

**MINUTES:** of the meeting of Surrey County Council's Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) held at 14:00 on Monday 05 June 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
Mrs Kay Hammond	Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
Mr Simon Harding	

\* part of meeting only

**Members Present – Reigate and Banstead Borough Council**

Cllr RM Bennett	Cllr F J Moore
Cllr MHC Buttery	Cllr R C Newstead
Cllr B C Cowle	Cllr R F C Wagner
Cllr SA Kulka	

**PART ONE - IN PUBLIC**

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

31/06 **APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN**

The Area Director called for nominations to chair the meeting. Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin nominated Dr Lynne Hack. Mrs Frances King seconded the nomination.

Dr Lynne Hack was appointed as Chairman for the meeting.

A Chairman and Vice Chairman will be appointed for the council year 2006/07 at the meeting if the County Council on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2006.

**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. No questions were received.

32/06 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mrs Angela Fraser, who would be arriving late for the meeting.

33/06 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING – 20 MARCH 2006 [Item 2]**

The minutes were agreed as accurate.

34/06 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

Cllr RM Bennett declared an interest in item 6, as Chairman of the Tadworth Cricket Club.

Mrs Kay Hammond declared an interest in item 7 as a member of the Surrey Police Authority.

35/06

**PETITIONS [Item 4A]**

Mrs P O'Shea of Burgh Wood, Banstead, presented a petition containing 434 signatures, on behalf of residents of Banstead & Nork requesting that the A217 junction with Burgh Wood be made safer.

Mrs P O'Shea informed the Committee of the local communities concerns following a recent fatal accident at the site. Mrs P O'Shea stated that the speed camera referred to has yet to be installed, and also felt that there had been more accidents than the figures in the report indicated.

The Local Transportation Service confirmed that there had been delays to installing the speed camera, but that this was due to be installed imminently. The Committee noted the petition.

**RESOLVED**

That:

- (i) An investigation be undertaken to introduce an experimental closure of the central reservation gaps on the A217 at Burgh Wood and at a second location approximately 500m to the north, as part of the A217 Route Study to be completed this year;
- (ii) A temporary Prohibition of All Traffic Order is made for the same period as the experimental gap closure;
- (iii) In association with (i) a consultation is carried out with local residents;
- (iv) Consideration and resolution of any objections received are delegated to the East Area Transportation Group Manager in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee and Local Members;
- (v) Following monitoring of the temporary closures, if found to be successful, the gap closures and Traffic Regulation Order are made permanent.

The Committee noted the imminent placement of a safety camera sited immediately south of the Burgh Wood junction viewing northbound traffic. The Committee discussed the impact on other roads of closing the gap. The Local Transportation Service confirmed that this would be monitored as part of the study.

36/06

**PETITIONS [Item 4B]**

Members of the Greenacre School Eco Club presented petitions containing 714 signatures, requesting a Zebra crossing on Sutton Lane to help students and local residents cross this road.

Catherine Gulliver, Erica Read, Nicola Larcombe and Amelia Warner informed the Committee of the schools aim to encourage greener ways to travel to and from school, but that safety for students is a concern.

A recent survey by the Eco Club showed that only 7% of the students walk or cycle to school, but that this figure would increase by at least 10% if there was a safe crossing.

The Committee noted the petition and would welcome the Eco Clubs views when a scheme is developed. The Local Transportation Service will ensure the club is consulted when a scheme is drawn up.

## **RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes that feasibility, design and installation of a pedestrian crossing facility in Sutton Lane near to the Winkworth Road / Croydon Lane roundabout is carried out as agreed at the Local Committee on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006, and funded from the local allocation as detailed in paragraph 2.4 of the report.

### **37/06 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 5]**

No public questions were received.

### **38/06 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]**

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

**Cllr R M Bennett, Member for Tadworth and Walton ward, asked the following questions:**

#### **Lywood Close – antisocial parking**

“Residents of Lywood Close are regularly prevented from entering or exiting their road because of antisocial motorists who park across the end of the road, (they also regularly block the service road to the shops). We already have heavy white lines across the junctions, what else can be done to help the residents? Could we paint a yellow box?”

#### **The Local Transportation Manager responded:**

“The Local Committee, at its meeting on the 5th December approved a priority programme for amendments to waiting and parking restrictions following the introduction of Decriminalised Parking Enforcement in 2004. As a consequence of this the northern villages, which includes Tadworth, is being reviewed in the current financial year.

The consultation process for the changes to waiting and parking restrictions in Tadworth is underway and has involved meetings with local residents association members and Councillors. As part of this process the issue of obstructive parking across the junction of Lywood Close has been identified. Both Officers and the local County Member have contacted residents of Lywood Close in order to determine the scale of the problem and consequently it is considered that the most appropriate solution is to place 'at any time' restrictions (double yellow lines) across the junction/access to Lywood Close.

A yellow box marking is usually reserved for junctions on main roads with high traffic flows. Entering the box when its exit is blocked by stationary traffic is a fixed penalty offence under Section 36 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1988, and can only be enforced by Surrey Police. Surrey Police are unlikely to support a yellow box marking at the Lywood Close junction or be able to adequately enforce such a restriction. Consequently double yellow lines are considered the most appropriate solution to this problem.”

### **Mill Road - markings**

“The entrance to Tadworth Cricket Club is in Mill Road. At a recent inspection of the club, it was suggested that a yellow box be painted on the road to prevent parkers blocking the emergency entrance. Could this work be undertaken urgently, please?”

### **The Local Transportation Manager responded:**

“The instructions set out in the Highway Code referring to yellow boxes say that drivers "must not enter the box until your exit road or lane from it is clear". This type of marking is intended for junctions only and would be inappropriate as a means of preventing parking. It can be anticipated misuse of the markings would be opposed by the Police as it would tend to weaken the effectiveness of the marking where used as intended. What may be offered to the Cricket Club is an informatory white line or "H-bar" marking which highlights to drivers the presence of the entrance. If inconsiderate parking continues to prevent vehicles from exiting the site, it may be dealt with by the Police as obstruction.”

Mr Simon Harding proposed implementing the H-bar marking. The proposal was seconded by Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin and agreed.

### **RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Agrees the installation of an “H-bar” marking to highlight the entrance of Tadworth Cricket Club.

### **Tadworth Cricket Club – kerb stones**

“The kerb stones and the entrance to Tadworth Cricket Club are so low that every time it rains, water cascades off the road and floods the entrance. Can the kerb stones be raised as a matter of urgency please?”

### **The Local Transportation Manager responded:**

“There is no system of positive drainage in Mill Road and rainwater is channelled off the carriageway via sags or gaps in the kerb. Behind the kerb the grass verge and asphalt footway provide a backfall allowing water to cross and soak away into the ground beyond. This will have been the arrangement since the time the road was first constructed and the highway authority now has rights of drainage over adjoining land, which it is important to retain. If the kerb in the vicinity of the Cricket Club entrance were to be raised, water would still run into their entrance but only after a large puddle had collected on the highway. A suitable solution may be for the Cricket Club to extend a strip of asphalt into their site, suitably shaped to shed water onto the adjoining grassed areas, which would allow drivers and pedestrians to access the site without crossing through standing water. This work would take place off the public highway and thus fall outside the responsibility of the highway authority.

POST QUESTION NOTE: Councillor Bennett contacted Reigate and Banstead Local Transportation Service (01/06/2006) and raised a further query regarding a cess pit on cricket club ground – Reigate and Banstead Local Transportation Service to investigate.”

### **Reigate and Banstead highways budget**

“It has now been acknowledged that Reigate and Banstead has not had its fair share of the County Highways budget for a number of years. What steps have been taken to ensure that the Borough gets its fair share of the total budget in future and what steps are being taken to ensure that the Borough benefits from some extra budget allocations to make up for the shortfall in the past.”

### **The Local Transportation Manager responded:**

“Reigate and Banstead Local Transportation Service receives funding sources as follows:

- (i) Structural Maintenance - Major maintenance and Minor maintenance
- (ii) Environmental Maintenance
- (iii) Safety Maintenance
- (iv) Damage to County Property
- (v) Local Transport Plan - for highway improvement schemes
- (vi) Local Allocation
- (vii) Member Allowances

The allocation methodology for items (i) to (iv) are outlined in the Annual Highway Management Plan For The East Surrey Transportation Service report to the Local Committee (5<sup>th</sup> June 2006). This allocation was confirmed by the Executive, at its meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> March 2006 under the same headings (i) to (iv). Funding for individual schemes are determined centrally in the County based on surveys of carriageway condition, STAMP asset management principles, best value performance indicators contained in the County's Corporate Plan, accident data, constructor's inspection and Surrey County Council highway stewards referrals and Local Transportation Service bids for schemes. It should be noted that funding for Major Schemes is not targeted to borough/district boundaries but actual roads based on set criteria.

The allocation methodology for items (v) and (vi) were outlined in the Integrated Transport Capital Projects Schemes List Review report to the Local Committee on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006. As outlined in this report the Local Transport Plan funding for highway improvement schemes is identified via a formula based upon Road Length, accidents (KSI's) and population. This allocation was confirmed at the Executive, at its meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2006 and allocated Reigate and Banstead the third highest allocation (behind Guildford and Waverley – due to the formula).

The Local Allocation (Capital funding) is a set amount (the same for each borough/district) allocated each year to be used at the discretion of the Local Committee.

The comparison with other districts/boroughs in County over the last three years is as follows:

<b>Source of funding</b>	<b>2004/05 Comparison with other districts in the County</b> (Ref Executive reports 17/2/04 & 13/4/04)	<b>2005/06 Comparison with other districts in the County</b> (Ref Executive reports 15/2/05 & 15/3/05)	<b>2006/07 Comparison with other districts in the County</b> (Ref Executive reports 14/2/06 & 15/3/06)
Structural Maintenance – Major maintenance and Minor maintenance	Fourth Highest*	Fourth Highest*	Highest*
Environmental Maintenance	Fifth Highest	Fourth Highest	Second Highest
Safety Maintenance	Second Highest	Ninth Highest	Highest
Damage to County Property	Sixth Highest	Sixth Highest	Third Highest
<b>Total Maintenance Allocation</b>	<b>Sixth Highest</b>	<b>Sixth Highest</b>	<b>Highest</b>
Local Transport Plan for highway improvement schemes	Third highest (due to the formula)	Third highest (due to the formula)	Third highest (due to the formula)
Local Allocation	Same	Same	Same
Member Allowances	Same	Same	Same

\* Based on minor maintenance as these figures only available (for 2006/07) at time of drafting this response

From this table it can be seen that, in the main, the financial allocations for Reigate and Banstead have increased and in some cases has the highest allocation in 2006/07 of the funding available towards highway improvements and maintenance.”

### **Highways repairs**

“Driving around the county recently I cannot help but notice the difference in the quality of the road surfaces - and those in Reigate and Banstead are MUCH worse than elsewhere. I have noticed kerb stones being replaced on pavements that are hardly ever used and roads that are billiard table flat being signed for resurfacing, yet in my ward we cannot even get potholes filled, drains to work properly and pavements repaired. When is the chronic backlog of highways repairs going to be addressed?”

**The Local Transportation Manager responded:**

“East area defects are repaired by Carillion following Health and Safety Inspections (HIS) or passed through from the Local Transportation Service. Defects are undertaken Countywide to reduce the risk of third party claims against the county. As such priority is given to dealing with Accident and Emergencies, Category 1 (24 hour) and Cat 2A (7 day) repairs.

