

MINUTES: of the meeting of Surrey County Council's Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) held at 14:00 on Monday 20 March 2006 at Reigate Town Hall, Castlefield Road.

Members Present – Surrey County Council

Mrs Angela Fraser DL	Mr Nick Harrison
Mr Michael Gosling	Mr Daniel Kee
Dr Lynne Hack	Mrs Frances King
Mr Simon Harding	Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin

Members Present – Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

Cllr RM Bennett (Tadworth and Walton)	Cllr F J Moore (Redhill East)
Cllr MHC Buttery (Tadworth and Walton)	Cllr AR Mountney (South Park and Woodhatch)
Cllr AJ Kay (Horley Central)	Cllr M G Ormerod (South Park and Woodhatch)
Cllr SA Kulka (Meadvale and St Johns)	Cllr B A Stead (Nork)

Public Open Session

Before the formal Committee session began, the Chairman invited questions relating to items on the agenda from members of the public attending the meeting. Questions were received regarding item 7, 8 and 9. These were taken during discussions of the items.

PART ONE - IN PUBLIC

[All references to items refer to the agenda for the meeting]

13/06 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mrs Kay Hammond and Cllr JM Miller.

14/06 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING – 09 JANUARY 2006 [Item 2]**

The minutes were agreed with the following amendments:

06/06 Members' Question Time [Item 6]

The leaning post in Cavendish Road and the light in Whitepost Hill were reported towards the end of August 2005, not November as stated.

15/06 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

Mrs A Fraser, Member for Banstead East, declared a personal interest in item 8, as Chairman of Age Concern.

Cllr RM Bennett, Member for Tadworth and Walton, declared a personal interest in item 7, as a day nursery owner.

Mr N Harrison, Member for Banstead West, declared a personal interest in item 8, as Governor of Shawley Community Primary School.

Cllr MG Ormerod, Member for South Park and Woodhatch, declared a personal interest in item 8, as a member of the Woodhatch Community Association.

Cllr AR Mountney, Member for South Park and Woodhatch, Cllr SA Kulka, Member for Meadvale and St Johns, and Mrs F King, Member for Earlswood and Reigate Hill, declared personal interests in item 8, as committee members of the Woodhatch Park Project.

Cllr MHC Buttery, Member for Tadworth and Walton, declared a personal interest in item 8, as a board member of the Preston Self Reliance Partnership.

16/06 **PETITIONS [Item 4]**

A petition of 5020 signatures was received on behalf of Banstead residents, opposing the proposed closure of Banstead Youth Centre.

Mark Clouter and Toni Fitzsimons addressed the Committee, stating their wish for investment in the youth centre, rather than closure, to continue to provide a safe environment for children and young people to meet with friends. Closure of the centre could result in an increase of anti-social behaviour and require an increased community safety presence, with the additional cost this would entail. The Committee were informed of the opportunities currently available through the centre, such as Duke of Edinburgh awards, and national sporting competitions, that provide young people with new skills and development.

The petition detailed how the Youth Centre plays host to a number of local groups including the Horseshoe Community pre-school. The pre-school has operated for 30 years and plays a vital role in the provision of early learning in the area. Closure of the centre would threaten the existence of the pre-school. There was concern that this seemed to clash with the proposals to develop children's centres.

The Committee noted the petition.

RESOLVED

That:

- (i) The Chairman of the Committee present the petition alongside the petitioners Mark Clouter and Toni Fitzsimons, to the County Council's Executive Committee meeting on 6th April, where the Business Delivery Review will be considered.

17/06 **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 5]**

Two public questions were received:

Mr John Bunner, Hazelwood Lane, asked the following question:

Hazelwood Lane

"The majority of Hazelwood Lane needs fully re-furbishing and a new tarmacadam surface laid. When can I expect this permanent remedial action to be taken rather than the temporary pot-hole repairs which do nothing to rectify this deplorable and dangerous state of affairs"?

The Local Transport Manager Responded:

"Hazlewood Lane was last resurfaced in 1998 (a length of approximately 400m from the junction with Outwood Lane). Officers understand, however, that in the last two years a number of reports of potholes have been made along Hazlewood Lane

During 2005 Reigate and Banstead's Local Transportation Service (R&BLTS) attended the area sixteen times and carried out thirty-one pothole repairs. R&BLTS have recently inspected Hazlewood Lane and have ordered further pothole repairs to be undertaken.

Due the limited amount of funding that Surrey County Council receives from Central Government towards highway maintenance, the County has to prioritise the list of schemes that require major maintenance or resurfacing. Each Local Transportation Service (representing each district in the County) submits annual bids to a central County team who then assess and prioritise the improvements across the County so that the areas of most need in each district are brought up to a suitable standard. In the meantime R&BLTS undertake regular inspections and undertake pothole repairs to ensure the safety for road users.

R&BLTS can add Hazlewood Lane to its list of roads seeking funding for major resurfacing and also on the list of what is known as Local Structural Repairs (which targets the sections of the road requiring greatest attention, rather than the whole road). As stated earlier, however, this request would have to compete with other maintenance priorities across the County and as such is not guaranteed to receive major funding in the near future.

With regard to comments about the road being dangerous, I can confirm that there have been no accidents along this length of road in the last 3 years (the criteria used to assess safety improvements) as a result of the highway condition. The County is aware that the character and alignment of this road does require drivers to drive within the posted speed limit."

Mr Bunner asked the Local Transportation Service to consider the number of vehicles using the road, which he believed had been measured recently.

Reverend Robert J May, Horley Baptist Church, asked the following question:

Court Lodge Infant School site, Horley

“We would like to ask the Local Committee either to explain or to enquire as to why there is the current delay in any information about the Council's hopes or intentions for the site and also why there is no information currently about how and when the County Council intends to dispose of the site.”

The Valuer and Estates Manager Responded:

“In order to protect the children at the school site it was considered inappropriate to actively market the site. Now the school is empty our consultants have been requested to finalise a disposal strategy with a recommendation as to whether the site should be sold by private treaty or auction. It is anticipated that the site will be advertised for sale in Mid May when relevant details will be made available. In the meantime consultants have been requested to manage the site pending sale.”

Reverend May expressed concern that sale by auction would favour developers who are able to raise large sums of money at short notice, and asked if any assurances could be given to give community groups a fair and favourable opportunity to purchase the site.

The Chairman stated that Surrey County Council must ensure that any land disposal brings value for money to the council taxpayer, but that the overall value and benefits to the community can be considered.

RESOLVED

That:

- (i) The Local Committee supports the disposal of the Court Lodge Infant School site for community use;
- (ii) The Chairman and local Members for Horley will ensure that this view is presented to the Member Asset Panel, when it considers the site.

18/06 **MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]**

Two Member questions were received. The following responses were tabled at the meeting.

Mr N Harrison, Member for Banstead West, asked the following questions:

Annual Highway Maintenance Plan

"As the year is almost complete, could a progress report be provided on the Annual Highway Maintenance Plan, approved by this Committee on 18th July 2005? This should include progress against each of the Major Maintenance Schemes, as well as the Footway Schemes, and the Local Structural Patching Schemes, as well as the revenue programmes."

Road maintenance, Banstead West division

"Hillside and Burgh Wood are the worst maintained roads in Banstead West, suffering from severe problems in a number of places. In Hillside, the situation has been exacerbated by house construction at the end of the road. There are road collapses, as well as extensive potholes. I am informed that the condition of these roads is not serious enough for Highways Department to include them in next year's Major Maintenance Schemes. Can this be confirmed and if so, could the condition of these roads be re-examined and a scheme prepared to address these problems, once the house building is complete. Is Highways Department taking action to claw back such monies as it can justify from the house builder responsible at least in part for the problems?"

The Local Transport Manager Responded:

Annual Highway maintenance Plan

"Please see the response to the question raised at Local Committee on 9th January 2006."

Road maintenance, Banstead West division

"Due to the limited amount of funding that Surrey County Council receives from Central Government towards highway maintenance, the County has to prioritise the list of schemes that require major maintenance or resurfacing. Each Local Transportation Service (representing each district in the County) submits annual bids to a central County team who then assess and prioritise the improvements across the County so that the areas of most need in each district are brought up to a suitable standard. In the meantime R&BLTS undertake regular inspections and undertake pothole repairs to ensure the safety for road users. The next Statutory Inspection in this area is due in May 2006.

With regard to Hillside Reigate and Banstead Local Transportation Service officers have met the developer undertaking the house construction at the end of the road several times. As a result remedial and temporary patching work has been undertaken to the hammerhead turning area to stabilise a subsiding area of the carriageway.

Due to the current ongoing house building works this road has not been included in the major maintenance schemes for 2006/07. Upon completion of the works R&BLTS officers will re-examine the area and will seek repairs at the developers cost. This could include larger scale repairs (such as resurfacing) but may be restricted to the hammerhead area and the adjacent footway in that area due to the extent of the development.

Any resurfacing of the remainder of Hillside and Burgh Wood would need to be addressed by the Local Transportation Service. R&BLTS will add these areas to its list of roads seeking funding for what is known as Local Structural Repairs (which targets the sections of the road requiring greatest attention, rather than the whole road) or for major maintenance. As stated earlier, however, this request would have to compete with other maintenance priorities across the County and as such is not guaranteed to receive funding."

The Area Transportation Director informed the Committee that Surrey County Council is required to maintain and improve the value of the highways assets. To do this the Surrey Transportation Asset Management Plan uses a SCANNER system to score the network.

The principle road network is measured every year.

The non principal network is measured once every two years.

The remaining network is split into thirds and measured on an annual rolling basis.

This information is used to determine how major maintenance funding is distributed.

In addition to the two questions, a response was tabled to Member questions received at the Local Committee on 9th January 2006:

Mr N Harrison, Member for Banstead West, asked the following questions:

Local Maintenance Schemes

"The papers for the meeting give a progress report against capital projects. Could a report also be provided of progress against the various local maintenance schemes agreed at the 18th July 2005 meeting?

Could information be provided for each major maintenance scheme, footway enhancement and local structural patching scheme (Item 19 annex A and B), plus street lighting replacement projects?"

Highways Key Performance Indicators (KPI's)

"It has been reported in the East of the County that the headline KPI's for the ShiP project have not been met, Carillion falling short of the 80% target. Could it be explained how this has affected the standards of service and what steps are being taken to remedy the situation?"

Highway Defects

“In relation to highway defects in Reigate & Banstead, and their classification (Cat 1, Cat 2A, Cat 2B etc), could we be advised of the achievements so far this year:

- In defects remedied by type;
- The outstanding number of defects by type, at the beginning and end of the period;
- The average time it takes to get defects remedied by type, compared to the target times.”

Local Maintenance Schemes

“The Leader of the Borough Council has recently commented on the unfairness in the allocating the County highways budget to the road network in Reigate and Banstead, compared to the funding to the network in other borough and district areas. Could the allocation methodology be explained and any areas of unfairness be identified?”

The Local Transportation Manager Responded:

Local Maintenance Schemes

“A regular report will be provided at the Local Committee on progress against the various local maintenance schemes. This is something that can be produced in 2006/07 following the confirmation of the maintenance budgets. Progress against the various local maintenance schemes agreed at the 18th July 2005 meeting is as follows;

Major Maintenance Schemes

A217 Cockshott Hill	Completed
A217 Dovers	Deferred to 2006/07 as linked to improvement scheme
Green/Woodhatch	Completed
A23 Bonehurst Road	Completed
A242 Croydon Road	Completed
D355 Masons Bridge Road	Completed

Prudential Funded Schemes

B2032 Outwood Lane	In progress
B2036 Balcombe Road	Deferred to 2006/07 as linked to improvement scheme
D1178 Rocky Lane	Completed
D1207 Somers Road	Completed
D1215 Warren Road	In progress
D1250 Clarence Walk	Completed
D1250 Copse Road	Completed
D1270 St Johns Road	Withdrawn as scope of works would have exceeded available funding *
D1297 Arden Close	Withdrawn due to priority of other schemes *
D1306 Bushfield Drive	Completed
D1306 Rathgar Close	Completed

* *Replaced with the following roads which featured next on the prioritised list:*

Meath Green Lane	Value £11,500
Blackhorse Lane	£7,700
Waterhouse Lane	£15,000
Massetts Road	£22,600
Longshott	£14,800

Footway Enhancement Schemes

B2034 Blackborough Road	Withdrawn due to priority of other schemes above*
C23 Prices Lane	Deferred to 2006/07 pending housing development
D1027 Tattenham Grove	In progress
D1215 Warren Road	In progress
D1114 St Monicas Road	Completed

Local Structural Patching Schemes

A23 Marketfield Way	Deferred to 2006/07 pending British Gas works
A23 Princess Way	Programmed for March 2006
D1022 Shawley Way	Completed
D1106 Shelveys Way	Completed
D1298 Sandcross Lane	Completed

Street lighting replacement projects

Dorking Road	Lighting at junction improved EDF awaited
Croydon Road	Localised lantern upgrade
Nork Way	Replaced columns and lanterns
Shelveys Way	Replaced 3 columns and lanterns
Purbeck Close	Upgraded columns
The Crescent	Upgraded columns
Maple Road	Lighting at junction improved junction improvement

The Committee asked for a similar report to be presented to each Committee meeting.

Highways Key Performance Indicators (KPI's)

Key performance indicators (KPIs) relate to a range of topics including timeliness of delivery, delivery within budget and standard of workmanship. Each topic has a weighting, which is set out in the SHiP contract and serves to define its relative importance. The prime purpose of KPIs is to monitor the contract, identifying where shortcomings may lie and help develop means of making things work more smoothly and efficiently.

KPI percentages are calculated by comparing assessed targets against actual performance. An overall score is then produced by factoring in individual weightings and adding together the values produced.

In December 2006 the headline KPIs improved from 46% to 80% following efforts of both the Contract Performance Monitoring Team and Carillion to target problems that performance indicators had identified.

KPIs are also referred to at the end of each contract year when the Contract Performance Monitoring Team assess what extension (if any) of contract the Constructor is to be awarded.

There is a risk of linking work standards to KPI's as some of the KPI's are about timeliness of discrete schemes, for example the start and finish times of site works etc. Both Carillion and Surrey County Council are working to raise the KPI standards.

Highway Defects

During the period April to November 2005 the following statistics were collected.

Category	Time standard	Defects Identified	Completed	Percentage	Of which on time	Percentage
A & E	1 hour	747	747	100	747	100
Cat 1A	24 hours	200	194	97	142	73
Cat 2a	7 days	1294	459	35	247	54
Cat 2b	28 days	630	201	32	104	52

The Committee were informed that the figures above are the defects identified during that period, and do not include any backlog prior to April 2005.

Local Maintenance Schemes

There are various sources of funding provided to Reigate and Banstead Local Transportation Service. These comprise:

Improvements

- Local Transport Plan Capital Funding
- Local Allocation

The funding allocation for 2005/06 was approved by the Executive at it's meeting on 15 February 2005.

Maintenance

- Structural Maintenance
- Environmental Maintenance
- Safety Maintenance

The level of maintenance funding for 2005/06 was approved by the Executive on 15th March 2005.

Regrettably due to the current pressures on staff resulting from the Business Delivery Review it has not been possible to provide a full and final answer to this question regarding the allocation methodology. The Area Transportation Director and Local Transportation Manager very much apologises for this and will endeavour to provide a full report at the next Local Committee."

