

**MINUTES:** of the meeting of Surrey County Council's Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) held at 14:00 on Monday 7 December 2009 at Reigate Town Hall.

**THESE MINUTES REMAIN DRAFT UNTIL FORMALLY APPROVED AT THE 1 MARCH 2010 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	Mr Peter Lambell
Dr Zully Grant-Duff	

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

Cllr Richard Bennett	Cllr Richard Olliver
Cllr Mark Brunt (substitute)	Cllr Brian Stead
Cllr Brian Cowle	Cllr Anna Tarrant
Cllr Rosalind Mill	

**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.

**51/09 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr De Save and Cllr Wagner. Apologies for lateness were received from Mr Nick Harrison.

**52/09 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING – 21 SEPTEMBER 2009 [Item 2]**

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

[Minute 38/09: Delete “no” from third line and replace with “now”.]

53/09 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest.

54/09 **PETITIONS [Item 4]**

One petition was received from Mrs Janine Harrison signed by 296 residents of Banstead Village and the surrounding local area requesting the provision of formal pedestrian crossings at the St Anne's roundabout junction of Garratts Lane, Holly Lane and Bolters Lane in Banstead.

The Committee **AGREED:**

- (i) That petitioners be advised that pedestrian Safer Routes to School improvements are already included in the Reigate and Banstead five year scheme programme, as agreed by Local Committee on 20 July 2009, to investigate, design and implement the provision of pedestrian crossing facilities at the junction of Holly Lane/Garratts Lane/Bolters Lane and improvements on the surrounding footways.
- (ii) That improvements to the eastern footway in Bolters Lane between High Street and Court Road be carried out in 2009/10, funded from the Local Transport Plan budget as approved by Local Committee on 20 July 2009.
- (iii) That Local Revenue Funding, up to the value of £3,000 be used to carry out option identification and feasibility work for formal pedestrian crossings at the St Anne's roundabout junction in 2009/10.

55/09 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

None received.

56/09 **MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

A Member Question was received from Mr Nick Harrison on the subject of gully cleaning. The response of the Interim Local Highways Manager was tabled at the meeting and is attached as **Appendix A**.

[Members were concerned that the response gave an unclear position on gully cleaning in the borough. Highways officers agreed to liaise with individual Members on gully cleaning in their divisions.]

57/09 **CONSULTATION ON SURREY MINERALS PLAN [Item 7]**

The Planning Policy Manager presented the report.

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

- The current access to the Salfords Depot was unsuitable for HGVs as it was via a residential area. Members felt that a new access should be made from the industrial estate to the rear of the site rather than Southern Avenue, and that the designation of the site should not change until this issue was resolved.
- Although not in the borough, it was felt that the extension of mineral workings at Nutfield Marsh should not be permitted, as this would have an impact on Merstham residents. The officer reported that no further extensions were proposed other than those identified in the plan.
- Members wished to know if the purpose of restoration schemes was to return sites to their original land use or to convert to a different use. The officer explained that the majority of restorations return the land to its original use, or for nature conservation purposes.
- Dr Lynne Hack, in her role as Cabinet Member for the Environment, reminded Members that the purpose of the Minerals Plan was to suggest suitable sites, and did not constitute planning permission. Any change in use would require approval from the Planning and Regulatory Committee and all aspects of the site and its impact would be considered.

The Committee **AGREED:**

- (i) To note the Minerals Core Strategy and Primary Aggregates Documents published by the County Council prior to submission to the Government for independent examination.
- (ii) To make the following comments for submission on the draft aggregates recycling and final draft minerals site restoration documents:
  - Minerals Site Restoration SPD – Are the restoration schemes to return the land to its original state or to something else?
  - Salfords Depot – Access to the site through Southern Avenue is wholly unacceptable. It must be provided by developing a new access through the industrial estate. What is the nature of the activity proposed?

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/reigateandbanstead](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/reigateandbanstead)

58/09 **AMENDMENTS TO LOCAL PROTOCOL ON PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT [Item 8]**

The Countryside Legal Team Manager presented the report.

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

- In response to Members' concerns, it was emphasised that the deadline of 14 days was for objectors or supporters of Rights of Way applications to send their written representation to the Countryside Legal Team. The deadline of five days was for those wishing to speak at Committee to register with the Local Committee and Partnership Officer. Anyone wishing to speak at Committee must have previously made a written representation. This process was already in place for the Planning and Regulatory Committee and worked well.

The Committee **ADOPTED** the revisions to the Local Protocol relating to public participation on Rights of Way applications.

59/09 **HORLEY TOWN CENTRE PUBLIC REALM ENHANCEMENTS [Item 9]**

The Senior Transportation Development Control Officer presented the report.

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

- Although broadly supportive of the scheme, Members were concerned that the plan submitted as part of the report highlighted a larger proposed area than that described. The officer noted that the plan was not a good indication of the proposed area, and a clearer version would be produced.
- Concerns were also raised that the plan would reduce access for disabled drivers. The officer informed Members that deliveries and disabled access would be covered in the consultation for the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).

The Committee:

- (i) **NOTED** the proposals for phase 2 of the proposed public realm enhancements for Horley town centre.
- (ii) **AGREED** to the advertising and statutory consultation for the TRO to prohibit or limit vehicle rights over the highway outside the Jack Fairman public house and Choices estate agency, as

proposed in phase 2 of the works, in order to help create a new public space at a key gateway to the town centre.

## 60/09 **TRANSPORT FOR REDHILL AND REIGATE [Item 10]**

The Major Schemes Team Leader presented the report.

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

- Members asked how wide an area was covered by the hub. The officer replied that a hub can be defined as both a gateway and a destination (a gateway being defined as “wherever you want to go, start from here”, and a destination being defined as “whatever you want, you can get it from here”). As such they serve a wider hinterland but are focussed on areas of proposed housing and commercial development and transport interchange. The hub would therefore focus on Redhill and its hinterlands.
- It was suggested that improvements to the junction of the M23/A23 at Hooley would divert more than half the traffic for Gatwick Airport away from Redhill and Reigate. The officer reported that the Highways Agency were closely involved in discussions, and would be part of the Transport for Redhill and Reigate board.
- Concerns were raised that some roads were too narrow for bus lanes to be installed. The officer replied that feasibility work had not yet started, and bus priority did not only include bus lanes but measures such as improved detection for buses at traffic signals to improve bus journey times. Any bus lanes identified would be subject to being confirmed as feasible.
- Members asked why the name of the board referred to “Redhill and Reigate” rather than “Reigate and Banstead” as this may alienate residents living north of the M25. The officer explained that the name was chosen to align with the hub definition in the South East Plan. There may be scope to broaden the remit in future, but the current priority was the Redhill and Reigate hub, which had £20m of funding identified in the Regional Funding Allocation (subject to the submission of a successful Major Scheme Business Case).

The Committee **AGREED**:

- (i) That Transport for Redhill and Reigate be established with the broad remits as shown in Annex A to the report submitted.
- (ii) That the Divisional Member for Redhill be the County

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/reigateandbanstead](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/reigateandbanstead)

Councillor representative on Transport for Redhill and Reigate.

- (iii) That the Transport for Redhill and Reigate Task Group provide regular updates on progress to the Local Committee and to the Transport for Surrey Board.

61/09 **REDHILL – PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS  
CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS [Item 11]**

The Parking Strategy and Implementation Group Manager presented the report.

Annex A to the report was circulated to Members separately and is attached to the minutes as **Appendix B**.

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

- Due to the late receipt of objections, it was suggested that officers meet with the Local County Councillor and the Borough Councillors for the wards affected to discuss the objections in detail, with comments brought to an extraordinary meeting of the Local Committee in January for a decision on implementation of the proposed new or amended waiting restrictions.

The Committee agreed to **DEFER** consideration of this item to an extraordinary meeting of the Local Committee on 25 January 2010.

62/09 **NATIONAL CYCLE ROUTE 22: SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS FOR  
CYCLISTS AT THE JUNCTION OF A217 BRIGHTON ROAD AND  
B2219 GARRATTS LANE [Item 12]**

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report.

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

- Members felt that the proposed signs looked acceptable, and that this revised scheme provided better value for money than what had previously been proposed.

The Committee **AGREED** that the two signs described in the report submitted be erected.

63/09 **NATIONAL CYCLE ROUTE 22: SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS FOR CYCLISTS AT THE JUNCTION OF A240 REIGATE ROAD AND B2221 GREAT TATTENHAMS [Item 13]**

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report.

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

- That the comments under agenda item 12 also applied to this item.

The Committee **AGREED** that the two signs described in the report submitted be erected.

64/09 **REVIEW OF 20MPH SPEED LIMITS OUTSIDE SCHOOLS [Item 14]**

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report.

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

- Concerns were raised that the 20mph speed limit signs outside St Anne's School were largely ignored because they were permanent, and it was suggested that flashing signs at appropriate times would be more effective at reducing speeds. Members noted that the purpose of the proposed TRO would enable the 20mph limit to be enforced, and that there were cost implications of installing electronic signs.
- Members felt that the number of parked cars on the roads outside schools, whilst sometimes problematic, did help to reduce the speed of cars travelling along these roads.
- It was noted that the Cabinet has agreed to carry out a review of Surrey County Council's speed limits policy, and therefore Members suggested deferring a decision on this issue until the results of the review become known.

The Committee agreed to **DEFER** consideration of this item to a future meeting.

65/09 **MAINTENANCE PROJECTS PROGRESS REPORT [Item 15]**

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report.

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

- Members asked when the carriageway works on Malmstone Avenue, Merstham, would be completed. The officers agreed to provide a response outside the meeting.

The Committee **NOTED** the information report.

66/09 **MEMBER LOCAL REVENUE FUNDS FOR HIGHWAYS  
PROGRESS REPORT[Item 16]**

The Interim Local Highways Manager presented the report.

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

- Members suggested that many gullies were blocked with leaf fall, grass cuttings and other rubbish, and that if cleansing were coordinated better with the Borough Council, the problem would not be as bad. The Chairman agreed to write to the Borough's Executive Member for the Environment on behalf of the Local Committee.

The Committee **NOTED** the information report.

67/09 **LOCAL COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN (LCAP) – TADWORTH  
VILLAGE [Item 17]**

Local Members congratulated Janet Hill, Community Liaison Officer for Reigate and Banstead Borough Council for her work on the LCAP. The Chairman agreed to write to her on behalf of the Local Committee.

The Committee **NOTED** the LCAP for Tadworth Village and the priorities within it.

68/09 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING [Item 18]**

The Committee:

- (i) **AGREED** the following items submitted for funding from 2009/10 Local Committee delegated revenue budget totalling £10,320:

1.	Langshott Infant School – Playground Project	£4,130
2.	Brambletye Junior School – Providing maths opportunities and enriching the numeracy curriculum	£1,000



- |    |   |        |
|----|---|--------|
| 3. | New Bench – Elmore Pond, Chipstead                    | £690   |
| 4. | Banstead West Music in the Park 2010                  | £1,500 |
| 5. | Easilok Seat/Wheelchair Restraint System for Buses 4U | £3,000 |

(ii) **AGREED** the following item submitted for funding from 2009/10 Local Committee capital budget:

- |    |                                       |         |
|----|---------------------------------------|---------|
| 1. | Strawson Hall, Horley – Refurbishment | £20,000 |
|----|---------------------------------------|---------|

(iii) **NOTED** the items submitted for funding from 2009/10 Local Committee delegated revenue budget totalling £1,100 agreed under delegated powers in accordance with the Local Financial Protocol.

69/09 **CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION PARTNERSHIP UPDATE [Item 19]**

Kay Hammond reported that the next meeting of the CDRP would take place on 9 December 2009.

70/09 **CABINET FORWARD PLAN [Item 20]**

The Committee **NOTED** the report.

71/09 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN [Item 21]**

- (i) The Committee **NOTED** the report.
- (ii) The Committee **NOTED** the following meeting dates for 2010/11:
- Monday 25 January 2010 (Extraordinary Meeting)
  - Monday 1 March 2010
  - Monday 21 June 2010
  - Monday 20 September 2010
  - Monday 6 December 2010
  - Monday 28 February 2011

All to take place at 2pm at Reigate Town Hall.

[The request for an update on Children's Centres in Reigate and Banstead at a future meeting was noted].

**[Meeting Ended: 4.25pm]**  
**Chairman**

**Member Questions**

**Mr Nick Harrison, Member for Banstead West, asks the following question:**

**Gully Cleaning by Surrey Highways**

“With the heavy rainfall this autumn, it is timely for the Local Committee to monitor the gully cleaning programme.

Is Surrey Highways up to programme in Reigate and Banstead with its target to clean every gully at least annually?

How many have been cleaned so far in relation to the total number, and is it forecast that the programme will be complete by end March? Please provide information for Banstead West and for the borough as a whole.

Where an attempt has been made to clean a gully, but that has not been successful, please provide the following:

How many have been unsuccessful, and what are the reasons for the lack of success – e.g. vehicle blocking access, gully cover blocked, dig out required, re-bore required. Please provide information for Banstead West and for the borough as a whole.

Where cleaning has not been successful, what are the arrangements to revisit, and address the issues?”

**The Interim Local Highways Manager responds:**

“SCC Highways have been advised by the maintenance team that the gully cleaning program for Reigate and Banstead is up to date and is due to be completed by the end of the financial year - please see attached program and analysis sheets for details of the programme and the number of gullies cleaned to date and details and numbers of any problems.

Where gullies have not been cleaned for one reason or another these then fall back to the area team to assign to the community gang to investigate if there is available space in their work load program. It must be remembered that the Reigate and Banstead community gang is one of two A&E response gangs for the east area and therefore they may not be able to carry out as much programmed works as requested. If this is not possible then they are placed on the jetting list and as the members will be aware Reigate and Banstead get a share of this resource two days per calendar month.

It should also be noted that some of the general issues blocking gullies at this time of year is the leaf fall and in this regard Reigate and Banstead Borough Council need to keep on top of this situation.

It should also be noted that it has now been widely reported that this past November 2009 has been the wettest since records began and therefore there may have been more reported instances of flooding than would normally be expected.”

**Attachments:**

1. Reigate & Banstead Gully Cleaning Programme 2009 –10
2. Reigate & Banstead Gully Cleaning Analysis 2009 –10