

MINUTES: of the meeting of Surrey County Council's Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) held at 14:00 on Monday 21 September 2009 at Reigate Town Hall.

THESE MINUTES REMAIN DRAFT UNTIL FORMALLY APPROVED AT THE 7 DECEMBER 2009 MEETING

Members Present – Surrey County Council

Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin (Chairman)	Dr Lynne Hack
Mrs Frances King (Vice-Chairman)	Mrs Kay Hammond
Mrs Angela Fraser DL	Mr Nick Harrison
Mr Michael Gosling	

Members Present – Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

Cllr Brian Cowle	Cllr Brian Stead
Cllr Adam De Save	Cllr Mrs Anna Tarrant
Cllr Richard Olliver	Cllr Richard Wagner

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.

29/09 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Dr Zully Grant-Duff, Mr Peter Lambell, Cllr Moore and Cllr Mrs Mill. Apologies for lateness were received from Kay Hammond.

30/09 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING – 20 JULY 2009 [Item 2]**

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the previous meeting.

[Minute 23/09: Cllr Wagner asked whether progress had been made on the queries raised under this item. The Interim Local Highways Manager agreed to follow this up with the Highways Engineer.]

31/09 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest.

32/09 **PETITIONS [Item 4]**

None received.

33/09 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

One public question on the subject of the Horley railway underpass was received. The written response is attached as **Appendix A**.

34/09 **MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

None received.

35/09 **REIGATE AND BANSTEAD'S COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND THE LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP [Item 7]**

The East Area Director presented the report.

During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were noted:

- Members raised concerns that the thematic groups involved the “usual suspects” and were not inclusive. The Area Director emphasised that the Local Strategic Partnership had no hidden agendas. Consultation on the priorities within the Community Plan had involved members of minority and mainstream groups and reflected their views. Furthermore, the Local Strategic Partnership has also agreed to meet in public at least once a year.
- Concerns were raised that the thematic groups were irrelevant to the actual work being undertaken by the frontline, for example, Highways. The Area Director assured the Committee that the focus of the groups was partnership working to address locally identified priorities, and that many organisations and individuals would be involved in the actual delivery of these priorities.

The Committee **AGREED**:

- (i) That county Members are linked with each of the four thematic groups as follows: Your Environment – Lynne Hack; Neighbourhoods for the Future – Michael Gosling; Vibrant

www.surreycc.gov.uk/reigateandbanstead

Communities – Kay Hammond; The Right Services in the Right Places – Dorothy Ross-Tomlin.

- (ii) That comments or suggestions be fed into the process through the appropriate county Member as the action plans are finalised.

36/09 **INTEGRATED TRANSPORT SCHEMES 2009/10 – 2013/14 – REVISED [Item 8]**

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report.

During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were noted:

- Further details of the A217 Mill Road/The Warren crossing were requested. The Interim Highways Manager agreed to discuss this with the Member concerned outside the meeting.

The Committee **NOTED** the report.

37/09 **£100,000 MEMBER LOCAL REVENUE FUNDS FOR HIGHWAYS [Item 9]**

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report.

During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were noted:

- Discussion took place regarding the equal allocation of £5,000 per Division for works, as the Divisions varied in size and perceived need. The Interim Local Highways Manager explained that the funding needed to be shared proportionately; each Borough or District was given the same amount of funding regardless of size.
- The Interim Highways Manager agreed to look into the drainage issues on Banstead High Street outside the meeting.
- A Member asked whether white lines and clearing mud from gullies was funded centrally. The Area Highways Manager explained that there was a central revenue budget for drainage, and dig-outs were included in this. He agreed to discuss this point with the Member outside the meeting.
- It was suggested that the service should publicise the costs of replacing gully covers due to anti-social behaviour.
- A Member asked when the works in Lesbourne Road, Reigate, would commence. The Interim Highways Manager would confirm this after the meeting.
- It was noted that many gullies are blocked with tree roots and

www.surreycc.gov.uk/reigateandbanstead

grass cuttings, and the suggestion was made that the County and Borough Councils co-ordinate their works to avoid this. It was suggested that the Borough Portfolio Holder for Environment be contacted.

The Committee **APPROVED**:

- (i) £5,000 for works in each division as detailed in Annex A to the report submitted, and any amendments to be dealt with by officers in conjunction with the county Member directly.
- (ii) £15,000 for an additional area wide gully cleaning programme as indicated in Annex A to the report submitted.
- (iii) £40,000 to be allocated to allow parking schemes and parking/Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS) schemes for 2009/10 to continue as per Annex B to the report submitted.

38/09 **MAINTENANCE PROJECTS PROGRESS REPORT [Item 10]**

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report. Members were informed that since the publication of the report, the resurfacing of Malmstone Avenue, Merstham, was no due to be completed by the end of November 2009.

The Area Highways Manager explained that the criteria for prioritising roads for maintenance were point-scored by the Asset Management Group, and included lab data, skid data, accident data, public enquiries, nominations by local Members and the view of the Highways Engineer.

The Committee **NOTED** the report.

39/09 **MERLAND RISE, EPSOM DOWNS – SAFER ROUTES TO SCHOOL IMPROVEMENTS [Item 11]**

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report.

During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were raised:

- Concerns were raised that a small gap for cyclists to pass was required. Officers emphasised that the kerb build out would form a crossing point for schoolchildren, and that the cycling issue had not been highlighted in the safety audit. Although this could be altered in the detailed design, it was thought unlikely.
- Concerns were raised that the crossing point should be

located south of the school instead of north. It was explained that uphill traffic should have priority under the Highway Code, but officers would look into this after the meeting.

- Members asked that officers look into the use of reflective posts, as these cause annoyance to residents and not visible enough to motorists.
- Concerns were raised that new street lighting formed part of the proposal when a new PFI contract for street lighting had been agreed. The Interim Local Highways Manager explained that these lights were a necessity for the installation of the crossing, but would also be covered by the PFI.

The Committee **AGREED** that:

- (i) Consultation be carried out with local residents, Epsom Downs Primary School and the emergency services regarding the introduction of a kerb build out in Merland Rise north of the school entrance.
- (ii) Subject to consultation and detailed design, the kerb build out as shown in Annex A to the report submitted be approved for construction.
- (iii) Authority be delegated to the East Area Group Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local elected Member to resolve any representation received as a result of the consultation.

40/09 **PRICES LANE / ALEXANDER ROAD, WOODHATCH – PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN REFUGE [Item 12]**

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report.

The Local Member for Earlswood and Reigate South, who had contributed to the costs of the scheme via her Member's Allocation, welcomed the scheme, which would make the junction safer for elderly residents walking to the surgery.

The Committee **AGREED** that:

- (i) Consultation be carried out with local residents and the emergency services regarding the introduction of a pedestrian refuge island in Alexander Road at the junction with Prices Lane.
- (ii) Subject to consultation and detailed design, the pedestrian refuge island as shown in Annex A to the report submitted be approved for construction.
- (iii) Authority be delegated to the East Area Group Manager in

consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local elected Member to resolve any representation received as a result of the consultation.

41/09 **WOODMANSTERNE STREET, BANSTEAD – PROPOSED FOOTWAY IMPROVEMENTS [Item 13]**

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report.

Members welcomed the proposals, but felt that consultation with local residents and the Residents' Association was unnecessary due to previous consultations on improvements, and would delay the commencement of works. It was therefore proposed and seconded to remove the words "local residents, the Residents' Association from recommendation (i).

The Committee **AGREED** that:

- (i) Consultation be carried out with the emergency services regarding the widening of the footways in Woodmansterne Street between Court Haw and the cricket ground for the provision of a pedestrian crossing facility.
- (ii) Subject to consultation and detailed design, the footway widening pedestrian crossing facility and associated works as shown in Annex A to the report submitted be approved for construction.
- (iii) Authority be delegated to the East Area Group Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local elected Member to resolve any representation received as a result of the consultation.

42/09 **A23 BRIGHTON ROAD / HONEYCROCK LANE, SALFORDS – PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS [Item 14]**

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report.

During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were raised:

- Members noted that the plan submitted did not detail how the pedestrian island would be improved. The Committee was informed that this would form part of the detailed design.
- Concerns were raised regarding speeding in Honeycrook Lane, and Members asked for increased enforcement. The Interim Highways Manager agreed to discuss this with the relevant officers.

Members felt that Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council should also be consulted on the proposals and it was therefore proposed and seconded to add this to recommendation (ii).

The Committee **AGREED** that:

- (i) The Local Allocation funding approved by the Local Committee on 20 July 2009 for the provision of an additional pedestrian refuge island in Honeycrook Lane be redeployed to enable measures to improve the existing pedestrian crossing point in Honeycrook Lane and other minor road safety improvements in the vicinity of the A23 Brighton Road / Honeycrook Lane junction to be implemented.
- (ii) Consultation be carried out with local residents, Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council and the emergency services regarding the introduction of measures to improve the existing pedestrian crossing point in Honeycrook Lane and other minor road safety improvements in the vicinity of the A23 Brighton Road / Honeycrook Lane junction.
- (iii) Subject to consultation and detailed design, the measures as shown in Annex A to the report submitted be approved for construction.
- (iv) Authority be delegated to the East Area Group Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local elected Member to resolve any representation received as a result of the consultation.

43/09 **NETHERNE ON THE HILL – NETHERNE LANE CLOSURES**
[Item 15]

The Senior Transport Development Control Officer presented the report. It was noted that the developer, Gleeson, was meeting the cost of the closures, and that residents were happy with the proposal following a meeting held the previous week.

During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were raised:

- Members asked whether the bollards were already on site. The officer confirmed this.
- A question was asked regarding access by emergency vehicles. The officer understood that all emergency services would have a key to access the gates, but she agreed to check this after the meeting.

The Committee **AGREED** that:

- (i) A permanent traffic regulation order be advertised for the prohibition of all vehicles (with the exception of bicycles and emergency vehicles) at certain points on Netherne Lance, as marked on the plan attached as Appendix 1 to the report submitted, and should any objections be raised, these will be brought back to this Committee.
- (ii) Consultation with emergency services be undertaken and any objections be brought back to this Committee to be resolved.

44/09 **NATIONAL CYCLE ROUTE 22: SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS FOR CYCLISTS AT THE JUNCTION OF A217 BRIGHTON ROAD AND B2219 GARRATTS LANE [Item 16]**

The Cycling Officer presented the report.

Following discussion, the Committee **REFUSED** the proposal on the grounds that:

- (i) There are already two crossing points in the vicinity, and a further crossing would confuse pedestrians.
- (ii) The proposal did not represent value for money, and the budget should be used to fund other improvements.

45/09 **NATIONAL CYCLE ROUTE 22: SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS FOR CYCLISTS AT THE JUNCTION OF A240 REIGATE ROAD AND B2221 GREAT TATTENHAMS [Item 17]**

The Cycling Officer presented the report.

During the discussion, Members expressed the view that the proposed scheme did not represent value for money, and that improved signage would be sufficient to improve safety at the junction. Therefore, an alternative recommendation was proposed and seconded, which the Committee **AGREED** as follows:

That the proposal be reviewed with a view to developing a simplified scheme involving improved signage only.

[The meeting adjourned between 3.40pm and 3.45pm]

46/09 **AMENDMENTS TO LOCAL PROTOCOL ON PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT [Item 18]**

The Committee agreed to **DEFER** the item to the next meeting.

[Members raised concerns regarding a perceived discrepancy between the deadline for submission of written representations on Rights of Way applications (14 days) and the deadline for the publication of the Local Committee agenda (five clear working days). A deferral was sought to enable officers to seek legal advice on the matter.]

47/09 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING [Item 19]**

The Committee:

(i) **AGREED** the following item submitted for funding from 2009/10 Local Committee delegated revenue budget totalling £3,800

1. Street lighting in Staplehurst Close, Woodhatch £3,800

(ii) **NOTED** the items submitted for funding from 2009/10 Local Committee delegated revenue budget totalling £2,000 agreed under delegated powers in accordance with the Local Financial Protocol.

48/09 **CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION PARTNERSHIP UPDATE [Item 20]**

Kay Hammond provided a verbal update on the recent meeting of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP). Issues discussed at the meeting included:

- CDRP Action Plans
- Frontline training for partners on the prevention of terrorism
- Overview and scrutiny of CDRPs

49/09 **CABINET FORWARD PLAN [Item 21]**

The Committee **NOTED** the report.

50/09 **FORWARD PLAN [Item 22]**

The Committee **NOTED** the report with the addition of the deferred item on Amendments to the Local Protocol on Public Engagement to be brought to the 7 December 2009 meeting.

[Meeting Ended: 4.10pm]

Chairman

APPENDIX A

A Public Question has been received from Mr Neil McAlister on the subject of the Horley Underpass:

“Why did the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) present one report about the Horley underpass at the last Local Committee meeting, on 20 July 2009, that only made vague and skewed references to costs of mounting CCTV covering the Horley underpass, but failed to present another more detailed report, written by a Siemens engineer who is a technical manager and who had actually visited the underpass? I now understand his report, which runs to several pages, had the kind of essential information on which a proper decision by the Local Committee could have been based about mounting CCTV covering the Horley underpass. I have reason to believe that the CDRP knew about the engineer’s report before the meeting on 20 July.

I had learned in August of this year, from reading an official document, that the Siemens engineer whom I had mentioned in my speech to the Local Committee on 20 July had actually gone to the trouble of preparing a quotation for work required for a CCTV scheme in connection with the Horley underpass and submitted that information to the Community Safety Manager, who I understand is very closely associated with the CDRP. From asking questions I then discovered that he had also written a report on the topic, dated 24 June. I also understood from the Town Clerk that the report had gone to the CDRP.

The public are owed a full explanation as to why the engineer’s report was not submitted to the Local Committee.”

Response:

As Mr McAlister states, the Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) received a report written on behalf of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) in response to his petition for the installation of CCTV at Horley Underpass. The Local Committee agreed a number of recommendations, and the relevant minutes extract is attached as **Annex A** to this response. These recommendations still stand.

Roles of the Local Committee and CDRP

It is firstly necessary to clarify the fact that the Local Committee does not have any decision-making powers with regards to the installation of CCTV. The CDRP focuses on key areas of crime and disorder within the Borough and is one of the groups that can determine the installation and expansion of CCTV. Improvements to the underpass, including the potential for CCTV are being considered as part of the Horley Regeneration Project, which has a broader remit than the CDRP.

It should also be noted that the underpass is in the ownership of Network Rail.

The report of the Siemens Engineer

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council's Community Safety Manager, on behalf of the CDRP, commissioned a report from Siemens in order to establish the potential feasibility and associated costs with a CCTV scheme for the Horley Underpass. This report was dated 24 June 2009, and its purpose of this report was to enable the CDRP to make an informed decision. Siemens did not give permission for its content

to be released into the public domain, and although it was the subject of a Freedom of Information request by Mr McAlister to Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, the information was deemed to be exempt on the grounds of commercial interests and security, and the request was denied. Mr McAlister was informed in a letter dated 17 September 2009.

The report would also have been exempt under the County Council's Access to Information rules. Article 3.02(k) of the County Council's Constitution states: "the public may be excluded from meetings whenever it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings that exempt information would be disclosed". If the report of the Siemens engineer had been submitted to the Local Committee, it would be exempt under Categories 3 and 7. Category 3 concerns information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information); Category 7 concerns information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime. Exempt reports are circulated only to Members of the Committee and are not available to the public either electronically or as paper copies. During discussion of exempt items, the Committee would enter private session and the press and public would be excluded.

Monitoring of the underpass by Surrey Police

One of the recommendations agreed by the Local Committee in July was to monitor incidents of crime and anti-social behaviour at the location over an allotted period of time. In the subsequent period, the Surrey Police Safer Neighbourhoods Team has monitored the area as part of their regular patrols. They have confirmed that there have been no reported crimes or neighbourhood issues during this period. It should also be noted that there is no evidence of crime or anti-social behaviour being deflected from the town centre. In addition, no crimes or incidents have been reported to British Transport Police.

Current position and next steps

A number of multi-agency meetings have taken place, involving Surrey Police, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council (Community Safety Manager; Horley Regeneration Manager), Network Rail and Surrey County Council (Highways; Local Partnerships Team).

Network Rail has already implemented drainage improvements to the underpass, and has agreed to carry out a structural survey of the underpass, which is necessary before any improvement works can be implemented. Improvements will be undertaken as part of the Horley Regeneration Project, and the Horley Regeneration Manager has agreed to write to Mr McAlister detailing these plans.

**Extract from Minutes of 20 July 2009 meeting of the Local Committee
(Reigate & Banstead)**

16/09 **PETITIONS [Item 5]**

- (b) A petition was received from Mr Neil McAlister signed by 364 users of the Horley railway underpass, requesting the installation of CCTV.

The Committee **AGREED** that in partnership with Network Rail, a rolling programme of works is developed to improve the environment of the subway through appropriate maintenance and management, to include:

- (i) Improvements to the overall condition by painting and upgrading the lighting levels, especially within the tunnel area. The suggestion of installing CCTV cameras and mirrors placed on future projected works if then deemed necessary using appropriate, current intelligence.
- (ii) Investigation of methods to curtail cycle use which does not impinge on disability groups i.e. are there any particular railway by-laws that can be applied in relation to property.
- (iii) Monitor incidents of crime and anti-social behaviour at the location over a specified period of time in order to assess the level of risk.