MINUTES: of the meeting of the Tandridge Local Committee held at 10.15am on Friday 5th March 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 Michael Cooper
  * Cllr Martin Fisher
  * Cllr Eric Morgan
  * Cllr Marian Myland
  * Cllr Brian Perkins

* = Present

01/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mr David Hodge and from District Councillor Lisa Bangs. District Councillor Ashley Burridge substituted.

02/10 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 4 DECEMBER 2009 [Item 2]

Accepted.

03/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Mr Tony Elias declared an interest as a Chairman of the District Council’s Community Services Committee in respect of ITEM 11 relating to the Climate Change Fund where Tandridge District Council is the applicant.

04/10 PETITIONS [Item 4]

District Councillor Simon Morrow addressed the Committee on behalf of the residents of Warlingham in respect of a site in Chaldon Road, which was rumoured to be under consideration by Surrey County Council as a prospective location for re-siting the waste facility in Bond Road. The Chairman explained that planning matters lie outside the remit of the Local Committee and that objections could only be dealt with by Planning. However, having made every effort to discover who such objections should be addressed to, it became clear that a number of sites had been visited by officers, including Chaldon Road, none of which were considered suitable or were being progressed. As there was no planning proposal to formally object to, the Chairman allowed Councillor Morrow to make his statement in order to draw the matter to a close. Mrs Marks commented that it would be helpful if local residents could make suggestions as to where a facility could be sited.
05/10 PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS [Item 5]

Following the recent sale of County property in Caterham where the developer’s plans had subsequently been rejected, District Councillor Jane Ingham asked for the Committee’s support in challenging developers who seemed to be focussing on more and smaller dwellings which were not needed, rather than supplying the kind of properties that might benefit the area. The formal response was that planning for housing is the responsibility of the District Council and that, while Surrey County Council supports their policy, there is nothing more that officers can do. Mrs Marks then spoke in support of Councillor Ingham and expressed the hope that developers would pay heed to public statements by the local authorities and discuss this with them before drafting and submitting their plans.

06/10 MEMBERS’ QUESTIONS [Item 6]

There were none.

07/10 COUNTY COUNCILLORS ALLOCATIONS FOR 2008/09 [Item 7]

At its annual budget meeting in February 2009, £8,250 revenue funding was delegated to each Member for this financial year plus £35,000 capital funding per Local Committee to support community initiatives.

The Local Committee considered 11 applications for funding, 10 of which had been included with the papers and one of which was tabled. Members made the following amendments to bids. Mr Tony Elias pointed out that Bletchingley had entered the In Bloom competition for two years previously, not one; District Councillor Michael Cooper said that the Festival Street Party would not be free but would be subsidised and Mrs Marks expressed disappointment that, due to the intervention of the Schools Confederation, the De Fest event would not be competitive. The Chairman accepted that the timing of the late bid from de Stafford School’s De Fest project was crucial as the event was planned for June to coincide with the Caterham Festival and the next formal meeting was scheduled for 2nd July 2010. However, with all other bids agreed there was no funding left from the current budget. The Committee therefore discussed the bid and took the decision to forward fund £2,000 from next year’s budget allowing it to go ahead as soon as the budget has been set.

It was RESOLVED that:
(i) the Tandridge Local Committee considered new requests for funding from the Members’ Allocations budget as set out in Annex A of the report and APPROVED the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live &amp; Direct</td>
<td>£3,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lawrence Hospital</td>
<td>£800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAHPA</td>
<td>£5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst Parish Council</td>
<td>£2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted Responders</td>
<td>£4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Stephen’s School</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted Band</td>
<td>£580.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bletchingley in Bloom</td>
<td>£500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham Festival</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Vouchers</td>
<td>£2,335.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, to forward fund De Fest for £2,000.00 from next year’s budget; and
(ii) AGREED to waive the outstanding sum of £7,000 due to be recovered from TVSC following their move to Oxted Library.

Reason for Decisions
All projects under consideration had been sponsored by, and had the support of, the appropriate Local Member. Members then considered them as a group and decided to approve them.

08/10 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL’S DAY SERVICES CHANGE 2010 [Item 8]

This report aimed to provide Members with a progress update on changes proposed to in-house services for people with learning disabilities and followed a report taken to Committee last year when traditional facilities, such as Colebrook, were under review.

The service had to consider whether it was cost-effective to upgrade existing facilities, which fall short of current needs, or to close them and use the available funding to deliver services in a more modern, flexible and relevant way. As there are no static facilities in Tandridge, accessing services has always been problematic, involving travel to Redhill. After consultation with partners and clients, it was felt that delivering bespoke services would be a benefit to vulnerable people in Tandridge, however, it would also necessitate finding premises locally that could be hired on a needs basis.

Mrs Marks congratulated the service on completing and describing a complex piece of work. She supported the idea of drop-in centres not being site-specific and reiterated concern that these had to be close to home for clients. Claire Richards, Project Officer, said that they needed to be not only local, but integrated, such as libraries and community centres and asked Members to use their local knowledge to suggest suitable premises in their local divisions. Mrs Marks also asked that no units be closed until re-provision was in place and suggested that Tandridge Voluntary Service Council could help to identify locations. District Councillor Brian Perkins suggested sharing premises with local charities and thought that there were opportunities of mutual benefit. District Councillor Eric Morgan suggested the Red Cross drop-in in Oxted as a venue and that, if transport were an issue, taxi vouchers might be a solution. Claire Richards advised that there is a ‘travel buddies’ scheme, which is a befriending scheme whereby vulnerable people are encouraged to plan and execute their travel with support from volunteers. But taxi vouchers are useful for social events. District Councillor Michael Cooper suggested that the new youth facility in Caterham might be used as a venue. Mr Nick Skellett asked about consultation with clients. Claire Richard explained that they are fully involved both in direct planning and also when viewing properties. The change plan is a slow but inclusive process.

RESOLVED that the Local Committee (Tandridge) AGREED to:

(i) review the updated changes to the original Day Services Change proposals and their implications locally, and
(ii) discuss and recommend, where possible, local property solutions.

Reasons for Decision
This report was mainly for information and requested support from the Local Committee in furthering an ongoing process.

09/10 HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE JOINT SERVICE IN EAST SURREY [Item 9]

This report aimed to update the Committee on the Integrated Health and Social Care Services for Tandridge.
Alan Warren, Director of Adults Health & Social Care Services, East Surrey asked Members to note National Safeguarding Week in June where Surrey Arts are producing an event on the theme of Community Nursing with Tandridge District Council more integrated with care management.

District Councillor Martin Fisher was deeply concerned about the self-assessment forms, which he felt were demeaning and degrading and, as such, a barrier to accessing services. He questioned their value as Surrey County Council could supply much of the information from its records. Alan Warren agreed that the forms were not ideal but had been rationalised down from 15 pages to 3 sides of A4 and support was available to anyone wishing to complete them. He was also clear that emergency services would be available without completing a form.

District Councillor Michael Cooper asked if there was any way to influence the length of stay in hospital without rehabilitation, eg exercise, being offered as the lack of exercise can impede recovery. Alan Warren said that Community Matrons visit new admissions with a view to getting patients back to community services quickly but he was not sure that this had been considered and that he would raise the issue with the hospital’s Chief Executive Officer at a meeting scheduled for later that day to see what improvements might be made.

District Councillor Brian Perkins asked about dignity and sensitivity and how this is dealt with in staff training. Alan Warren described the walk through exercise whereby all aspects of visiting hospital are reviewed from arrival through to pharmacy from the patient perspective and how this is used to influence systems and rules and to inform training.

The Chairman thanked the Director and reflected that joint working had started in East Surrey and was working well. It was a good initiative allowing organisations to join budgets, to interface and solve problems.

**RESOLVED** that the Local Committee in Tandridge AGREED to:

(i) consider the effectiveness of the current integrated health and social care service, and
(ii) agree in principal the general approach to the developments of the service

**Reasons for decisions**

This report was mainly for information and Members were asked to consider the contents of this report and give views about the proposed service developments.

---

**10/10 LOCAL COMMUNITY AFFAIRS** [Item 10]

This item is intended to allow Members to reflect on and publicise initiatives in the wider community in which it has an interest. Wendy Varcoe, Executive Director for Surrey Community Foundation (SCF), and Mike Moss, Chairman of the Tandridge Community Fund, attended to update on progress locally.

SCF is an independent charitable trust specialising in philanthropy connecting those who wish to make significant donations for the benefit of their local area to those in need. It is supported by the Government in that can attract some matched funding, for example, to its Grass Roots fund. The Foundation is keen to foster and maintain links to the local community.

**RESOLVED** that the Local Committee (Tandridge) AGREED to note the content of the briefing and suggest ways in which Members might further the aims of the Community Foundation to the benefit of local residents.

**Reasons for decisions**

This report was mainly for information.
[NOTE: As the meeting was over-running, the Chairman deferred Item 11 – Climate Change to the end of the agenda and Committee adjourned for coffee at 12.00 and reconvened at 12.10]

11/10 **PETITIONS** [Item 12]

There were none.

12/10 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS** [Item 13]

There were three written questions from Members of the public including Mr Jerry Poland who asked about flooding, Mrs Heather Stark, who asked about winter maintenance in Tandridge village and Dormansland Parish Council on the lack of progress on a road safety scheme which was presented by Mrs Suzy Greaves of Dormansland Road Action Campaign (DRAC). The text of these questions and responses is attached as an Annex. However the Chairman agreed to contact the portfolio holder to ask for clarity on the budgets as it was understood that the available funding was being directed into maintenance at the expense of Highways schemes. Committee was also concerned that the final budget figures for 2010/11 had not yet been released inhibiting local planning.

On the subject of the Dormansland scheme, it was resolved that the Highways Manager and the Local Member would meet with DRAC to look at the findings of the feasibility scheme that had been completed with a view to having it costed to see whether key parts of the design might be met from local fundraising.

13/10 **MEMBERS’ QUESTIONS** [Item 14]

There was a formal question from Mrs Sally Marks on the delays to the crossing at the Well Farm Heights development on the A22 and two from District Councillor Martin Fisher on the subject of planning permission for mineral extraction and the other on the subject of road safety in relation to the heavy goods vehicles operating in Chalkpit Lane.

On the subject of Well Farm Heights, Caroline Smith from Transport Development Control confirmed that work was due to start next week. On the subject of Chalkpit Lane, the Chairman added that the matter was still under discussion and the legal implications were being looked at at some expense to the County Council.

The Highways Group Manager (East) Roger Archer-Reeves summarised the cost implications of the bad weather and pothole repairs currently running at £120,000 pr week in East Surrey.

[NOTE: Marian Myland left at 12.53 pm]

14/10 **HIGHWAY SCHEMES IN TANDRIDGE PROGRESS REPORT** [Item 15]

As the meeting was running late, the Chairman requested that this report be taken as listed for information only and it was not debated in detail. However, the Chairman asked whether all divisional meetings had been organised.

District Councillor Michael Cooper also pointed out a discrepancy on page 48 where £45,000 for Caterham’s Shabby to Smart scheme had been recorded as £45. This was duly noted.

**RESOLVED** that the Local Committee (Tandridge) NOTED the report for information.
Reason for Decision
This report was for information only.

15/10  **GRANTS LANE BRIDGE** [Item 16]

A strength assessment of Grant’s Lane Bridge has found that it only has capacity to carry vehicles of 3 tonnes gross vehicle weight. The bridge spans a railway and the weakened state of the structure poses a potential hazard to the general public unless restrictions are put in place.

**RESOLVED** that the Local Committee AGREED that:

(i) a permanent weight restriction of 3 tonnes combined with a 6’6” width restriction be imposed on Grants Lane Bridge and that the necessary traffic regulation order be made
(ii) if objections are received that they be reported back to Committee

Reason for Decision
In order for Grants Lane bridge to carry 40 tonne vehicles it will be necessary for it to be strengthened or replaced. No funds are available at the present time for this work. A temporary traffic order will only last for 18 months. As a scheme of this nature is likely to take several years to construction a permanent order is requested which will protect the structure until work can be carried out. The imposition of a 3 tonne weight restriction combined with a 6’6” width restriction on Grants Lane Bridge would be the simplest and cheapest option to protect the bridge and highway users and would not create undue inconvenience for immediate residents. Red Lane offers an alternative, parallel, route a short distance to the west, which can be used by excluded vehicles.

16/10  **GODSTONE ROAD, LINGFIELD SPEED MANAGEMENT MEASURES** [Item 17]

The Chairman allowed this report to be tabled due to time constraints that could undermine the developer’s ability to access government funding which is due to run out at the end of March. By accepting the report, the Chairman made it clear that he was doing so to allow officers some flexibility and that any decisions agreed by Committee would be taken in good faith without seeking to pre-empt or influence the District Council.

Caroline Smith of Transport Development Control attended to present the report and members raised a number of concerns.

The main points were in relation to:

- Recommendation (iii) with regard to consultation, the recommendation appeared to prejudge the acceptability of this proposal which, at this stage, was by no means proven. Ms Smith confirmed that there was no intention to prejudge and that the proposal was still open to amendment in light of points raised. However it was important that the consultation process should begin and advertising could be run in parallel without pre-empting the outcome.
- Recommendation (v) suggested that any or all objections could be resolved which, given the contentious nature of the proposals, could not be guaranteed. The Chairman therefore asked that the wording to be amended accordingly from ‘will’ to ‘may’. The Chairman also called for a rider to be added to the recommendations to make it clear why the decisions were being taken and that this did not signal intent.
- Recommendation (vi) which referred to a ‘successful’ outcome appeared presumptuous. The Chairman therefore asked for it to be withdrawn as the Committee had no desire to pre-empt the outcome of the consultation nor to influence the District Council.
District Councillor Brian Perkins stated that this was not a popular proposal and that he was against narrowing the road.

As the local Member, Mr Michael Sydney wanted an assurance that he would be fully involved in the consultation process and that it would be inclusive. Ms Smith assured him that she would welcome his involvement and his input into how the consultation process should be carried out.

Members wished to NOTE that a full consultation be effected with the involvement of the Local Member.

The Local Committee (Tandridge) AGREED:
(i) to the advertising of the Traffic Order to relocate the start of the 30 mph speed limit as described above;
(ii) to the introduction of the above Traffic Order subject to there being no objections to its introduction;
(iii) to a period of Public Consultation in respect of the provision of a suitable ‘gateway’ feature 90m to the north west of the new access in order to reinforce the impression that drivers are entering a built up area and should be slowing down; and the provision of a kerb build out 40m to the south east of the new access to reduce traffic speeds for vehicles exiting the village;
(iv) to the introduction of the above speed restraint measures subject to there being no objections to its introduction;
(v) that, should there be any significant objection, this may be resolved by the Highways Group Manager in consultation with the Divisional Member and the Chairman/Vice-chairman of the Local Committee. [NOTE: Approved as an urgent item accepting that it gives officers flexibility to proceed IF agreement can be reached on the outstanding issues with Tandridge District Council and subject to agreement through consultation.]

Reasons for decisions
To reduce traffic speeds and to improve the safety of all users of Godstone Road and to facilitate the delivery of affordable housing for households currently in need in Lingfield. However, Committee duly noted that it was not prepared to pre-empt any deliberations by the District Council in its role as Planning Authority and subsequently amended recommendation (v) by adding a rider to it. Members further declined recommendation (vi) on the grounds that it pre-supposed a successful outcome that might, in the circumstances, not be achievable.

Members wished to note that a full consultation be effected with the involvement of the Local Member.

17/10 CLIMATE CHANGE FUND [Item 11]

The Leader of Surrey County Council made £50,000 available across the County to any Local Committees who wished to apply competitively for up to £10,000 for local initiatives tackling climate change. One application for £10,000 had been received from Tandridge District Council and Members were asked to consider whether to sponsor it.

[NOTE: Mr Tony Elias had previously declared an interest in the item as Chairman of the District Council’s Community Services Committee.]

Mr Elias’s interest was not considered to be prejudicial as the final decision on funding did not lie with the Local Committee.

Mrs Marks spoke in support of the application, which was for an awareness-raising event to take place in September to promote, among other initiatives, the use of green cones for disposing of garden waste and to subsidise the cost of the cones.
Mr Michael Sydney expressed some reservations about the impact on landfill statistics and District Councillor Martin Fisher raised concerns over whether District Councillors could vote on this topic. The Local Director confirmed that the whole Committee had voting rights on this item. In the event Councillor Fisher abstained but there was no dissent and Committee agreed to sponsor the proposal.

The short listed sponsored applications are due to be decided by the Leader and a small supporting team and the outcome communicated by 23 March 2010.

**RESOLVED** that the local committee (Tandridge) considered the bid attached as Annex 1 and AGREED to submit it as its application to the Climate Change Fund.

**Reasons for decision**
The Leader of the Council announced £50,000, which Local Committees could bid for. Committee was able to decide whether to submit a bid and whether they would support the bid attached at Annex 1.

[Meeting Ended: 1.10 pm]

____________________________________
Chairman