in a conservation area.

The AHM stated that it might affect planning consents which are done through MVDC and it would therefore be best to consult with the team at the district council.

Question 4 was raised by Mr John Moyer who was not in attendance at the meeting but members raised the following points in his absence:

With regards to a) the chairman stated that the answer provided was fine although the question did ask about the dealings with Thames Water, what was next with them and how did this move forwards?

The AHM confirmed that highways were in correspondence with Thames Water and site visits would be made to Cleeve Road for investigation.

With regards to b) the information on Hawks Hill was missing from the response. Officers would relook at this and ensure it was included and answered.

Question 5 was raised by Mr Roger Troughton who attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary question:

Thank you for your response; in your reply you said "The height of the existing subway under the A24 just north of Westhumble Street is lower than that required under the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges." However, you did not mention the height of the subway or the figure in the manual. I went down and measured the height of this subway at both entrances and the middle and found it to be fractionally over 7ft6in (approx 2.29m).

I then went looking for a height figure in the manual and discovered Table 2.5.2 Dimensions for Underbridges which quotes the "Absolute Minimum Cycle Track Headroom" as 2.2m (regardless of subway length).

I found this in Interim Advice Note 195/16 Cycle Traffic and the Strategic Road Network (Oct 2016), which "supplements and amends the cycling specific information provided in a number of documents" including TD 36/93: Subways for Pedestrians and Pedal Cyclists Layout and Dimensions (part of

ITEM 2

Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) which may be the document you had been referring to.

In my original question, I did include a photograph of a segregated subway below the A3 at Malden Way which has a height warning of 6ft6in, some 12 inches lower than the height of the subway at Westhumble. Obviously this situation is acceptable to Transport for London.

I would urge Surrey Highways to review the published guidelines and reconsider their decision, particularly if they are serious about encouraging cyclists to use this route in preference to the road.

The AHM thanked Mr Troughton for his question and advised that the information he had gathered shouldn't be used in isolation and other factors needed to be considered. It was appreciated that cyclists were encouraged to use the route for safety reasons and although it was noted there was a difference between an experienced cyclist and a Bikeability Level 2 cyclist (10-11 year old), all cyclists must be asked to dismount on approach to the subway. It was noted that different local authorities had different policies.

Question 6 was raised by Cllr Paul Kennedy who attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary question:

When can I expect an answer to my question?

The Chairman advised that the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care was looking in to the matter and awaiting an answer from the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

Members suggested the question be raised at the next meeting of the SCC Adults and Health Select Committee on 13 June 2019 or at the next meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board on 5 September 2019. The Chairman agreed to put in a question on behalf of the committee to the Health and Wellbeing Board to obtain an answer.

b MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 5b]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: The questions and officer responses were provided within the supplementary agenda.

Question 1 was raised by Cllr Claire Malcomson, who asked the following supplementary question:

Can we come to some compromise over the verge cutting as when Mole Valley District Council were in charge of the mowing they did attempt to do the edges. When can we discuss the preservation of orchids?

The AHM stated that when orchid areas were known these were protected. The county Ecologist has been working with teams to look at alternative ways for work to be done.

Question 2 was raised by Cllr Nancy Goodacre, who asked the following supplementary questions:

1. Are there definite dates in the diary for the summer consultation meetings with user groups and local stakeholders? Which user groups and local stakeholders will be invited to these meetings?
2. *Likely to be complete in Autumn 2019* is very vague. Could you provide a definite target date for planned completion of the detailed plans? Perhaps Thursday 31st October?
3. Please clarify what '*detailed planning for the site*' will include. Would this, for example, include:
 - o detailed plans for the new building, including floor plans
 - o a date for when the current building will be demolished
 - o when completion of the new building is expected
4. Who will run the new community building? Are there any plans to transfer it to the Community under a Community Asset Transfer? If it remains with SCC what sort of rents will be charged given it is currently a Peppercorn rent & youth-work based.

These questions would be put to the officer who provided the original response for answering.

16/19 PETITIONS [Item 6]

One petition was received before the deadline.

17/19 PETITION TO: MAKE IT SAFER FOR OUR CHILDREN TO CROSS THE GUILDFORD ROAD IN BOOKHAM BETWEEN GROVESIDE AND HAWKWOOD RISE [Item 6a]

This petition was deferred until the next meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee on 4 September 2019.

18/19 PRESENTATION FROM SURREY WILDLIFE TRUST [AGENDA ITEM ONLY] [Item 7]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zoe Channon, Liaison Officer, Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT)

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: The PowerPoint presentation provided by the Liaison Officer is included as Annex B to these minutes.