From inspection of the County’s fault report system (CONFIRM), the County has committed orders of approximately 173 repairs (CAT 1 to CAT 2B identified by Surrey County Council and Carillion) in Tadworth between April 2005 and April 2006. This is only a guide and there may be a higher number of repairs as this represents only those repairs where Tadworth has been included as a location indicator in the CONFIRM system. It should be noted that highway defects will be carried out on priority for the East as an area.

Cyclic drainage works are carried in all areas, with all gullies cleaned at least once a year in the whole of the East (including Tadworth). In addition the local Highway Maintenance engineer may also place orders for specific gullies to be cleaned where there is an identified problem. The County is working hard to address and prioritise highway maintenance issues in the County against the available funding streams. ”

**Tadworth Bridge drainage**

“The drain on the bridge in Tadworth has not been working properly for over 2 years. Despite regular requests for something to be done, only once has any work been undertaken. That did make a slight improvement (temporarily), but once again it is not working properly. What do I have to do the get it repaired properly?”

**The Local Transportation Manager responded:**

“The gully in question is directly outside the estate agent's office and considerable resources have been deployed in the past, including the last two years, to clear blockages that have developed. Investigative work carried out at the time of attendance indicates that the connecting pipe extends into Network Rail land, which has made it difficult to determine where the water collected in the gully is ultimately channelled. Operations carried out on site have included jetting and testing to determine the capacity of the existing infrastructure to receive water. However, it is recognised that at times of particularly heavy demand the system may flood leading to premature silting and blockage of the pipework. There are many instances, such as this, within the County where drainage has been provided in the past in an informal manner, which had led to maintenance difficulties. No feasibility work has been undertaken to determine whether more formal drainage arrangements are possible but it is considered that such provision would be costly to provide. Until now the gully has been on the annual cleansing programme but in view of the regularity of the problem being encountered, arrangements have been made to increase this to a quarterly visit. Low cost solutions to prevent premature silting up of the gully aperture are also being investigated.”

Cllr RM Bennett believed the problem is with a different gully than that referred to in the answer. The Local Transportation Service will arrange a site meeting to investigate further.

## **Vehicle Activated Signs**

“I note that the Vehicle Activated Signs have been erected either side of the Mill Road / New Road junction with Dorking Road. The signs are far too close to the junction and have not yet been connected to the electricity. Can the signs be moved further from the junction, and when are they to be connected?”

### **The Local Transportation Manager responded:**

“An order is with EDF, the energy supplier, to connect the Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) units but, at the time of writing, no firm date of when this work will be undertaken has been received. Every effort is being made by Council officers to ensure that EDF attend as promptly as possible.

The VAS sited on the southbound approach is positioned 45 metres in advance of the junction and can view and react to oncoming vehicles at a distance of 50 metres. The Highway Code states that the total thinking and stopping distance of a vehicle travelling at 40 mph is 36 metres so, in the event of an emergency a driver should have sufficient notice and opportunity to stop. On the northbound approach, where measured average speeds are marginally higher, the sign is placed 110 metres in advance of the junction providing drivers with a total of 160 metres advanced notice. Figures taken from the Highway Code state that vehicles travelling at 50 mph require a total stopping distance of 53 metres. Even in extreme cases where vehicles are approaching at 70 mph, 30 mph over the prevailing limit, the stopping distance is 96 metres so drivers should be able to stop before reaching the junction in the event of an emergency.

It is not currently considered appropriate to re-site the signs further from the junction and the suggestion has been made that displaying the signs too early may even reduce their impact. The Police have inspected the site and have raised no objection to the positioning of the signs. Their only request has been to have foliage on the southbound approach cut back to improve visibility and an order for this work has been placed with the Council's constructor.”

The Local Committee requested that there be better consultation between the Local Committee and the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership (SSCP).

### **Cllr F Moore, Member for Redhill East ward, asked the following question:**

#### **Ladbroke Road, Redhill**

“Ladbroke Road, Redhill was placed on the Rolling Programme for resurfacing in November of 2003.

This prompted me to ask, the then Local Transportation Director, why it was not included in the programme for 2004/2005. Unsurprisingly, I was informed its exclusion resulted from lack of funding. The Director's response however did assure me, the road would be considered for 2005/2006 funding, from either the LTP settlement, or Prudential Funding.



Regrettably a personal health problem prevented my taking an interest when the 2005/2006 programme was considered. However I recently enquired, as to whether Ladbrooke Road was included in the programme for 2006/2007, and was told that it will be considered for 2007/2008.

From a Borough Member's perspective, and in view of the aforementioned, I trust I may be forgiven a touch of scepticism. Especially as I am informed, the composition of the Annual Maintenance Plan is decided by the Officers in isolation, and presented to this Committee for information only.

Therefore may I ask that, this Committee be informed of the criteria used to decide inclusion in, or exclusion from the Annual Maintenance Plan? Additionally I think it would be helpful, and add to the transparency of the process as a whole, if a comparative table of Central Government's contribution, towards highway maintenance could be published."

### **The Local Transportation Manager Responded:**

"The process for the composition of the Annual Maintenance Plan is outlined in the report on the Annual Highway Management Plan For The East Surrey Transportation Service to this Local Committee meeting (5 June 2006).

Funding for individual schemes are determined centrally in the County based on criteria including:

- Surveys of carriageway condition,
- STAMP asset management principles,
- Best value performance indicators contained in the County's Corporate Plan,
- Accident data,
- Constructor's inspection and SCC highway stewards referrals and
- Local Transportation Service bids for schemes.

The identified schemes are then walked and assessed by a County road pavement engineer who assesses how many defects are present on the scheme length and the urgency of each scheme. Schemes are then prioritised and included on a rolling programme, which is reviewed annually against available funding streams. As a result Ladbrooke Road is currently identified within the rolling programme for 2007/08 due to the priority of other schemes to be undertaken in 2006/07. In the meantime the County's Maintenance engineers have inspected this road and identified a number of Category 2C defects for repair. Following this inspection the County's Maintenance engineers contacted Councillor Moore (on 18<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> May) and outlined the aforementioned situation.

The report on the Annual Highway Management Plan For The East Surrey Transportation Service to this Local Committee meeting (5<sup>th</sup> June 2006) includes a comparative table of highway maintenance funding with other districts/boroughs in the East. A comparison of funding for all districts across the County and details of Central Government funding towards highway maintenance can be found in the report to the County's Executive Committee at its meeting of 15<sup>th</sup> March 2006 a copy of which can be obtained from the County's website."

39/06 **COMMUNITY SAFETY IN REIGATE AND BANSTEAD - STRUCTURES AND STRATEGIES [Item 7A]**

The Area Director introduced the report that updated the Local Committee on the structures and strategies around community safety in Reigate and Banstead. The report detailed some of the key changes that will effect the community safety partnership work in the Borough, such as the Local Area Agreement, the national review of Crime and Disorder and police force amalgamation.

Mr Simon Harding tabled a motion that the Committee opposes the Police force amalgamation. The motion was seconded by Cllr RC Newstead and agreed.

**RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the implications of government proposals and the Local Area Agreement for community safety partnership working;
- (ii) Agrees the arrangements that have been agreed with the CDRP for spending the County Council's funding allocation;
- (iii) Strongly opposes the proposed amalgamation of Surrey and Sussex police forces, in that this will cause a dilution of the excellent work Surrey Police provide for our residents, by spreading resources across too great an area with obviously different requirements.

The opposition to the police force amalgamation will be forwarded to the County Council's executive Committee and the Home Office, as part of the consultation.

