



**LOCAL COMMITTEE
(REIGATE AND BANSTEAD)**

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

19 SEPTEMBER 2011

Two public questions have been received on the subject of the experimental kerb build-out at High Road, Chipstead:

1. Mr Geoff Eales asks:

“Minute number 29/11 of the 20 June 2011 meeting of the Local Committee states that: “The Area Team Manager South East presented the report and noted that it was necessary to set up a private meeting between the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Divisional Member, the Chipstead Residents’ Association and officers. The Local Committee noted the report for information.” Please can the Committee advise on the outcome of the private meeting with the Chipstead Residents’ Association? And if not, why not?”

The Chairman responds on behalf of the Committee:

“The County Council's position is that it will be seeking reimbursement from the Chipstead Residents’ Association (CRA). Workload and resource issues combined with the summer holiday period has meant that a meeting with the Chipstead Residents’ Association is yet to be held. In addition, the Area Team Manager wishes to seek legal advice before further discussions are held with the CRA. A meeting has been set up with the County Council's lawyers, to be attended by the Area Team Manager and the Local Committee Chairman. A meeting with the CRA will be held after this meeting has taken place and, subject to diary commitments, is likely to place in October.”

2. Mrs Angela Marshall asks:

“At the June meeting of the Local Committee, Agenda Item 12 (Update Report – High Road, Chipstead and 20mph Speed Limits outside Schools), it said that discussions are ongoing with the Chipstead Residents’ Association regarding funding of the scheme. The Minutes of that meeting said that: “The Area Team Manager South East presented the report and noted that it was necessary to set up a private meeting between the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Divisional Member, the

Chipstead Residents' Association and officers". Although this as a CRA sponsored scheme and in 2008 the CRA committed to fund this scheme its now publicly stated position is that "the CRA is expecting to carry forward the funding so far spent on the current failed scheme to fund an alternative viable scheme, and we will have further discussions on funding issues with SCC" (CRA Newsletter). Since the CRA commitment to funding was not conditional on the success of this scheme and it was agreed that the scheme would have to be removed if safety issues arose, we would like to know:

- (a) What was the outcome of the "ongoing discussions regarding funding with the CRA" reported by the Area Team Manager to the June Committee?
- (b) Why a private meeting with the CRA and the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Divisional Member and officers is considered necessary to resolve this matter?
- (c) Has this group of Members been given delegated powers by the Committee to take a decision on how the costs of this scheme are to be finally met and, if so, when did Committee agree to this delegation?
- (d) Given the CRA's publicly stated position is that the £10,000 for this failed scheme should not now be paid and this sum should be carried forward to another scheme, will the Committee be asking the CRA to honour the commitment to provide £10,000 towards the costs of the High Road scheme or is the full cost of this scheme to be borne by the Local Committee?
- (e) If the CRA will not be asked to honour the commitment it made, could the Committee please explain why not?

The Chairman responds on behalf of the Committee:

- (a) The County Council's position is that it will be seeking reimbursement from the CRA. Workload and resource issues combined with the summer holiday period has meant that a meeting with the Chipstead Residents' Association is yet to be held. In addition, the Area Team Manager wishes to seek legal advice before further discussions are held with the CRA. A meeting has been set up with the County Council's lawyers, to be attended by the Area Team Manager and the Local Committee Chairman. A meeting with the CRA will be held after this meeting has taken place and, subject to diary commitments, is likely to place in October.
- (b) The County Council has been working in partnership with the CRA and would not wish to demand payment using any legal powers that may be available to the County Council without first having tried to reach an amicable agreement between all parties involved after full discussion of all the issues and concerns. The meeting will be held in private, as is normal practice in such circumstances.
- (c) Local Committee agreed in February 2011 to allocate £5,000 towards the removal or making permanent of the experimental kerb build-out, prior to the decision to remove the scheme on safety grounds. No delegated powers have been given by Local Committee to any group of Members to approve the allocation of additional Local Committee funds to this scheme. Any further allocation of funding for this scheme would require Local Committee agreement.

- (d) The CRA made the commitment to contribute £10,000 towards the cost of the experimental scheme and subsequently made an initial down payment of £3,000. The County Council's position is that it will be seeking reimbursement from the CRA to the sum of £10,000.
- (e) Please see response to part (d) of the question above.

NOTES:

- (i) Surrey County Council's constitution, (Standing Order 66) requires that public questions be sent in writing to the Local Committee and Partnership Officer at least 7 days before the meeting.
- (ii) At the discretion of the Chairman, a member of the public who has given notice of a question may ask one supplementary question relevant to the subject of the original.