

| | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| <u>MINUTES:</u> | of the meeting of Surrey County Council's Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) held at 14:00 on Monday 5 March 2012 at Reigate Town Hall. | |
| <u>THESE MINUTES REMAIN DRAFT UNTIL FORMALLY APPROVED AT THE 18 JUNE 2012 MEETING</u> | | |
| <u>Members Present – Surrey County Council</u> | | |
| | Dr Zully Grant-Duff (Chairman) | Dr Lynne Hack |
| | Mrs Frances King (Vice-Chairman) | Mr Nick Harrison |
| | Mrs Angela Fraser | Mr Peter Lambell |
| | Mr Michael Gosling | Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin |
| <u>Members Present – Reigate and Banstead Borough Council</u> | | |
| | Cllr Mrs Natalie Bramhall | Cllr Mrs Gill Emmerton |
| | Cllr Mark Brunt | Cllr Norman Harris |
| | Cllr Brian Cowle | Cllr Dr Richard Olliver |
| <u>PART ONE - IN PUBLIC</u> | | |
| [All references to items refer to the agenda for the meeting] | | |
| 01/12 | APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1] | |
| | Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Kay Hammond, Cllr Stephen Bramhall, Cllr Mrs Anna Tarrant and Cllr Barbara Thomson. Apologies for lateness were received from Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin. | |
| 02/12 | MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS – 5 DECEMBER 2011 [Item 2] | |
| | The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the previous meeting. | |
| 03/12 | DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3] | |
| | Mr Nick Harrison declared Prejudicial interests in Item 14 by virtue of being a governor of Shawley Primary School, and by virtue of being involved in the steering committee setting up Tattenhams Community Library. | |
| | Cllr Mark Brunt declared a Personal interest in Item 14 by virtue of being Chairman of the Merstham Community Facility Trust. | |
| | | |

| | |
|-------|---|
| 04/12 | PETITIONS [Item 4] |
| | None. |
| | |
| 05/12 | FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5] |
| | None. |
| | |
| 06/12 | FORMAL MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6] |
| | None. |
| | |
| 07/12 | SURREY 2012 PROGRESS REPORT [Item 7] |
| | <p>Surriya Subramanian, Surrey 2012 Business Development Manager, presented the report. Inspector Richard Haycock, Local Policing Commander, was also in attendance.</p> <p>During discussion by the Committee, the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were raised regarding the quality of tannoy announcements made during the London Surrey Cycle Classic test race held in August 2011. The Business Development Manager explained that he was aware of the feedback and this had been passed to the London Organising Committee (LOCOG). • With regards to the test race, concerns were also raised regarding signage to toilet facilities. The Business Development Manager acknowledged the issues with regards to facilities, which also included availability of food, water and bins. The crowd management plans were being finalised and the community of Box Hill would be consulted due to the large crowds expected at this location. • A question was asked regarding the relationship between the previously held Surrey Youth Games and the P&G Surrey School Games. The Business Development Manager explained that the Surrey Youth Games involved district and borough teams competing against each other, whereas the School Games involves individual schools competing against each other in around 50 county finals across a range of different sports. • Members wished to know the cost of hosting the 23 teams signed up to train in the county, the cost of the Torch Relay, and who would be paying. The Business Development Manager informed the Committee that each national team had received a £25,000 grant from LOCOG to pay for their training camps. It was expected that a further £0.5 million would be brought into Surrey as a result of athletes' friends and families staying in the county. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>With regards to the Torch Relay, SCC has an obligation to ensure that roads are closed as part of the rolling roadblock, and there are costs associated with signage, although the exact figure is not yet available. LOCOG would be meeting the bulk of the costs relating to the cycling road races. The Local Policing Commander added that the policing of the Torch Relay was being funded separately. Local police working patterns would be adjusted so that there would be no additional costs, and crime investigation and emergency response would continue as usual.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were raised with regards to the possibility of a major incident at Gatwick Airport and the impact on East Surrey Hospital occurring during the Torch Relay. The Local Policing Commander assured the Committee that contingency plans for all the emergency services would be in place, and that there would be no disruption to normal service. • Members noted the problems caused by rolling road closures during the trial cycling event due to the time taken to re-open roads, and asked if measures were in place to avoid a recurrence. The Business Development Manager reported that all businesses and residents along the route would be informed by newsletter when roads would be closed and re-opened. Due to security considerations, it was likely that the closures for the Olympic road races would be longer than during the trial race, with roads likely to be closed at 4.30am on the morning of the event, and re-opening later in order to disperse crowds safely afterwards. Consultation had taken place with colleagues in Adults Services, and with Send Prison and local hospices to ensure that critical staff can reach their workplace. The Registration Service had also been contacted to ensure that weddings are able to take place. • Discussion took place regarding the use of voluntary organisations such as St John Ambulance. It was noted that a tendering process was currently taking place for emergency management and St John Ambulance and The Red Cross were bidding. In addition, 450 members of the public would be volunteering to provide local knowledge to assist visitors. This would supplement the trained stewards supplied by LOCOG. <p>The Local Committee AGREED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) To note the work of the Surrey 2012 Team and the progress of the wider programme. (ii) To use the information and continue to be advocates for the wider Surrey 2012 programme. |
| | |

