

MINUTES: of the meeting of Surrey County Council’s Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) held at 14:00 on Monday 28 February 2011 at Reigate Town Hall.

THESE MINUTES REMAIN DRAFT UNTIL FORMALLY APPROVED AT THE 20 JUNE 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
Dr Lynne Hack	Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
Mrs Kay Hammond	

Members Present – Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

Cllr Brian Cowle	Cllr Brian Stead
Cllr Mrs Gillian Emmerton	Cllr Richard Wagner (substitute)
Cllr Dr Richard Olliver	

PART ONE - IN PUBLIC

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

01/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Mark Brunt, Cllr Adam De Save, Cllr Mrs Anna Tarrant and Cllr Barbara Thomson. Cllr Richard Wagner substituted for Cllr Brunt.

02/11 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS – 6 DECEMBER 2010 [Item 2]

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

03/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

04/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SERVICE DELIVERY PLAN FOR REIGATE AND BANSTEAD 2011/12 [Item 4]

The Service Manager, Youth Development East, presented the report, and the Cabinet Member for Community Safety provided a verbal update on the “Fit for the Future” project, which included proposals to involve Local Committees in the commissioning of resources in future, and the targeting of resources towards the most

vulnerable young people.

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

- A question was asked regarding the new community centre being built at Reigate Methodist Church, and whether the Youth Development Service had plans to make use of this facility in the future. The Service Manager reported that whilst there were no current plans, they would look at this in the future to ensure that services complemented each other.
- Members noted that the Phoenix Youth Centre was not mentioned in the report and asked what the plans were for the next year. The Service Manager responded that services would continue as they are at this centre for 2011/12. The Youth Development Officer added that there was a focus on specific target groups; for example, one night a week at the Phoenix Centre was used for sports activities.
- The Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme was noted and commended by Members, who asked whether the service supported the Award Scheme for pupils outside of Fresh Trax. The Service Manager reported that an officer was responsible for accreditations, including supporting the development of the Duke of Edinburgh Award. However, the Fresh Trax scheme was run specifically by Youth Development Service staff for this particular group of young people and tailored to their needs.

The Local Committee **APPROVED** the 2011/12 Youth Development Service Delivery Plan for Reigate and Banstead as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report submitted.

05/11 **PETITIONS [Item 5]**

- (a) **430/435 Bus Route, Merstham – reinstatement of original route**
A petition was received from Mr Glyn Trathan signed by 107 residents, requesting the reinstatement of the original route for local bus services 430/435 in Merstham following changes made in Phase 1 of the County Council's Bus Review.

The Senior Transport Officer presented a response and informed the Committee that she would consider moving the now-redundant bus shelter from Portland Drive to the new bus stop at the junction of Malmstone Avenue and Delabole Road, although this would require consultation with local residents.

The Local Committee **NOTED** the response of the Senior Transport Officer.

(b) **On-Street Parking in Quality Street, Merstham**

A petition was received from Mrs Katherine Blayney, on behalf of Mr Hugh Everitt, signed by 43 residents, requesting the implementation of a residents' parking scheme in Quality Street and Mill Lane, Merstham.

The response of the Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager is attached to the minutes as **Appendix A**. He noted that the new parking policy being adopted in April 2011 would make it easier for permit parking to be introduced, but the impact of proposed pay and display parking on the A23/M25 overbridge would need to be reviewed first. The Local Member for Merstham and Reigate Hill expressed support for the residents' request as a solution to a longstanding problem.

The Local Committee **NOTED** the response of the Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager.

06/11 **FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

Five public questions were received. Written responses are attached to the minutes as **Appendix B**.

Mr Collins asked a supplementary question in relation to Question 4 which was covered under Agenda Item 8.

Mr Fleming asked a supplementary question in relation to Question 5 regarding the enforcement of the parking restrictions after the lines have been painted, and whether this takes effect immediately. The Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager reported that as soon as the lines were painted, the restrictions were enforceable as the orders have already been made.

07/11 **FORMAL MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 7]**

None.

08/11 **PROPOSED ON-STREET 'PAY AND DISPLAY' PARKING CHARGES IN REIGATE AND BANSTEAD – LOCAL COMMITTEE CONSULTATION [Item 8]**

The Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Leader presented the report.

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

- It was noted that Reigate and Banstead ran car parking at a profit, and should be rewarded for good stewardship. Members noted that Civil Enforcement Officers in the borough were very efficient.
- It was felt that a free 30-minute parking period in Horley would help small businesses in the town. This suggestion was supported by some other Members as a way of increasing churn and would enable short visits to local shops across the borough. The Parking Strategy and Implementation Officer informed Members that the proposed tariffs were part of the consultation, and that different options were being looked at, including free parking periods.
- Concerns were raised that the measures were being brought in for financial reasons, and that it would take 10 years for the capital outlay on the machines to be recouped when the installation and maintenance were taken into account. The officer acknowledged that there would need to be an income to enable the cost of maintenance to be covered.
- It was noted that many Banstead residents had expressed the view that the proposals would not achieve anything. Currently the churn of traffic in Banstead High Street was very high, and local traders are not abusing the parking in the High Street. It was felt that there were more suitable areas where charging should be brought in, such as Eastgate in Nork which suffered from commuter parking.
- Members noted that the proposals did not include the introduction of a daily flat rate for commuter parking. One of the roads listed in Annex A, Station Approach in Horley was used purely for commuter parking and it was suggested a daily rate be introduced here. The Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager agreed to look into this.
- A Member suggested that the minimum parking period be reduced to 15 minutes, and that if possible, the ticket machines should give change. The officer responded that machines which give change are far more expensive than those typically seen in public car parks and would not be appropriate for on-street use. He noted that there was an option of “buying time” for parking.
- Clarification was sought as to whether Blue Badge Holders would be exempt from the charges. The officer confirmed that they would be.
- Concerns were raised that the proposals would strengthen the position of the large supermarkets in the borough with free car parks, and that this would lead to the loss of viability of the shopping areas in Banstead and Reigate town centres which

consisted mainly of small, independent businesses.

- Members expressed concern that drivers would park in residential roads to avoid the charges. The officer noted that with over 200 parking spaces in Banstead, it was difficult for Civil Enforcement Officers to enforce all the spaces as well as tackling illegal, unsafe and obstructive parking. Pay and Display would enable them to work more efficiently.
- Concerns were raised that the machines and signage would cause clutter on the pavements.
- The proposal to allow payments by mobile phone was criticised on the grounds that many older people did not use mobile phones, and that it was more expensive than paying by cash. A suggestion was made that if this payment method was introduced, there should not be a premium for using it. The Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager explained that this method of payment was being looked at alongside coin payment, and was intended to help people who don't have any change available when they wish to park.
- It was suggested that London Road in Redhill be added to the list of areas affected by commuter parking and considered for daily charging.
- Concerns were raised that The Horseshoe in Banstead was an unadopted road and that introducing parking restrictions there would not be permitted. Officers explained that the The Horseshoe was owned by SCC's Estates Planning and Management department and although it is not publicly maintained, it is a public highway and is currently enforced.

The Local Committee **NOTED** the report and **AGREED** that the above comments form the Committee's response to the consultation.

09/11 **LIBRARY PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW [Item 9]**

The Library Operations Manager presented the report. Following the publication of the report, the decision of the Cabinet had been called-in by the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee and been referred back to the Cabinet for a decision on 1 March 2011.

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

- Concerns were raised regarding the proposal for Tattenhams Library to be transferred to community ownership. The Local Member for Banstead West reported correspondence from

www.surreycc.gov.uk/reigateandbanstead

residents highlighting the value of the library to the area and its use by older people, young children, and the wider community for MPs surgeries and advertising local groups. It was felt that the selection criteria ignored social need as Tattenhams Library serves the Preston estate.

- Further concerns were raised regarding the expected financial savings arising from the proposal and the fact that Tattenhams Library has a lower cost per issue than Epsom Library.
- The Local Member also raised concerns that it would be a challenge to cover 29.5 hours a week with volunteers, and cited the example of charity shops being forced to introduce paid managers because of a lack of suitable volunteers. This situation would be made more difficult in Tattenhams as there is no parish council to lead on this.
- Other Members of the Local Committee expressed the view that savings had to be made, and that many local people visited Banstead Library rather than Tattenhams. The service was commended for attempting to make a minimal reduction in service.
- Concerns were raised regarding the loss of the mobile library service, as many of its users had mobility issues or lived in rural areas where their access to services was already reduced. Members expressed a view that alternatives were needed including the possibility of finding volunteers to drive people to the nearest library.

The Local Committee:

- (i) **AGREED** to identify and assist the Library Service in consulting and engaging with local community groups and organisations on the viability of establishing a community partnership at Tattenhams Library, subject to the outcome of the Cabinet meeting on 1 March 2011.
- (ii) **NOTED** that the Library Service will maintain published opening hours and avoid closures by recruiting up to the level of the budget allocated.

10/11 **SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY DRAFT PUBLIC SAFETY PLAN [Item 10]**

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety and the Assistant Chief Fire Officer presented the report. A background presentation was tabled and is attached to the minutes as **Appendix C**.

During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were raised in relation to the proposals in the Public Safety Plan (PSP):

- (Proposal 1) Members noted that the model response time for Reigate and Banstead was just over eight minutes, and wished to know how this was calculated. The Assistant Chief Fire Officer informed the Committee that the way the response standards are measured would not be changing. The clock runs from when the operator has enough information about the incident to determine the response required. The quickest response is then mobilised. Mobilising systems can help to identify the location of the caller and whether they are calling from a landline or mobile phone. In road traffic collisions it may not be obvious where the incident has occurred, and the caller may not know their location, so this requires skill on the part of the operator to identify the location.
- (Proposal 1) The Chairman asked for it to be noted that she was not satisfied that the response times for incidents in the Chipstead area are acceptable.
- (Proposal 2) Concerns were raised that Horley would not receive adequate cover in future following the reduction to one fire engine at Horley Fire Station by West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service and the proposal to reduce night cover at Reigate Fire Station. It was noted that the Horley fire engine could be in use for incidents at Gatwick Airport whilst other incidents were happening in Horley. The Assistant Chief Fire Officer explained that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) had an agreement with West Sussex under the Fire Services Act for Horley to be covered. SFRS were in the process of procuring software to ensure that mobilising systems were kept better informed.
- (Proposal 2) Members noted that Banstead West division was mainly served by Epsom Fire Station and raised concerns that this was not mentioned in the report. The Assistant Chief Fire Officer explained that Epsom would have the same number of fire engines as Reigate – 1 providing 24/7 immediate response cover and 1 providing day time only immediate response cover. Countywide, there would be 21 fire engines available at night (including retained service). Full details of the impact in other areas of Surrey can be found in the main draft Public Safety Plan.
- (Proposal 6) Members wished to know whether the family needs of firefighters with children would be accommodated in the new rotas. The Assistant Chief Fire Officer replied that all staff had been consulted on the new rotas and their comments taken into account.
- (Proposal 10) The Chairman felt that SFRS should retain the current governance arrangements.

- (Proposal 12) Members wished to know the level of savings achieved from carrying out proactive, preventative work in the community, and whether any work would take place with local planning departments to ensure that sprinklers become mandatory in all new developments. The Assistant Chief Fire Officer replied that more time would be committed to preventative work, and that this was an investment rather than a saving. Legislation had recently been introduced in Wales for sprinklers in all new build properties, but this is not yet the case in England.

The Local Committee **NOTED** the Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority draft Public Safety Plan and **AGREED** that the above comments form the Committee's response to the consultation.

11/11 **REVIEW OF 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS OUTSIDE SCHOOLS** **[Item 11]**

The Highways Area Team Manager presented the report.

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

- Some Members expressed concerns that the 20 mph speed limit had not made a difference to the level of accidents and injuries, and that without the mean speeds it was difficult to make a comparison. It was felt that the 20 mph signs distracted drivers and cluttered the roads, and that therefore the speed limit should not be implemented. The Area Team Manager informed Members that the Police had advised that following the end of the pilot, the speed limit had become the National Speed Limit of 60 mph and the 20 mph was unenforceable. If the 20 mph signs were removed, the speed limit would revert to 30 mph.
- Other Members noted the considerable cost of removing the signs, and that it was cheaper to retain them for the four pilot schools but not introduce any measures at the other schools in the borough.
- A question was asked regarding the available budget and when this would be available. The Area Team Manager informed the Committee that the budget breakdown was provided under Agenda Item 12, and that it would form part of the proposed Speed Management Work to be undertaken in the spring.
- Members noted the need for the Police to enforce the 20 mph limits, and the fact that there were already a number of effective initiatives aimed at reducing anti-social driving and speeding such as Drive Smart, Community Speedwatch and School

Speedwatch. It was noted that the majority of drivers did take care around schools, and that a consistent approach across the County was required.

- Concerns were raised that this decision would preclude other schools from having a 20 mph speed limit in future. The Area Team Manager reported that Highways would look at schools on an individual basis when asked to.
- Concerns were raised that the ongoing costs would outweigh the cost of removal, for example, replacing damaged signs. The Area Team Manager reported that where possible, the service can recover the costs of replacing damaged signs from the perpetrator.

The Committee **AGREED** that:

- (i) The required Traffic Regulation Order be made to formalise the 20mph speed limit at the four pilot schools.
- (ii) Any objections to the Traffic Regulation Order be reported to the next available meeting of the Local Committee for their consideration.
- (iii) The decision to implement 20mph speed limits outside all schools in Reigate and Banstead be revoked and a revised approach be adopted whereby the specific issues at each school are considered and appropriate, staged interventions undertaken, subject to the identification of funding in the forward programme.

12/11 **HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 12]**

The Highways Area Team Manager presented the report.

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

- Members asked what could be achieved with the £20,000 allocated for Parking. The Area Team Manager informed the Committee that there was scope for virement between the different budget headings, and that the £20,000 was currently a nominal figure which would allow works to move on.
- Members wished to know if the “Waiting Restriction Implementation” referred to the Banstead and Southern Villages Parking Review. The Area Team Manager confirmed that it did, and that the spend profiles of revenue and capital would be reported back to the Committee.

- Concerns were raised as to whether funding would be available for the Reigate Parking Review. The Area Team Manager reported that the Parking Team had agreed in principle towards making the Borough one review area in future.
- One Member expressed the view that the implementation or removal of the High Road, Chipstead speed reduction measures should be funded by the Chipstead Residents Association rather than SCC.
- Concerns were raised that £10,000 was insufficient to carry out the Croydon Lane Pedestrian Island works. The Area Team Manager noted that these, along with the £5,000 quoted for the Traffic Regulation Orders for the four 20 mph speed limits, were notional figures and that there was an unallocated £141,050. He intended to talk to Members informally in April regarding the allocation of these funds.
- A question was asked regarding the cost of the Pendleton Road works. The Area Team Manager noted that he would be reviewing the cost with the new constructors.

The Local Committee:

- (i) **NOTED** progress with delivery of highways schemes.
- (ii) **NOTED** the position of its highways schemes and revenue maintenance budgets.
- (iii) **AUTHORISED** the Area Team Manager to reallocate any residual 2010/11 revenue funds as necessary within the approved categories to prevent any potential under spend.
- (iv) **AUTHORISED** delegation of authority to the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant local Member, to determine which schemes to progress in the 2011/12 financial year from the schemes listed in Appendix 1 to the report submitted.
- (v) **AUTHORISED** the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, to vire the Integrated Transport Scheme capital budget between the schemes listed in Appendix 1 to the report submitted if required.
- (vi) **AUTHORISED** the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant local Member, to use any allocated revenue

maintenance budget for 2011/12 as detailed in section 3.3 of the report submitted.

- (vii) **AUTHORISED** the Area Maintenance Engineer, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, to vary the revenue maintenance budget between the headings detailed in Table 3 of the report submitted if required.
- (vii) **NOTED** commencement of the new highways contract on 28 April 2011 and the potential for variation of indicative scheme costs resulting from this.

13/11 **A23 BONEHURST ROAD – JUNCTION WITH CROSSOAK LANE, HORLEY – PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNALS [Item 12a]**

The Project Manager, Transportation Development Control, presented the report and annexes, which were tabled and are attached to the minutes as **Appendix D**.

