

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 2.00 pm on 12 December 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 Claire Malcomson
- * Cllr Vivienne Michael

* In attendance

OPEN FORUM

A note of the questions asked at the public forum is annexed to the minutes.

35/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

There were no apologies for absence.

36/18 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The chairman noted he had been advised of a correction required to the draft minutes – any reference to Bookham Residents' Association should read 'Bookhams' as a plural. With this amend, the minutes from 5 September 2018 were agreed.

37/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None declared.

a PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]
Declarations of interest: None

Officers present: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager, Duncan Knox, Road Safety and Active Travel Team Manager.

ITEM 2

The chairman noted that responses to the written questions received were published in the supplementary papers.

Question – Mrs Caroline Salmon – Safer route to school for the Weald School, A24 Beare Green

- Mrs Salmon was not in attendance.
- The divisional member for Dorking Rural noted that she had previously asked if the carriageway could be reduced to a single carriageway with a feeder lane, as has been done on the north side. This would provide a feeder lane in and out of Newdigate Road. Could this be looked at?
- The Area Highway Manager agreed this suggestion could be put forward. The number of accidents at that site is currently low compared to other sites across the county. It would likely therefore be a low priority for design work, but it may be possible to work with the county councillor and with the parish council to see if funding can be identified. The Road Safety and Active Travel Team Manager agreed this was certainly worth looking at.

Question – Mr John Favell – Leatherhead Bypass A245

- Mr Favell was not in attendance.
- Members asked for more clarification over the reference to mean speeds –if more than half of people are exceeding the speed limit, how can the response state that there is good compliance? The Road Safety and Active Travel Team Manager acknowledged there is some speeding on that road. However this road has been looked at in some depth and measured with Surrey Police, but it does not meet the criteria for the Police to prioritise, in comparison with other sites. The Chairman noted that the speed figures are variable depending on the time of day as there is heavy congestion at certain times, and therefore not a consistent pattern.

Question from Mrs Louise Buckland – Partnership working and children’s centres

- Mrs Buckland was not in attendance.

Question from Mrs Helen Sutherland – use of volunteers in children’s centres

- Mrs Sutherland was in attendance. She stated that children’s centres do use volunteers, but that this is often for the benefit of the volunteer, to build their confidence and employment skills. Volunteers cannot replace staff members. She stated that many organisations are struggling to keep and retain volunteers. While volunteers have a role, she does not agree that recruiting a volunteer workforce will deliver the services residents expect. Will the committee ask Cabinet to remove the plan to use volunteers?
- Members noted that Mole Valley has historically had proportionately higher levels of funding than other parts of the county. The county council faces dire financial issues. Members urged the public to give their views through the consultation, and to use the ‘free text’ boxes in the questionnaire to reflect their views fully.

- The divisional member for Ashted noted that there is a petition on the county council's website regarding the proposal to close Leatherhead's children's centre. Leatherhead has areas of deprivation that need to be taken into account.
- Members noted that there was no reference to a 58% cut in the budgets for Mole Valley in the consultation material, and noted it is difficult for the public to respond if they are not aware of the consequences. The funding that Mole Valley has had has been well used – Goodwyns children's centre has an outstanding Ofsted report. Members noted that the decision following the consultation rests with Cabinet and not with the local committee.
- Members agreed to discuss the family resilience proposals further, with a view to putting a formal local committee response to Cabinet in January.
- The Leader of the District Council noted that Mole Valley District Council would be providing a more detailed response to the consultations, following the motion to oppose the closures passed at their council meeting. There would be the opportunity for the local committee to determine if it endorses this response.

Question – Mrs Katherine Stranger – Cuts to children's centre budgets

- Mrs Stranger was not in attendance.

Question – Mrs Donna Harwood-Duffy – Impact on Dorking children's centre if Leatherhead closes

- Mrs Harwood-Duffy was present and asked a supplementary question. As Headteacher of Dorking Nursery Children's Centre, she would welcome the opportunity to have a discussion with the councils about family resilience. While aware that historically Mole Valley has been better funded, the impact of the cuts is important to consider. There has been a reduction in deprivation statistics, and this is linked to the children's centres' work. The main site at Dorking is bursting at the seams. The Leatherhead site is hugely valuable and already a hub – it is used by Banardos and midwives for example. If that site closes, all those partners will be looking for new venues. How can the site accommodate other agencies, such as providing a base for social workers, when it is already full?
- The chairman agreed to provide a response following the meeting.

Question - Mr Ron Billard – Give-way signs on the cycle track between Dorking and Leatherhead

- Mr Billard was not present.

Question - Mr Meudell – Dorking Sustainable Transport Project

- Mr Meudell was present. Mr Meudell indicated his concern that a meeting with the Dorking Town Forum to discuss lessons learned from the Dorking Sustainable Transport Package phase one, as agreed at the local committee's meeting in June 2018. Mr Meudell stated that the meeting had not taken place, and that the chairman of the Dorking Town Forum had messaged officers asking for a date but received no

ITEM 2

reply. The forum had valid reasons for pursuing the complaint to the LEP in the way they did, and wish to discuss the lessons learned, as well as the Access for All Network Rail programme, and the condition of Deepdene station, with members of the committee. Mr Meudell stated that the response provided was factually incorrect, and should be withdrawn. A separate meeting should be held to go through the issues.

- The Area Highway Manager agreed to take the points raised back to the Transport Policy Team, and stated that the response provided indicated a meeting was scheduled for January 2019. In response, Mr Meudell stated that the Dorking Town Forum was asked to submit a bid for Dorking Deepdene and that the January meeting is being coordinated by the town forum, with the county council being the last body to respond to the invitation. The forum were not invited to the meeting in November as a whole, just a selected number of individuals.
- Members said that the appropriate councillors and officers need to meet with the Dorking Town Forum to resolve this long-running issue. The chairman agreed to take this back to the relevant team.

Question – John M – Randalls Road, A245, pavement width.

- The resident was not present.
- Councillor Dickson stated that following discussion with officers at the district council, she is informed that the funds are being gathered from both Queen Elizabeth and Beechcroft for the work to be done on this pavement, and also on the shuttle bus for Beechcroft, to fulfil the S106 agreement.

Question – Ockley Parish Council – road safety study in Ockley

- No representative from Ockley Parish Council was present.
- The divisional member for Dorking Rural noted that the parish has done a lot of work to understand the issues in the village, as a number of parishes have done, and they want to know how best to raise this and take it forward with the county council. They have already commissioned and paid for traffic surveys. Will officers meet with the parish to discuss in more detail and agree a way forward? The parish has a strong desire to take forward, and this is a good example of localism.
- The Area Highway Manager stated that when setting a new speed limit, it has to comply with the county council's 'Setting Local Speed Limits' policy. Part of the policy involves undertaking a speed survey in collaboration with the Police. For gateways, there needs to be sufficient road width, and any underground apparatus need to be considered. To be added to the Integrated Transport Schemes list, a scheme needs to be assessed as feasible in broad terms, to be taken forward to the next step. Further assessment is needed. The Area Highway Manager agreed to discuss further with the divisional member.

Question – Councillor Elizabeth Daly – pedestrian safety in South Bookham and Bookham Youth and Community Centre

- Councillor Daly was not present at the meeting. Councillor Kennedy asked supplementary questions on behalf of councillor Daly: is there any scope for obtaining funding from the expansion of the Howard of Effingham school and associated new housing development?
- The Area Highway Manager agreed to look into this, and into potential CIL, but felt it was perhaps unlikely.
- Councillor Kennedy also stated on Councillor Daly's behalf, that the response on Bookham Youth and Community Centre is disappointing for Bookham and Fetcham families considering that the impending closure of the centre has been known for some time and 617 people have signed a petition on the Surrey County Council website requesting a permanent centre. When will the Council be in a position to give a definitive answer on the future of the centre?
- The divisional member for Bookham and Fetcham West responded that she had been very actively involved in the plans evaluating the future of this site, which also involves discussions with Planning Officers at the district council. There is no definitive date at this point, but she hopes that it will be sooner rather than later. The Chairman noted that various voluntary organisations who use the centre have been involved in discussions with the county council's Property Team about what facilities are needed. Once there is a plan in place, then it will need to go through the planning process.

Tabled question – Caroline Salmon – Average speed cameras A24

- The Chairman noted that a public question and response had been tabled at the meeting, owing to a misunderstanding with officers. The response had been provided to the resident.

b MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers present: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager, Duncan Knox, Road Safety and Active Travel Team Manager.

Written questions and responses are published in the supplementary papers for the meeting.