| | |
|-------|---|
| 08/12 | RELOCATION OF A ZEBRA CROSSING – LESBOURNE ROAD, REIGATE [Item 8] |
| | <p>Richard Cooper, Assistant Transport Development Planner, presented the report.</p> <p>During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification was sought as to whether refusal to move the zebra crossing would impact upon the status of the planning permission. The officer informed Members that the planning permission would still stand; however, the applicant would need to apply to the Local Planning Authority (the Borough Council) for the condition requiring the crossing to be moved to be rescinded. • Concerns were raised that moving the crossing would be dangerous. The officer reported that the proposal had been subject to a Road Safety Audit, and a number of measures had been agreed by the developer, including improvements to the bus stop and a guard rail to direct pedestrians towards the crossing on exiting the Omnibus Building. The cost of these measures would be fully funded by the developer. • Members wished to know if the Highways Authority was satisfied that the proposed safety measures would mitigate the original objections. The officer informed the Committee that a number of objections had originally been made by the Highways Authority on the planning application: firstly, that the visibility from the access onto Lesbourne Road was substandard; secondly, the geometry and location of the access in relation to the existing zebra crossing, and thirdly, the steep gradient of the private access road leading to the development. The developer had amended the scheme to improve the visibility by acquiring a small piece of land adjacent to the access, which addressed the first point. The widening of the access, in conjunction with the zebra crossing relocation addressed the second point. However, at the appeal, the Highways Authority maintained an objection that the gradient of the access road was substandard and could not safely accommodate the intensification in use of the site. The Planning Inspector acknowledged the objection of the Highways Authority, but concluded that the highway safety improvements proposed would adequately compensate for the additional use of the road. • Strong concerns were raised by Members that developers could get unacceptable proposals approved on appeal by offering to pay for safety measures. • Members wished to know if a Judicial Review had been considered. The officer felt that it would be unlikely to succeed |

| | |
|-------|---|
| | <p>and explained that the scheme which had been granted planning permission secured a significant improvement in highway safety terms compared to the proposal originally submitted by the applicant to the Local Planning Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A question was asked regarding the current position of the zebra crossing and whether this would have been subject to a safety audit. The Highways Area Team Manager confirmed that this would have been the case. <p>The Local Committee DEFERRED a decision on this item to a future meeting.</p> <p>[The reason for deferral was to enable officers to seek advice from Legal Services regarding the feasibility of seeking a Judicial Review.]</p> |
| 09/12 | LOCAL SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FUND [Item 9] |
| | <p>Lyndon Mendes, Transport Policy Team Manager, and Paul Fishwick, LSTF Project Manager, presented the report.</p> <p>During discussion by the Committee the following key points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some concerns were raised that the proposals did not represent a good use of public money; however, the majority of Members, particularly those on the LSTF Task Group felt that the scheme provided a number of opportunities, particularly for young people, to encourage people to access newly created jobs in a regenerated Redhill. • Members wished to know how the Brompton Bike Dock would work, and why this was chosen over other hire schemes, such as the London scheme. The Transport Policy Team Manager informed the Committee that a number of schemes had been considered. The Brompton Dock cost 1/25th of the London scheme, and already operated successfully in Guildford. A number of private companies had made enquiries to SCC as to how they could implement similar schemes. • Discussion took place around the wider benefits and objectives of the LSTF and whether it would make a difference. The Project Manager provided examples of how improved and joined-up cycle routes had achieved a 27% increase in cycling, based on existing cycle counters. New routes such as the Basingstoke Canal had seen increases of between 75% and 215% with an 89% increase in walking to Woking town centre. There were now 1,500 cycle journeys into the town centre daily. The town had benefitted from two and a half years of funding. The project was aimed at changing attitudes towards walking and cycling and there were |

| | |
|-------|--|
| | <p>further examples from elsewhere in the UK and Europe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members were informed that there was flexibility within the elements set out in Annex C to the report submitted. A final decision would be made at the Local Committee in June following further discussion by the Task Group. <p>The Local Committee AGREED that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The Bike It scheme listed under the Key Component within Annex A to the report submitted be approved for the 2012/13 financial year. (ii) The 'Headline' schemes within the Large Bid listed in Annex A to the report submitted be approved for consultation and developed further with the Task Group, with further details to be reported to the next meeting of the Local Committee on 18 June 2012, together with an analysis of the consultation. |
| 10/12 | YOUTH SMALL GRANTS [Item 10] |
| | <p>Deborah Honey, Contracts Performance Manager - Prevention, presented the report.</p> <p>During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members wished to know if Cadet Forces were eligible to apply for funding. The Contracts Performance Manager confirmed that they were. A question was asked regarding publicity for the fund. Contracts Performance Manager informed Members that publicity would be produced by the Communications Team, and a web page had been set up. Concerns were raised that paragraph 2.4 of the report submitted did not specify which young people would be involved in the consultation regarding delegated bids. The Chairman suggested that a young person from the Reigate and Banstead Youth Task Group should perform this role. Members noted that with regards to the reference in paragraph 2.4 of the report, the reference to the process for agreeing delegated Member Allocations bids did not reflect the practice of this Committee, where all County Members of the Local Committee are consulted on proposed bids. <p>The Local Committee AGREED the process for approving Youth Small Grants as set out within paragraphs 2.3, 2.5 and 2.6 as set out</p> |

| | |
|-------|---|
| | <p>within the report submitted, and paragraph 2.4 as amended by the Committee below:</p> <p>(i) Insert the words: “from the Reigate and Banstead Youth Task Group” after: “young person”.</p> <p>(ii) Replace the words: “the local divisional Member” with: “all Local Committee Members”.</p> |
| 11/12 | <p>HIGHWAYS SCHEMES 2011/12 – END OF YEAR UPDATE [Item 11]</p> |
| | <p>John Lawlor, Area Team Manager, presented the report.</p> <p>During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns were raised that some schemes had not been completed due to parked cars, and Members wished to know if the contractor, May Gurney, had access to lifting equipment to remove cars if they caused an obstruction. The Area Team Manager explained that a Traffic Regulation Order would be required to move parked cars under the Parking Act. He agreed to pass the comments back to the Central Team. Members wished to know if a statement of their individual Community Pride funds could be provided. The Area Team Manager agreed to action this. A question was asked regarding Beech Grove, which was called forward from the previous year but did not appear in this report. The Area Team Manager would follow this up with the divisional Member outside the meeting. Members noted that the A217 Reigate Hill casualty reduction scheme had now been removed due to the number of accidents caused. Concerns were raised that the junction with Gatton Bottom was still very dangerous and suggestions were made to improve white lining and introduce a “Stop” sign. The Area Team Manager agreed to look at the Small Safety Schemes allocation for next year. Concerns were raised that yellow lines indicating parking restrictions introduced by the Banstead and Southern Villages and Redhill Parking Reviews had not yet been painted. The Area Team Manager would raise this with the parking team and seek an update for Members. A request was made that the resurfacing of Holly Lane, Banstead, be carried out before any new lining. Members thanked the team for their work during the 2011/12 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|----------------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------|----------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|------------------------|
| | financial year. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | The Local Committee NOTED the report for information. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12/12 | HIGHWAYS SCHEMES 2012/13 [Item 12] | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>John Lawlor, Area Team Manager, presented the report. He informed Members that the following budget had been allocated to Reigate and Banstead by the Cabinet:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Revenue</td><td>£284,110</td></tr> <tr> <td>Integrated Transport Schemes</td><td>£223,050</td></tr> <tr> <td>Capital Maintenance</td><td>£223,050</td></tr> <tr> <td>Community Pride</td><td>£45,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><u>TOTAL</u></td><td><u>£775,210</u></td></tr> </table> <p>The Area Team Manager suggested that the allocation of the additional funding be discussed at the 16 April 2012 informal meeting of the Local Committee with approval at the next formal meeting on 18 June 2012. He suggested that it be used for Local Structural Repairs and Footway Schemes. Funding was also available for a “Community Gang” to carry out minor works put forward by Members.</p> <p>During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members wished to know if Reigate and Banstead had received a fair allocation of the budget, given the borough’s population and high volume of use of its roads. The Area Team Manager informed Members that Reigate and Banstead had received the second highest allocation in the county, which was welcomed by Members. • A question was asked regarding footway improvements in Balcombe Road, Horley, which had been the subject of a recent petition to the Local Committee. The Area Team Manager reported that works would commence from 1 April 2012. • The Area Team Manager confirmed that funding for “Community Gangs” could be capitalised if Members wished to fund larger schemes. • It was noted that The Drive, Banstead was listed twice, and Downland Way had been omitted. Members also wished to know whether the Pendleton Road, Reigate pedestrian crossing was still on the list. The Area Team Manager agreed to respond outside the meeting regarding these points. | Revenue | £284,110 | Integrated Transport Schemes | £223,050 | Capital Maintenance | £223,050 | Community Pride | £45,000 | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>£775,210</u> |
| Revenue | £284,110 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Integrated Transport Schemes | £223,050 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Maintenance | £223,050 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Community Pride | £45,000 | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>£775,210</u> | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>The Local Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) NOTED the position of its highways schemes, revenue maintenance and Community Pride budgets for 2012/13. (ii) APPROVED the list of schemes given in Annex 1 to the report submitted, and AGREED that further schemes can be added to the list during the year, subject to formal Local Committee approval. (iii) 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, including the identification of Local Structural Repair schemes, in the 2012/13 financial year from the schemes listed in Annex 1. (iv) AUTHORISED the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, to be able to vire money between the schemes listed in Annex 1 to the report submitted, if required. (v) AUTHORISED the Area Maintenance Engineer, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant local Member, to use any allocated revenue maintenance budget for 2012/13 as detailed in Table 1 of the report submitted. (vi) AUTHORISED the Area Maintenance Engineer, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, to vire the revenue maintenance budget between the headings detailed in Table 1 of the report submitted if required. (vii) AGREED that the Community Pride funding be devolved to each County Councillor based on an equitable allocation of £5,000 per division. (viii) AGREED that Members should contact the Area Maintenance Engineer to discuss their specific requirements with regard to their Community Pride allocation and arrange for the work activities to be managed by the Area Maintenance Engineer on their behalf. (ix) NOTED the provisional programme of major maintenance, surface treatment, footway and drainage schemes in Reigate and Banstead, as set out in Annex 2 to the report submitted. |
| | |

| | |
|-------|--|
| | |
| 13/12 | SUTTON LANE, BANSTEAD – EXTENSION OF 30MPH SPEED LIMIT [Item 13] |
| | <p>John Lawlor, Area Team Manager, presented the report.</p> <p>During discussion by the Committee, the following key points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members wished to know how many accidents had taken place on the National Speed Limit section of the road. The Area Team Manager confirmed that there had been three slight conditions, all involving single vehicles, and each with a specific causal factor (ice; surface water; animal in the road). In addition, five slight collisions had taken place at the junction of Sutton Lane, Downs Road and Cotswold Road in the London Borough of Sutton. • Concerns were raised that many of the problems were caused by parked cars at the junction with Downs Road, which was in the London Borough of Sutton. It was suggested that Sutton should enforce the parking restrictions before spending money on this scheme. • The Area Team Manager agreed to report these concerns the London Borough of Sutton. <p>The Local Committee DEFERRED a decision on this item to a future meeting.</p> <p>[The reason for deferral was to enable officers to report the concerns raised by the Committee to the London Borough of Sutton.]</p> |
| | |
| | [The meeting adjourned between 4.25pm and 4.32pm] |
| | |
| 14/12 | LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING [Item 14] |
| | <p>Mr Nick Harrison declared Prejudicial interests in this item by virtue of being a governor of Shawley Primary School, and by virtue of being involved in the steering committee setting up Tattenhams Community Library.</p> <p>Cllr Mark Brunt declared a Personal interest in this item by virtue of being Chairman of the Merstham Community Facility Trust.</p> <p>The Local Committee:</p> <p>(i) AGREED the following items submitted for funding from 2011/12 Local Committee delegated revenue budget totalling £36,990:</p> |

