

**Mole Valley Local Committee – 29 September 2021****Written Member Questions****Question 1****From County Councillor Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)**

The first main directional sign on the A24 southbound approach to the Givons Grove Roundabout was reported to County Highways as damaged (partially missing) in March 2020 (Reference: 1528477) and a request made for the sign to be reinstated. The sign remains damaged with three quarters of the sign missing.

It is my understanding of the KPI is that damaged signs reported in one Quarter, are ordered for replacement in the following Quarter, and replaced in subsequent Quarter by the contractors.

As it is now eighteen months since this damaged sign was reported and the report was acknowledged by the County Council, can an explanation be given as to why the damaged sign has not been replaced and can a commitment be given as to the date when the damaged sign will now be replaced?

**Response**

It is appreciated that it has taken longer than usual to arrange for this direction sign to be replaced. This has been due to several factors, outside of the KPI process, including supply difficulties for specialist support clips for the new sign. The sign is on passive type posts, because of the speed and nature of the road, and specialist clips are needed to attach the sign to these posts.

The sign work has been chased, and although the replacement sign has been delivered there is still a supply difficulty for the clips to attach the sign to the passive posts. The contractor made an initial visit to the site on 20 September, however, the work has been delayed due to the clip supply difficulties.

The sign installation will take place as soon as is possible once the specialist clips have been delivered. The Principal Maintenance Engineer will inform County Councillor Hazel Watson when the replacement sign has been installed.

**Question 2****From District Councillor Elizabeth Daly (Bookham South)**

Residents in Downs Way, Great Bookham, tell me they have complained to Surrey County Council about:

- (i) the danger caused by inconsiderate parking in the lower part of the road near the junction with Leatherhead Road, which makes the speeds currently encountered a threat to residents, pedestrians, cyclists and learner drivers; and
  - (ii) the number of potholes and damaged footpath at the lower part of the road.
- In response, Surrey County Council have (i) told residents they need to pay for £50 for an application and, if successful, £120 for installation of access protection marking, and (ii) patched some of the potholes last winter, only for them to reappear.

## ITEM 5b

Why is Surrey County Council addressing these issues properly for other roads, but not for the residents of Downs Way?

### Response

*(i) the danger caused by inconsiderate parking in the lower part of the road near the junction with Leatherhead Road, which makes the speeds currently encountered a threat to residents, pedestrians, cyclists and learner drivers*

Downs Way, Great Bookham is a residential road with a concentration of on-street parking on one side of the road at its northern end.

Surrey County Council hold personal injury collision data for traffic collisions that have occurred over the most recent 5 year period this information is provided by Surrey Police and shows that there has been no personal injury collisions in Downs Way over the most recent 5 year period for which data is available (from 01/07/16 to 30/06/21).

Access protection markings are white "H" shaped lines which can be painted on to the road to draw attention to a driveway or access, to try to discourage drivers from parking too close to private accesses and preventing their use. These white lines are advisory and therefore have no legal standing. Access protection markings are also not an effective tool to ensure that on-street parked vehicles, do not obstruct the visibility of approaching vehicles for drivers exiting private accesses.

Due to the sheer number of requests received for access protection markings, it is no longer financially sustainable to provide these markings free of charge, and it is considered unfair for the general tax payer to fund something from which they would derive no benefit.

Therefore, the following charges apply regarding the installation and maintenance of access protection markings;

- 50 (non-refundable) for application and assessment, plus (subject to a successful application),
- £120 for installing a new APM, refreshing an existing APM, or extending and refreshing an existing APM up to 7 metres in length, or
- £160 for installing, refreshing or extending and refreshing an APM more than 7 metres in length.

Further information regarding applying for an access protection marking is available at the following location on Surrey County Council's website;

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/parking/restrictions-and-controls/access-protection-markings-h-bars>

In order to address concerns about on-street parking, Surrey County Council could install waiting restrictions (e.g double or single yellow lines) or controlled parking (e.g parking bays at the side of the road reserving space for parking at specific times). Surrey County Council receive numerous requests each year for parking restrictions and have to consider all requests that are received, and unfortunately not all get progressed to implementation. However, Surrey County Council are currently accepting requests for the 2022 Mole Valley parking review and will be up until the end of May 2022.

Further information regarding how to submit requests for new parking controls or restrictions is available on Surrey County Council's website at the following location;

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/policies-plans-consultations/policies-and-plans/traffic-policy-and-good-practice/waiting-restrictions-and-controlled-parking>

(ii) *the number of potholes and damaged footpath at the lower part of the road.*

All roads have regular Highway Safety Inspections, and this inspection provides information about the condition of the surfaced road. To maximise funding from central government Surrey prioritises major maintenance schemes on the Horizon 2 programme in accordance with best practice guidance on asset management. All roads on the Horizon 2 programme have been prioritised in accordance with the cabinet approved prioritisation process. The process takes account of criteria including: condition; network priority; risk and network management.

The pavements in Downs Way were slurry sealed in 2013. Slurry sealing is a waterproof material which seals the surface of the footway. The pavements were assessed in December 2019 and some minor condition defects were present such as moss, tree roots and some damaged vehicle crossovers but overall condition did not require a scheme.

Footpath FP62, that leads on from the southern end of Downs Way, is a public Right of Way and the levels of maintenance to public footpaths are not as high as those for pavements. However, it is very helpful if residents report any specific individual or multiple potholes with a high risk to pedestrians to us (including photos and location) so that these could be inspected and either repaired or the path closed.

The prioritisation for surfacing of Downs Way, Bookham has been checked and is on the list of resurfacing schemes for future programme consideration. In the meantime, until this surfacing work is prioritised, any pot holes that meet the intervention threshold for repair will be fixed. Details can be found on our website here:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/policies-plans-consultations/policies-and-plans/highway-safety-inspections-standards-and-procedures>

Any reports regarding the footpath section should be reported using our online reporting system via this link:

[Contact us or report a problem on a Right of Way - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/contact-us-or-report-a-problem-on-a-right-of-way)

### **Question 3**

#### **From District Councillor Paul Kennedy (Fetcham West)**

Please can you provide a list of locations where parking restrictions were requested but not taken forward as part of the current parking review?

#### **Response**

The remaining sites that were not progressed as part of this parking review are listed below.

- Oaken Coppice, Ashtead
- Allen/Leatherhead Road, Bookham
- Sole Farm/Little Bookham Street, Bookham
- Woodlands Road, Bookham
- Tanners Meadow, Brockham
- Glovers Road, Charlwood
- Ashcombe Road, Dorking
- Bennetts Way, Dorking
- Harrow Close, Dorking
- Oak Corner, Dorking
- Pippbrook Gardens, Dorking
- Cock Lane, Fetcham
- Copperfields, Fetcham

## ITEM 5b

Hazel Way (opp Rec Ground), Fetcham  
Povey Cross Road, Hookwood  
Cleeve Road, Leatherhead  
Kingston Road (Plough Roundabout), Leatherhead  
Middle Road, Leatherhead  
Orchardleigh, Leatherhead  
Poplar Avenue, Leatherhead  
Poplar Road, Leatherhead  
Russell Court, Leatherhead  
Ashley Way, Westcott

37 requests were received via letter or email to the Highways inbox, 66 requests via the webpage and 8 requests via email direct to the Parking Officer from councillors. Removing those that were repeats, had already been introduced, or had been added to the review produced the list above. The majority of requests were from residents.

### **Question 4**

#### **From District Councillor Paul Kennedy (Fetcham West)**

Ahead of the discussion of Mole Valley Local Committee's forward programme for 2021/22, can you please provide a full list of the Committee's scrutiny and decision-making responsibilities with details of any meeting(s) at which it is currently proposed that those responsibilities will be discharged?

### **Response**

The Local Committee's responsibilities are described in Paragraph 7 of Part 3, Section 1 of the County Council's Constitution (via [this link](#)). This outlines the executive and non-executive functions (where the committee can take decisions), and the service monitoring functions. The Local Committee is not constituted as a scrutiny committee – there are separate functions set out in the SCC constitution that cover this work.

Regarding forthcoming meetings, there are two formal meetings (for decision-making) in the diary after the September meeting: 10<sup>th</sup> November and 9<sup>th</sup> March (provisional). The need for other meetings can be considered according to the subjects suggested for discussion and there are different possible formats such as a private (informal) meeting or an interactive session with local residents. These can be scheduled on an ad hoc basis.