40/06 **COMMUNITY SAFETY IN REIGATE AND BANSTEAD - LOCAL ACTIONS [Item 7B]**

The report outlined the local community safety partnership work and the achievements against the Reigate and Banstead Community Safety Strategy. Representatives from the Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, Trading Standards and Surrey Fire and Rescue addressed the Committee, outlining key successes and barriers that face services working to improve community safety in the Borough.

The Committee heard that the drought order is restricting the use of the graffiti removal equipment.

Reigate and Banstead has a very low crime rate, and a low fear of crime with 90% of residents feeling safe during the day. This drops after dark, and the Committee could consider improving street lighting in areas where residents feel unsafe.

The Committee highlighted the fragmented media approach as a barrier to improving community safety.

Mr Nicholas Harrison tabled a motion regarding CCTV at railway stations. The motion was seconded by Cllr MHC Buttery and agreed.

## RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the achievements of the Reigate and Banstead Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership and the ongoing strategic aims of the Reigate and Banstead Community Safety Strategy 2005-08;
- (ii) Supports the use of the “graffiti buster” and would support an application to the Water Company for an exemption to the drought order to allow its continued use throughout the summer;
- (iii) Requests the CCTV Partnership investigates ways to work with the railway companies to improve the standard and effectiveness of CCTV at railway stations in the Borough.

41/06

### **LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP IN REIGATE AND BANSTEAD [Item 8]**

The report provided the Committee with an update on the Local Strategic partnership, and the proposals for restructuring the group and developing a new sustainable community strategy for the Borough.

## RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the planned timetable for developing the next sustainable community plan for Reigate and Banstead;
- (ii) Notes the four themes agreed by the Local Strategic Partnership for consultation;
- (iii) Notes the changes to the structure and membership of the Local Strategic Partnership.

42/06

### **LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING - PROPOSALS FOR EXPENDITURE [Item 9]**

The Committee received a presentation summarising the delegated funding allocated in 2005/06. The presentation included feedback and photos from some of the groups that have benefited from the funding.

## RESOLVED

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

- |  |        |
|--|--------|
| 1. Delta Club – support for travel                   | £2,000 |
| 2. Age Concern – exercise classes and social outings | £2,000 |

43/06 **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN [Item 10]**

Following the Local Committee's support for the former Court Lodge School site to be retained for community use, the Local Committee were informed that Members had attended a recent Executive meeting. At this meeting the Executive agreed to open the site for bids from all groups, and to consider the overall benefits as well as the financial ones.

The County Council was unable to comment on the land due to the existing planning application for the site.

**RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee:

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

44/06 **ANNUAL HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT PLAN 2006/07 [Item 11]**

The East Area Transportation Group Manager introduced the report, which detailed the outcome of the financial year 2005/06 and the new maintenance programme for 2006/07. The draft plan that was attached to the report will change over the year as the financial details become clearer.

The Committee were informed that as the Highway Authority, Surrey County Council must achieve the Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPI's) targets or risk a reduction in funding. If the County Council achieves the BVPI targets, it is allowed to borrow additional funds to invest in the highway structure.

**RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Approves the report as the Annual Highway Management Plan for the Local Transportation Service in Reigate & Banstead for 2006/2007;
- (ii) Notes the outturn figures for the Maintenance Programme for 2005/2006;
- (iii) Notes that there is discretion for the East Area Transportation Group Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman to vire up to 100% of the indicative allocations for each expenditure head within the revenue budget whilst retaining the County Councils policies and standards.

Mr Daniel Kee left the meeting during this item 11.

Mrs Angela Fraser DL joined the meeting during item 11.

45/06 **WOODHATCH CROSSROADS JUNCTION IMPROVEMENT PROPOSALS [Item 12]**

The report detailed the design of a scheme developed including improved facilities for pedestrians and new safe crossing points for cyclists

The Local Transportation Manager asked the Committee to note the conversion of specific lengths of footway to shared footway / cycle tracks so that the scheme links to existing shared footway / cycle tracks and that pedestrians and cyclists gain maximum benefit from the proposals.

## RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Approves phase 1 of the proposed junction improvement as detailed in Annex A of the report (*drawing RB278/2001 Rev E*);
- (ii) Approves phase 2 of the junction improvement as set out in Annex B of the report, (*drawing RB278/2005 rev E*), subject to acquisition of riparian land and consent for re-designation of existing common land as public highway from the Department of Fisheries, Food & Rural Affairs DEFFRA and Government Office for the South East;
- (iii) Approves the conversion of existing footway to a shared unsegregated footway / cycle track:
  - a) Along the northern footway of Woodhatch Lane, between a point approximately 4 metres east of the junction with Cockshot Hill and the junction with Hornbeam Road;
  - b) Along the southern footway of Woodhatch Road, between the junction with Dovers Green Road and a point approximately 18 metres east of the kerblines of Dovers Green Road;
  - c) Along the eastern footway of Dovers Green Road, between the junction of Woodhatch Road and a point approximately 123 metres south of the southern kerblines of Woodhatch Road;
  - d) Along the northern footway of Prices Lane, between the junction with Cockshot Hill and a point approximately 15 metres west of the western kerblines of Cockshot Hill;
  - e) Along the western footway of Cockshot Hill, between the junction with Prices lane and a point opposite the northern flank of 15 Western Parade;
  - f) Along the link path between the Dovers Green Lane service road directly opposite the filling station and the kerblines forming the southwest corner of the junction where Dovers Green Road intersects with Prices Lane; as shown on drawings RB278/2001 and RB278/2005 to become shared unsegregated footway/cycletrack.

Mr Nicholas Harrison left the meeting during this item 12.

46/06

### **NUTFIELD ROAD TRAFFIC CALMING PROPOSALS [Item 13]**

The report detailed proposals for a traffic calming scheme in Nutfield Road, which will be funded by Reigate and Banstead Borough Council through section 106 allocations.

## RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Approves statutory consultation for and undertaking construction of speed cushions and give way priority features in Nutfield Road from the junction with Battlebridge Lane and Southcote Road to the junction with Mill Lane as shown in Annex C of the report (*drawing P0051/05*);
- (ii) Approves advertisement of the Notice for the construction of the Speed Cushions;
- (iii) Agrees that the consideration and resolution of any representations/objections are delegated to the East Area Transportation Group Manager in discussion with the Chairman of the Local Committee and Local Member(s).

47/06

### **PRICES LANE PROPOSED PUFFIN CROSSING [Item 14]**

The report outlined proposals for a puffin crossing in Prices Lane, immediately east of Sandcross Lane. A proposal has been received to develop properties on the north side of Prices Lane, and as a result the developer has offered to fund the construction of a puffin traffic signal controlled crossing.

## RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Approves consultation is undertaken with local residents and emergency services;
- (ii) Agrees that, subject to the outcome of the consultation, the required statutory processes, including advertising, are undertaken and the puffin crossing is constructed as shown in Annex A of the report;
- (iii) Agrees that the consideration and resolution of any representations are delegated to the East Area Transportation Group manager in discussion with the Chairman of the Local Committee and Local Member(s).

48/06

### **ITEM FOR INFORMATION ONLY – CAPITAL AND MAINTENANCE PROJECTS PROGRESS REPORT [Item 15]**

## RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the report.

49/06 **ITEM FOR INFORMATION ONLY – HOLMETHORPE TRAFFIC MONITORING REVIEW [Item 16]**

**RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the report.

50/06 **ITEM FOR INFORMATION ONLY – AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT AREAS [Item 17]**

**RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the report.

51/06 **FORWARD PLAN [Item 17]**

**RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the forward plan.

**[Meeting Ended: 17:08]**

**Chairman**