| | | |
|-----|---|---------|
| 1. | Tadworth Jubilee Woodland Park | £2,109 |
| 2. | Alternative Energy Science Workshops | £2,000 |
| 3. | Primary Science Workshops | £3,000 |
| 4. | Downlands Project Land Rover | £2,500 |
| 5. | Reigate and Banstead Winter Night Shelter | £2,000 |
| 6. | Woodhatch Christmas Lights | £1,250 |
| 7. | Challenge Saturdays | £1,300 |
| 8. | Us in a Bus Database Project | £1,300 |
| 9. | Banstead West Playgrounds Project | £3,469 |
| 10. | Shawley Community Primary School Library Software | £1,385 |
| 11. | Tattenhams Community Library | £1,500 |
| 12. | St Peter's Churchyard | £500 |
| 13. | Sandcross School Outdoor Project | £1,000 |
| 14. | Oakwood School Citizenship Award | £1,000 |
| 15. | Royal Alfred Seafarers Society | £2,000 |
| 16. | Holistic Harmony – Seeds of Change | £2,000 |
| 17. | Chipstead Village Olympics 2012 | £287.45 |
| 18. | East Surrey Domestic Abuse Services | £1,000 |
| 19. | Redhill and Reigate YMCA – Safe Internet for Young People | £1,000 |
| 20. | Redhill and Reigate YMCA – Trampolining for Young People | £160 |
| 21. | Furze Field School – Summer Holiday Club | £3,600 |
| 22. | Meath Green Infant School – Improving Road Safety | £2,500 |
| | | |
| | (ii) NOTED the items submitted from 2011/12 Local Committee delegated revenue budget totalling £13,303 agreed under delegated powers in accordance with the Local Financial Protocol: | |
| 1. | Salt/Grit Bin – Home Farm Close, Epsom Downs | £1,000 |
| 2. | Reigate Methodist Toddler Group | £500 |
| 3. | Diamond Jubilee Fun Day in Horley | £1,000 |
| 4. | Kingswood Residents Association Jubilee Celebrations | £180 |
| 5. | Whitebushes Youth Club | £1,000 |
| 6. | Youth Engagement Scheme | £250 |
| 7. | Waterhouse Lane, Kingswood – VAS | £571 |
| 8. | Redhill Town FC – Disability Pan for All Football | £1,000 |
| 9. | Salt/Grit Bin – Manor Road, Reigate | £1,000 |
| 10. | Salt/Grit Bin – Fairford Close, Reigate | £1,000 |
| 11. | Reigate and Redhill Live At Home Scheme – Day Trip | £600 |
| 12. | Reigate and Redhill Live at Home Scheme – Computer Equipment | £1,000 |
| 13. | Meath Green Junior School | £1,000 |

| | | |
|-------|---|------|
| 14. | Face 2 Face | £992 |
| 15. | Action for Life – Walking for Health | £800 |
| 16. | Young Linking Lives Pilot | £660 |
| 17. | Giant Picnic – Epsom Downs School | £250 |
| 18. | Bring It All Back – Banstead Film Factory | £500 |
| | | |
| | <p>(iii) NOTED that the Committee has fully spent its 2011/12 capital budget.</p> <p>(iv) NOTED a correction to paragraph 3.2.10 of the report submitted. The Member proposing the bid was Dr Zully Grant-Duff.</p> <p>(v) AGREED that any 2011/12 Local Committee delegated revenue budget uncommitted by the end of the financial year be allocated to the Bursaries Scheme for Looked after Children.</p> | |
| | | |
| 15/12 | CABINET FORWARD PLAN [Item 15] | |
| | The Local Committee NOTED the report. | |
| | | |
| 16/12 | LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN [Item 16] | |
| | The Local Committee NOTED the report. | |
| | [Members suggested an additional item for the 18 June 2012 meeting: Utility Works and Road Surface Reinstatement.] | |
| | | |
| 17/12 | PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN ASSOCIATION WITH A NEW SECTION OF FOOTWAY AT YATTENDON ROAD, HORLEY [Item 17] | |
| | <p>[This item was heard earlier in the agenda between Items 13 and 14.]</p> <p>John Lawlor, Area Team Manager, presented the report.</p> <p>During discussion by the Committee, the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Member for Horley East welcomed the proposals and thanked officers for their work. • The Area Team Manager confirmed to Members that the scheme was being funded with Section 106 money relating to the Horley Masterplan. <p>The Local Committee AGREED:</p> | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>(i) To give approval to implement waiting restrictions for the Prohibition of Waiting, Loading and Unloading on Yattendon Road as shown on the drawing in Annex 1 to the report submitted.</p> <p>(ii) That the consideration and resolution of any representations received as a result of advertising the Traffic Regulation Order be delegated to the South East Surrey Area Group Manager, the Parking Team Manager, and in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee and local elected Members.</p> |
| | |
| | [Meeting Ended: 4.45pm] |
| | |
| | <p style="text-align: center;">Chairman</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____</p> |