Key points from the discussion:

- A question was asked about the use of glyphosate and whether anything could be changed so as to not use it. The Liaison Officer explained the herbicide was usually spot sprayed on to specific plants rather than

ITEM 2

blanket sprayed. SWT were limited on what they could do onsite.

- Members raised concerns about fly-tipping on Norbury Park and whether this had been reported to MVDC via the website. It was confirmed that it had been reported and although the amount that was being fly-tipped was steady, it was low.
- A question was asked in relation to tree felling and whether the trees would be replaced. It was noted that the SWT needed to wait 5 years to see what species naturally grew. If the regeneration rate wasn't as required then it was likely that new trees would be planted.
- Concerns were raised over the potential income that may have been generated from the selling off of woodchip to the power station. It was confirmed that the SWT barely broke even on this. Members suggested the SWT may need to illustrate this to residents to change the perception.

The Liaison Officer finished by issuing an apology on behalf of the SWT for the handling of the glamping site application at Phoenix Fields. She admitted that they hadn't got it right and didn't think properly about the access. She confirmed that SWT were also no longer involved in the application.

19/19 APPOINTMENTS TO LOCAL COMMITTEE TASK GROUPS AND EXTERNAL BODIES 2019/20 [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Jess Edmundson, Partnership Committee Officer, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Resolution:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed:

- i. The terms of reference for the Property Task Group and the membership of this task group as set out in Annex 1 with the addition of Mr Stephen Cooksey, Cllr Mary Huggins and Mr Tim Hall.
- ii. The terms of reference for the Parking Task Group and the membership of this task group as set out in Annex 1 with the addition of Cllr Raj Haque.
- iii. The terms of reference for the Leatherhead Major Schemes Task Group and the membership of this task group as set out in Annex 1 with the addition of Mrs Helyn Clack and Mr Tim Hall.
- iv. The terms of reference for the Dorking Major Schemes Task Group and the membership of this task group as set out in Annex 1 with the addition of Mr Stephen Cooksey, Cllr Mary Huggins and Cllr Claire

Malcomson.

- v. The nominations to outside bodies (Community Safety Partnership) as set out in Annex 1 (Mr Tim Hall).

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) noted:

- vi. That the representatives nominated by the committee in June 2018 (Chris Townsend and Mary Huggins) would remain as the local committee representatives on the Early Help Advisory Board pending review of this board (Paragraphs 2.11 – 2.12 of this report).

Reason for decisions:

The above decisions were made in order to update the list of representatives to task groups and nominations to outside bodies for the 2019/20 municipal year.

20/19 LOCAL COMMITTEE COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: None

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Key points from the discussion:

- The Chairman urged members to look for possible recipients of the funding. Adding that the money was ideal for pump priming any new projects.

Resolution:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed that:

- i. The committee's delegated community safety budget of £3,000 for 2019/20 be retained by the Community Safety Team, on behalf of the local committee, and that the Community Safety Partnership and/or other local organisations be invited to submit proposals for funding that meet the criteria and principles set out at section 3 of this report.
- ii. Authority be delegated to the Community Safety Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the local committee and divisional members as appropriate, to authorise the expenditure of the community safety budget in accordance with the criteria and principles stated in section 3 of this report.
- iii. The committee receives updates on the project(s) that are funded, the outcomes and the impact it has achieved.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) noted:

ITEM 2

- iv. The update from the North Leatherhead Street Talk Project regarding the use of the funds in 2018-19.

Reason for decisions:

The above decisions were made to set out a process for allocating the committee's delegated community safety budget of £3,000 to local organisations.

21/19 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION] [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Key points from the discussion:

- A question was asked in relation to the first scheme in annex 1; St Pauls Road West/ Horsham Road safety measures. It was noted by the divisional member that the scheme did not work and needed to be looked at again. The AHM explained that there was unusual driver behaviour being exhibited, in which vehicles were driving through and behind the crossing in order to park on the footpath. Work was to continue with partners to tackle the problem and officers from the Joint Enforcement Team (JET) would be involved.
- Concerns were raised over the continuous flooding problem outside Downsends School, Ashted and it was questioned whether this had any connection to the cycle path. It was confirmed there was no connection and that the drainage issue was complex. The soakaways and gullies had previously been checked and cleared and work would be starting from 17 June 2019 to fully investigate the issues.

Resolution:

The Mole Valley Local Committee noted the contents of the report.

22/19 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Jess Edmundson, Partnership Committee Officer, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Resolution:

The Mole Valley Local Committee noted the decision tracker.

23/19 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Jess Edmundson, Partnership Committee Officer, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Resolution:

The Mole Valley Local Committee noted the forward plan.

Meeting ended at: 3.57 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank