

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Mole VALLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 2.00 pm on 9 December 2020
 at Virtual.

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

23/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Nancy Goodacre; Cllr Caroline Salmon attended as her substitute; and Cllr Rosemary Dickson.

24/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the previous meeting on 17 June 2020 were agreed as a true record.

25/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Mrs Hazel Watson declared an interest in Item 5b as a Governor of Ashcombe School, whose pupils would benefit from a crossing on Chalkpit Lane.

26a/20 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

Declarations of Interest: None

ITEM 2

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM), SCC and Duncan Knox, Road Safety and Active Travel Team Manager (RSATTM), SCC

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

Question one was submitted by Cllr Caroline Salmon, who asked the following supplementary question;

Do officers know what is causing the subsidence and do they feel leaving it until 2021 is safe?

The AHM responded by saying the whole area of A24 had undergone a detailed investigation and would continue to have frequent highways safety inspections and be monitored until the time that it prioritised for work.

Question two was submitted by Cllr James Friend, who did not attend the meeting but did ask that he be provided with an update when the meeting between officers had taken place. The AHM agreed this.

Question three was submitted by John Arnold, Mole Valley Cycling Forum. Mr Arnold attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary question;

Given that it is now nearly 2021, and there is no date for commencement of a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) for Mole Valley and only a vague statement that "other areas of the county, including Mole Valley, will follow (Reigate & Banstead) in due course." Without a LWCIP, Mole Valley will not be eligible for any government funding for cycling and walking improvements. The Mole Valley Cycle Forum, and other stakeholders, have 'oven ready' proposals for a workshop and would appreciate a firm date to be identified when the first workshop can take place which would be a constructive contribution to the LWCIP process.

The AHM thanked Mr Arnold for his question and noted a question about LCWIPs was recently asked at full council. It was noted that three LCWIPs had been diarised; Reigate & Banstead, Elmbridge and Runnymede. Approximately one every four months. The roll out of the LCWIPs was expensive and labour intensive and therefore it was not possible to roll them out in all areas at one time. Currently there was no further schedule for the remaining LCWIPs. But when a time for the Mole Valley LCWIP was known, it would be shared with the Mole Valley Cycling Forum. The AHM thanked Mr Arnold for his 'oven ready' proposals; adding it was always useful to know what the local community was looking for. She added however, these would not form part of the LCWIP process.

Question four was submitted by Rosemary Hobbs. Mrs Hobbs attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary question;

How should residents inform Surrey County Council and Surrey Police when they have concerns about excessive noise and speed?

The RSATTM advised Mrs Hobbs that the SCC website contained a report it function. It was suggested this would be the best way to inform the County Council over ongoing issues of speeding. It was suggested a specific incident would be best reported to Surrey Police. He noted however, that providing details such as a number plate was not always easy or practically possible in such cases, particularly when vehicles were travelling at speed.

Question five was submitted by Cllr Roger Adams, who did not attend the meeting. The divisional member noted the question raised was a good one and one that was frequently raised by residents. She noted the officer response with regards to the compulsory purchase order of the adjacent land. And added that it may become possible to improve matters at the junction with A246 through a Section 106 agreement, should the Chalkpit Lane depot across the road be redeveloped.

Question six was submitted by Mr Andrew Matthews, who attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary question;

The planned provision for cycling to the new Howard of Effingham School appears inadequate, with only 10% of students able to store their bicycles at the new school, and with no dedicated cycle highway planned. This will result in cyclists competing with pedestrians on the shared path. Given the recent government drive for people to take up active travel, can Surrey County Council explain why there is not a better plan for sustainable transport to the new school when the council recently applied for a £7.8million grant to improve facilities elsewhere in the county?

The AHM thanked Mr Matthews for his question; noting that the response had been provided by colleagues from Transport Development Planning (TDP), who were not at the meeting. She stated that it would be best for the supplementary question to be responded to outside the meeting by TDP colleagues. This was agreed by the Chairman and Mr Matthews.

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

The response mentions the Road Safety Working Group. Who is invited to this and who does this group report to?

The RSATTM explained this group was hosted by colleagues from within his team and included colleagues from Surrey Police and Area Highway teams. He added that each Borough/District had six-monthly meetings to review accident hotspots. This involved analysing the problem and looking at solutions. He added the schemes across the whole county were prioritised based on number of collisions and cost benefit analysis. It was confirmed the working group was accountable to the Cabinet Member for Highways and in cases where speed limit changes were suggested as solutions, these were brought to the Local Committee for approval.

26b/20 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

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. One written question was received before the deadline.

Question one was received from Mrs Hazel Watson. Mrs Watson thanked officers for the response and added it was a shame the whole road wasn't resurfaced when sections of it were done in 2019. As it was likely this would have been more cost-effective.

27/20 PETITIONS [Item 5]

Two petitions were received before the deadline. The full wording of these petitions and officer responses were provided within the supplementary agenda.

28/20 PETITION TO: IMPROVE THE SAFETY ON THE NEWDIGATE ROAD FOR OUR SCHOOL AND CHILDREN [Item 5a]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM), SCC and Duncan Knox, Road Safety and Active Travel Team Manager (RSATTM), SCC

Petitions, Public Statements, Questions: Mr James Baguley, Head teacher of The Weald CofE Primary School attended the meeting and addressed the Local Committee with his concerns.

He stated the problem was mostly an issue at the end of a school day. The Newdigate Road was narrow in nature and parents often parked in a dangerous manner when congregating. He added there was a lack of signage along the road and suggested that adding signs to make motorists aware of the road's speed limit, could help.

Key points from discussion:

- The divisional member noted a site visit with officers had recently taken place, as noted in the response. And also that as the neighbouring pub had recently put in a planning application to turn in to housing, it was unlikely they would be able to help by offering the use of their car park for parents.
- It was suggested the school could launch an internal campaign and plea to parents to change their behaviour and improve their parking to improve the safety of the road.
- The RSATTM noted that SCC would be rolling out pedestrian training for primary school children, when safe to do so following the COVID-19 pandemic.

Therefore, the Local Committee noted:

1. Several site visits were carried out by officers from SCC's Road Safety Team, SCC's Active Travel Team, SCC's South East Area Highways Team and Surrey Police. These visits were carried out both during the morning school drop off and afternoon school pick up.
2. The recommendation within the Road Safety Outside Schools report regarding an additional parking restriction and that this would be further investigated by the parking team.
3. The Safer Travel Team would work with the school to introduce the recommended additional road safety education activities and school travel plan and assist with the negotiation of using the pubs car park as a park and stride location.

29/20 PETITION TO: INSTALL A SAFE, CONTROLLED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING AT CHALKPIT LANE, DORKING [Item 5b]

Declarations of Interest: Mrs Hazel Watson declared an interest as a Governor of Ashcombe School, whose pupils would benefit from a crossing on Chalkpit Lane.

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

Petitions, Public Statements, Questions: Aimee Fairhurst and Kathy Kyle attended the meeting to address the Local Committee with details of their petition. The PowerPoint presented to the Local Committee is attached as Annex A to these minutes.

Key points from the discussion:

- Members thanked the petitioners for their excellent presentation and undisputable case for why a crossing was needed on Chalkpit Lane.
- It was suggested that if Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) did not have enough Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding for the scheme that SCC should pursue Strategic CIL from the District Council instead, because the scheme was both wanted and needed by the immediate and wider communities.
- It was noted that CIL funding could not be used to fund feasibility studies. And such a study would be required at this location. It was confirmed that finding a source of funding for a feasibility study was the greatest challenge.
- The AHM explained that even when funding for feasibility had been found and the study completed, it didn't always result in the desired scheme being taken forward, as this wasn't always found to be the most suitable.
- Members noted the issues of funding were complex and acknowledged the AHM, along with other officers would continue to work on finding suitable sources of funding for this scheme.

Therefore, the Local Committee noted:

ITEM 2

- i. The continued requests for a controlled pedestrian crossing to be installed on Chalkpit Lane, Dorking.
- ii. The factors that have an impact on the opportunity to provide a controlled pedestrian crossing point which would be safe to use.
- iii. That officers will continue to look for other sources of funding to construct a controlled crossing point in Chalkpit Lane that would be safe for pedestrians to use.

30/20 HIGHWAYS FORWARD PROGRAMME 2021-22 AND 2022-23 [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 6]

Declarations of Interest: None

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

Petitions, Public Statements, Questions: None

The AHM introduced the report drawing members attentions to the figures in the table on page 11 and annex 1 of the proposed schemes to carry out in 2021-22 and 2022-23.

Resolution:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley):

General

- i. Noted that the Local Committee's devolved highways budget for capital works in 2021/22, subject to approval by full Council in February 2021, was £240,400.
- 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.

Capital Improvement Schemes (ITS)

- iv. Agreed that the capital improvement schemes allocation for Mole Valley be used to progress the Integrated Transport Schemes programme set out in Annex 1;
- v. Authorised 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. Agreed that the remaining £24,000 from the £100,000 possible Capital Improvement Schemes (ITS) budget be split equally between members

(£4,000 per member) to be used towards the funding of an ITS scheme, part match funding of a CIL funded scheme or as an additional contribution towards the Member's capital maintenance scheme (eg.LSR)

- vii. 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)

- viii. Agreed 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. Noted 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; and
- x. Agreed that the Member Local Highways Fund be managed by the Area Maintenance Engineer on behalf of and in consultation with members.

Reasons for Decisions:

The above decisions were made in order to agree a forward programme of highways works in Mole Valley for 2021/22 – 2022/23, funded from the Local Committee's devolved budget.

31/20 SPEED LIMIT ASSESSMENTS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 7]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Duncan Knox, Road Safety and Active Travel Team Manager (RSATTM), SCC

Petitions, Public Statements, Questions: None

The RSATTM introduced the report noting that the Road Safety Working Group had identified a history of collisions on A29 and A243 that they believed could be addressed by a reduction in speed limit. Having conducted speed limit assessments, officers noted that average speeds were close enough to 40mph that it was felt reducing the speed limit on these roads could make a difference on its own.

ITEM 2

The RSATTM noted the proposal in relation to A217 was to convert a 50mph stretch - sandwiched between two 40mph stretches - to 40mph. This would then result in one continuous 40mph stretch.

The officer further added that he had already proceeded to advertise this, for which he apologised, acknowledging that he should have sought permission from this Local Committee to advertise, before doing so. He stated that when the results from the consultation were in, he would present these to the Mole Valley Local Committee to see if the committee wished to proceed. He concluded he had previously taken this proposal to the Reigate & Banstead Local Committee for decision. For which they had already agreed to its advertisement.

Key points from the discussion:

- Members thanked the RSATTM for his report and welcomed the suggested proposals to reduce the speed limits. It was felt residents would likely be very supportive of these proposals also.
- In relation to the A29 speed limit reduction, it was requested a 20mph advisory sign on a sharp bend be kept in place as it encouraged motorists to slow down accordingly.

Resolution:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley):

- i. Noted the results of the speed limit assessments undertaken;
- ii. Agreed that, based upon the evidence, the speed limit be reduced to 40mph (from 60 mph or 50mph) in the section of the A29 Ockley Road/Beare Green Road and Stane Street, Ockley, for the length which extends from a point 60 metres south-west of the junction with the Beare Green Roundabout south-westwards to a point 260 metres north-east of the junction with Coles Lane.
- iii. Agreed that, based upon the evidence, the speed limit be reduced to 40mph (from 60mph) in the section of the A243 Kingston Road Leatherhead for the length which extends from a point 200 metres north of its junction with the Junction 9 Roundabout to a point 80 metres south of its junction with Epsom Gap.
- iv. Authorised 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 changes described above, revoke any existing traffic orders necessary to implement the change, and, subject to no objections being upheld, that the order be made;
- v. Noted that a speed limit order has already been advertised in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to implement a change in speed limit from 50 mph to 40 mph on the A217 Reigate Road for the length of road which is currently 50 mph between the Westvale Park roundabout and the junction with Horse Hill, and to revoke any existing traffic orders necessary to implement the change. Note that part of the speed limit change proposal on the A217 described above falls within Reigate and Banstead. The Reigate & Banstead local

committee have previously authorised the advertisement of this order.

- vi. Authorised 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 proposals described above.

Reason for Decisions:

The above decision were made because a reduced speed limit would help to reduce traffic speeds and therefore reduce risk and severity of collisions on the A29 Ockley Road/Beare Green Road and Stane Street, Ockley and the A243 Kingston Road, Leatherhead where there has been a history of collisions including death and serious injury.

A reduced speed limit on the A217 Reigate Road, Hookwood would also reduce the risk and severity of collisions and would improve the consistency in the speed limits on this road.

32/20 DECISION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 8]

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

A question was asked about the timeline for implementation of schemes agreed from the 2019 parking review. It was thought this would likely be in early 2021.

33/20 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 9]

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

Meeting ended at: 3.23 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank