

**MINUTES:** of the meeting of Surrey County Council's Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) held at 14:00 on Monday 6 December 2010 at Reigate Town Hall.

**THESE MINUTES REMAIN DRAFT UNTIL FORMALLY APPROVED AT THE 28 FEBRUARY 2011 MEETING**

**Members Present – Surrey County Council**

Mrs Angela Fraser (Chairman)	Mr Nick Harrison
Dr Zully Grant-Duff (Vice-Chairman)	Mrs Frances King
Mr Michael Gosling	Mr Peter Lambell
Mrs Kay Hammond	Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin

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

Cllr Mark Brunt (Vice-Chairman)	Cllr Brian Stead
Cllr Richard Bennett	Cllr Richard Wagner (substitute)
Cllr Mrs Gillian Emmerton	

**PART ONE - IN PUBLIC**

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

**56/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Dr Lynne Hack, Cllr Brian Cowle, Cllr Adam De Save, Cllr Dr Richard Olliver, Cllr Mrs Anna Tarrant and Cllr Barbara Thomson. Cllr Richard Wagner substituted for Cllr Dr Olliver.

**57/10 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS – 20 SEPTEMBER 2010 [Item 2]**

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

**58/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest.

**59/10 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

None.

**60/10 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

None.

61/10 **FORMAL MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

None.

62/10 **REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH COUNCIL AND SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL DRAFT JOINT MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT [Item 7]**

The Strategic Director – Environment and Infrastructure presented the report. He emphasised that the joint Memorandum of Agreement was still in draft form, and was the result of discussions between the leaders and senior officers of both councils, including the Borough Council's Chief Executive. He informed Members that whilst the draft document referred to formal joint committee arrangements, it was now envisaged that the governance arrangements were more likely to be informal, and would involve relevant senior Members and officers from both councils to drive delivery in the areas highlighted. He also noted that the priorities were subject to change; for example, the review of public sector assets would define the asset shaping agenda, and that an action plan would be drawn up.

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

- Members asked whether the targets would be quantified. The Strategic Director replied that they would be.
- A question was asked regarding the future role of the Local Committee. The Chairman stated that the intention of this work was to bring together Members and officers with specific knowledge of the relevant subjects, and not to create more committees. Members were keen that there should be a mechanism to report back to the Local Committee, regardless of whether the structures were formal or informal.
- Concerns were raised regarding the Preston section of the report; it was noted that the plans for Banstead Leisure Centre had recently changed, and that the premature mortality rates and poor educational outcomes for the area were not reflected. It was noted that the Preston Regeneration Board needed to be re-established, and that there was an ongoing issue regarding the sale of the De Burgh site, whereby Surrey County Council needed to ensure that the land was sold for the best price possible.
- Members suggested that a working group be set up for each section of the report, and that the work should be linked to the Local Community Action Plan (LCAP) work which was already taking place.
- Concerns were raised that the Horley section of the report described work that was already happening. It was noted that a Regeneration Forum already met regularly and that duplication of work should be avoided. There was a need to link the objectives

to the corporate objectives of both councils.

- Members requested that Horley Town Council and Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council should be included in the work.
- It was noted that the Cabinet of Surrey County Council and the Executive of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council would make decisions on the Memorandum of Agreement in the New Year.
- Members requested that the issue of planning contributions be referred to in the Memorandum of Agreement. The Strategic Director agreed to clarify the position regarding Section 106 agreements.
- Concerns were raised that the Memorandum of Agreement did not make reference to Merstham as a Priority Place, and that although there was specific reference to the proposed Merstham Community Hub, the regeneration plan was wider than this and also included retail provision.
- The Strategic Director agreed to consider the Local Committee's comments in the redrafted Memorandum of Agreement, with a view to further discussion on the proposals taking place at future Local Committee meetings.

The Committee **NOTED** the development of a Memorandum of Agreement as set out in the report submitted.

#### 63/10 **A217 REIGATE HILL FOOTBRIDGE, REIGATE [Item 8]**

The Structures Projects Team Leader presented the report. The purpose of the report was to provide early warning to Members of the proposed works, and further information would be provided nearer to the commencement of the works.

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

- Members requested that suitable communication with the public regarding the works be made, including site notices. The officer replied that this would take place nearer to the commencement time, when further information would be available. He noted that discussions were already taking place with the local press.
- Members asked what the works would involve, and whether temporary measures would be put in place for users. The officer reported that the works involved the repair of the concrete structure and railings of the footbridge. A temporary bridge to carry pedestrian and equestrian traffic would be erected alongside the existing structure for the duration of the work.
- Concerns were raised that the proposed partial road closures would increase congestion on the A217, particularly given that water pipeline works were due to take place. Members asked whether the works could be co-ordinated with the water company. The Area Highways Manager agreed to explore this.

The Local Committee **NOTED** the report.

64/10 **REPORT ON SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL TRADING STANDARDS SERVICE [Item 9]**

In the absence of an officer from the service, the Cabinet Member for Community Safety undertook to respond to Members' questions.

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

- Members noted the County Council's "Eat Out Eat Well" initiative and wished to know whether there was any co-ordination with the Borough Council's "Scores on the Doors" scheme. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety reported that Trading Standards were looking outwardly to deliver services with other councils across the region, and with district and borough councils.
- Further information on the overall Trading Standards budget and efficiency savings, including cuts and changes to the service, was sought. The Cabinet Member noted that discussions regarding efficiency savings were ongoing, and collective work was taking place to mitigate the impact of the Comprehensive Spending Review.
- Paragraph 2.2 (Underage Alcohol Sales) – Members wished to know what the 35% referred to. This point would be referred back to officers for a response.
- Concerns were raised regarding proxy sales of alcohol (adults purchasing alcohol on behalf of under-18s). Members wished to know if there had been a reduction in the number of complaints, and asked whether Trading Standards could reinforce the message that proxy sales are illegal with off-licenses. The Cabinet Member noted the work of Trading Standards in collaboration with Surrey Police in carrying out test purchasing, but emphasised that proxy sales were difficult to tackle as they needed to be caught at the right time with the Police knowing which premises to target. The service would be asked to provide figures.

The Committee **NOTED** the activities being undertaken by the Trading Standards Service.

65/10 **REIGATE AND BANSTEAD COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP - VERBAL UPDATE [Item 10]**

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety reported that the next meeting of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) would take place on 15 December 2010.

She informed Members that the Safer and Stronger Communities Partnership Board (SSCPB) was looking at ways for CSPs to work

more effectively and efficiently, and a working group had been set up to co-ordinate this, consisting of the Chief Constable, Surrey County Council's Strategic Director for Customers and Communities, and the Chief Executive of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council on behalf of the 11 district/borough councils in Surrey.

She agreed to provide a further update at the next meeting of the Local Committee.

## 66/10 LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING [Item 11]

An addendum to the report was tabled and is attached as **Appendix A** to the minutes.

The Committee:

- (i) **AGREED** the following items submitted for funding from 2010/11 Local Committee delegated revenue budget totalling £25,966.87:

1.	Age Concern Merstham, Redhill and Reigate – Christmas Project (Merstham, Redhill, Reigate and Meadvale)	£500
2.	Walking for Health in Reigate and Banstead	£900
3.	Walton Street, Walton on the Hill – Footway Improvements	£5,400
4.	Waterhouse Lane, Kingswood – Vehicle Activated Signs	£971.89
5.	Replacement of the Scout and Guide Hall, Walton on the Hill	£2,500
6.	Manorfield School – Community Copse	£2,000
7.	Horley Crusaders – Refurbishment of Portacabin at Lee Street, Horley	£3,000
8.	St Luke's Church Community Project – Revenue	£2,413
9.	Surrey Coalition of Disabled People in association with Reigate and Banstead Disability Action – The Hub, Redhill	£2,500
10.	Community Play in a Day and Gala Performance at the Harlequin Theatre, Redhill – Orbit Shed	£3,000
11.	Training Equipment for Horley Army Cadets	£901.98
12.	Installation of Marker Posts, Balcombe Gardens, Horley – Horley Town Council	£1,880

- (ii) **AGREED** the items submitted for funding from 2010/11 Local Committee capital budget totalling £14,800.22:

1.	The Merstham Centre Improvement Project – Age Concern Merstham, Redhill and Reigate	£9,800.22
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

2. St Luke's Church Community Project – Capital £5,000

67/10 **CABINET FORWARD PLAN [Item 12]**

The Area Director informed Members that the Cabinet report on the Transforming Youth Project had been postponed from the 30 November Cabinet meeting, and would now be taken to the 21 December meeting.

Members raised concerns that there would not be an opportunity for the Local Committee to comment on the Library Service Public Value Review report prior to its discussion by Cabinet. It was suggested that individual Members could make representations to Cabinet if necessary.

Borough Councillors requested that they receive notification of Cabinet agenda publication. The Local Committee and Partnership Officer agreed to action this.

The Committee **NOTED** the report.

68/10 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN [Item 13]**

The Committee **NOTED** the report.

**[Meeting Ended: 3.05pm]**

**Chairman**

---