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

- The Local Member for Horley West informed the Committee that the proposed traffic signals had been anticipated for some time. Development of the Horley North East Sector had recently started again, and more people are moving in. She stated that the new bus shelter should not be removed when the yellow box junction is installed and requested that officers check this before commencing works.

The Local Committee:

- (i) **AGREED** that authority be given to advertise the installation of a new traffic signal controlled junction, under section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) as shown on the drawing at Annex A to the report submitted and, subject to no objections, or those being withdrawn the crossing be installed.]
- (ii) **APPROVED** the advertising of a yellow box junction on A23 at Empire Villas and at the builder's merchants yard.

[In accordance with Access to Information Rule 6.05(f) (Special Urgency), the Chairman of Transportation Select Committee had agreed that this decision could not be reasonably deferred to the next scheduled meeting of the Local Committee because of the need to start the works in spring/summer 2011. In accordance with Select Committee Rule 7.03(o)(ix) this decision is not subject to call-in.]

13/11 **CAPITAL AND MAINTENANCE PROJECTS PROGRESS REPORT [Item 13]**

The Local Committee **NOTED** the report.

14/11 **COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP UPDATE [Item 14]**

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety informed the Local Committee that the ongoing review of Community Safety and the introduction of a new Police and Crime Commissioner may have a future impact on the work of the Community Safety Partnership.

15/11 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING [Item 15]**

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

The Local Committee:

- (i) **AGREED** the following items submitted for funding from 2010/11 Local Committee delegated revenue budget totalling £44,133.25:

1.	Rowan Close/Star Lane Footpath, Hooley – Lighting Improvements	£3,902.34
2.	Secure Minibus Parking – Age Concern Merstham, Redhill and Reigate	£5,592.02
3.	Reigate and Redhill Live at Home Scheme	£2,000
4.	Reigate Priory Community Junior School – shade for pupils	£2,500
5.	Face 2 Face – Parents Supporting Parents – Weekly Coffee Mornings	£500
6.	Us In A Bus Party for Service Users	£500
7.	School Hill, Merstham – Illuminated Sign	£3,200
8.	Merland Rise, Epsom Downs – Remedial Works	£8,000
9.	Yattendon School – equipment	£2,000
10.	The Redhill Corps of Drums and Band	£1,200
11.	Live at Home Scheme – Horley Branch	£1,400
12.	Contact the Elderly	£88.56
13.	Sovereign Centre – Redecoration and Lighting	£67.00
14.	Banstead District Guides Headquarters	£1,810.20
15.	Horley Young People’s Centre and Surrey Fire and Rescue Service – Video Project	£2,270
16.	Southlands Avenue, Horley - Verge Protection	£4,103.13
17.	Provision of Salt/Grit Bin – Palmers Close, Redhill	£2,500

www.surreycc.gov.uk/reigateandbanstead

18. Provision of Salt/Grit Bin – Alpine Way, Redhill £2,500

(ii) **AGREED** the items submitted for funding from 2010/11 Local Committee capital budget totalling £5,200:

1. “Raise the Roof” – 2 nd Reigate Scouts	£2,200
2. Sovereign Centre – Redecoration and Lighting	£2,000
3. Banstead District Guides Headquarters	£1,000

(iii) **NOTED** the items the items submitted from 2010/11 Local Committee delegated revenue budget totalling £7,492.38 agreed under delegated powers in accordance with the Local Financial Protocol:

1. Banstead Village May Queen Event	£1,000
2. A242 Gatton Park Road/Croydon Road, Reigate - Signing	£692.38
3. “Raise the Roof” – 2 nd Reigate Scouts	£800
4. Provision of Salt/Grit Bin – Copsleigh Avenue, Salfords	£2,500
5. Provision of Salt/Grit Bin – Clarence Way, Langshott, Horley	£2,500

16/11 **CABINET FORWARD PLAN [Item 16]**

It was noted that the report on On-Street Parking Charging would be submitted to the Cabinet in May. The Surrey Fire and Rescue Service Public Safety Plan would be submitted to the Cabinet in June.

The Local Committee **NOTED** the report.

17/11 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN [Item 17]**

The Local Committee **NOTED** the report.

[Meeting Ended: 5.25pm]

Chairman