19/06

CHILDREN'S CENTRES IN REIGATE AND BANSTEAD [Item 7]

Sue Turton, from Surrey County Council's Early Years service, gave a presentation updating the Committee on the development of Children's centres in Reigate and Banstead. The centres are aimed at children aged 0-5 and their parents/carers, underpinned by the community.

The Epsom Downs Children's centre, a phase one centre, has already been established.

There are 5 phase two children's centres planned in Reigate and Banstead: 3 with the full core offer, 1 with a near to minimal offer that reflects local need, and 1 with the minimal offer that reflects local need.

A site has yet to be found for a centre in Redhill.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the programme to develop Children's Centres across the county and the specific sites identified in Reigate and Banstead;

20/06

LOCAL MEMBER INITIATIVE FUND PROPOSALS [Item 8]

The Committee thanked the Local Partnerships Team for their work in producing the report, given the large number of allocations.

RESOLVED

That the following proposals be approved from Local Member Initiative funding:

1. Replacement of concrete bollards, Banstead	£400
2. Weekend Activities Worker, Hillbrook House, Redhill	£6,800
3. All Weather Garden, Wray Common Primary School	£3,000
4. Meadvale Friendship Club	£2,000
5. Vehicle Activated Signs, Horley	£8,200
6. Library Equipment, Sandcross School	£766.35
7. Lighting at Riverside, Horley	£1,953.60
8. CCTV, Horley Recreation Ground	£500
9. Horley Youth Council	£500
10. English Language Courses	£650
11. Community Speedwatch	£6,061
12. Crime Reduction Scheme – Door Security	£1,196.40
13. Mobility Independence Scheme	£1,430
14. Hearing Loop, Peter Aubertin Hall	£1,209
15. Interactive Electronic Equipment, Shawley Community Primary School	£2,500
16. Colebrook Project Hydro	£537.22
17. Playground Project, Orchard Infant School	£1,000
18. Woodhatch Park Project	£1,000
19. Environmental Project, Dovers Green School	£1,000
20. Manorfields School, Horley	£1,000

21. Emlyn Meadows	£1,000
22. Merstham Cricket Club	£500
23. Preston Self Reliance Partnership	£9,485.25
24. Merstham woodland walk	£1,200
25. Furnistore	£1,300

RESOLVED

That the following proposals be approved from Local Committee Capital for Voluntary Organisations Funding:

1. Colebrook Project Hydro	£35,000
----------------------------	---------

21/06 BUSINESS DELIVERY REVIEW [Item 9]

The Local Committee considered a report outlining the context and local impact of the County Council's Business Delivery Review Surrey County Council must make substantial savings in 2006/07 to secure a sound financial ground.

The Committee noted that this is a very anxious time for staff, and were concerned about the time pressures that staff have been given in applying for posts.

Public engagement over the proposals has only been carried out through the locally elected members. The usage of a building should be considered in deciding any changes to provision. There was some concern that the process was still a 'knee jerk' reaction and needs to be considered carefully.

Since the report was produced a number of the proposals have changed, and will continue to be reviewed until County Council takes the final decision on 11th April 2006. The Committee encouraged anyone to raise specific concerns with their local County Councillor.

Mr N Harrison, Member for Banstead West tabled a motion on Banstead Youth Centre, seconded by Mr Michael Gosling, Member for Banstead South. The motion passed unanimously.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Acknowledges the value of the Youth Centre in Banstead, both as a thriving location for youth work, and as a community facility for many local groups and activities. It urges the Executive to ensure that Youth Services take steps to allow its continued functioning, through a programme to
 - Increase community involvement in the management and operation of the centre
 - Control ongoing operating costs
 - Increase revenue, by charging more appropriate, market based hiring fees.

- (ii) Recommends that the Executive does not take steps to close the centre until all alternatives to reduce the net costs to an acceptable level have been exhausted, and if closure is still considered necessary, until alternative youth provision is in place, as provided in the original BDR proposals;
- (iii) Notes the context for the Business Delivery Review.

22/06 **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN [Item 10]**

The Local Partnerships Team will circulate the Executive and County Council decision on the Business Delivery Review to all Members as soon as it is available.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the forward plan of the County Council's Executive Committee.

23/06 **LOCAL COMMITTEE PROTOCOL [Item 11]**

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council members welcomed the opportunity to participate in all committee discussions. Borough members will continue to have voting rights on highways matters only.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee agree:

- (i) The following amendments to the Local Committee protocol in Reigate and Banstead:

The Local Committee will work to monitor and improve local service performance and partnership working in Reigate and Banstead by:

- Inviting Borough Council members of the Committee to join discussions (but not hold voting rights) on a range of issues in addition to transportation and highway matters;
- The Chairman of the Local Committee inviting partners, such as the Leader of the Borough Council, to join discussions (but not hold voting rights) at Local Committee meetings;
- Varying Committee meeting venues, including Surrey County Council offices, Reigate Town Hall and community venues;
- Focusing on monitoring and improving partnership work in certain areas. Such areas could include:
 - Independent adult living, elderly or vulnerable people
 - Environment/street scene issues
 - Young People and children
 - Waste
 - Community Safety
 - Specific geographical areas
 - Any other relevant area.
- County Councillors joining the local Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Local Community Action Plan (LCAP) Steering groups.

24/06 **INTEGRATED TRANSPORT CAPITAL PROJECTS SCHEMES LIST REVIEW
[Item 12]**

Surrey County Council has published its second Local Transport Plan containing revised objectives and targets, which, necessitates a revision of the system used to prioritise schemes.

The Executive agrees the funding allocation to each local transportation service. Decisions on how to allocate this funding to schemes and projects is delegated to the Local Committee.

The Local Transportation Service have developed a system, which has been applied to the Reigate and Banstead Integrated Transport Capital scheme list, which was developed with the Joint Member Transport Task Group.

A revised forward programme has been produced, using the new system, along with a proposed list of schemes to be progressed in 2006/07.

The Committee raised the importance of finding the most cost effective solutions, without over complicating schemes.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Endorses the revised methodology for assessing and prioritising integrated transport schemes;
- (ii) Approves funding the proposed list of Local Transport Plan capital schemes identified for progression in 2006/07 (Annex B of the report);
- (iii) Approves funding the proposed list of schemes identified for progression in 2006/07 under the Local Allocation, should this funding be confirmed (Annex B of the report);
- (iv) Approves the indicative five-year forward programme for progression under the County's second Local Transport Plan (Annex C of the report);
- (v) Delegates authority to make any amendments to the 2006/07 scheme list to the South East Area Transportation Director, in discussion with the Chairman of this Committee, as a result of changes in available funding following the closing of the 2005/06 accounts.

25/06 **A242 CROYDON ROAD/ GATTON PARK ROAD (PART) - PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS [Item 13]**

The Committee considered the findings of the feasibility study, to provide pedestrian and highway safety improvements along the A242 Croydon Road and Gatton Park Road, to assist students of St Bede's School and Wray Common Primary School.

RESOLVED

That:

- (i) Subject to funding, acquisition of riparian land, statutory procedures and safety audit, the proposals shown within Annex A of the report, be progressed to detailed design and implementation.
- (ii) A Traffic Regulation Order is advertised to extend the existing 30mph speed limit as indicated in Annex A of the report.
- (iii) Statutory consultation is undertaken with regard to the introduction of speed reducing features.

26/06 **HORLEY NORTH EAST SECTOR DEVELOPMENT TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS & TRAFFIC MEASURE CONSULTATION [Item 14]**

Mr David Taylor, Transportation Development Control, was in attendance to assist with any comments and questions.

The Local Committee heard that as a result of proposals to develop the North East Sector site in Horley to provide residential accommodation and associated amenities, a number of highway measures will be necessary, both within the site boundary and at locations within the existing road network local to the site.

The proposals were developed following consultation with local residents. The new access road is designed in line with the current highway design guideline.

Mrs D Ross-Tomlin, Member for Horley East, passed comments from the local parish council to David Stempfer and David Taylor to be considered.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the layout of the proposed link road, traffic calming measures and proposed highway improvements as shown in Annex A & B of the report, as approved by the Reigate and Banstead Planning Committee;
- (ii) Agrees the advertising and statutory consultation for the proposed traffic calming as shown in Annex B of the report;
- (iii) Agrees that the consideration and resolution of any representations received as a result of advertising and consultation for the proposed traffic calming be delegated to the South East Area Transportation Director in agreement with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of this Committee, and in discussion with the locally elected Members;

- (iv) Agrees the modification of the existing traffic order pertaining to Cross Oak lane, extending the 40 mph limit to include the access road between Cross Oak lane and the site access roundabout as shown in Annex A of the report;
- (v) Agrees the creation of a traffic regulation order banning the left turn out of, and the right turn into Cross Oak Lane, at its junction with Lake Lane and the proposed access road as shown in Annex B of the report;
- (vi) Agrees the creation of a traffic regulation order preventing the use of motor vehicles in Lake Lane except for access and as shown in Annex B of the report;
- (vii) Agrees that the consideration and resolution of any objections received as a result of advertising and statutory consultation for the proposed traffic regulation orders be delegated to the South East Area Transportation Director, in agreement with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of this Committee, and in discussion with locally elected Members.

27/06 **ITEM FOR INFORMATION – M23/A23 UPDATE [Item 15]**

The Local Transportation Manager updated the Committee on the M23/A23 Hooley interchange.

Surrey County Council officers met with the Highways Agency on 14th March 2006 to establish whether acceptable solutions, similar to Option C, can be delivered within available funding constraints.

Surrey County Council officers have produced suggestions regarding the feasibility of a potential hybrid solution of Options B and C that might reduce costs, meet the requirements of the scheme and address the concerns of the local community. These were discussed at the meeting and the Highways Agency have agreed to instruct their consultants to investigate the suggestions in terms of practicality, estimated costs and economics.

Surrey County Council officers have asked to be involved in the work and are to meet again with the Highways Agency, in approximately 2 months time, to establish whether the suggestions are viable and affordable.

The possibility of delivering a phased solution that firstly addresses the safety issues followed by a scheme that provides for all movements and a defined end of the motorway was discussed at the meeting with the Highways Agency. There are however, issues with this in that the safety benefits are an integral part of the economic case supporting a junction and defined end of the motorway.

28/06 **CAPITAL PROJECTS PROGRESS REPORT [Item 16]**

Comments were raised on the following sections:

The mini roundabout at Outwood Lane/Lower Park Road – the mini roundabout is not yet complete, contrary to the statement in the report.

Tadworth Street/Station Approach – the local member was unaware that the safety audit had been completed, and still has some issues to be resolved. The Committee asked that local Members be informed when Road Safety Audits are to take place.

Dorking Road/Mill Lane junction improvements – there was concern that the position of the vehicle activated signs are too close to the junction.

Garratts Lane traffic light phasing - recently changed and as a result rat running along adjacent roads has increased.

The Local Transportation Service will investigate these issues.

RESOLVED

That

- (i) The Local Committee notes the report.

29/06 **FORWARD PLAN [Item 17]**

An update on the monitoring undertaken in respect of the Holmethorpe development is provisionally due to the Local Committee in July 2006.

The Local Committee noted the forward plan.

30/06 **PRESS RELEASE [Item 18]**

The Committee requested a press release in respect of item 4 and 9, regarding the proposed closure of Banstead Youth Centre.

[Meeting Ended: 16:10]

Chairman