

MINUTES: of the meeting of Surrey County Council's Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) held at 14:00 on Monday 03 March 2008 at Reigate Town Hall.

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	

Members Present – Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

Cllr Richard Bennett	Cllr Brian Stead
Cllr Mark Brunt	Cllr Richard Wagner
Cllr Michael Buttery	

for part of meeting

PART ONE-IN PUBLIC

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

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. There were no questions asked.

- 01/08 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**
Apologies were received from Cllr Michael Miller, Cllr Roger Newstead and Cllr Brain Cowle. Apologies for lateness were received from Mrs Angela Fraser DL.
- 02/08 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING – 3 DECEMBER 2007 [Item 2]**
The minutes were agreed as accurate.
- 03/08 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**
Mrs Kay Hammond declared an interest in item 9, as a member of Surrey Community Action.
- 04/08 **PETITIONS [Item 4]**
No petitions were received.
- 05/08 **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 5]**
No public questions were received.

06/08 **MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]**

Two members' questions were received. The questions and responses are attached as Annex A.

Following a supplementary question by Cllr Wagner, it was suggested waiting restrictions in Stagbury Avenue could be funded through a combination of Local Committee capital funding and local members allocations.

Following a supplementary question by Cllr Stead, Mr Simon Harding gave an update on the County Council's work towards a street lighting PFI. Any street lighting improvements would be carried out in discussion with District and Borough Councils.

07/08 **SURREY LOCAL RESILIENCE FORUM UPDATE [Item 10]**

This item was brought forward by the Chairman.

Ian Good, Head of Contingency Planning, introduced the report, which provided an update on the county's contingency plans to ensure Surrey is prepared in the event of an emergency. Surrey County Council and 36 other key partners have formed the Surrey Resilience Forum to coordinate this work, developing plans to respond to and recover from a range of incidents such as flooding, terrorism or pandemic flu.

The committee raised questions about mutual aid, working with large employers and hospital capacity to respond to emergencies.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Note the report.

08/08 **SELF RELIANCE AND INDEX OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATION 2007 – REIGATE AND BANSTEAD [Item 7]**

The Area Director and Local Committee Officer introduced the report, which provided members with a local demographic profile based on the recently published Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). The report highlighted key areas within the borough that are identified by the IMD. The report also provided an update on the ongoing self reliance work in Preston and Merstham, two areas previously highlighted by local profiles.

Laurence Nasskau, Communities that Care Coordinator, provided further insight into the self reliance projects established in Preston, many with County Council funding.

The Committee commended all the work that has been undertaken in key areas, but noted that a number of areas within the borough have been highlighted by IMD data but are not currently targeted by self reliance work.

There were a couple of errors within the report. In table 2, the columns should state 10% and 25% least deprived areas. In paragraph 5.3, it is the Merstham Community Facilities Trust that is working to develop a community facility in Portland Drive, not New Merstham Residents Association as stated.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Welcomes the initiatives in progress and in development in Preston and Merstham.
- (ii) Provide insight into the areas highlighted by the Index of Multiple Deprivation, on the basis of Members' local knowledge.

REASON FOR DECISION

The Local Committee is responsible for monitoring services provided locally and the funding for self reliance projects within the borough. These roles provide an excellent opportunity for supporting the work in targeted self reliance areas.

09/08 LOCAL COMMITTEE TASK GROUPS [Item 8]

The Local Committee Officer introduced the report, which proposed a template for task group terms of reference. The need for terms of reference has been identified following a complaint in another Local Committee area. It was noted that this Local Committee does not currently have any task groups.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Approve the terms of reference template, attached as Annex B to these minutes, to be used for all Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) task groups.

REASON FOR DECISION

A formal complaint has been received by the County Council, and one of the investigating officers recommendations is to have formal terms of reference for all Local Committee task groups. A template will make this process clear and transparent.

10/08 LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING - PROPOSALS FOR EXPENDITURE [Item 9]

Due to the need for an urgent decision, a supplementary paper was tabled containing one additional proposal.

Twenty two capital funding bids had been received. The Chairman proposed that the capital funding be allocated to 1st Tattenhams Scouts, TS Ark Royal Sea Cadets and Woodhatch Park Project.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee agrees that the:

- (i) Following proposals be approved from Local Committee revenue funding:
- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Vehicle activated sign – Tattenham Crescent | £5,000 |
| 2. Extension of graveyard – St Peter’s Church
Woodmansterne | £5,000 |
| 3. Hooley and Chipstead club promotions and
outings – Age Concern Merstham, Redhill and
Reigate | £2,500 |
| 4. East Surrey buggy walks – Action for Life | £800 |
| 5. Fit for Life – YMCA Reigate and Redhill | £680 |
| 6. “Cracking Up” men and mental health comedy
project – Surrey Primary Care Trust | £1,100 |
| 7. Sun shade areas – St John’s Primary School | £1,500 |
| 8. Exciting science in primary schools –
SETPOINT Surrey | £600 |
| 9. Outreach project – Citizens Advice Bureau | £2,206.95 |
| 10. Walking for Health – Action for Life | £500 |
| 11. Banstead youth centre – YMCA Reigate and
Redhill | £1,000 |
| 12. PA system – Surrey Police | £300 |
| 13. The Youth Project – Reigate and Redhill Air
Cadets | £4,000 |
| 14. Playground improvements – Langshott School | £845 |
| 15. Marketing and training – Cool2Care | £2,000 |
| 16. Planting in Whitebushes | £208.65 |
| 17. Lighting – Redhill Football Club | £1,000 |
| 18. Display unit – Reigate library | £841.93 |
| 19. Replacement of bus – Brambles respite care
centre | £1,505.38 |
| 20. Boccia sets – Woodfield School | £263 |
| 21. Housing and mentoring support – Surrey Police | £2,000 |
| 22. Youth engagement – Mynthurst Cricket Club | £2,000 |
| 23. Shared garden project – Meath Green Infant
School / Horley Row community playgroup | £2,000 |
| 24. Ceiling repairs – Salfords Guides Association | £2,000 |
| 25. Exclusive playschemes – Reigate and Redhill
YMCA | £1,000 |
| 26. Personal development programme for young
adults – Surrey Care Trust | £893 |
| 27. Volunteer recruitment and training – Homestart
Banstead | £1,115.20 |
| 28. Marbles pond redevelopment – Raven Housing
Trust | £1,022.05 |

- (ii) Following proposals be approved from Local Committee capital funding:
- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Building improvements – 1 st Tattenhams (St Mark) Scout Group headquarters | £4,500 |
| 2. Electrical Rewiring – “TS Ark Royal” Reigate Borough Sea Cadets | £12,000 |
| 3. Gazebo roofing – Woodhatch park project | £2,242.91 |
- (iii) Following proposals not be approved from Local Committee capital funding:
- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 1. Hall refurbishment – Art Matters | £6,492 |
| 2. Disabled facilities – Banstead Lawn Tennis Club | £18,000 |
| 3. Training equipment – Cruse Bereavement Care south east Surrey | £1,192 |
| 4. Exciting science in east surrey primary schools – SETPOINT Surrey | £3,370 –
£5,960 |
| 5. Disabled and baby change facilities – Merstham Football and Social Club | £18,742.91 |
| 6. Marbles pond redevelopment – Raven Housing Trust | £3,400 |
| 7. Folding hall dividers – St Wilfrid’s Church, Horley | £4,000 |
| 8. E-citizen qualifications – Travel Matters Enterprises Ltd | £4,200 |
| 9. Brewer room refurbishment – Reigate and Redhill YMCA | £2,000 |
| 10. Route 4 – The Warwick School | £5,980 |
| 11. Whitebushes village hall renovation | £7,100 |
| 12. The Odemerestor Garden – Woodmansterne Primary School | £4,400 |
| 13. Cricket nets – Woodmansterne Cricket Club | £5,000 |
| 14. Extension of car park – Colman-Redland Centre, Reigate | £18,742.91 |
| 15. Window replacement – Colman-Redland Centre, Reigate | £7,461.25 /
£9,987.50 |
| 16. Presentation equipment – The Salvation Army | £1,500 |
| 17. Kitchen refit – Diamond Centre for Disabled Riders | £4,328 |
| 18. Office equipment – Cardiac Risk in the Young | £6,000 |
| 19. Fire and emergency support service – British Red Cross | £4,065.32 |

The Committee encouraged the unsuccessful bids to reapply in the next financial year.

REASON FOR DECISIONS

The spending proposals put forward have been assessed against the County standards for appropriateness and value for money.

- 11/08 **LOCAL COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN – REIGATE TOWN [Item 11]**
The Area Director introduced the report, which provided a summary of the Reigate Town Local Community Action Plan.

The local County Councillor, Mr Simon Harding, congratulated and thanked the Borough Council for the partnership approach to the Reigate Town plan. He asked the Chairman to pass these comments and thanks to Charlotte Fletcher, the officer that supported the development of the plan.

Cllr Buttery also supported the process, particularly the effect they have on getting the community to work together.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Welcomes the Local Community Action Plan for Reigate Town and the priorities within it.

- 12/08 **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN [Item 12]**
Mrs Kay Hammond proposed that the Local Committee submit its support to continued support for the Fastway service, which will be considered by the Executive shortly. Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin seconded the proposal

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the forward plan of the County Council's Executive Committee.
- (ii) Submit its support for county council revenue support for Fastway in advance of section 106 contributions being received, to be considered by the Executive on 25th March.

- 13/08 **FORWARD PLAN [Item 13]**
The Committee asked that they receive a report on the highways patching gangs, funded in 2007/08, at the Committee meeting on 2nd June. The Committee also suggested releasing a press release to promote the work that these gangs have carried out.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Approve the Local Committee forward plan for 2008/09 and beyond.

[Meeting Ended: 15:57]

Chairman

MEMBER QUESTIONS

Two questions were received

1 Cllr Brian Stead, Member for Nork, asked the following question:

Street Lighting

“Some years ago, my residents submitted a petition for a new street light to illuminate the junction of their road Claremount Gardens, Epsom Downs with the busy A240 Reigate Road. Where does this bid stand in the order of priorities for street lighting and when can my residents expect a light to be installed?”

Over the past few years this Committee has not received a report on street lighting - a programme of works planned or completed. Can we please have at least an annual report on this work?”

The Local Highways Manager responded:

“A petition of 52 names was submitted to the Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) at its meeting on 2nd June 2003 from residents of Reigate Road and Claremount Gardens. The petition raised an issue of safety at the junction of Reigate Road and Claremount Gardens at night, the volume of traffic, sight lines, speed of traffic and lighting levels. The petition requested additional lighting to assist in safety during hours of darkness.

The resulting Local Committee Report provided the following comments in response:

1. This request has previously been brought to the attention of the Local Transport Service. The instigator was written to and made aware of the bidding process that implementing the project would depend on levels of finance, the number of requests from other areas and its priority rating. The request will remain active until the scheme is implemented. An assessment has been carried out and was rated at 9 points (medium priority). Due to the levels of funding, priority ratings and numbers of requests, Reigate Road / Claremount Gardens has not been successful yet.
2. The accident records for the junction have been considered. There have been 3 accidents since 1997; all have been slight and in daylight.
3. However, in response to the safety concerns raised it is suggested that the appropriate action is to refer the site to the local Accident Working Group for consideration.

This site was referred to the Accident Working Group for consideration at its meeting on Thursday 17th October 2003. The number of accidents occurring over the previous 3 years was reviewed at this meeting. The three accidents that had occurred were shunt accidents, however, none of these occurred during the hours of darkness. Therefore additional street lighting was not considered appropriate. A right turn lane into Claremount Gardens was considered but discounted as there is insufficient carriageway width for an additional right turn lane and due to the steep hill the outside lane is often used by cars overtaking slow moving heavy goods vehicles. Changes to the lighting or layout of this junction were therefore not considered appropriate.

Following receipt of this question from Councillor Stead an updated assessment has been made of the accidents in the last 3 years. This has shown that there has only been one injury collision in the past three years. This accident took place in daylight hours and was caused by a car travelling up the hill being distracted by the blue flashing lights of a police motorcycle and shunting a car waiting to turn right. Again this does not support the case for additional street lighting in this area.

The second part of this question concerned the regular street lighting improvement reports that were historically submitted to the Local Committee, which set out a programme of works planned or completed, and asked why these reports had not recently been provided.

The reason street lighting improvement reports have not been submitted to the Local Committee over recent years is one of funding. A separate capital budget used to be provided for street lighting improvements. Over the last three years, however, there has been no capital budget for the provision of additional lighting due, in part, to the development of a street lighting PFI contract. A County Executive decision is awaited regarding the progression of the PFI street lighting contract.

If, however, a case can be made for additional street lighting in terms of highway safety or crime and disorder, funding could be made available from other budgets. As an example, if there is a pattern of recorded personal injury highway accidents for which dark conditions are a contributory factor then funding could be considered from Local Transport Plan or Accident Working Group.

Similarly if there is a case for additional lighting to resolve a crime and disorder issue then a bid can be made either to the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership or through Member allocations. It should be noted that a robust case would need to be made to confirm that the provision of additional lighting will directly address the issue under consideration.”

2 Cllr Richard Wagner, Member for Chipstead, Hooley and Woodmansterne, asked the following question:

Waiting Restrictions in Stagbury Avenue, Chipstead

“A prudent decision was taken by officers and local councillors to defer implementation of waiting restrictions in Stagbury Avenue until there was certainty about the level of displacement parking that would be caused by restrictions in roads that, while they do not adjoin Stagbury, are in the vicinity. Displacement parking throttled Stagbury (a one-way street) at its entrance and for a third of its length. But a December 2007 decision by the local committee (minutes page ii) means:

- a) Officers are frustrated in their efforts to fund the £1,500 cost
- b) The response to a petition from 49 of the 61 residents in Stagbury Avenue grants the relief they need in principle but not in practice.

What alternative funding is available to implement the Stagbury Avenue restrictions before officer time in seeking to unravel the matter exceeds the £1,500 cost?”

The Local Highways Manager responded:

“The waiting restrictions in Stagbury Avenue were originally considered at the Local Committee meeting on 24th July 2006. A consultation had been carried out in Stagbury Avenue as it was identified that if parking restrictions were implemented in Lackford Road the displaced parking would almost certainly move into Stagbury Avenue. As such the Local Committee report (Post Consultation comments) on 24th July 2006 considered various options;

- (i) Do nothing, however this had the implication that commuter parking would be displaced into Stagbury Avenue and residents would encounter similar difficulties to the residents of Lackford Road.
- (ii) Do nothing at present and possibly implement a Residents Parking Zone in the future if this was viable.
- (iii) Include the staggered 1 hour parking restriction in the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) but not to implement the order immediately. This would however involve additional costs as an additional ‘have made’ notice would need to be advertised.

Residents outlined their views during the Public Open Session at this meeting and requested that parking restrictions were not implemented. The Local Committee resolved option (iii) above, that the parking restriction was included in the TRO but not implemented immediately but could be implemented within 18 months should a problem arise.

Further the Local Committee report - Post Consultation Comments stated that there is an eighteen month period after the advertising of a TRO when the TRO can be made, which would have brought the amendment into another

financial year and hence not be covered by the funding allocated for the Northern Villages parking review. It also stated that an additional cost would be involved to advertise the 'Have Made' notice.

Residents of Stagbury Avenue subsequently submitted a petition to the Local Committee on 3rd December 2007 requesting that this parking restriction be implemented. A debate followed regarding this amendment and how it should be funded. There was concern expressed that the amendment should not be funded from the 2007/08 Local Transport Plan (LTP) funding for parking restrictions. The Local Committee subsequently agreed the following:

"The parking restrictions in Stagbury Avenue will be implemented as advertised, in principle, subject to Officers securing funding, and delegating agreement of this funding to the Group Manager Surrey Highways - East in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman."

Following this recommendation officers have sought to identify funding for these restrictions outside of the LTP funding. One such source of funding that was investigated was via the Member allocations. Unfortunately, however, it was confirmed that no Member allocation funding would be available for the 2007/08 financial year for these works.

The costs for these works are currently estimated as £1,500 (approximately £500 for the cost of the signs, £400 for the lining and £600 for the 'Have Made' notice).

As there is no available funding identified for the current financial year (2007/08) funding for these works would have to be sought from either the 2008/09 LTP allocation or 2008/09 Member allocation (should the Local Committee approve this allocation), unless there are other funds that may be available e.g. Reigate and Banstead Borough Councillor allowances. To date such alternatives have not been identified."

**Surrey County Council's Local Committee
(Reigate and Banstead)**

**{Name of Task Group}
Terms of Reference**

Objective:

The Local Committee agreed on the {Date of approval} meeting, that a Working Party be formed to consider the {Details of task groups purpose}.

Timings:

The start date of this Task Group is {Date}, with the end date to be determined when the programme is recommended to the {Responsible Officer} and taken back to the Local Committee for approval.

Membership:

The Task Group membership to be: {Names of Members/Officers}.

General

1. Task Groups exist to advise the Local Committee and will
 - a. Unless otherwise agreed, meet in private;
 - b. Develop a work programme;
 - c. Formally record actions;
 - d. Report back to the Local Committee on progress.
2. The Task Group will contain appointees from the membership of the Local Committee, identified in such a way to ensure adequate geographical coverage for the particular Task Group area and function.
3. The Task Group's function is to develop a programme to be recommended by the {Responsible Officer} to the Local Committee for approval.
4. The Task Group will agree and publish criteria for the prioritisation of the scheme in question and circulate to the {Responsible Officer} and the Local Committee.
5. The report containing the Task Group's recommendations to the Local Committee will be supported by a summary of the reasoning behind its prioritised programme.
6. The Task Group will monitor the progress of the work programme and recommend any adjustments as appropriate to the {Responsible Officer} to be taken back to the Local Committee.