

DRAFT MINUTES to be agreed on 24 September 2010

MINUTES: of the extraordinary meeting of the Tandridge Local Committee held at 10.15am on Friday 2nd July 2010 at Tandridge District Council Offices, Oxted.

County Council Members

- * Mr N W Skellett - Chairman
- * Mrs Sally Ann B Marks - Vice-Chairman
- * Mr Tony Elias
- * Mr David Hodge
- * Mr John Orrick
- * Mr Michael Sydney

District Council Members

- * Cllr Lisa Bangs
- * Cllr Nick Childs
- * Cllr Michael Cooper
- Cllr Martin Fisher
- * Cllr Ken Harwood
- * Cllr Marian Myland

* = Present

25/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from District Councillor Martin Fisher. District Councillor Colin Walker substituted.

26/10 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 5 MARCH 2010 AND 4 JUNE 2010 [Item 2]

Agreed as a true record.

27/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Mr Tony Elias declared a non-prejudicial interest in Item 14 [Tandridge Annual Parking Review 2010] in his capacity as Chairman of the Tandridge District Council's Community Services Committee. District Councillors Lisa Bangs, Nick Childs and Colin Walker declared an interest as members of the same committee. District Councillor Bangs also declared a personal interest in relation to Item 5 Public Questions in her capacity as a member of Lingfield Parish Council and in relation to Item 9 in her capacity as Vice-Chairman of Lingfield Youth Clubs Management Committee. District Councillor Michael Cooper declared a personal interest in Item 18 The Square, Caterham, in his capacity as a member of the Caterham Community Partnership, although this item was for information only.

28/10 PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were none.

29/10 PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS [Item 5]

As Item 14 [Tandridge Parking Review 2010] was brought forward, the Chairman took questions relating to parking at this point. There was one public question from Lingfield Parish Council, which received a written response appended as Annex A.

30/10 TANDRIDGE ANNUAL PARKING REVIEW 2010 [Item 14]

[NOTE: This item was brought forward in order to accommodate Mr David Hodge who had given prior notice that he would have to leave by 11.00 am.]

This report asked the committee to consider the implementation of new waiting and loading restrictions and amendments to existing restrictions at various locations across the district. It detailed the locations that the county's Parking Strategy and Implementation Group (PSIG) recommended should be subject to advertisement and formal consultation with a view to introducing new and amending existing parking controls (as outlined in annexes A, B and C).

Annex C was taken first, as a decision on this aspect had been deferred from the extraordinary meeting on 4th June 2010 pending costings that had not been available at that time. Mr Tony Elias said that he thought the estimated costings were too low. However the attending officer explained that, while this was not an exact science, he was confident that the figures were reasonable. He said that figures received from the District Council appeared to take no account of the fact that a parking enforcement team was already in place. Allowing for that, the costs contained in Annex C were in line with those being applied across the County by districts and boroughs who had been operating for some time and were therefore justifiable. District Councillor Lisa Bangs asked whether 80 permits was a realistic number for 62 households. The attending officer said that, before going out to consultation, there was no way of establishing with any certainty what the take-up would be but that the estimates were based on comparative data from across the County and he reminded members that this would be subject to an annual review. He further explained the process for visitor permits, ie that they were normally provided in a book with detachable tickets, each valid for one day, that could be individually displayed in the windscreen of a visitor's car. He also confirmed that while, at present, the scheme was limited to two cars per household, a policy review report was due to go to Cabinet on 13th July and that that limitation could potentially be relaxed. Tendering for implementation of parking enforcement contracts would also be under review at that time and that should also help to keep costs competitive.

The committee then looked at the schemes listed in Annex A in some detail and agreed each in turn. The only exception to the list was Tupwood Lane, Caterham, where District Councillor Michael Cooper raised an objection to the length and position of the proposed yellow lining. This was accepted and the list was amended to consult on extending the yellow lines from Woolhams up to Grange Road in order to incorporate the bends.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Tandridge) AGREE:

- (i) the recommendations detailed in annex A (with supporting drawings in annex B), with the proviso that, in Tupwood Lane, the yellow lines be extended to include Woolhams to Grange Road; and with an amendment to Annex C to include the following recommendations which were proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Mrs Marks and APPROVED that an informal consultation be undertaken with local residents and, subject to local support:
 - a) a permit scheme be established for Hillbury Road, as detailed in the report to this Local Committee on 4 June 2010 with the exception of the permit costs, which are to be revised as per this Annex C
 - b) permit costs be set at £75 per annum for the first permit and £100 for the second per household, subject to an annual review

DRAFT MINUTES to be agreed on 24 September 2010

- c) visitor permits be £1.00 per permit, valid for one day
 - d) the County Council follow the due process to amend traffic regulations orders for the recommended parking controls to be implemented
 - e) the scheme be introduced as part of the 2009 proposals (Part 2 Locations).
- (ii) that the Local Committee allocate the necessary funding of £20,000 to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments,
 - (iii) that the County Council follows the due process to amend existing traffic regulation orders for the recommended parking controls to be implemented, and
 - (iv) to note (for information) the controls to be implemented as part of the 2009 parking review – part one locations.

Reason for decisions

The main reasons were to improve road safety; to assist with access for emergency vehicles; to aid access for refuse vehicles and to ease congestion and improve the environment for residents.

[NOTE: Mr David Hodge left at 10.50 am]

31/10 **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS** [Item 6]

There were none.

32/10 **LOCAL COMMITTEE PROTOCOL ANNUAL REVIEW, DELEGTON OF COMMUNITY SAFETY BUDGET AND NOMINATIONS TO LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS** [Item 7]

This report asked the Committee to consider the existing local protocols and to agree any amendments for the coming 12 months; to delegate the Community Safety Budget and to nominate representative(s) to the Community Safety Partnership and Local Strategic Partnership.

There were no recommended amendments to the local protocols governing public participation in meetings.

The Chairman clarified the point that a disproportionate amount of the small funding budget available for community safety was ring fenced for domestic abuse because of an existing contract, which Mrs Sally Marks commended as delivering an invaluable service to the community.

Mr Ken Harwood then nominated the Chairman, Mr N W Skellett as representative on both the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) and the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP). There were no other nominations, Mrs Marks seconded the nomination and it was put to the vote and formally approved. Mrs Marks was subsequently nominated and approved as deputy.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Tandridge) APPROVED:

- (i) the version of the local protocol attached as Annex A to the report, noting the impact on the changes to the constitution with regards to public speaking on reports relating to public rights of way,

DRAFT MINUTES to be agreed on 24 September 2010

- (ii) delegation of the Community Safety Budget to the Area Director for use by the Tandridge Community Safety Partnership (CSP), and
- (iii) the formal nomination of Mr N W Skellett to the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) and Local Strategic Partnership (LSP).

Reason for decisions

The reason for reviewing the Local Protocol was so that it was effectively monitored on an annual basis and any amendments incorporated in a timely manner to improve the running of committee meetings and provide an operational framework that was unambiguous. Based on revisions to the SCC constitution, the suggested amendments sought to clarify processes for the benefit of the public that would improve the facilitation of public meetings.

The reason for delegating the community safety budget to the Area Director was to allow the funding to be spent in a timely manner in accordance with the agreed priorities of the CSP to the benefit of all Tandridge residents.

The reason for considering and approving nominations to the CSP and LSP, as laid out under Standing Order 22.1, was to ensure that the Local Committee had a voice on all local issues and that the nominated representative could ensure that the Committee was kept fully informed of progress.

33/10 **COUNTY COUNCILLORS' ALLOCATIONS FOR 2010/11** [Item 8]

This report set out the funding available to County Councillors from the delegated budget for 2010/11 and asked them to consider requests for received bids and to review the spending priorities and protocol for 2010/11. Each County Councillor has £8,250 revenue and the Committee as a whole has a further £30,000 capital to spend on local projects meeting the agreed criteria. The constitution further allows Members to delegate authority to the Area Director to agree applications up to £1,000.

Without discussion, Members approved the priorities and protocol, duly noting the changes occasioned by the removal of the £100,000 capital, traditionally delegated to highways.

They further noted the single payment of £470 made under delegated authority to the Lingfield Chamber of Commerce in respect of the purchase of banners promoting the Open Day Business event celebrating the re-opening of Lingfield High Street following an extended period of utility road works. Mr Michael Sydney thanked the committee for making this possible and reported that the event was a great success.

They then discussed the seven new bids listed in the report plus a further two, which were tabled by Mrs Marks, in respect of the Woldingham Garden Village Peace Hall and the Craigmile Glebe Playground. The bid from Warlingham School at par 3.2.2 was reduced to £3000.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Tandridge) agree to:

- (i) CONSIDER new requests for funding from the Members' Allocations budget as set out in Annex A, and APPROVE the following:

Caterham and Warlingham CAB Refurbishment	£2,420
East Surrey Carers' Association Annual Trip	£1,000
Warlingham School All weather playing surface	£3,000
Warlingham Parish Council Warlingham Green Power Supply	£3,000

DRAFT MINUTES to be agreed on 24 September 2010

Bluehouse Festival Author visits free to schools	£ 925
Felbridge Parish Council Bulb Planting	£ 250
Bletchingley Youth Club Set up costs	£1,000

A further two bids were tabled and APPROVED as follows:

Woldingham Garden Village Peace Hall refurbishment	£2,345
Craigmile Glebe Playground	£1,000

- (i) NOTE payments made under delegated authority, also at Annex A, and
- (ii) CONSIDER the locally agreed priorities and arrangements as set out in Annex B and approve them for a further 12 months without amendment.

Reason for decisions

All projects under consideration had been sponsored by, and had the support of, the appropriate Local Member. Members were requested to consider them as a group and to decide whether or not to approve them.

34/10 **SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE DELIVERY PLAN 2010/11 [Item 9]**

This report sought approval for a local delivery plan that outlined the Service's planned provision in 2010/11 and also introduced the transformation strategy that will modernise all Services for Young People in order to fulfil the County Council's ambition to offer world class services for young people.

The attending officer confirmed that there would be no changes to provision or establishment in this financial year but that substantial savings would have to be identified over the coming months. In order to achieve this a new approach would be implemented that would radically change the way that statutory services to young people (13 – 19 yrs) are delivered and that, through commissioning, there would be considerably more join up with the voluntary sector and partner agencies. He described the transformation process in some detail and said that the future focus would be on a locally designed model.

District Councillor Ken Harwood queried the cost of the Needs Assessment and which young people had been consulted. The officer replied that while the costs had not yet been quantified, it had involved a great deal of officer time over many months and resulted in a very comprehensive picture of what the service needed to address. The young people mostly fell in to the targeted group but also included the Youth Parliament, Youth Councils, focus groups perceived to be representative of those 'at risk' and 'hard to reach' as well as young offenders, but there was no specific geographical information available. District Councillor Marian Myland raised concerns about the lack of leisure provision, particularly in the rural and less accessible areas. The officer agreed that there was no capacity to provide a comprehensive service and that the new approach might offer opportunities. District Councillor Michael Cooper applauded the new approach but was concerned that of 100% of provision only 10% was provided by SCC and 90% by the schools and voluntary sector and suggested that SCC should target support at local initiatives to get clubs up and running. He was advised that the Youth Development Service targets those most in need as a statutory requirement but does also provide support and information to those wishing to start up clubs locally and referenced Youth Focus which not only provides support but also holds a budget that can be applied to for funding. Meanwhile, discussions are ongoing with local providers such as TLL to look at ways in which closer working might benefit all young people in a locally redesigned service.

The Chairman summed up by reflecting that it would be some time before the local budget became clear and a process was put in place to initiate changes that could be influenced by the Local Committee.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Tandridge) agree to:

- (i) APPROVE the Youth Development Service element of the Services for Young People Delivery Plan 2010/11 (Attached as Annex A), and to
- (ii) NOTE the transformation strategy for young people

Reason for decisions

To ensure that the Local Committee has had an opportunity to consider the content of this report so that the Plan could be implemented in Tandridge.

[NOTE: Committee adjourned for refreshments at 11.50 am and reconvened at 12.10 pm]

35/10 **PETITONS** [Item 10]

There were two petitions, from the residents of Hillbury Road in Whyteleafe, and the residents of Bletchingley, both of which received written responses attached as Annex B.

36/10 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS** [Item 11]

Having taken questions on parking under Item 5, there were no further formal questions and only one informal question, which related to Item 17.

37/10 **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS** [Item 12]

No formal questions were received but Mrs Sally Marks asked about unresolved issues at the junction with Banstead Road and Coulsden Road which the Local Highways Manager agreed to follow up on, and District Councillor Michael Cooper asked why the parish council had been contacted about consultation on parking in Commonwealth and Farningham in Caterham while the local District Councillor Jane Ingham had not. The Local Highways Manager asked for details and agreed to investigate.

38/10 **FINANCIAL ALLOCATIONS 2010/2011 FOR HIGHWAY WORKS** [Item 13]

This report set out the level of revenue funding for highway maintenance works for the 2010 / 2011 financial year and sought approval for expenditure of the £100,000 Local Revenue budget. Capital budgets known as the Local Allocation and Local Transport Plan have been withdrawn.

In response to member comments and questions, the Local Highways Manager explained that rather than being held in abeyance pending available funding, schemes were subject to consideration against set criteria over a given period of time and would continue to be assessed annually. He also said that the East had argued slightly higher proportion of the global budget (62%) because of the longer length of public highway and poor condition of the roads. He further clarified that the budget for drainage was for cyclic cleansing while the revenue budget would be targeted on repair and maintenance of pipes. He could not comment on invasive species such as Japanese knotweed. District Councillor Lisa Bangs asked whether it was cheaper to pay out on insurance than to repair potholes and the Chairman explained that the

DRAFT MINUTES to be agreed on 24 September 2010

rural nature of the roads meant that they were not as robust as they needed to be. Mr Tony Elias and District Councillor Marian Myland both commented on the lack of cross-border co-operation when it came to completing road surfacing on Philanthropic Road and asked the LHM if he could take this up with his colleagues to see whether the work could be completed. They also wanted to know whether it would be possible for the Grange Meadow crossing to be implemented if funding could be raised elsewhere. The LHM said that he would be happy to work with the parish council to see if this could be progressed. Mr Michael Sydney pointed out that there was a scheme already under discussion in Lingfield and offered to discuss it with Mr Elias.

After further discussion about what might be achieved more cheaply locally in partnership with the parish councils, the Chairman suggested that the recommendations be amended to capture the Committee's response to the current funding situation.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Tandridge):

- (i) NOTE the funding for highway maintenance revenue works as set out in Annex A;
- (ii) APPROVE use of the £100,000 Local Revenue allocation as follows:
 - £55,000 to be used by the maintenance engineer for priority drainage and other maintenance works
 - £20,000 to be used for the implementation of approved speed limits in Bletchingley, Limpsfield and Nutfield and to progress others.
 - £25,000 to implement parking restrictions previously approved by the Local Committee.

Three additional recommendations were proposed by the Chairman and seconded by Mrs Marks and put to the vote where it was

RESOLVED that the Local Committee Tandridge AGREE that

- (iii) The Local Committee would seek clarification of the new highways contract to allow flexibility to use local providers for small scale local schemes;
- (iv) Whilst regretting the need to lose £100,000 capital funding from the budget, to request that the County Council consider options for borrowing whilst interest rates are low in order to offset severe deterioration of Tandridge highways, and
- (v) The Local Committee would write to parish councils to inform them of the present funding position and to ask them to consider whether they are in a position to financially support important local projects.

Reason for decisions

To allow officers to use the Local Revenue as approved by the Local Committee.

39/10 PROPOSED UPDATED SPEED LIMIT POLICY FOR CONSULTATION WITH LOCAL COMMITTEES [Item 15]

Local Committees already have delegated authority to set speed limits. However, they must take decisions within the overarching Speed Limit Policy set by the Cabinet. The Leader and relevant Portfolio Holders have made a commitment to introduce greater flexibility into the Speed Limit Policy to enable Local Committees to take more account of situations where local residents are concerned about traffic conditions and safety on a particular road.

The local committee was asked to consider and comment on a proposed amended county council's policy on the setting of speed limits.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee:

- (i) PROVIDE any comments they wished to have considered in finalising the report and policy to Cabinet and they recorded the following comments:

that the committee was in favour of the policy; that it needs to be implemented wisely and that Members were keen to consider lower speed limits around schools.

Reason for decision

The proposed new policy balances the need to reduce road safety casualties against the importance of increasing the powers and flexibility of local committees. Cabinet has asked that the views of the Transport Select Committee and the local committees inform the new policy.

40/10 **TRAFFIC CALMING EXPERIMENT, SUNNYBANK, WARLINGHAM** [Item 16]

A traffic-calming scheme was introduced in Warlingham about 15 years ago. Sunnybank, one of the traffic-calmed roads in the scheme, has recently been resurfaced. As a trial, the speed cushions in it were not replaced following this work. Vehicle speeds have been monitored and have been found not to have significantly increased. The Committee was therefore asked to consider whether they should be permanently removed.

With very little discussion, the Committee arrived at the conclusion that it would be expensive and disruptive to replace the speed cushions and that there was insufficient evidence that it was necessary on safety grounds but that the situation should continue to be monitored.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee APPROVE the permanent removal of the speed cushion traffic calming in Sunnybank, Warlingham and monitor the longer term effect on accidents and traffic speeds.

Reasons for decision

The arguments for and against replacing the speed cushions was balanced and consequently the Local Committee was asked to decide on how to proceed. They took the view that recommendation (i) was more cost effective and less disruptive and therefore more beneficial to local residents.

41/10 **PROPOSED BUS STOP CLEARWAYS IN OXTED AND BLETCHINGLEY** [Item 17]

This report sought the Local Committee's approval to create bus stop clearways in Oxted and Bletchingley. New bus stop clearways were needed at three bus stops in Oxted and Bletchingley to keep parked vehicles clear and help passengers use the bus services safely. The Committee was asked to approve the implementation of these so that they could be enforced by the District Council Civil Enforcement Officers.

After clarifying that the underlying problem was caused by buses laying over in bays that were intended for dropping off and picking up, causing congestion and interrupting traffic flow, the Committee concluded that this was an appropriate solution.

RESOLVED that the Tandridge Local Committee AGREE that:

- (i) a bus stand clearway be marked in Gresham Road at the existing bus stop, adjacent to District Council Offices with restricted hours of 08:30 - 18:30 Monday to Sunday.
- (ii) a bus stop clearway is marked at the existing bus stop adjacent to St Mary's School in Silkham Road with restricted hours 07:00-19:00, Monday to Friday.
- (iii) a bus stop clearway be marked at the existing stop at Needles Bank, Godstone Green with restricted hours 07:00-19:00 Monday to Sunday

Reason for decisions

Bus stop clearways help improve bus services in Surrey, one of the objectives of our Local transport Plan.

42/10 **THE SQUARE, CATERHAM** [Item 18]

A community-led Caterham Healthcheck group identified ideas to make Caterham a more attractive place to live and work, including a desire to improve the appearance of the town, changing it from 'Shabby to Smart'. Successful funding bids were made to SEEDA following financial commitments from Caterham Parish Councils, Surrey County Council and Tandridge District Council.

This report provided an update on one of the improvements, the proposed environmental enhancement works centred around The Square.

District Councillor Michael Cooper, who had declared an interest as a member of the Caterham Community Partnership, commended the work on the grounds of good partnership working between the community and the local authorities and the enhancement of the town centre. Members were further reassured that the SEEDA contribution would not be compromised by the current political climate which had rendered its future uncertain.

The Local Committee NOTED the content of the report.

Reason for decision

The scheme meets the policy objectives of Surrey County Council's Local Transport Plan.

43/10 **HIGHWAYS SCHEMES IN TANDRIDGE PROGRESS REPORT** [Item 19]

On 3 July 2009, the Local Committee agreed a list of integrated transport schemes funded from the Local Transport Plan and Local Allocation budgets which have now been withdrawn. This report set out progress on these highway schemes and other maintenance related works funded from other sources.

The Local Committee (Tandridge) NOTED the report for information.

[Meeting Ended: 1.05 pm]

Chairman