Councillor Kennedy - verbal question – Ash Dieback

- Councillor Kennedy asked a question informally at the meeting - what action is the county council taking to protect users of Mole Valley's highways from accidents as a result of falling trees/branches affected by Ash Dieback?
- The Area Highway Manager provided a response on behalf of the Highways Arboriculture Team. It stated that this is an issue the team are very much aware of, and arboriculture specialists inspect all trees on main roads every three years, and on minor roads every five years. Wherever a tree is found that presents a significant risk of harm to road users, arrangements are made for the tree to be removed. If it is on private land, then they inform the landowner who then needs to take responsibility for the tree. In some higher risk locations, trees have been proactively removed, such as high speed dual carriageways. From January 2019, trees will be inspected as part of

the annual cycle of highway safety inspections. This is a new initiative, and one that is hoped to help identify trees that have deteriorated rapidly in between inspections from specialists. Residents are encouraged to report large trees that are clearly dead, diseased or dying, where they are close to a road. For a number of reasons, such as the extent of underground utility pipes and cables, it is not always possible to replace a tree that has to be cut down.

Question – Mr Tim Hall – drainage

- Mr Hall noted that he will undertake a site visit with local highways officers, because there remains a blockage.

Question – Councillor Claire Malcomson – Children's Centres

- Councillor Malcomson expressed disappointment with the response. She asked the council to take back these proposed cuts and make the brave decision to support parents and carers. She hopes that this committee can make the case to Cabinet. Officers do not appear to be listening to the experts, who are the staff running the centres. The questionnaire is confusing, and it feels that the decision has already been made.
- Members noted that the proposals are supposed to be helping improve family resilience, given that Surrey's children's services are being overseen by the commissioner having been judged inadequate. However there are elements of outstanding practice, such as children's centres. Members urged residents to have their say through the consultation.

Question – Councillor Rosemary Dickson – flooding on Leatherhead Road Ashtead

- Councillor Dickson asked when the investigation will be done as this flood can be very deep and causes congestion.
- The divisional member for Ashtead noted that as the county councillor he had been dealing with this issue for some time. He had recently been in touch with the headteacher and an inspection of the soakaway undertaken. This revealed a possible blockage going through to the soakaway. Funding needed to be found to resolve.
- Members asked that this be treated as a priority, as the 2019/20 drainage programme was too far away.

Question – Mrs Hazel Watson – Pippbrook Mill Path

- Mrs Watson was disappointed that residents had been promised this footpath would be added to the Definitive Rights of Way Map but there now seemed to be backtracking. There should be an agreement between both the district and county councils with a clause that the district council should pay the costs if the weir collapsed or needed repair. This is a really important local footpath. There is nothing to stop the district council selling the footpath and the public possibly losing access to the path. Will officers agree to take this suggestion back to both councils?
- The Area Highway Manager noted that the response has been provided by the Countryside Access Team. The situation had developed since the original request, and there cannot be additional pressure put onto the county council's budgets. The Area Highway

Manager agreed to take this back to the Countryside Access Team and look at it again.

- The Leader of the district council noted that advice given to her at the time of the proposed sale showed the path would remain open to the public, despite any proposed change in ownership.

Question – Mrs Hazel Watson – A24 London Road resurfacing

- Mrs Watson expressed disappointment that the section of road is not being resurfaced. It is in a very poor state of repair, and desperately needs resurfacing. Can officers repair the very bad trench on southbound carriageway just north of the railway bridge?
- The Area Highway Manager responded that several roads were put forward for the severe weather programme by each councillor, but only the top priority road was able to go forward for each member. The list of prioritised roads is available on the county council's website. London Road is not on this list at this point. The road can be put forward again would still have to be prioritised against other roads across the county. The local highway officer will inspect the trench problem.

Question – Mr Tim Hall – Children's Centres

- Mr Hall noted the response.
- Members urged the public to read the Family Resilience Strategy that is online with the consultation documents.

Question – Mr Stephen Cooksey – Dorking Transport Study

- Mr Cooksey asked if the local committee would have the opportunity to comment on, and approve/reject the study? The study makes a number of recommendations, and it is important to be clear who will take the decision on what gets taken forwards.
- The Area Highway Manager responded that she understood the report will be presented for information. She agreed to feed back to the relevant project team. The study proposes potential schemes to be put forward onto the local transport strategy.

Question – Councillor Paul Kennedy – flooding in Fetcham and Surrey library strategy

- Councillor Kennedy noted there had been three flooding episodes in the past few weeks. Thames Water had attended recently and found that the sewer pipes were totally blocked. Residents feel there is a lack of street cleaning. Prevention is better than a cure.
- With regards to libraries, the proposals out for consultation say that 18 of the libraries account for 65% of the services provided. Is it possible at this stage to rule out closure of libraries? The chairman responded that it is not possible to rule out anything at this stage.

39/18 PETITIONS [Item 5]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers present: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

The petition response and report was published with the supplementary papers.

ITEM 2

One petition had been received, from Mrs Susan Leveritt, with regards to Leatherhead High Street. The petition was sponsored by the Leatherhead Residents Association and the Leatherhead & District Chamber of Commerce. It is a request for the return of free parking to Leatherhead High Street at 3.30pm, with the Pedestrian Zone finishing an hour earlier than the current end time of 4.30pm.

This petition follows on from the discussion the local committee had in September 2018 when Mrs Leveritt also presented a similar petition on this matter. At that meeting, members asked officers to reconsider their response, and so officers have provided an update report to the local committee as Item 13.

To facilitate the discussion, the chairman decided to consider the petition and the report at Item 13, together. The minutes for the petition are therefore contained within Item 13.

40/18 UPDATE ON PETITION RECEIVED 05 SEPTEMBER 2018 FOR "REQUEST THAT LEATHERHEAD HIGH STREET BE OPEN FROM 3.30PM FOR PARKING AND ACCESS, 4.30PM ON MARKET DAYS, FOR AN EXPERIMENTAL PERIOD OF SIX MONTHS, TO ENCOURAGE AN INCREASE IN FOOTFALL' (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 13]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers present: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

The report was published with the supplementary papers. It was accompanied by a petition and response. To facilitate the discussion, the petition and Item 13 were heard together, after Item 4b and with Item 5.

A petition had been received from Mrs Susan Leveritt, with regards to Leatherhead High Street. The petition was sponsored by the Leatherhead Residents Association and the Leatherhead & District Chamber of Commerce. It is a request for the return of free parking to Leatherhead High Street at 3.30pm, with the Pedestrian Zone finishing an hour earlier than the current end time of 4.30pm. This petition follows on from the discussion the local committee had in September 2018 when Mrs Leveritt also presented a petition on this matter. At that meeting, members asked for officers to reconsider their response, and so officers have provided this update report to the local committee.

Mrs Leveritt spoke on the petition and her statement included the following points:

- High streets in neighbouring communities have some free parking between 8am and 6pm. Leatherhead has none.
- The first petition since losing parking, was brought in 2013, by 56 town centre traders, 13 of whom have since gone. There are now five sites vacant. In 2015 traders asked for a parking trial but consultation

results were 50-50 so the proposal was dropped. Over 1000 people have now signed this users petition presented at this meeting.

- Safety review and feasibility study – this should have started in September after the first petition was heard. This seems onerous as what the petition is asking for is already permitted every Sunday and evening. The crash map website indicates only one accident on the high street in the last five years; at midnight between cars and not involving pedestrians.
- The petition is only asking for access for 2 hours and 15 mins in the late afternoon at a time when there are fewer pedestrians in the High Street. The timing should help to capture families after the school run and could save some of the banks. Traders need more footfall.
- Both Surrey Highways and Mole Valley District Council in published strategies commit to supporting business prosperity. Will the committee please remember this today. All other considerations seem more important than business needs.
- The closure of Eden Flowers, and news that Martyns, including the Post Office, will close in 2019 - how many more have to close until the traders get the return of free parking?

Mr John Howarth, on behalf of Leatherhead and District Chamber of Commerce also spoke on the petition, and his statement included the following points:

- There is reference in the report at 2.6 (p36) to a feasibility study. However the 6 month trial proposed in the first petition was effectively proposing a feasibility study in situ. Has an opportunity been missed in this respect?
- There are five vacant units with more closures on the way. Does the committee agree there is a need for urgency? Does the committee agree that these studies need to be completed ASAP? The committee should insist on completion dates for these studies.
- There is a risk that retailers have looked at Leatherhead, enticed by the promises of Transform Leatherhead, seen the vacant units, and left. Is this not potentially damaging to the Transform Leatherhead vision?
- Given this risk, does the committee agree this must be dealt with as a matter of urgency?

