

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 2.00 pm on 11 March 2020
 at Council Chamber, Pippbrook, Reigate Road, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1SJ.

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.

1/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Chris Townsend.

2/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes from the previous meeting held on 22 January 2020 were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

3/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

4a/20 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

Declarations of Interest: None

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

ITEM 2

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

Five written questions were received before the deadline.

Question 1 was from Roger Troughton. Mr Troughton was present and asked the following supplementary question:

What is the best way to report issues? Is it best to report this to MVDC or SCC?

It was noted that MVDC had previously stopped sweeping footways and the perception of residents was that many of these were dangerous. It was confirmed that MVDC were to reinstate a programme of cleaning across the district. This would also include work on roundabouts but as this would require road closures, was a little more complex. This news was welcomed by members of the committee who were assured they would receive more information on this, when available.

Question 2 was from John Moyer. Mr Moyer was not present to ask a supplementary question. It was noted however that despite works being done, the flooding situation was not getting better and if anything was getting worse. It was confirmed that this location remained a high priority for flood investigation works.

Question 3 was from Stuart McLachlan. Mr McLachlan was not present but the divisional member made the following comments:

It was noted this was a real problem in the area with scramble bikes and 4x4s using the area for recreational purposes and causing many a problem. The refuse collector, Amey, had also refused collections up the lane as they had deemed the road too dangerous.

It was therefore suggested, as this was rather complex, that a site visit be arranged to include officers from the Countryside Access Team, Joint Waste Solutions, divisional Members and Parish Council reps to look at the existing problems and what could be done.

Question 4 was from Cllr Paul Kennedy. Cllr Kennedy was present and asked the following supplementary question:

Thank you for the response I asked this question as I had residents ask about why their requests were not included in the parking review that was presented to the Local Committee in January. Can we include an addendum to future parking review that shows why certain roads were not included in the review?

It was agreed that this would be useful information but it was noted that some of the requests may not have been clear and reasoning for non-inclusion could therefore be confusing. Members noted looking at the list there were several roads that had been put forward for restrictions that were un-adopted private roads and it was therefore not possible for SCC to add any restrictions on these.

Question 5 was from Danielle Armitage. Ms Armitage was not present at the meeting to ask a supplementary question.

4b/20 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were none

5/20 PETITIONS [Item 5]

There were none

**6/20 UNIVERSAL YOUTH OFFER CONSULTATION [AGENDA ITEM ONLY]
[Item 6]**

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nigel Denning, Early Help Transformation Lead, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The slides presented for this agenda item are attached as Annex B to these minutes.

Key points from the discussion:

- Members welcomed the approach of involving the Voluntary Community and Faith Sector (VCFS) but questioned who would be making the final decision over which group would be running each centre. It was confirmed in some cases there had been one main group come forward to lead on the work; supported by others. In other areas where there were several groups that had expressed interest; a competitive commissioning process would take place. The decision would likely be signed off by the Executive Director and Cabinet Member.
- It was reiterated that there was no intention to close any youth centres but to look at alternative uses for the buildings.
- The divisional member pointed out that Bookham Youth Centre was not being included in this consultation and was being treated differently and separately.

7/20 FUTURE MOLE VALLEY LOCAL PLAN - STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE IMPLICATIONS [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 7]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Jane Smith, Interim Planning Policy Manager (PPM), MVDC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

[Cllr Haque left the meeting briefly at 15.33; returning at 15.38]

The PPM introduced the report by saying the Mole Valley Local plan was about planning for new development and concerned all development that was needed. She added the plan included a predominate need for housing but her

ITEM 2

report to the Local Committee was to focus on infrastructure needs for the district.

She added she was aware there was much concern about how infrastructure would cope and the new infrastructure that was needed.

She wanted to ensure that the Local Committee was fully engaged in the process and that their views were given as part of the consultation.

Key points from the discussion:

- Members raised concern about infill development. Stating residents had lesser concerns for larger developments as they felt like the infrastructure for these was more considered. Whereas several infill developments of 2-3 properties in an area could have more of a significant impact. That perhaps hadn't been accounted for in the local plan. It was confirmed the local plan considered anticipation of larger developments as well as for smaller infill developments.
- Concerns were raised over the Strategic Highways Assessment that was mentioned in the report. Many members felt figures were inaccurate as they could all recall roads in their divisions that were frequently congested yet did not appear on the list. They queried how the analysis was done. It was confirmed the analysis had come from a team at SCC. It was suggested the officers responsible should be invited to attend a Local Committee informal meeting to run a workshop for the members about traffic modelling. The committee could then understand how the results quoted in the report had been achieved.
- Members commented that they felt highways elements of the local plan were not thought about in the correct way; almost too late. There didn't seem to be much cohesion and joined up working with neighbouring authorities with things that were going on there.
- Members also raised concern about healthcare provision, school places, drainage and transport.
- The MVDC Cabinet Member for Planning attended the meeting. She thanked the Local Committee for their comments and noted many of their concerns had been raised previously. She acknowledged that the biggest difficulties in relation to the Local Plan were difficulties with infrastructure as well as the greenbelt.
- The PPM acknowledged all the concerns made and reiterated the current plan that was out for consultation was still a draft. She added that Central Government had insisted on the housing quota and it was the responsibility of MVDC to ensure this was met.

Resolution:

The Local Committee noted the contents of the report.

8/20 CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS UPDATE TO COUNCIL [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: None

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

It was noted this item was for information only and any questions/comments would be forwarded to the Cabinet Member for a response.

Key points from the discussion:

One concern was raised about the use of plastic mixed with asphalt on road surfaces and whether the plastic used was then making its way in to the ecosystem. The AHM confirmed she would find out from the relevant team and report back.

Resolution:

The Local Committee noted the contents of the briefing.

9/20 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES 2019/20 – END OF YEAR UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION] [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

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

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Resolution:

The Local Committee noted the contents of the report.

10/20 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 10]

The Local Committee noted the contents of the decision tracker.

11/20 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 11]

The Local Committee noted the contents of the forward plan.

Meeting ended at: 4.02 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank