

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 2.00 pm on 5 September 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 Malcomson
- * Cllr Vivienne Michael

* In attendance

OPEN FORUM

Questions and responses from the open forum session are attached as Annex A.

24/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mr Townsend, Mr Cooksey, Cllr Malcomson and Cllr Dickson (substitute Cllr Ladell).

25/18 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

Members agreed the minutes of the meeting from 06 June 2018 to be a true record.

26/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

For the purposes of item 5 (petition no. 2) and item 6 members made the following declarations of interest:

1. Cllr Kennedy - member of the Bookham Residents' Association,
2. Mrs Curran – designated SCC member of Bookham Residents' Association

ITEM 2

a **PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]**

Declarations of interest: None

Officers present: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

1. Written questions had been submitted by Michelle Watson. Responses had been provided (see supplementary agenda pack). She was not present to ask a supplementary.
2. Rosemary Campbell had submitted a written question and had received a response (see supplementary agenda pack). In her absence the divisional member for Dorking Hills urged that the issue be prioritised for funding given the concerns of residents.
3. The Area Highways Manager reminded members that they always receive more requests than they have funding for and this year's budget was already fully allocated. It was too early to know about the level of next year's budget.
4. Elizabeth Daly had asked a question and received a response (see supplementary agenda pack).
5. In her absence the divisional member for Bookham and Fetcham West expressed her surprise that the fact that she and district councillors had been dealing with this issue for some time, had not been reflected in the response from officers.
6. The vehicles in question are not HGVs; they were taxed and insured, and parked so as not to constitute an obstruction, but in an 'un-neighbourly' way. Councillors had been working with the owner to try and resolve the issue.
7. Members agreed that this was a growing problem in other areas and that the Cabinet Lead Member for Place should be alerted to the growing issue.
8. Ian Anderson had submitted a question as a follow up to the one he had submitted to the local committee meeting in June 2018. He had received a response (see supplementary agenda pack).
9. District council members assured the committee that officers had been working hard behind the scenes for months on this issue, but that it had been difficult engaging with Network Rail.

b **MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

Declarations of interest: None

Officers present: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

1. District Councillor Claire Malcomson had submitted questions and received responses (see supplementary agenda pack), but was not present.
2. Mr Hall had submitted two questions and received responses (see supplementary agenda pack).
3. He asked a supplementary to Q2: Given that only 10% of the gullies in Mole Valley had been cleaned in five months, how likely was it that the remainder would be completed by the end of the 2018 financial year?
4. The AHM confirmed that this work had been passed through to the contractors. Gully cleaning was essential to keeping roads open in wet weather and the work would be audited to ensure KPIs were met.

5. Cllr Kennedy had submitted two questions. He would ask a follow up question to Q2 at a future local committee meeting.

28/18 PETITIONS [Item 5]

Declarations of interest:

1. Cllr Kennedy - member of the Bookham Residents' Association,
2. Mrs Curran – designated SCC member of Bookham Residents' Association

Officers present:

Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager
Steve Clavey, Senior Engineer (parking)

Petition (178 Signatures) presented by Ms Angela Woodhams on behalf of Hookwood Residents' Society (see supplementary agenda for petition details and officer response).

1. Members acknowledged the complex nature of the issues. They sympathised with the petitioners; the problems had been caused in part by a change in the nature of the businesses in the area.
2. Members urged Surrey Highways and MVDC Planning to work together to find a resolution for the problems caused by businesses operating in residential roads.
3. The new parking measures proposed in drawing number 55 (included in the parking review at item 8) did not deliver what residents had requested; they had wanted double yellow lines to be implemented, in order to deter taxis and holiday parking.
4. The divisional member for Dorking Rural highlighted the problems with enforcement in rural areas and suggested it might be better covered by Reigate & Banstead officers.
5. The location of the parking bay (drawing 55) had already been moved following requests, but the Senior Engineer (Parking) suggested meeting the petitioners on site, to look at other available options.
6. The local committee (Mole Valley) agreed to note the officer's response.

Petition (190 signatures) presented by John Howarth on behalf of Bookham Residents' Association (petition details; supporting letter from the Chief Executive of the Grange Centre, Bookham; officer response included in the supplementary agenda pack).

1. Members welcomed the extra funding for investigative works, although they were disappointed that officers had not been able to identify a solution.
2. The results of the investigations would be presented to the Local Resilience Forum (Bookham Flood Forum) and be included in a future highways update.
3. The local committee (Mole Valley) agreed to note the officer's response.

ITEM 2

Petition (99 signatures) was presented by Susan Leveritt on behalf of the Leatherhead Residents' Association and the Leatherhead and District Chamber of Commerce.

1. The petitioners expressed disappointment at the officer response and asked the committee to reject the recommendation and allow an experimental Traffic Regulation Order.
2. Members commended the petitioners for the high quality presentation of their petition and their committed approach.
3. Members sympathised with the town's business owners and acknowledged that to allow parking after 4.30pm would improve access to Leatherhead's shops and businesses.
4. A trial would provide essential data on footfall; in Dorking a few 30 minute parking bays had been introduced to encourage visits to local shops.
5. Some members highlighted the fact that improvements were already being made to the town centre and suggested it would be advisable to align any trial with the transport study, as described in the officer response.
6. This approach was supported by officers, who expressed concerns over a trial being carried out in isolation and the adverse impact it might have on other users. They would ask the team responsible for Transform Leatherhead to investigate.
7. The restrictions had been in place for a number of years and it was possible that needs had changed since then, and this would be reflected in the transport study results.
8. While understanding that there were currently no parking spaces marked out on the High Street and this situation would have to be assessed, members highlighted that this was no different from the situation on Sundays or during the evening, when parking restrictions were not in force.
9. The introduction of an experimental TRO would incur additional costs as it would be separate to the scheduled parking review.
10. Officers stressed again the need to balance competing interests including accessibility for disabled users and agreements on delivery times with some businesses.
11. While they acknowledged the points raised by officers, Members agreed with the petitioners and business owners that something needed to be done to improve the situation in the town centre.
12. Their view was that a trial would give a good indication as to whether changing the parking restrictions would have a positive impact on business in the High Street.
13. The divisional member for Bookham and Fetcham West proposed a change of recommendation, seconded by the divisional member for Dorking Rural.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed:

To ask officers to reconsider the proposal, and in discussion with the Chairman and the petitioners, what the way forward might be, in light of the strong views expressed by the committee, to introduce a trial period.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

Members agreed with petitioners and other stakeholders that action needed to be taken to support businesses on the High Street. The proposed trial of amended parking measures would evidence whether such new measures would have a positive impact on local trade.

29/18 PUBLIC FOOTPATH 75 - LEATHERHEAD: APPLICATION TO RESTRICT PEDESTRIANS AT CERTAIN TIMES [OTHER COUNCIL FUNCTIONS] [Item 6]

Declarations of Interest:

1. Cllr Kennedy - member of the Bookham Residents' Association,
2. Mrs Curran – designated SCC member of Bookham Residents' Association

Officer Present: Debbie Prismall, Senior Countryside Access Officer

Speaker in support:

Julia Dickinson made the following points in support of the application.

1. Surrey County Council had a statutory duty with regard to ensuring the safety of the school pupils.
2. There was an alternative path, that the public could use.

Speakers objecting to the application made the following points.

Vivien White – on behalf of Effingham Residents Association:

1. Residents were very concerned as this was the only safe route for pedestrians. If it were closed, some people would become isolated.
2. The planning application for the school had been delayed, and as a consequence, the period of closure would have to be extended.

Cllr Arnold Pinder - on behalf of Effingham Parish Council

1. The school had underestimated the number of people using the footpath. It was the only safe route for those with buggies etc.
2. There was no evidence of any serious incidents to justify closing the footpath. Other measures such as erecting hedge borders would be acceptable.

James Nicholls – life-long resident

1. The proposal was unnecessary, and the police had not received reports of any serious incidents.
2. Other routes were more dangerous for pedestrians.

Reverend Mandy McVean

ITEM 2

1. Her parishioners regularly used the footpath to access the church and its closure would have an adverse impact on attendance at services and the toddler group.
2. The safety of pupils was equally important but there were alternative solutions available, even if they were less convenient.

Caroline Irwin - resident

1. The applicant had previously been unsuccessful in an application to extinguish rights and would prefer a permanent closure.
2. She knew of no legal precedence to support closure of the path and urged members to refuse the application.

Key points raised in the member discussion:

1. Some members had attended a site visit, which had helped them understand the issues.
2. Members had been surprised by how short the relevant section of path was and thought that it was misleading to think that its closure would cut off access to the school; other footpaths ran adjacent to the school boundaries.
3. Members agreed that safeguarding issues were an important duty for the school, however this closure did not give the security suggested in the application.
4. There were other access points to the school grounds and members would like to have heard from the school as to why other measures, such as additional fencing would not work.
5. The Chairman suggested that the school should engage more with the local community, to find a solution.
6. The officer's recommendation was supported unanimously by members of the committee.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) agreed that:

The request by the Howard of Effingham Partnership Trust to make a legal order to close Public Footpath 75, Leatherhead at certain times of the day is refused.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The County Council has powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to close public footpaths. In this instance, due to the number of objections that have been received, the lack of a suitable safe alternative route and the inconvenience it would cause to local residents the officer's opinion is that no such order should be made.

30/18 PRESENTATION FROM SCC LEAD CABINET MEMBER FOR PEOPLE ON WORKING TOGETHER WITH DISTRICTS AND BOROUGHES WITH THE KEY FOCUS ON HEALTH AND WELLBEING [AGENDA ITEM] [Item 7]

The Cabinet Lead Member for People guided members through a presentation (attached), focussing on the health and well-being of residents, and covered the following topics:

1. Context- Surrey vision 2030
2. Understanding the wider determinants of health
3. The role of local authorities
4. Evolving health and care systems in Surrey
5. Surrey Heartlands- case study

Member discussion highlights:

1. The way in which the county council provided essential services would have to change; adult social care and Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) were the two largest areas of expenditure.
2. Organisations needed to do more to help and support people to look after themselves with prevention and early intervention being key.
3. The Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board was a statutory, multi-agency body, to oversee delivery of health services across the county, but it needed to do more to raise its profile and improve engagement with partners. The Leader of Mole Valley District Council was a current member of the committee.
4. Surrey Heartlands (covering around 850,000 people) was considered one of the most advanced sustainability and transformation partnerships with regard to the devolution of NHS services.
5. The Cabinet Member suggested that local councils could contribute more to the improvement of health and wellbeing outcomes for their residents, for example through the local plan.
6. The new people and places agenda supported a coordinated approach by partners, which included the co-location of staff and shared use of buildings. The county council was currently looking into how, it could make better use of the buildings it owned, for the benefit of residents.
7. The district council had already demonstrated its commitment to improving outcomes for its residents; it was one of the few local councils to have a portfolio holder for Health and Wellbeing. MVDC already had various initiatives in place eg. walk for health scheme, exercise on referral
8. Some members highlighted that a cohesive approach was all the more important given the reductions in some budgets. For example, on the one hand, encouraging people to walk more for health, on the other, pavements may be in a bad state of repair and country paths overgrown. In Elmbridge for example, Community Infrastructure Levy money had funded improvements.
9. Members acknowledged that with a larger proportion of residents living longer but not necessarily healthier lives, there was a need to take more individual and community responsibility. The limited budget envelope would only be able to fund those who really needed it and all

ITEM 2

stakeholders needed to take a new collaborative and creative approach.

31/18 MOLE VALLEY ON STREET PARKING REVIEW [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 8]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers present: Steve Clavey – Senior Engineer (Parking)

Public questions, statements: None

Petitions: refer to item 5 – petition regarding parking issues near Povey Cross, Hookwood

Members' discussion highlights:

1. District Councillor Irvine referred to the proposed measures (drawing 33) in Leslie Road, Pixham where cars parked on both sides of the road were obstructing the refuse collection vehicles.
2. Residents had expressed huge concern about all day restrictions and needed to be consulted on the options. Members queried whether there were other possible solutions and suggested the use of a smaller vehicle.
3. The new contractors Amey had suggested restricted timings (ie 9am-12pm on Wednesdays) as this would allow sufficient time to make their collections. A 15ft vehicle was standard, but it would not be economical to purchase a half-sized one, given the number of the properties it would serve.
4. Members discussed the fact that this had been an ongoing issue since 2012. When the district council had been responsible for the refuse collection, vehicles had to make return visits in order to complete the round.
5. Members agreed that the restricted parking (9am – 12pm on Wednesdays) should be advertised and the Chairman prompted local councillors to encourage residents to respond to the consultation, not just to object, but also to support the proposals.
6. Members highlighted that drawing 30 did not show all the existing driveways along Boxhill Road.
7. Officers agreed not to advertise the proposals for Chalkpit Lane/Curtis Road in Dorking (drawing 37) where there had already been objections from the divisional member and local residents.
8. With reference to the earlier petition regarding parking and traffic issues in the vicinity of Povey Cross, Hookwood (Item 5) and related drawing 55, officers had reached an agreement with the petitioners on the proposed location of the loading bay, which would now go out to consultation.
9. In response to queries for background information from members, officers explained that the costs given for the planning review were an estimate. The final figure would depend on the amount of signage

needed. Under current law the consultation still had to be published in the printed press and each advertisement could cost £10,000.

10. Members agreed to the recommendations, taking into account the small amendments made above.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) resolved to agree:

- (i) The recommendations detailed in Annex 1, without additions;
- (ii) To allocate funding as described in 5.1
- (iii) That the County Council's intention to make an order under the Road Traffic Regulation act 1984 be advertised and, if no objections are maintained, the order be made;
- (iv) That if objections are received the Parking Strategy and Implementation Group Manager is authorised to try and resolve them, in consultation with the Chairman / Vice Chairman of this committee and the county councillor for the division, and decides whether or not they should be acceded to and therefore whether the order should be made, with or without modifications.

32/18 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 9]

Declarations of interest: None

Officers present: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Public questions, petitions, statements: None

The local committee (Mole Valley) agreed to note the contents of the report.

33/18 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 10]

The local committee (Mole Valley) noted the recommendations tracker and agreed to remove those items marked 'closed.'

34/18 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 11]

ITEM 2

The local committee (Mole Valley) noted the contents of the forward plan.

Meeting ended at: 4.47 pm

Chairman