

Minutes of the meeting of the
Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 2.00 pm on 24 February 2021
 at Virtual.

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

Surrey County Council Members:

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

Borough / District Members:

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

* In attendance

1/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Nancy Goodacre. Cllr Paul Kennedy attended as her substitute.

2/21 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

Minutes of the previous meeting on 9 December 2020 were agreed as a true record.

3/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Mrs Hazel Watson declared a personal interest in item 4b as she was a Governor at The Ashcombe School.

4/21 PETITIONS [Item 5]

One petition was received before the deadline. The full wording of this and the officer response were available to view in the supplementary agenda.

5/21 PETITION TO: INTRODUCE TWO BOX JUNCTIONS IN DORKING [Item 5a]

Declarations of Interest: None

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

Petitions, Public Statements, Questions: Charlotte Whitaker from Dorking Town Partnership attended the meeting to present the petition to the Local Committee. She stated she didn't understand why the installation of box junctions would make congestion worse, when their purpose was to improve congestion. She asked if SCC could reconsider their response and look at the junctions again.

Key points from discussion:

- Members acknowledged that something needed to be done about the congestion in Dorking. Although members were unsure if box junctions were the answer to the problem.
- It was noted that the proposals for box junctions were almost universally opposed by residents of the villages to the west of Dorking. And the installation of these boxes would further divide the villages from the town.
- Some members suggested that there could be a trial of the box junctions to see what effect this had. Although it was argued by other members that if the Officer advice was against the installation of the boxes, as they would serve no purpose, then members should follow Officer advice and not try to pursue the installation.
- The AHM noted that a comprehensive transport study had been completed for Dorking and most roads in and around Dorking were already over capacity throughout most of the day. She added that the installation of box junctions had been looked at on many occasions for Dorking and she would not advocate a trial, as it would be unlikely to pass the safety audit.
- Although the box junctions were not thought to be the way forward, the AHM added further work would continue with local businesses to find a solution for Dorking.
- There was a divide in opinion from the committee regarding the way forward.

Resolution:

The committee voted on the recommendation and with a vote of 5 for the recommendation, 4 against and 3 abstentions, the Mole Valley Local Committee agreed to note:

1. That the installation of a yellow box at this junction will not be effective at reducing congestion on Vincent Lane or the A25 Westcott Road and will likely lead to further congestion.
2. There are no plans to install KEEP CLEAR markings on South Street, which could lead additional queuing/congestion on South Street.

Reason for decisions:

The above decisions were made as the local committee agreed, on officer recommendation, that the installation of a yellow box junction or KEEP CLEAR markings were not viable solutions to the issue at hand.

6/21a PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM), SCC, Katie Stewart, Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure (ETI), SCC and Carolyn McKenzie, Director for Environment, SCC

Petitions, Public Statements, Questions: Seven written public questions were received before the deadline. The full wording of the questions and officer responses were included within the supplementary agenda.

Key points from discussion:

Question 2 was submitted by Julia Dickinson who attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary question;

In the officer response, it was noted further information is awaited from Coast 2 Capital. Can the response therefore be updated when this further information has been provided?

It was agreed that further information would be provided when available. The Local Committee agreed it would also be useful for them to be briefed on this topic in the future when the information was available.

Question 1 submitted by Cllr Roger Adams and Question 6 submitted by Cllr Paul were in relation to the Norbury Park sawmill. Both attended the meeting along with SCC officers; the Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure and Director for Environment who responded to concerns raised.

It was noted there was lots of concern about the closure of the sawmill and questions were asked about the decision making process as it appeared the sawmill had been profitable for the vast majority of past years.

It was confirmed by Officers that the decision was about who should run the sawmill and not about whether it should be there. The decision taken by SCC was that it was not financially viable for them to run the sawmill. SCC would continue to work with local community interest groups to find a projects that could run sustainably at the site.

It was questioned about the cost for SCC to take on the sawmill running and what the quoted figure of £280k included. It was confirmed this figure included the purchase of the structure and equipment as well as costs for essential site improvements. It was confirmed that if SCC took on the running, the site would become illegible for certain grants and funding, they otherwise would have been able to access.

Members noted their disappointment about the lack of engagement and consultation with them. This was acknowledged by Officers and noted that

ITEM 3

conscious efforts would be made in the future to better engage with local stakeholders.

Question 3 was submitted by Peter Seaward who attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary question;

Thank you for this answer, do we know when these results will be known?

It was confirmed that the School Places Planning Team were due to meet with schools from March onwards and it was therefore likely the results would be available from early-mid summer.

Question 4 was submitted by Cllr Caroline Salmon who attended the meeting. She noted it was disappointing to not have a response as the issue was pertinent now.

The AHM requested further information about the issue and agreed to follow up on this outside the meeting.

Question 5 was submitted by Cllr Elizabeth Daly, who did not attend the meeting nor ask a supplementary question.

Question 7 was submitted by Cllr Paul Kennedy who attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary question;

Is it possible to provide a ball park figure for this work based on previous work?

The AHM confirmed she would provide the full list of ball park figures for work to the Local Committee.

6/21b MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

Declarations of Interest: Mrs Hazel Watson declared a personal interest as a Governor of The Ashcombe School.

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

Petitions, Public Statements, Questions: The questions and officer responses were provided within the supplementary agenda. Five written question was received before the deadline.

Question 1 was submitted by Mrs Hazel Watson, who asked the following supplementary question;

Do officers agree that banning a left turn at the junction of Station Road and Chalkpit Lane would help the problem?

The AHM noted that all possible options would need to be looked at within the feasibility study. She added there would be no reason to ban the left turn on safety grounds and also no guarantee that drivers would comply with this. She concluded further investigation would be required before any agreement or disagreement could be made.

Question 2 was submitted by Mrs Hazel Watson, who asked the following supplementary question;

My specific question was not answered in the officer response. Why was only one survey carried out at the time, when it was known that more surveys would be needed in the future?

The AHM responded by stating the original speed survey had been carried out for initial scoping and was just the first step, and not the full study. She confirmed the speed survey hadn't been undertaken to specifically look at reducing the speed limit. It was conducted on the request of the Head Teacher of Boxhill School, who was concerned about the possible safety issues outside the school.

Question 3 was submitted by Cllr Rosemary Dickson, who made the following comment in response;

I do see that it is a bigger issue than just simply moving the white line. I am surprised there have not been any personal injury claims but I do know the museum has been hit by turning vehicles.

The AHM noted the comment and stated she would have a conversation with the Road Safety Manager about the junction. She concluded it would be unlikely the junction would get a full redesign but it would be useful for officers to keep an eye on this.

Question 4 was submitted by Mr Stephen Cooksey, who asked the following supplementary question;

Can I seek assurance that the investigative work will take place in the relatively near future?

The AHM confirmed that officers would try to progress this work as soon as possible; adding that engineers would be in touch shortly to see if the divisional member would like to use any of his capital maintenance funding to assist.

Question 5 was submitted by Mrs Hazel Watson, who asked the following supplementary question;

Are you aware I raised a question yesterday at Cabinet? The Cabinet member answered the question and offered to meet to discuss the scoring.

The AHM confirmed she would be happy to meet to discuss the scoring but noted the scheme in question only had a priority score of 70, compared to other proposed schemes, where the lowest priority score over the 3 year programme, was 190.

**7/21 UPDATED HIGHWAYS FORWARD PROGRAMME 2021-22 TO 2023-24
[EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 6]**

Declarations of Interest: None

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

Petitions, Public Statements, Questions: None

Key points from the discussion:

- A query was made about the clearing of drain and gullies. It was noted that drainage didn't fall under the ITS and was funded through a centralised budget.
- Members raised concern around the consultation process and the schemes that were chosen to be taken forward. It was confirmed the long ITS list consisted of schemes that had come forward from questions or petitions raised by residents. These schemes were then scored against 5 criteria before the highest scoring, affordable projects were proposed to the local committee for agreement.

Resolution:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley):

General

- i. Noted that the Local Committee's devolved highways budget for capital works in 2021/22 is £537,000.
- ii. Agreed that the devolved capital budget for highway works be used to progress both capital improvement schemes and capital maintenance schemes.
- iii. Noted 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.
- iv. Authorised that the Area Highway Manager, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, be able to allocate any additional funding for schemes, in accordance with any guidance issued surrounding that funding.

Capital Improvement Schemes

- v. Agreed that the capital improvement schemes allocation for Mole Valley be used to progress the Integrated Transport Schemes programme set out in Annex 1.
- vi. 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.
- vii. Agree that the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Area Highway 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)

- viii. Agree that the capital maintenance schemes allocation for Mole Valley be divided equitably between County Councillors to carry out capital maintenance works in their divisions, and that the schemes to be progressed be agreed by divisional members in consultation with the Area Maintenance Engineer.

Revenue Maintenance

- ix. Note that the members will continue to receive a Member Local Highways Fund (revenue) allocation of £7,500 per county member to address highway issues in their division; and
- x. Agree that the Member Local Highways Fund be managed by the Area Maintenance Engineer on behalf of and in consultation with members.

Reason for decisions:

The above decision were made in order to agree a forward programme of highways works in Mole Valley for 2021/22 – 2023/24, funded from the Local Committee's devolved budget.

8/21 DECISION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 7]

The Local Committee noted the decision tracker and agreed items marked as closed and complete could be removed.

9/21 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 8]

The Local Committee noted the forward plan of items expected to be received at future meetings.

Meeting ended at: 4.00 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank