

**THESE MINUTES REMAIN DRAFT UNTIL FORMALLY APPROVED AT
THE 4 MARCH 2013 MEETING**

Minutes of the meeting of the
Reigate AND BANSTEAD LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 2.00 pm on 3 December 2012
at Reigate Town Hall, Castlefield Road, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0SH.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Dr Zully Grant-Duff (Chairman)
- * Mrs Frances King (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mrs Angela Fraser
- * Mr Michael Gosling
- * Dr Lynne Hack
- * Mrs Kay Hammond
- * Mr Nick Harrison
- * Mr Peter Lambell
- * Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Members:

- * Borough Councillor Mrs Natalie Bramhall
- * Borough Councillor Mark Brunt
- * Borough Councillor Keith Foreman
- * Borough Councillor Mrs Rita Renton
- * Borough Councillor Jonathan Essex
- * Borough Councillor Norman Harris
- * Borough Councillor Graham Knight
- * Borough Councillor David Powell
- * Borough Councillor Sam Walsh

* In attendance

55/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Frances King, Mrs Kay Hammond, Cllr Mark Brunt and Cllr David Powell. There were no substitutions.

56/12 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING - 17 SEPTEMBER 2012 (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 2]

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

57/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

58/12 PETITIONS (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 4]

None received.

59/12 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 5]

One public question was received from Cllr Christopher Whinney, on the subject of the maintenance of Reigate Priory. The question and response were tabled, and are attached to the minutes as **Appendix A**.

Cllr Whinney asked a supplementary question, asking when Surrey County Council would be providing the annual report on the maintenance of Reigate Priory, which he understood was one of the terms of the lease agreement with Reigate and Banstead Borough Council. The Chairman indicated a written response will be provided.

60/12 FORMAL MEMBER QUESTIONS (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 6]

None received.

61/12 MEMBER ALLOCATIONS FUNDING (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 7]

The Community Partnerships Team Leader (East) presented the report.

The Committee:

- (i) **AGREED** the items presented for funding from the Local Committee's 2012/13 revenue budget, as set out in section 2 of the report submitted and summarised below:
 - Wheels for Us in a Bus - £3,000
 - Reigate and Banstead Winter Night Shelter - £2,500
- (ii) **AGREED** the item presented for funding from the Local Committee's 2012/13 revenue budget, as set out in section 2 of the report submitted and summarised below:
 - Pathfinder Scout Group: Renovations to Scout Hall in Salfords - £22,600
- (iii) **NOTED** the expenditure previously approved by the Community Partnerships Manager and the Community Partnerships Team Leader under delegated authority, as set out in section 3 of the report submitted.
- (iv) **NOTED** any returned funding and/or adjustments, as set out within the report submitted and also in the financial statement at Appendix 1 of the report submitted.

62/12 APPROVAL OF SMALL GRANTS BIDS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 8]

The Contract Performance Officer presented the report.

An additional bid was tabled and is attached to the minutes as **Appendix B**.

The Committee:

- (i) **APPROVED** the following bids for funding:

- Redhill Youth Consortium – Redhill Youth Club - £5,000
- Raven Housing Trust – Merstham Youth Clubs – Residential - £2,009*
- Studio ADHD Centre – Fishing Project - £2,176
- 1st Walton on the Hill Scouts – the purchase of new tentage and portable stoves - £1,714.75
- Reigate & Banstead Duke of Edinburgh Award Forum Group - £500**
- Surrey Young Farmers – core supportive activities 2012 - £425
- Tadworth Cricket Club – Support towards costs of coaching - £750

*approved on the condition that activities take place at one of Surrey Outdoor Learning and Development's venues.

**reduced amount as Members wished to see the funding spent directly on the purchase of books for young people participating in the scheme.

(ii) **REFUSED** the following bid:

- ReigateHub Limited – CodeClub – £5,000

[Reason: concerns were raised regarding the fact that the organisation was not yet established and lacked a base.]

(iii) **DEFERRED** the following bid to the next meeting:

- 7th Banstead Scout Group – New Scout Van - £1,000

[Reason: to enable further bids to be received prior to a decision on a final award to this group.]

63/12 LOCAL PREVENTION COMMISSIONING 2012/13 (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 9]

The Contract Performance Officer presented the report.

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

- Members were satisfied that the performance of the Surrey Youth Consortium had improved significantly since the previous meeting of the Committee. It was felt that the previous refusal to extend the contract had sent a message that had been responded to, and therefore Option 3 (extension of the current contract by 5 months) was preferred.
- Members wished to know what the next steps would be. The Contract Performance Officer explained that the provider would continue work under the current contract until 31 August 2013. Alongside this, a procurement exercise would take place for a new contract to begin on 1 September 2013. The new contract would be for 2 years.

The Committee **AGREED** to adopt Option 3 as set out in the report submitted.

64/12 BOROUGH WIDE REVIEW OF ON-STREET PARKING (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 10]

The Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager presented the report.

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

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

- Members raised a number of locations around the borough which they considered to require additional measures. These were noted by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager for further investigation, and he agreed to respond on these points and include them where necessary prior to finalising the statutory consultation.
- It was noted that all Members would be able to comment further on the proposals after the meeting, but the deadline for these was the end of December. Changes could then be made if necessary prior to the statutory consultation period. Finalised plans would be re-circulated to Members prior to the statutory consultation. After this, the comments and objections would be reported back for consideration.

The Committee **AGREED**:

- (i) The proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Reigate and Banstead, as set out in Annexes 1 and 2 to the report submitted.
- (ii) That the Parking Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local Member, make any necessary adjustments to the proposals and agree detail, based on informal consultation, prior to statutory consultation.
- (iii) That the intention of the County Council to make an Order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on-street parking restrictions in Reigate and Banstead, as shown in the annexes to the report submitted (and as subsequently modified by (ii)), are advertised, and that if no objections are maintained, the Order be made.
- (iv) That the Parking Team Manager will report the objections back to the Local Committee for resolution.
- (v) To allocated funding of £20,000 in 2012/14 to implement the parking amendments.
- (vi) That bus stop clearways be marked at the existing stops in Chetwode Road, Tadworth, and Fir Tree Road junction with Nork Way, as described in the report submitted.

**65/12 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES PROGRESS REPORT (INFORMATION ITEM)
[Item 11]**

[This item was taken after Item 13 on the agenda.]

The Area Highways Manager presented the report.

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

- A request was made for the junction of Tadworth Street and the A217 to be widened using Section 106 funding, in order to reduce the waiting time at the traffic lights. The Area Highways Manager agreed to add this to the list of externally funded schemes.
- Concerns were raised regarding ongoing work at Honeycrook Lane, Salfords. The Area Highways Manager would look into the issues around this.
- Issues in the Banstead East division, including Woodmansterne Lane, Croydon Lane, and White Hill were raised. The Area Highways Manager agreed to ascertain the start dates for works on Woodmansterne Lane and White Hill.
- Concerns were raised regarding the proposed footway scheme at The Drive, Banstead, and the fact that microslabs could not be used due to trees. The Area Highways Manager would look into this and provide feedback.
- Feedback was requested regarding Epsom Lane North and Yew Tree Road, Banstead.
- Concerns were raised regarding the condition of Waterlow Road, Reigate. It was noted that works were imminent and the road was due to be closed for resurfacing.
- Issues regarding blocked drains in The Cutting, Earlswood, and the condition of Philanthropic Road, Redhill; Holly Lane, Banstead; Netherne Lane, Hooley and Woodplace Lane, Hooley were also noted. Flooding at the junction of Bolters Lane and Garners Lane, Banstead was felt to be particularly hazardous.
- Members thanked the Area Highways Manager for progress during the last financial year and the noticeable improvements in service.

The Committee **NOTED** the report for information.

66/12 REDHILL BALANCED NETWORK (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 12]

The Transport Policy Team Manager and Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) Project Manager presented the report.

The Transport Policy Team Manager explained an amendment to the recommendation contained in the report submitted. The Committee were

asked to extend their support for a joint bid to the Growing Places Fund to include the Coast to Capital Transport Fund Body or other funding opportunities that may arise. The reason for this was to enable officers to secure the most advantageous funding sources available.

Revised costings were tabled and are attached to the minutes as **Appendix D**.

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

- Members wished to know why the proposed public realm changes focused on the most expensive option available. The LSTF Project Manager replied that this was the worst-case scenario.
- Clarification was sought as to the meaning of “statutory undertakings”. Officers informed Members that this referred to the diversion of gas, electricity and water plant. All costs had been taken into account.
- A suggestion was made that the unstaffed public exhibition remain in the Harlequin Theatre during the busy pantomime season. Officers responded that it was not possible to leave the exhibition in place due to a lack of space at that time.
- Members welcomed the news that the response from the public so far had been good. It was suggested that further publicity be given to the fact that the consultation is open until 4 January 2013, in case people had overlooked it in the build up to Christmas. This point was noted by officers.

The Committee **AGREED**:

- (i) To support a joint bid to the Growing Places Fund, and/or Coast to Capital Transport Body Fund by Surrey County Council and Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, or other funding opportunities that may arise.
- (ii) To delegate authority to the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Divisional Member for agreement to proceed towards submitting a bid to the Growing Places Fund, and/or Coast to Capital Transport Body Fund, or other funding opportunities that may arise, following the public consultation.

[Mr Peter Lambell, Cllr Norman Harris and Cllr Graham Knight left the meeting at 3.50pm]

67/12 TRAVEL SMART LOCAL SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FUND (LARGE BID) DELEGATION OF BUSINESS TRAVEL FORUM DECISIONS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 13]

The Travel SMART Delivery Manager presented the report.

The Chairman proposed an amendment to the recommendation contained in the report submitted to enable consultation with the Local Sustainable

Transport Fund Task Group. This was seconded by Mr Michael Gosling and carried.

The Committee **AGREED** to delegate authority to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee, in consultation with the Local Sustainable Transport Fund Task Group, to determine the proposals from the forums for implementation this financial year (2012/13) only.

[Reason: to enable consultation with the Local Sustainable Transport Fund Task Group.]

68/12 TRADING STANDARDS UPDATE REPORT (INFORMATION ITEM) [Item 14]

The Business Advice and Compliance Supervisor, Surrey Trading Standards, presented the report.

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

- Members wished to know if a list of rogue traders operating in the area was available. The officer informed the Committee that whilst there was no definitive list, the service worked to publicise and raise awareness of the tactics used by rogue traders.
- The weekly update emails from the service were felt to be very useful, and Members commended the service on these.
- Members wished to know how Pedlars' Licenses were issued and regulated. The officer reported that these were issued and regulated by the police.
- An offer was made to fund "No Cold Calling" sticker packs via Member Allocations. The officer thanked the Member for their offer, but confirmed that funding was currently in place for the sticker packs.
- Concerns were raised regarding budget reductions to the service. The officer responded that the service was focusing on delivering a quality service. It was noted that ongoing business advice would be charged for in future, with the first hour of advice provided free of charge. There had been no noticeable reduction in the take-up of the service. The service also received income from its role as a Primary Authority for large companies based in the county.
- The service was thanked for its role in supporting the recent Alcohol Awareness Week events in Redhill and Reigate, and for its promotion of the Eat Out, Eat Well campaign.

The Committee **NOTED** the report for information.

[Mr Michael Gosling left the meeting at 4.40pm]

69/12 CABINET FORWARD PLAN [Item 15]

The Committee **NOTED** the report for information.

70/12 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN [Item 16]

The Committee:

- (i) **NOTED** the report for information.
- (ii) **AGREED** the provisional meeting dates for 2013/14.

Meeting ended at: 4.45 pm

Chairman



**LOCAL COMMITTEE
(REIGATE AND BANSTEAD)**

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

3 DECEMBER 2012

A public question has been received on the subject of the maintenance of Reigate Priory:

1. Borough Councillor Christopher Whinney asks:

“Much concern has been expressed for some time about the level of maintenance of Reigate Priory, the Grade One listed building in Priory Park. What is the position over the maintenance of the Priory?”

The Chairman responds on behalf of the Committee:

“A maintenance condition survey was undertaken by external surveyors Lambert Smith Hampton in 2010 and this formed the basis of a 5 year planned maintenance programme for this site (see expenditure details below).

A further programme of condition surveys is to commence in 2013 for Surrey County Council’s entire estate. This will be undertaken by our own newly recruited internal surveyors, and will be of a more in-depth nature, with 25-year lifecycle costs and planned preventative programme. Reigate Priory will be one of the early buildings to be surveyed during early 2013, and this will be undertaken by a speciality, enabling a new planned preventative programme for the building and full understanding of the future financial commitment.

Currently we are carrying out structural investigations, and on conclusion we will be in a position to finalise the specification of remedial works. Throughout the investigations we have consulted with English Heritage and will continue to consult with them to ensure that any remedial works meet their requirements. It is currently envisaged that these remedial works will be completed in the summer of 2013.

APPENDIX A**Capital Maintenance Spend History**

	Full Year Budget	Full Year Spend
	£000s	£000s
2010/11 – Heating / Asbestos / Tar Paving		245
2011/12 – Windows and doors		80
2012/13 – Structural repairs and drainage	503	
2013/14 – Structural repairs	500	

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.

Reigate and Banstead Local Committee Report 03/12/12**Updated Summary – Bids to be approved**

Bid no	Organisation Bidding	Title of Bid	Amount requested
1	ReigateHub Limited	CodeClub	£5000
2	Redhill Youth Consortium	Redhill Youth Club	£5000
3	Raven House Trust	Merstham Youth Clubs – residential	£2009
4	Studio ADHD Centre	Studio ADHD Centre Fishing Project	£2176
5	1st Walton on the Hill Scouts	The purchase of new tentage and portable stoves	£1714.75
6	Reigate & Banstead DofE Forum Group	Reigate & Banstead Duke of Edinburgh Award (DofE) Forum Group	£1000
7	Surrey Young Farmers	Surrey Young Farmers - core supportive activities 2012	£425
8	7th Banstead Scout Group	New Scout Van	£1000+
9	Tadworth Cricket Club	Support towards costs of coaching (bid form below)	£750

**Surrey County Council's Local Committee for Reigate &
Banstead**

Bid for Youth Small Grants

**(All applications will be considered subject to the criteria and
process for applications being approved by Local Committees)**

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS FORM ELECTRONICALLY

Please answer questions 1-17 below		
Project details	Help Notes	
Q1 Project title: Support towards Costs of Coaching for Tadworth Cricket Club	Full title of specific project	
Q2 Specific neighbourhood or area: Tadworth		
Q3. Borough: Reigate and Banstead		
Q4 How many young people will your project be working with?	Include numbers of those who will be participating in the project.	
Ages Males Females		
10-12 50 2-5		
13-17 40 2-5		
18-19		
Bidder details		
Q5 Name of the organisation carrying out the project and organisation type: Tadworth Cricket Club	Name of the organisation responsible for carrying out the project and if it is a voluntary, public or private organisation.	
Q6 Does the organisation have a turnover of £100,000 or less: Yes		

What are you seeking funding for ?	
Q8 Description of the project. What difference will this make? Tadworth Cricket Club is running a successful cricket programme for girls and boys aged 7 to 16. To enhance the quality of the coaching that can be provided we need to secure the services of qualified ECB coaches that can support the 100+ colts that we have secured as members for each of the last 3 years. This coaching offers cricket to the youth of the local community and supports cricket in the local community	What will be done?

<p>Q9 When will the project be: a) started: May 2013 b) completed: Aug 2013</p>	<p>The dates you expect your project to begin and finish.</p>
Financial Questions	
<p>Q10 When will you need the funds? April 2013</p>	<p>The date when you will require the funds.</p>
<p>Q11 What is the total cost of the project? £1500</p>	<p>The total cost of the project.</p>
<p>Q12 Amount applying for i.e. How much of the total cost would you like from the Local Committee? Please include estimate/breakdown of this part. £750 - 50% of the total costs of coaching. The remainder will be generated from club funds</p>	<p>If you have a quote, please attach it to the form.</p>
<p>Q13 Where is the rest coming from? Club Funds Is it promised already, or still to be found? will be taken from membership fees</p>	<p>Names and amounts from other funders</p>
<p>Q14 Have you applied for this funding from any other part of Surrey County Council? Please give details: No</p>	<p>Please give names of the department, and dates applied.</p>
<p>Q15 Are you currently in receipt of any grant or contract funding from Surrey County Council? Please give details: No</p>	<p>Please include even if not for this particular project.</p>
<p>Q16 Has the organisation responsible for the project received any Local Committee funding for this or any other purpose in the past? Please give details: No</p>	<p>Include project purpose, dates and amounts.</p>
<p>Q17 If this project will need funding in future, how will the costs be met? (Costs may be included e.g. maintenance, replenishment, breakdown, repair, support) These coaching costs are an annual commitment to youth sport in Tadworth and the surrounding area</p>	<p>Information on how you intend to fund and/or maintain your project in the future.</p>

NB If your bid is successful; you will need a bank account in the name of your organisation. Please allow at least 8 weeks to be notified of the outcome of your bid, longer may be required if the application is for more than £1000 or depending on the local approval process. Any queries please contact Marcus Robinson, smallyouthgrants@surreycc.gov.uk :

Surrey County Council
Commissioning Team
Room 314
County Hall
Kingston
KT1 2DN

Please return the completed form, by e-mail to: smallyouthgrants@surreycc.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Redhill/Reigate Parking Review

Following the inspection visit on 19 November with Parking officer Adrian Harris, I would like to request the following amendments be tabled at the Local Committee Meeting on 3 December.

Zully Grant-Duff

- **Croydon Road, Reigate** – in addition to the current proposals at this location, introduce DYL on both sides at the Fire and Rescue Service HQ vehicular entrance. Include the existing advisory 'Keep Clear At Any Time' restriction into the TRO so that it becomes mandatory. There have been reports of obstruction by the kerb in spite of the Keep Clear marking.
- **Somers Road, Reigate** – extend the existing 'Monday – Friday, 08:00-18:30, 30 mins no return 2 hours' parking bay opposite no 16 Somers road, eastwards by approximately 15 metres. There have been requests by parents for more short term parking availability.
- **Somers Road, Reigate** – extend DYL at the junction with Pilgrims Way northeast side, by approximately 7 metres in an easterly direction to finish opposite the existing DYL on the opposite side of Somers Road. There have been reports of serious obstruction.
- **Manor Road, Reigate** – on the south side of the road extend the DYL at the intersection with Nutley Lane in a westerly direction by approximately 5 metres. There have been reports of serious obstruction.
- **Wray Park Road, Reigate** – extend DYL on the northern side of the road at the junction with Alders Rd in a westerly direction, and opposite the junction o/s 'High Cedars' and 'Kilmarnock' to avoid obstruction to vehicles turning into/out of Alders Rd, and well used residential accesses.
- *Manor Rd, Reigate – **long term**, consider introducing waiting restrictions on the south side from Nutley Lane and for about 100 mts, parking to be allowed on the north side only. To be considered in the next review of parking in Reigate and Banstead.*

This page is intentionally left blank

Redhill Balanced Network – Updated costs of project

The Redhill Balanced Network report (item 12), indicated in paragraph 5.7 that the Project Centre were obtaining updated cost estimates from third parties, including statutory undertakers' where diversion of plant and equipment may be required.

The details below are the revised estimated costs for the Redhill Balanced Network package of measures, public realm and estimated costs for third party works including statutory undertakers.

The attached Annex is an extract from the draft Stage 2 feasibility report. Some statutory undertakers have confirmed estimates, but others are based on estimates provided by the Project Centre. It is anticipated that all statutory undertakers estimated costs will be known by Christmas 2012.

In summary the revised estimated costs are as follows:

Redhill Balanced Network package of measures	£1,830,000 (rounded)
Public Realm (highest cost option3)	£1,520,000 (rounded)
Contract administration and supervision	£116,100
Design costs	£387,000
Street lighting and statutory undertakers costs	£523,400
Total estimated cost of all elements	£4,380,000 (rounded)

1. COSTS

10.1 A notional estimated cost for the balanced network proposals was included in the 'Redhill Town Centre Traffic Modelling – Final Report' issued in February 2012. The estimated cost of £2,285,000 included costs for feasibility, detailed design, construction and contingencies (such as an element of statutory undertakers' plant and equipment). The estimated cost did not include the proposed public realm works. The scheme design, on which the estimated cost was based, was prepared using Ordnance Survey plans.

10.2 In addition the costs were broad estimates and depended on factors such as timescale; choice of materials/equipment; impact on statutory undertakers' plant and equipment; and scope of works. Therefore, a deviation of +/- 50% should be allowed.

10.3 Included in the feasibility (stage 2) design was the provision of more detailed costs. Modifications to the balanced network proposals have been included in the overall scheme and general arrangement drawings prepared using the topographical survey output.

10.4 The outline construction cost estimate for the modified balanced network consists of the following :

Location	Cost
A23/A25 Lombard Roundabout	£235,118
A23/Sainsbury's Access	£199,000
A23/A25 Station Roundabout	£488,019
A25 Station Road/Noke Drive Jct	£47,500
A25 Redstone Hill/Cavendish Rd Jct	£96,850
A23/A25 Belfry Roundabout	£75,500
A25 Town Centre Section	£497,141
TOTAL	£1,639,128

10.5 A notional scheme-wide cost, made up of signing; road markings; preliminaries of 5%; and site clearance of 2.5%) has been added totalling £190,000. Therefore, the total cost of the balanced network proposals is £1,829,128.

10.6 In preparing the outline construction cost estimate for the modified balanced network the following assumptions/allowances have been made:

- No allowance made for statutory undertakers' diversion of plant and equipment (currently being sought);
- No allowance made for street furniture (eg bollards/bins etc);
- No allowance made for street lighting alterations;
- Assumed 20% for restrictive working and 30% for nightwork (eg surfacing);
- Assumed use of existing materials (eg precast concrete kerbing etc).

10.8 Three options have been considered for the public realm proposals for Station roundabout and Station Road between Station roundabout and High Street. The cost estimates for these proposals (assuming the highway improvements to Station roundabout are implemented) are:

Option 1 – Pedestrianisation -	£914,362
Option 2 – Public open space/carriageway delineation -	£1,453,768
Option 3 – Public open space/no carriageway delineation -	£1,516,062

10.9 The total cost estimate for the highway improvements and public realm proposals following Stage 2 to completion will be:

■ Amendments to design following consultation (indicative) –	£25,000
■ Undertake Highway Design (indicative) –	£362,000
■ Street Lighting Improvements (indicative) -	£183,400
■ Statutory Undertaker's Diversion of Plant (indicative 10%) –	£340,000
■ Construction Cost –	£1,829,128
■ Public Realm Cost –	£1,516,062
Contract Administration and Supervision Cost (indicative 3%)	
	– £116,100
Total Cost -	£4,371,690

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX D

Redhill Balanced Network - Costs

	18-Jun-12		03-Dec-12		29 Nov 12 Update	
Balanced Network Costs	£2,285,000		£1,560,000		£1,830,000	
Street Lighting (indicative)	unknown		unknown		£183,000	
Statutory undertakers (indicative)	unknown		unknown		£340,000	
Detailed Design (indicative)	included above		unknown		£240,000	
Contract administration and supervision	unknown		unknown		£71,000	
	£2,285,000				£2,664,000	Total

	18-Jun-12		03-Dec-12		29 Nov 12 Update	
Public Realm costs (Option 3)	unknown		£1,900,000		£1,517,000	
Street Lighting (indicative)	unknown		unknown		included in above	
Statutory undertakers (indicative)	unknown		unknown		£0	
Detailed Design (indicative)	unknown		unknown		£146,000	
Contract administration and supervision	unknown		unknown		£45,000	
					£1,708,000	Total

This page is intentionally left blank