Councillor Simon Edge, Cabinet Member for Prosperity at Mole Valley District Council spoke in response and his statement included the following points:

- The petition is not as straightforward an issue as it appears. Many high streets are facing challenges. A lot of the challenges are beyond the control of a local authority. The district council is doing a huge amount of work to help where it can. This includes the Economic Prosperity Strategy, and the Transform Leatherhead regeneration programme. Work has already been completed on Church Street, and some works have been completed on the Swan Centre. A refurbishment of the Swan Centre itself is also planned. The district council has also invested in high street property itself.
- The district council are also working with the county council on strategic transport studies, a significant review of traffic flows, and an

economic viability study of Leatherhead. Some of the initiatives will be quick, some will take time.

- There have been events in the town centre to boost footfall, and free parking in the lead up to Christmas.
- Work on signage and the waterless feature has also been commissioned, as noted in the recommendations. The district council has also instituted a business reference group to connect better with the business community.
- Having additional high street parking may be a viable option, and may be one that Transform Leatherhead can support once the studies have been done. However there could be better solutions – such as opening the road one way, or full pedestrianisation. Some people have equally contacted the council to say they do not want more cars on the high street.
- National research indicates that retailers can overestimate the impact of nearby parking on their footfall.
- It is important to wait until the studies have provided evidence, before taking action on what is likely to be a complex, and multi-faceted issue.
- As at September 2018, Leatherhead had a vacant retail space of 4.2% compared to the south east average of 3.8%. In Horsham, the figure is 3.4% and in Dorking it is 5.2%. This suggests that Leatherhead is not doing as badly as the petitioners suggest.
- County officers concur with these views, and that there are considerations that would need to be worked through, with expected cost of £30,000 to do as the petitioners request, for which there is no budget.
- With regards to Martyns and the Post Office, officers are working to look at this.

Member discussion – key points:

- Members noted this is a difficult issue to balance. It is demoralising to see the empty shops. It takes time to do anything because of the legal requirements that councils have to follow.
- Could free parking be provided in the Swan Centre instead? It was noted that the cost of this would be about £18,000 for a three month trial, and could also lead to calls for the same from the other towns in the district.
- Has the free parking on Saturdays made a difference to businesses? Could the district's own car parks become free from 3pm? Members noted that the free parking has made a big difference.
- Members asked if a shorter trial could be held to reduce the cost? Members noted the need to listen to officer advice because there are statutory requirements around implementing Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) even on a short-term basis.
- Introducing free parking in Mole Valley car parks would carry a significant cost implication. The district council made changes to its car park charges last year and at this point looked carefully at different models, including free parking at certain times of the day. A full parking review and strategy is underway. Traffic modelling is due to report in February 2019, so by the time a trial was able to start, the

results of the traffic modelling should be known. . The high street viability study is due to report in June/July.

- Why was the opportunity missed not to do the feasibility study earlier? High streets are dying and traders having to close. The council should be helping, and putting them first. Parking right outside is much more convenient for shoppers.
- The chairman acknowledged the need for urgency, and the feeling of neglect from the town. There is a feeling of decline. The studies need to be sped up if possible. The improvements to the Swan Centre car park need to be promoted. The problem of increasing parking in the Swan Centre is that customers would just use Sainsburys and leave.
- Given that the county council is looking for a new Headquarters, could Leatherhead be considered, as this would give a boost to local traders. It was noted a number of options in Mole Valley were being looked at.

The Area Highway Manager made the following points in response:

- There will be a full parking review across Mole Valley next financial year. But there are things that officers are proposing to do before that, in consultation with the district council and the Transform Leatherhead team, as set out in the recommendations.
- In terms of timing, a TRO has to follow a statutory process, including an assessment of safety. A statutory consultation period is also required, during which time people can raise objections. It is a long and expensive process. At present, there is no funding to start this process. However, the proposal remains on the table, but needs to be fed into the Transform Leatherhead programme. Officers cannot justify trying to find that level of funding only to find out a few months down the line, that it was not the right solution.
- Parking in the Swan Centre is the responsibility of the district council, and therefore not within the remit of the local committee.
- Since September, officers have been looking at the TRO processes, and commissioning the safety review, which will be undertaken in January. This will feed into the wider economic review and transport review.

Resolution:

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

(i) Note the joint statement from Surrey County Council (SCC) Local Committee Chairman Mr Tim Hall and Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) Cabinet Member for Prosperity Councillor Simon Edge, as an update on the Petition (Annex 1). In particular to note the actions going forward.

(ii) Note that a safety review, which considers all High Street users, to assess the risk of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, particularly for children, is to be carried out by SCC and is scheduled to be completed by March 2019.

(iii) Note that SCC has commissioned a repair of the walling to the ramps at the foot of the High Street, to improve the visual impact of this feature. This will be the removal of the damaged tiles and replacing this tiling with new rendering. This will be funded 50:50 by SCC and MVDC, with MVDC applying

ITEM 2

public realm planning contributions, and is scheduled to be carried out in February 2019, subject to normal construction delays, weather conditions and reducing inconvenience to traders and High Street users. The timing of the works was the result of consultation with the market operator, Leatherhead and District Chamber of Commerce.

(iv) Note that a further petition about Leatherhead High Street has been submitted to the 12 December 2018 Local Committee (Mole Valley) for consideration.

(v) Agree that, following a review of the signs in Leatherhead, that SCC and MVDC will work together to put forward proposals for a new car park signing scheme, and existing direction signs in the town centre. Also, that MVDC and SCC will review existing Leatherhead gateway signs, identify approaches where no existing signs are, and to agree appropriate type, location and wording for any possible new signs. The Task Group and Committee will be updated following discussions between MVDC and SCC regarding the detailed proposals, funding streams and timings.

Reasons for Decision

To propose measures to work with representatives of the Leatherhead Residents' Association and the Leatherhead and District Chamber of Commerce, in advance and alongside the Transform Leatherhead project.

41/18 A25 GUILDFORD ROAD, WOTTON - SPEED LIMIT ASSESSMENT [Item 6]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers present: Duncan Knox, Road Safety & Active Travel Team Manager

The Road Safety and Active Travel Team Manager introduced the report. He noted there was a history of collisions in this area that officers wish to address. The proposals have the support of Surrey Police, and are in line with the county council's Setting Local Speed Limits policy.

Member discussion – key points:

- The divisional member for Dorking Hills welcomed the proposal to help make the road safer. Some of the junctions have poor sight lines, and it will be more consistent with the speed limits either side. She would also like to see the speed limit on Abinger Lane through Abinger Common reduced. It is currently national speed limit but goes through a small village and urgently needs a reduced speed limit.

Resolution:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED to:

(i) Note the results of the speed limit assessment undertaken;

(ii) Agree that, based upon the evidence, the speed limit be reduced from 50mph to 40mph in the section of Guildford Road between the existing 40mph speed limit terminal signs at a point 34m west from the centreline with Wotton

Drive and a point 50m east of the centreline with Raikes Lane, in accordance with the current policy;

(iii) Authorise the advertisement of a notice in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to implement the proposed speed limit change, revoke any existing traffic orders necessary to implement the change, and, subject to no objections being upheld, that the order be made;

(iv) Authorise delegation of authority to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and the local divisional member to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposal.

Reasons for decision

A reduced speed limit would reduce traffic speeds and reduced risk and severity of collisions on this road where there has been a history of collisions including death and serious injury.

42/18 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 7]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers present: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Member discussion – key points:

- Members asked for clarification on the timing for Fetcham Village Infant School and Oakfield Junior School, Fetcham, where developer funding has been allocated to complete the design and carry out safety audits for the traffic calming scheme to support a permanent 20mph speed limit outside Fetcham Village Infant School and Oakfield Junior Schools. The Area Highway Manager confirmed it was scheduled for design next year, and would then be programmed for construction.

Resolution:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED to note the contents of this report.

Reasons for recommendations:

Programmes of work have been agreed in consultation with the Committee, and the Committee is asked to note the progress of the Integrated Transport Scheme programme and revenue maintenance expenditure. As well as work that is being carried out on the large scale, centrally funded maintenance and improvement schemes.

43/18 HIGHWAYS FORWARD PROGRAMME [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 8]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers present: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Resolution:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED to:

General

(i) Note that the Local Committee's devolved highways budget for capital works in 2019/20, and approved by full Council on 13 November 2018, is £181,818. It has been assumed that the Local Committee's devolved highways budget for capital works as set out within the 2018-21 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) for 2020-21 and will therefore be £36,363. The budget for 2019/20 approved by full Council on 13 November 2018 has removed the Local Committee's revenue budget. However each divisional Member will receive £7,500 to address highways issues in their division.

(ii) Agree that the devolved capital budget for highway works be used to progress both capital improvement schemes and capital maintenance schemes.

(iii) Note that should there be any changes to the programme of highway works as set out in this report, a report will be taken to a future meeting of Mole Valley Local Committee to inform members of the changes. Capital Improvement Schemes (ITS)

(iv) Agree that the capital improvement schemes allocation for Mole Valley be used to progress the Integrated Transport Schemes programme set out in Annex 1;

(v) 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 1, if required;

(vi) Agree that the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Area Team Manager, together with the local divisional Member are able to progress any scheme from the Integrated Transport Schemes programme, including consultation and statutory advertisement that may be required under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, for completion of those schemes. Where it is agreed that a scheme will not be progressed, this will be reported back to the next formal meeting of the Local Committee for approval.

Capital Maintenance Schemes (LSR)

(vii) Agree that the capital maintenance schemes allocation for Mole Valley (£96,000) 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

(viii) Note that the budget for 2019/20 approved by full Council on 13 November 2018 has removed the Local Committee's revenue budget.

(ix) Note that members will continue to receive a Member Local Highways Fund allocation of £7,500 per county member to address highway issues in their division.

(x) Agree that the Member Local Highways Fund be managed by the Area Maintenance Engineer on behalf of members.

Reasons for decision

To agree a forward programme of highways works in Mole Valley for 2019/20 – 2020/21, funded from the Local Committee's devolved budget.

44/18 SCHOOL TRAVEL PLANS - ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT [SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN] [Item 9]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers present: Duncan Knox, Road Safety & Active Travel Team Manager

Councillor Michael left the meeting during this item.

Member discussion – key points:

- It is striking that few of the Independent schools have anything to show. Is that because there is less funding for them for this? Is Howard of Effingham not on the list because it falls within Guildford? St Theresa's is on the list. The chairman noted its boundary falls partly in Mole Valley and partly in Guildford. The Road Safety and Active Travel Team Manager responded that he does not know why the independent schools are not doing so much. This is possibly because the county council focuses more on its own schools. However the county council would be happy to assist them.
- The divisional member for Ashted was surprised that Greville Primary School is listed, as their Headteacher has told him they do have an up to date travel plan. They have spoken of difficulties with the IT system used to fill it in. The Road Safety and Active Travel Team Manager responded that it is a national website. The table included with the report shows its status at the last academic year. He will confirm that Greville has updated theirs. The benefit of the online system is that officers can monitor it and get updates on what action is being undertaken.
- Is road safety education charged for? We need to encourage all schools to give road safety education. The Road Safety and Active Travel Team Manager responded that the council does charge for cycle training. The service is self-funding through grants and fees, and trains 18,000 young people each year through 4 officers and 50 bank cycling staff. The fees are charged to the schools. Many of the schools pass at least some of the costs on to the parents. Officers hope to introduce pedestrian training to schools in the coming year, for children from around eight years old.
- Members asked to be kept up to date with that initiative so they can work with schools locally to encourage them to take this up.

Resolution:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED to note:

ITEM 2

(i) The county council's Safer Travel Team will continue to encourage and support all Surrey's expansion schools to complete and maintain their School Travel Plan using the online Modeshift STARS system.

(ii) From 2018/19, the Safer Travel Team will also encourage all Surrey's schools to create a School Travel Plan using the online Modeshift STARS accreditation system. This will involve promotion and the offer of training and support to all schools

(iii) Members are invited to assist by encouraging schools to sign up to Modeshift STARS, and to take up the activities offered by the Safer Travel and Cycle Training Teams to improve road safety and encourage sustainable travel.

Reasons for recommendations:

Successful implementation of School Travel Plans will lead to improvements in road safety and more sustainable travel on school journeys. This will reduce congestion, improve air quality, and active travel will improve the health of children.

45/18 COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION] [Item 10]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers present: Vicki Eade, Partnership Lead (East)

Member discussion – key points:

- The chairman noted that they were going to look to try and do the project across the north of the district.

Resolution:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) AGREED to note the contents of this report

Reasons for recommendations:

To ensure the local committee are aware of the allocation of community safety funding for Mole Valley projects during 2018/19.

46/18 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 11]

The local committee noted the recommendations tracker, and asked for the final data on Member Community Allocation spend.

47/18 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 12]

Members noted the forward plan.

Meeting ended at: 4.42pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank