

Agenda

**We welcome you to
Surrey Heath Local Committee**
Your Councillors, Your Community
and the Issues that Matter to You



Discussion

- **Highways Update**
- **Creating Opportunities for Young People – Early Help**
- **Members' Allocations**

Venue

Location: St Marys Church Hall,
Park Road, Camberley,
GU15 2SR

Date: Thursday, 2 October
2014

Time: 6.30 pm – Public
Questions at 6pm

Surrey Heath
Local Committee

You can get involved in the following ways

Get involved

Ask a question

If there is something you wish know about how your council works or what it is doing in your area, you can ask the local committee a question about it. Most local committees provide an opportunity to raise questions, informally, up to 30 minutes before the meeting officially starts. If an answer cannot be given at the meeting, they will make arrangements for you to receive an answer either before or at the next formal meeting.

Write a question

You can also put your question to the local committee in writing. The committee officer must receive it a minimum of 4 working days in advance of the meeting.

When you arrive at the meeting let the committee officer (detailed below) know that you are there for the answer to your question. The committee chairman will decide exactly when your answer will be given and may invite you to ask a further question, if needed, at an appropriate time in the meeting.

Sign a petition

If you live, work or study in Surrey and have a local issue of concern, you can petition the local committee and ask it to consider taking action on your behalf. Petitions should have at least 30 signatures and should be submitted to the committee officer 2 weeks before the meeting. You will be asked if you wish to outline your key concerns to the committee and will be given 3 minutes to address the meeting. Your petition may either be discussed at the meeting or alternatively, at the following meeting.

Thank you for coming to the Local Committee meeting

Your Partnership officer is here to help. If you would like to talk about something in today's meeting or have a local initiative or concern please contact them through the channels below.

Email: nicola.thorntonbryar@surreycc.gov.uk

Tel: 01276 800269

Website: www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath



Follow @surreyheathLC on Twitter



Surrey County Council Appointed Members

C.Cllr David Ivison, Heatherside and Parkside (Chairman)
C.Cllr Bill Chapman, Camberley East
C.Cllr Denis Fuller, Camberley West
C.Cllr Chris Pitt, Frimley Green, Deepcut and Mychett (Vice-Chairman)
C.Cllr Adrian Page, Bisley, Lightwater and West End
C.Cllr Mike Goodman, Chobham, Bagshot & Windlesham

Borough Council Appointed Members

Cllr Rodney Bates, Old Dean
Cllr Valerie White, Bagshot
Cllr Josephine Hawkins, Parkside
Cllr Paul Ilnicki, Heatherside
Cllr John Winterton, Lightwater Ward
Cllr Vivienne Chapman, St. Paul's

Chief Executive
David McNulty

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print, Braille, or another language please either call Nicola Thornton-Bryar on 01276 800269 or write to the Community Partnerships Team at Surrey County Council Surrey Heath Borough Council, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD or nicola.thorntonbryar@surreycc.gov.uk

This is a meeting in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact us using the above contact details.

Use of social media and recording at council meetings

Reporting on meetings via social media

Anyone attending a council meeting in the public seating area is welcome to report on the proceedings, making use of social media (e.g. to tweet or blog), provided that this does not disturb the business of the meeting. Members taking part in a council meeting may also use social media. However, members are reminded that they must take account of all information presented before making a decision and should actively listen and be courteous to others, particularly witnesses providing evidence.

Requests for recording meetings

Members of the public are permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings provided that this does not disturb the business of the meeting and there is sufficient space. If you wish to film a particular meeting, please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that the Chairman can give their consent and those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place. Filming should be limited to the formal meeting area and not extend to those in the public seating area.


The Chairman will make the final decision in all matters of dispute in regard to the use of social media and filming in a committee meeting.

Using Mobile Technology

You may use mobile technology provided that it does not interfere with the PA or induction loop system. As a courtesy to others and to avoid disruption to the meeting, all mobile technology should be on silent mode during meetings.

			
C.Cllr David Ivison (Chairman) Heatherside and Parkside	C.Cllr Chris Pitt (Vice Chairman) Frimley Green, Deepcut and Mytchett	C.Cllr Bill Chapman Camberley East	C.Cllr Denis Fuller Camberley West
		 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL Local Committee (SURREY HEATH) County Councillors 2013-17	
C.Cllr Mike Goodman Bagshot, Windlesham & Chobham	C.Cllr Adrian Page Lightwater, West End & Bisley		

For councillor contact details, please contact Nikkie Thornton-Bryar, Community Partnership and Committee Officer (nicola.thorntonbryar@surreycc.gov.uk) Telephone: 01276 800269

			
Cllr Vivienne Chapman St Pauls Ward	Cllr Rodney Bates Old Dean Ward	Cllr Paul Ilnicki Heatherside Ward	Cllr Josephine Hawkins Parkside Ward
		<p>Local Committee (SURREY HEATH)</p> <p>Borough Council Co-optees 2014-15</p>	
Cllr Valerie White Bagshot Ward	Cllr John Winterton Lightwater Ward		

For councillor contact details, please contact Nikkie Thornton-Bryar, Community Partnership and Committee Officer (nicola.thorntonbryar@surreycc.gov.uk) Telephone: 01276 800269

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

(Pages 1 - 8)

To agree the Minutes of the last meeting, held on 3 July 2014.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests from Members in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting.

Notes:

- In line with the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012, declarations may relate to the interest of the member, or the member's spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom the member is living as husband or wife, or a person with whom the member is living as if they were civil partners and the member is aware they have the interest.
- Members need only disclose interests not currently listed on the Register of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.
- Members must notify the Monitoring Officer of any interests disclosed at the meeting so they may be added to the Register.
- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.

4 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

To answer any written questions from residents or businesses within the area in accordance with Standing Order 69. Notice should be given in writing or by email to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer by 12 noon, four working days before the meeting.

One question has been received from Mr Paul Chapman as follows:-

Back in August 2013 there was much fanfare and trumpeting that a solution had been found to the problems on Red Road and in particular the dangerous right turn out of MacDonald Road. This was covered widely in the local press, quote "Mike Goodman, Denis Fuller, Adrian Page and Bill Chapman threw their weight behind placing a roundabout at Lightwater Road" and on social media including interviews with Councillors Goodman and Fuller on the Surrey Heath Residents' Network where the plans were described as a "significant breaking news for the community".

That was over a year ago, and since then very little has been mentioned about the solution and nothing much seems to have changed at the junction.

Can the committee please give an update on what progress has been achieved over the past 14 months since this "significant breakthrough."

5 WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS

To receive any written questions from Members under Standing Order 47. Notice must be given in writing to the Community Partnership & Committee Officer by 12 noon 4 working days before the meeting.

6 PETITIONS

To receive any petitions in accordance with Standing Order 68. Notice should be given in writing or by email to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer at least 14 days before the meeting.

Alternatively, the petition can be submitted on-line through Surrey County Council's e-petitions website as long as the minimum number of signatures (30) has been reached 14 days before the meeting.

An on-line petition for Pine Ridge (closing deadline 16 August) will be presented to the meeting.

- *We, the parents, residents and concerned members of this community are urging the council to assess the lack of road safety measures outside Pine Ridge Infant & Nursery School, Esher Road, Camberley. It is becoming increasingly dangerous for our children making their daily journeys to & from school. It is indeed an accident waiting to happen. 4yr old Finley Fitzpatrick was involved in an RTA on the 1st May 2014 while crossing Mitcham Road due to instruction from the school to only use the entrance from Mitcham Road & the lack of school warning signs. Therefore we would like the council to implement improved road safety to provide our children with the safer environment they deserve.*

7 PETITION RESPONSE - CORDWALLES SCHOOL

To receive a report in answer to the petition presented at the March Committee as follows:-

The petition stated "We, the parents, residents and concerned members of this community are urging the Council to assess the lack of road safety measures outside Cordwalles Junior School, Berkshire Road, Camberley. It is becoming increasingly dangerous for our children making their daily journeys to and from school. It is indeed an accident waiting to happen. Therefore we would like the council to implement improved road safety to provide our school children with the safer environment they deserve."

8 HIGHWAYS UPDATE

(Pages 9 - 16)

To report progress made with the delivery of proposed highways schemes, developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2014/15 financial year.

The report also aims to seek approval of the contingency plans as laid out in section 2.1.14 of the report, to report on relevant topical

highways matters, and to provide an update on the latest budgetary position for highway schemes, revenue maintenance and Community Enhancement expenditure.

9 WOODLANDS LANE BRIDGE - TEMPORARY WEIGHT AND WIDTH RESTRICTION (Pages 17 - 20)

M3 Woodlands Lane Bridge is located to the east of Windlesham where it carries the single carriageway Woodlands Lane (C4) over the M3 motorway. The United Kingdom has been required to accept 40 tonne vehicles on roads since 1st January 1999 and at the same time has a requirement to assess highway bridges designed prior to 1973. A report, following a structural assessment in March 2001, resulted in a permanent weight limit of 25 tonnes on the structure.

Recent assessment of the structure has shown that its strength has degraded since the 2001 report and now requires a 7.5 tonne weight limit.

10 CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE - EARLY HELP (Pages 21 - 30)

Services for Young People is re-commissioning services for 2015-2020 and the new service model will be presented to Cabinet on 23 September 2014. The current Local Prevention commission ends on 31 August 2015 and new funding agreements will be awarded for provision to start on 1 September 2015, subject to Cabinet approval of the new service model.

The Youth Task Group has developed a set of priorities for Local Prevention in Surrey Heath which is based on local needs. Providers who bid for Local Prevention will be asked to respond to the local needs and priorities identified. The Local Committee is asked to approve the Surrey Heath local priorities so that the procurement exercise can start in October.

11 LOCAL COMMITTEE AND MEMBERS ALLOCATION FUNDING - UPDATE (Pages 31 - 36)

Surrey County Council Councillors receive funding to spend on local projects that help to promote social, economic or environmental well-being in the neighbourhoods and communities of Surrey. This funding is known as Members' Allocation.

For the financial year 2014/15 the County Council has allocated £10,300 revenue funding to each County Councillor and £35,000 capital funding to each Local Committee. This report provides an update on the projects that have been funded since April 2014 to date.

12 FORWARD PLAN (Pages 37 - 40)

This report is produced for each meeting of the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) so that members can review the forward plan.

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Surrey HEATH LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 6.30 pm on 3 July 2014
at Our Lady Queen of Heaven Church Hall, Frimley, GU16 7AA.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr David Ivison (Chairman)
- * Mr Bill Chapman
- Mr Denis Fuller
- * Mr Chris Pitt (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Adrian Page
- * Mr Mike Goodman

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Vivienne Chapman
- * Cllr Rodney Bates
- * Cllr Valerie White
- * Cllr Josephine Hawkins
- * Cllr Paul Ilnicki
- * Winterton

* In attendance

48/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Cllr Fuller.

49/13 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting, held on 13 March 2014 were agreed and signed by the Chair. The answer given to Mr Pavey on Southall Park Road was not recorded and would be added to Annex A.

50/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Cllr Rodney Bates declared an interest regarding agenda Item 8 as he resides in Berkshire Road.

51/13 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]

Two written public questions were received from Mr Jon McClelland, Local Resident and Murray Rowlands, Local Resident.

The questions asked and responses given are recorded in Annex B.

ITEM 2

52/13 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 5]

One written member question was received from Cllr Rodney Bates.

The question asked and written answer given are recorded in Annex B.

53/13 PETITIONS [Item 6]

There were no petitions received at this meeting.

54/13 RESPONSE TO A30 SLIP ROAD PARKING PETITION [Item 7]

The Local Committee received a petition at its meeting on 13 March 2014. The petition stated that “We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to refund parking charges incurred due to inadequate signs”.

Members noted the learning points for both Councillors and Officers and were pleased that the parking review this time had been altered to be more inclusive and consultative.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) noted the report and the measures that have been put in place since the parking issue arose.

55/13 RESPONSE TO CORDWALLES SCHOOL PETITION [Item 8]

The two local members present reported that they had met with County Officers on site outside the Cordwalles school. Road Safety is being considered at all the schools on the Old Dean estate and especially at Pine Ridge, where the change of access arrangements had caused issues.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) noted the report and that a further and more detailed assessment report will be submitted to the next meeting.

56/13 2014/15 PARKING REVIEW [Item 9]

Officers of Surrey County Council’s parking team carried out a review of on street parking restrictions within the borough of Surrey Heath and identified changes which would benefit road safety, reduce instances of obstruction and localised congestion.

Members were pleased that they had been involved with and consulted on the review from an early stage and had been able to check details with parish representatives.

Cllr Goodman accepted that something needed to be done in Bowling Green Road, Chobham but there was no easy solution, so on reflection, the proposed scheme was withdrawn. He also requested a slight change from 2 hour to 1 hour parking in Updown Hill.

Members discussed Wilton Road, which provided access to the amenity tip and whether restrictions were needed – however this land is owned by SHBC and not the County Council. Cllr Vivienne Chapman agreed to discuss this further with the Parking Team.

Committee approval was required in order to progress the changes to the stage of 'formal advertisement', where the proposed restrictions will be advertised for 28 days and open to comments or objections from members of the public.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed that:

- (i) the proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Surrey Heath as described in the report and shown in detail on drawings in annex A be agreed **to include the removal of Bowling Green Road, Chobham and a change from 2 hour to 1 hour parking restriction on Updown Hill, Windlesham.**
- (ii) funding be allocated as detailed in paragraph 5.1 of the report to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments.
- (iii) advertisement of 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 Surrey **Heath as described in the report** and shown on the drawings in annex A should proceed and that, if no objections are maintained, the orders be made.
- (iv) if there are unresolved objections, they will be dealt with in accordance with the county council's scheme of delegation by the parking strategy and implementation team manager, in consultation with the chairman/vice chairman of the committee and the appropriate county councillor. An additional member may be invited for comment.

57/13 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 10]

The Committee received a tabled report on the progression of all highway related schemes and works.

Members discussed the proposed works on the Toshiba roundabout and raised concerns over potential congestion as a result. It was noted that the works involved the widening of the road, so the congestion should be kept to a minimum as traffic would remain unimpeded as much as possible. Councillors would be kept up to date on works and disruptions whenever possible and information would be made available to the public using social media as appropriate.

Thanks were given to the Highways team for their work in the Surrey Heath area, with particular thanks from Cllr Pitt regarding Frimley Green and Canal bridge.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed to:

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2014/15 financial year,
- (ii) Note progress with budget expenditure,

ITEM 2

- (iii) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee

58/13 TRO - EXPERIMENTAL SCHEME FOR CAMBERLEY HIGH STREET [Item 11]

In response to a request from Surrey Heath Borough Council and Surrey Police, an Experimental Road Closure Order had previously been introduced for part of Camberley High Street. The Order had now expired.

The Order enabled the High Street to be closed at times when the clubs/pubs/restaurants in the High Street attract particularly large numbers of visitors. The proposed closures restrict access to vehicles along the High Street at a time where pedestrians are vulnerable. It also provides an environment where Surrey Police are able to proactively monitor and intervene in situations to reduce the amount of antisocial behaviour and/or crimes. Surrey Police have reported that the implementation of previous closures has resulted in a reduction in crimes and incidences of anti-social behaviour in the High Street.

Members discussed the provision of disabled parking bays and the inclusion of restrictions on New Years Eve.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed:

- (i) advertisement of a further Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (for a period of 18 months) to close the section of Camberley High Street between Portesbery Road and St Georges Road (as shown on the plan attached at Annex 1) at the times and dates specified in paragraph 3.4 of the report. The Order will include an exception for vehicles for the purpose of loading and/or unloading.
- (ii) any comments received during the period of the experimental closure should be considered by the Area Team Manager for Highways in consultation with the Divisional Member and Chairman (**consideration should also be given to Disabled Parking and the inclusion of NYE**); and
- (iii) to approve the advertisement of a Traffic Regulation Order to make the closures permanent if no irresolvable objections are received in response to the experimental closure; and that this issue only be returned to Committee if any objections prove insurmountable.

59/13 PORTSMOUTH ROAD CYCLE LANE - AGREEMENT TO CHANGE THE SEGREGATED CYCLE LANE TO A SHARED FOOTWAY [Item 12]

The Surrey Heath Local Committee's ITS scheme for 2014/15 was the widening of the Portsmouth Road between Toshiba Roundabout and the Frimley Park Hospital roundabout.

In order to create an additional lane, part of the existing cycle/footway needed to be moved over to allow the road to be widened.

The available space for the relocated cycle/footway would result in a facility that was narrower than existing and too narrow to allow it to remain as a

segregated facility. A cycle/footway could remain as a shared (as opposed to a segregated) facility.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed that the current segregated cycle/footway be converted to a shared cycle/footway.

60/13 TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER FOR A NO RIGHT TURN ONTO OSNABURGH HILL FROM LONDON ROAD, CAMBERLEY [Item 13]

The proposed restriction would improve traffic flow along London Road (eastbound) and reduce the risk of personal injuries at the junction.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed to:

- (i) The advertisement of a Traffic Regulation Order the effect of which will be to restrict traffic turning right into Osnaburgh Hill from Eastbound traffic on London Road.
- (ii) Any objections to the proposal will be reviewed by the Area Manager, following consultation with the Chairman and Local Member for the area
- (iii) Following the advertisement of the order, implement the scheme subject to no irresolvable objections

61/13 ROW BRIDLEWAY 19 [Item 14]

Officers do not have delegated powers to make TROs. Officers supported the decision to make the TRO to enable Network Rail to make safety improvements at the level crossing that they would be unable to do with horse use. The continuation of the route in Hampshire already had a TRO on it.

The Committee were asked to consider whether a Traffic Regulation Order should be imposed on bridleway 19 for the purpose of “avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising”. Members were asked to consider the Council’s duty under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, “to conduct an adequate balancing exercise to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic”. In essence they needed to decide whether prohibiting equestrian access would improve safety for other users.

Gail Brownrigg attended and raised the following points:- A bridleway is a route which pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders have a right to use. Surrey has a large number of bridleways, which enable riders to get off busy and dangerous roads, but this network is unfortunately fragmented and often lacking in connectivity. This bridleway gives access to the long-distance Blackwater Valley Path which does not currently have equestrian rights along its full length, but which may have the potential for upgrading in the future. The nearest alternative crossing from Surrey into Hampshire is at Tongham seven miles away. Network rail would like to install miniature stop lights with a red light and a beeping signal giving 20 seconds warning when a train is approaching. This is in use at Farnham North station and seems to be very effective. For equestrian use, the guidance states that minimum warning period should be 40 seconds. Network Rail are concerned that users would become accustomed to the fact that the crossing is closed for a longer time,

ITEM 2

and this might influence their decision to cross before the train arrives. There are however, telephones on each side of the crossing, to enable riders to check with the signalman that it is safe to cross and to confirm to him their safe arrival on the other side. This request is entered in a log book, where the last record dates to 2009, leading to the assumption that the crossing has not been used by riders since then. This is, however, incorrect. A resident living near the crossing says it was in regular use by riders until about three years ago, and a local rider confirms that she last used the crossing in November 2013. This indicates that riders have not been using the telephone to contact the signalman, but were using their own judgement to cross. Trains sound their horns before reaching the bend between 7 am and 11 pm, so there is warning of their approach before they are visible. Incomplete evidence for past use cannot be taken a reliable guide to future need.

Prohibiting equestrian use would not alter the status of the bridleway – it would therefore still be legal for cyclists to use it. It would, however, enable Network Rail to remove the telephones which they say are being misused, causing considerable train delays. I fully understand Network Rail's reasons for wanting a Traffic Regulation order imposed on this part of the bridleway. I support the proposed installation of stop lights and audible signal set at the 20 second timing appropriate for pedestrians and cyclists who comprise the majority of users, but I do not agree that it is necessary to prevent the rare equestrian access that takes place. There is adequate warning of an approaching train which sounds its horn, and the telephones are available for riders who might need more time. No equestrians are likely to wish to cross at night when the horns are not sounded, and any horse that is spooked by the sound of the signal should not be attempting to cross once the red light shows.

Network Rail responded to this, and it was noted that the actions proposed were to improve safety, which had been identified as at risk. It was highlighted that a collision with a large animal could derail a passenger train and that the Hatches did not have sufficient sight lines. Log books had not recorded any horse crossings since 2009, so it was deducted that horse owners were therefore not obeying the signage and following the safety procedures available.

Members discussed the usage of the bridleway and safety considerations. It was noted that no public objections to the advertisement of the TRO had been received within the statutory period. A recorded vote was held with 6 in favour, 5 against and 1 abstention.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed that the grounds for making a Traffic Regulation Order as outlined were met and an Order should be made for Public Bridleway No. 19 (Camberley & Frimley) to prohibit equestrian use under s1(a) of the Road Traffic Regulation Order 1984 for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road, or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, as shown on Drawing Number 3/1/84/H8 (Annexe 1).

62/13 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT FROM SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE [Item 15]

The Local Committee had an important part to play in supporting the local development of Services for Young People, ensuring that they provided the

right support to young people in local communities. In particular they had an important formal role in relation to the Local Prevention Framework.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) noted the progress Services for Young People had made during 2013/14 to increase participation for young people in education, training or employment, as set out in the appendix to the report

63/13 CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: LOCAL RE-COMMISSIONING FOR 2015 - 2020 [Item 16]

The report outlined plans to build on the successes of Services for Young People and proposed greater integration and working together for the commissioning of the Local Prevention Framework (LPF), Centre Based Youth Work (CBYW) and potentially other more integrated commissioning with partners such as Surrey Heath Borough Council, Public Health, Surrey Police and Active Surrey. It explained how Services for Young People planned to achieve its overall goal of employability for all young people.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed;

- (i) To support increased delegation of decision-making to include the current Centre Based Youth Work so that it can be re-commissioned alongside the current Local Prevention Framework.
- (ii) That local priorities for the newly delegated commissions within Services for Young People will be decided by the Surrey Heath Local Committee informed by the work of the constituted Youth Task Group.
- (iii) To reconstitute Surrey Heath Youth Task Group (See Item 17)

64/13 LOCAL COMMITTEE BUDGET AND TASK GROUP REPRESENTATION 2014-15 [Item 17]

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed:

- (i) The terms of reference for the Youth Task Group as set out in Annex A, with membership of the task group to be: Denis Fuller (Chairman), Chris Pitt (Vice-Chairman), Cllrs Valerie White and Rodney Bates.
- (ii) The terms of reference for the Major Projects Task Group as set out in Annex B and the membership of this task group to be: Cllrs David Ivison, Denis Fuller, Bill Chapman, Vivienne Chapman, Josephine Hawkins and Valerie White. It was also recommended that Cllr Paul Ilnicki be invited to attend any meetings with a focus on rail issues and that SHBC Officers Jenny Rickard and Jane Ireland be included.
- (iii) The nominations to outside bodies as:-

Surrey Heath Partnership – Cllr Bill Chapman
 Surrey Heath Strategic Parking Group – Cllrs Ivison and Page
 Surrey Heath Youth Council Stakeholders Group – Denis Fuller

ITEM 2

- (iv) That the community safety budget of £3,294 that has been delegated to the Local Committee be transferred to the Surrey Heath Partnership.
- (v) That the Community Partnerships Manager manages and authorises expenditure from the budget delegated to the Local Committee in accordance with (iv) above.

65/13 LOCAL COMMITTEE & MEMBERS' ALLOCATION FUNDING - UPDATE [Item 18]

Surrey County Council Councillors receive funding to spend on local projects that help to promote social, economic or environmental well-being in the neighbourhoods and communities of Surrey. This funding is known as Members' Allocation.

For the financial year 2014/15 the County Council has allocated £10,300 revenue funding to each County Councillor and £35,000 capital funding to each Local Committee. This report provides an update on the projects that have been funded since April 2014 to date.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) noted the amounts that have been spent from the Members' Allocation and Local Committee capital budgets, as set out in Annex 1 of the report.

66/13 FORWARD PLAN [Item 19]

The report was noted.

Meeting ended at: 9.00 pm

Chairman

Annex A**Surrey Heath Local Area Committee****3 July 2014****Open Public Question Time**

Public questions were audio recorded.

There were 12 members of the public present.

1. Judy Trow, SHBC Councillor

I would like to see Lovemans Lane in Chobham made one way only as it is a very narrow road – is this possible?

Reply from Mike Goodman

I am aware of the issue with this road and we are looking at the possibilities and options. There is no easy solution, but I will correspond with Cllr Trow outside of the meeting.

Reply from Andrew Milne, Highways Area Manager (NW)

I will liaise with Cllr Goodman over this and respond with the options.

2. Murray Rowlands, Camberley resident

For information

The Camberley Job Club is expanding and will be open on Mondays and Fridays at St Marys Church. There is also an opening of a Community Bank on 3rd October at 11am.

3. Cyril Pavey, Local resident

Regarding road markings and signage, why is there double marking on the roundabout at Prior Road, where it goes from 40mph to 30mph, with an additional SLOW written on the road.

Reply from Andrew Milne, Highways Area Manager (NW)

The 30mph limit is always signed. If this is near a location that requires a warning then this will be marked on the road where possible.

4. Dianne Beech, local resident

(Ms Beech understood that she had not registered to speak under Item 14 on the agenda re the Hatches bridlepath, however, she raised an observation under public questions)

Network Rail state that audible warnings might spook horses, however, who made that decision as most horses travel along roads, with traffic passing and are not spooked.

5. Bryan Reed, Camberley resident

Do traffic wardens operate in central Camberley in the evenings and at weekends?

Reply from Vivienne Chapman, SHBC

Yes they do.

6. Paul Deech, SHBC Councillor

Can Councillors provide an update on Frimley Park Hospital and the potential merger and future impact?

Reply from Bill Chapman

The merger is going forward. This will be a two step process with the competition commission monitoring and overseeing who controls the “trust” to ensure that there is benefit to local residents.

7. Clinton Wegrove, Local resident

There has been some activity at the Portesbury Road Police Station – what is happening there?

Reply from Bill Chapman

I don’t know what activity there has been recently, but the Police do still use the building. The general plans for the area are that the Portesbury Road school is to move to a new building in Summer 2015, so the whole area can be redeveloped. SHBC plans include an 80 unit Urban Village, but this is not yet agreed and has not been to planning. Developers are however, starting to show interest. The Police and Crime commissioner did put an embargo on the sale of Police buildings, but I do not know if this is still in force.

8. Judy Trow, SHBC Councillor

Two years ago, we were promised that the railings in Windsor Road (A319 Chobham High Street towards Sunningdale) would be mended. They are getting very wobbly.

Reply from Mike Goodman

This was raised at a Parish meeting some nine months ago and was promised for May 2014 – however, there are problems getting a supply of replacement railings and these are due later this year. I have raised this as a priority, but in the meantime, they are being regularly checked for safety.

Annex B



Surrey Heath Local Area Committee
3rd July 2014

Annex B

Written Public Questions, Responses and Supplementary questions

Q. Written question from Mr Jon McClelland, Local Resident

The Hatches path, officially referred to as Bridleway BW19 by the Countryside Access Team, is long overdue maintenance. The path is overgrown on each side and is now a narrow strip of tarmac, much of which is badly potholed. In winter the path is muddy and flooded making it very difficult for pedestrians & cyclists to navigate.

Many people would like to see the path properly tarmacked across the full width of the path (approx 7-9 feet) and treated as a "[Shared Use route for Pedestrians & Cyclists](#)". I have started a blog and petition to raise awareness of this, which has 89 signatures to date. I expect more signatures as conditions get worse in the autumn.

Blog: <http://thehatchespath.blogspot.co.uk/>

Petition: <http://petitions.surreycc.gov.uk/TheHatches/>

I have been in correspondence with Luke Dawson of the Countryside Access Team who has visited the path and confirmed it needs maintenance work carried out. He has requested funds "from a bigger pot" to fund improvement works but was unsuccessful this year. He has investigated interim solutions to fix the worst of the potholes and improve drainage. He also suggested "a scrape of the surface mud to allow the full available width". I noticed this was done recently (by Mon 23rd June) but this has only cleared the existing 4 foot wide path. Potholes still need to be fixed and drainage improved.

My blog has full details of my discussions with the Countryside Access Team and sustrans. I will also update with the committee's feedback. Thank you for your time".

The question:

Can the committee help the Countryside Access Team with funding to upgrade the path properly to a Shared use route for Pedestrians & Cyclists?

A. Response from Chairman on behalf of the Committee:

The Countryside access team have been working with Mr McClelland on this issue and initial remedial work has taken place as mentioned above. The team are working with Highways officers and the cycle strategy group to provide options and costings for the committee to consider.

A report will be produced for the next meeting.

Q. Written question from Murray Rowlands, Local Resident

Concern is expressed that in response to complaints about growing use of The Avenue, Heatherley Road, Woodway, Woodlands Road as a rat run to Frimley Road Councillor Fuller is advocating closing the bus only lane on the London Road which is a crucial element in the functioning of the excellent bus service between Aldershot and Camberley.

The question:

Are there plans to close the A30 bus lane?

A. Response from Chairman on behalf of the Committee:

Thank you Murray for raising this issue as it gives me the opportunity to state the views of this Local Area Committee on the question of removing the bus lane from the A30.

You may not be aware that this Committee discussed the issue some 3-4 years ago and voted against its removal. The Members in front of you again discussed the position at a Private Meeting two weeks ago on 19 June and again recommended not to pursue the issue.

The bus lane lies wholly in Cllr Fuller's Division and he is rightly concerned with accident and rat run issues and is perfectly entitled to his own views. He would have to convince this Local Area Committee to support his opinions.

There would undoubtedly be opposition from such bodies as, County Highways Surrey Heath Borough Council, Bus operating companies and probably others.

In my opinion, even if this Local Area Committee were to recommend the removal of the bus lane (with all its drawbacks), I would very much doubt whether it could overcome the wide support for its retention.

You may wish to be aware of plans to improve the A30 from the Meadows roundabout to Knoll Rd. This does not entail the removal of the bus lane and I can reassure you that there are no plans to do so.

This, of course, should not and will not deflect Cllr Fuller from his strongly-held ambition to remove the bus lane - but I would not offer him the realistic prospect of success in his campaign.

Annex B**Q. Supplementary question from Murray Rowlands, Local Resident**

My concern was with regard to rat running along Heatherley Road. A study was undertaken some years ago, when residents petitioned for speed humps, but these were refused as they would be needed in The Avenue too. The roads have always been busy despite the bus lane. What can be done about constant traffic? Could a traffic review be undertaken? Could the top of Wood Way be closed?

A. Response from Chairman on behalf of the Committee:

The Highways department get daily requests for traffic studies. The department does meet the regulations on safety speeding issues and have a speed management plan with the Police. Road closures can be considered as a last resort as we do have to maintain free access and passageway to road users. The Avenue was recently discussed, but the surveyed residents were not in favour of speed humps. I will ask the Highways Manager to look at this and report back to the next meeting.

Written Member Questions, Responses and Supplementary questions**Q. Written question from Cllr Rodney Bates**

The question:

Why did Surrey County Council decide to reject the findings of their own independent panel on member allowances and how much public money is being spent on the total increases of these allowances?

A. Response from Chairman on behalf of the Committee:

Thank you for your question – unfortunately, this question falls outside the remit of the local committee, however, I have asked David Hodge to respond directly to you on this matter and his response is included below:

A. Response from David Hodge, Leader of the Council:

There has been little change in Members allowances for thirteen years, despite the workload for Councillors (particularly those in the Cabinet) increasingly greatly. In fact, Government has added some 42 new responsibilities to County Councils since 2010 alone. As a result, these jobs are very much full-time and bear considerable financial responsibility – Surrey is the fifth biggest local authority in the country with an overall budget of £1.7 billion.

With these considerations in mind, the IRP felt that the Council's Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) levels for the most senior posts in the Cabinet were substantially below where they assessed they should be. The increases approved by Full Council on Tuesday 6th May for allowances and SRAs for most posts were fairly close to the IRP proposals or stayed as they were pre-review. In a pre-Council group meeting, Conservative members made a decision that the

Annex B

remuneration for the Leader should be upgraded to reflect the significant responsibility of this role. I did not partake in this discussion.

Overall the package of allowances and SRAs for 81 Members (excluding new roles and posts) as voted and approved, amounted to an increase of 12.3% costing an additional £163,000 p/a compared to now. I am hopeful that they will allow more people from different walks of life to consider becoming a Councillor. Surrey County Council has improved strongly over the past 4 years, making savings of £260m whilst also improving our services to residents. It is important that we have the best leadership in place to allow us to continue this journey over the coming years.

Q. Supplementary question from Cllr Rodney Bates

Please pass onto Mr Hodge that I am very grateful for his response. I would also like to know what budgets or local services have been cut to pay for these increases and if this is a move to encourage new Councillors, why was it not brought in prior to the elections?

A response will be provided outside of the meeting.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)****DATE: 2 OCTOBER 2014****LEAD OFFICER: ANDREW MILNE – AREA HIGHWAYS MANAGER (NW)****SUBJECT: HIGHWAYS UPDATE****DIVISION: ALL****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To report progress made with the delivery of proposed highways schemes, developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2014/15 financial year.

To seek approval of the contingency plans as laid out in section 2.1.14 of this report.

To report on relevant topical highways matters.

To provide an update on the latest budgetary position for highway schemes, revenue maintenance and Community Enhancement expenditure.

RECOMMENDATIONS:**The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to:**

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2014/15 financial year,
- (ii) Note progress with budget expenditure,
- (iii) Approve the contingency plans as laid out in section 2.1.14 of this report,
- (iv) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee,

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The above recommendations are made to enable progression of all highway related schemes and works.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1** Surrey County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) states the aim of improving the highway network for all users, through measures such as reducing congestion, improving accessibility, reducing personal injury accidents, improving the environment and maintaining the highway network so that it is safe for all users.

2. ANALYSIS:

2.1 Capital programme for 2014/15

- 2.1.1 Following the Surrey Heath Committee Local Committee meeting held on 5 December 2013, it was agreed to promote delivery of an additional lane between the Toshiba roundabout and Frimley Park Hospital roundabout.
- 2.1.2 This project remains the highest ranking priority for Surrey Heath, and considerable investment has already been made in the design process.
- 2.1.3 The cost of constructing the additional lane was estimated to be between £604,000 and £846,000, with the higher figure including an allowance of £254,000 towards diversion of utility apparatus and unforeseen construction risks.
- 2.1.4 In 2013/14, £622,574 was been set aside for this project, comprised of:
- a) £130,872 PIC monies
 - b) £185,000 s106 funding
 - c) £306,702 Local Committee capital
- 2.1.5 Taking into account the cost of design and modelling in 2013/14, and completion of the crossing upgrades, approximately £156,000 was used in the 2013/14 period. This allowed for £466,000 to be brought forward into the 2014/15 financial year for this project.
- 2.1.6 It was initially assumed that the cost of delivery would be £846,000, and that allowing for the £466,000 carry forward, a further £380,000 of capital would be required to complete this project.
- 2.1.7 Surrey Heath Local Committee agreed to use the entirety of their 2014/15 capital allocation towards this project (£306,702).
- 2.1.8 Progress**
- 2.1.9 Detailed design has now been completed, and final costs have been received from Surrey Highway's contractor, Kiers, together with final estimated costs from the majority of utility companies affected. Based on this information, it is anticipated that this scheme will fully utilise the available monies.

2.1.10 Stage 2 of the safety audit process has been completed.

2.1.11 Due to a delay with cost information from two of the utility companies affected, the delivery timescale has been revised. The works will be completed in two phases, with phase 1 (the utility works) being completed before Christmas 2014, and the construction phase commencing on 1st February 2015, with the intention of works being completed by the end of March 2015. It must be emphasised though that weather conditions and other factors can influence works programmes, and that the dates indicated may be subject to change.

2.1.12 Risks

2.1.13 The primary risk to the successful completion of this project is any unforeseen significant increase in costs arising from associated utility works. Although the risk level is considered to be low, following receipt of final estimated costs from the majority of the utility companies affected, it is important that this is highlighted to the Surrey Heath Committee.

2.1.14 Contingency planning

Contingency planning is necessary to ensure the effective use of Committee capital funding in the event of unforeseen circumstances. Although it is unlikely that contingency works will be necessary, the following prioritised list of Localised Structural Repair works have been proposed in the event of the Toshiba Project not being able to progress in 2014/15. It is still recommended that items would be funded from this list in the order shown, to the value of any remaining capital funding:

Priority	District	Road Number	Road Name	Location	Limits	Length	Estimated Area m2	Estimated Approx Cost £22/m2	Running Total
1	Surrey Heath	D533	Oakwood Rd	Windlesham	From outside no.1 to no.7	35	196	£4,312	£4,312
2	Surrey Heath	D3502	Holly Hedge Close	Frimley	Whole length	142	800	£17,600	£21,912
3	Surrey Heath	D3441	Chantry Court	Frimley	Approach & turning area	61	396	£8,712	£30,624
4	Surrey Heath	D3439	Apex Drive	Frimley	Full Length	174	1030	£22,660	£53,284
5	Surrey Heath	D3546	Kirkstone Close	Frimley	Whole Length of cul de sac	94	655	£14,410	£67,694
6	Surrey Heath	D3488	Edgemore Rd	Frimley	junction edgemore / martindale rd / goldney rd	60x6m 10x6m	420	£9,240	£76,934
7	Surrey Heath	D3522	Highclere Drive	Camberley	cw heavy crazing / structural failure	at junction with A325 portsmouth rd 40x6m	240	£5,280	£82,214
8	Surrey Heath	D3502	Holly Hedge Rd	Frimley	Section from Holly Hedge Close Jet to J/W Lauder Close	71	451	£9,922	£92,136

ITEM 8

9	Surrey Heath	B3012	Guildford Road	Frimley Green	Section - Both approaches and over canal bridge	100	511	£11,242	£103,378
10	Surrey Heath	D3567	Cheylesmore Drive	Frimley	Bell mouth & J/W Old Bilsey Rd		75	£1,650	£105,028
11	Surrey Heath	D3488	Old Bisley Rd	Frimley	Bell mouth & junction with The Maultway		252	£5,544	£110,572
12	Surrey Heath	D0004	Mill Pond Rd	Windlesham	Bell mouth & junction Nr no. 18	50	340	£7,480	£118,052
13	Surrey Heath	D3532	Kingsclear Park	Camberley	Full Length	333	1510	£33,220	£151,272
14	Surrey Heath	D3542	Inglewood Ave	Camberley	Full Length	698	4718	£103,796	£255,068
15	Surrey Heath	D3486	Tomlins Ave	Frimley	Whole length	282	1596	£35,112	£290,180
16	Surrey Heath	B383	Windsor Rd	Chobham	J/w Little Heath Rd, Windlesham Rd & Red lion Rd		575	£12,650	£302,830

2.1.15 This list has been considered by the Local Committee, who deferred making a decision on contingency schemes until the 2014/15 financial year, to allow the opportunity to respond to the changing condition of the highway network over the course of the Winter.

2.1.16 Since presenting this list for consideration, central planned maintenance programmes have been published. The items highlighted have now either been completed already from central budgets, or are planned for delivery from central budgets this financial year.

2.2 Revenue maintenance allocations and expenditure 2014/15

2.2.1 The 2014/15 revenue maintenance allocation for Surrey Heath is £226,525. Table 1 shows how these funds have been allocated, and the spend progress to date.

Item	Allocation (£)	Committed as at 22 nd September 2014 (£)
Drainage / ditching	50,000	40,120
Carriageway and footway patching	50,025	15,481
Vegetation works	90,000	93,870
Signs and markings	20,000	7,588
Parking	6,500	0
Low cost measures	10,000	2,476
Kier OHP	-	4,361
Total	226,525	£159,537

Table 1 – 2014/15 Revenue Maintenance Expenditure

2.3 COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT FUND

2.3.1 The total 2014/15 Community Enhancement allocation for Surrey Heath is £30,000. Committee have previously determined to divide this fund equally between County Councillor Committee Members.

- 2.3.2 The Maintenance Engineer for Surrey Heath will provide guidance and assistance, organise cost estimates, and raise orders to ensure delivery of works.
- 2.3.3 To ensure that this fund is effectively spent, and to enable highways contractors to deliver works before the end of the financial year, it is recommended that all works should be agreed by 31st October 2014, and that in the event of no firm spending decisions being made by this date, the Maintenance Engineer will determine suitable works and organise their delivery.
- 2.3.4 A summary of spend progress is shown in Table 2.

Member	Allocation (£)	Committed as at 22nd September 2014 (£)
Bill Chapman	5,000	1,009
Denis Fuller	5,000	0
David Ivison	5,000	0
Chris Pitt	5,000	0
Mike Goodman	5,000	2,043
Adrian Page	5,000	0
Total	30,000	3,052 committed

Table 2 – Community Enhancement Fund spend progress

2.4 Other highways related matters

- 2.4.1 The second quarter of the year has seen a reduction in the level of enquiries compared to the extremely high volume during the first quarter, mainly due to better weather. For the first half of the year, 87,775 enquiries have been received, giving an average of almost 14600 per month for the calendar year, down from 19000.
- 2.4.2 For Surrey Heath specifically, 5636 enquiries have been received since January, of which 2972 were directed to the local area office for action, and 96% of these have been resolved. This response rate is slightly above the countywide average of 95%. Although the response rate remains high, we are working hard in conjunction with our contractors to improve and also reduce the need for customers to chase for an answer.
- 2.4.3 The reduction in customer contacts has also been reflected in the volume of complaints received; 208 for the 6 months to the end of June compared to 143 for the first quarter. The North West area including Surrey Heath has received 28 stage 1 complaints. The main reasons for these complaints are listed as being communications, and the failure to carry out works to either the required standard or timescale. The Service is reviewing the customer service KPIs and is particularly looking at advance notification of works on the highway through our Customer Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 Options, where appropriate, have been presented in this report.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Consultation is routinely carried out for highway-related schemes with relevant key parties, including residents, Local Members, Surrey Police and Safety Engineering. Specific details regarding consultation and any arising legal issues are included in individual scheme reports as appropriate.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 Proposed ITS schemes are prioritised to ensure that the maximum public benefit is gained from any funding made available. So far as is practicable, Officer proposals follow the Countywide scheme assessment process (CASEM) and the prioritisation order determined by this.
- 5.2 The Committee Capital and Revenue Maintenance budgets are used to target the most urgent sites where a specific need arises, to keep up with general maintenance activities that reduce the need for expensive repairs in the future, and to support local priorities. The nature of these works is such that spend may vary slightly from that indicated in Table 1.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 It is an objective of Surrey Highways to treat all users of the public highway equally and with understanding. Appropriate and proportionate consultation is carried out with residents, and bodies representing particular user groups, to ensure that the interests of all highway users are considered.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 Through the views and needs expressed by local communities, and accommodating where possible the involvement of local communities in looking after the public highway, localism is routinely considered as part of the consultation and bidding processes for highway-related works. Specific details regarding localism are included in individual reports as appropriate.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

- 8.1 Other implications, such as the contribution that a well-managed highway network can give to reducing crime and disorder, are considered in relation to individual schemes, and specific details are included in individual reports as appropriate.

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After	No significant implications arising

Children	from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 The Committee is asked to note the progress with all schemes and budgets.
- 9.2 The Committee is asked to approve the contingency plans as presented.
- 9.3 It is recommended that a further Highways Update is presented at the next meeting of this Committee.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 Officers will continue to progress delivery of all schemes and ensure effective use of all budgets.

Contact Officer:

Andrew Milne, Area Highways Manager (NW) – 03456 009 009

Consulted:

-

Annexes:

-

Sources/background papers:

-

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)****DATE: 2 OCTOBER 2014****LEAD OFFICER: ANDREW MILNE****SUBJECT: WOODLANDS LANE BRIDGE – TEMPORARY WEIGHT AND WIDTH RESTRICTION****DIVISION: BAGSHOT, WINDLESHAM AND CHOBHAM****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

M3 Woodlands Lane Bridge is located to the east of Windlesham where it carries the single carriageway Woodlands Lane (C4) over the M3 motorway. This bridge is a Highways Agency (HA) asset and was constructed in 1971.

In accordance with a European Directive, the United Kingdom has been required to accept 40 tonne vehicles on roads since 1st January 1999 and at the same time a requirement to assess highway bridges designed prior to 1973. A report, following a structural assessment in March 2001, resulted in a permanent weight limit of 25 tonnes on the structure.

Recent assessment of the structure has shown that its strength has degraded since the 2001 report and now requires a 7.5 tonne weight limit.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to agree to

- (i) Implement a temporary traffic regulation order on Woodlands Lane, Windlesham, to reduce the weight limit to 3 tonnes and include a width restriction of 6'6"
- (ii) Following the advertisement of the order, any objections to the order can be resolved by the Local Area Manager (Andrew Milne) in consultation with the Chairman and Local Member

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Although a 7.5 tonne weight limit would be sufficient, this does not prevent the structure being used by heavier vehicles.

Reducing the weight limit and introducing a width restriction will allow for the inclusion of a structure that physically restricts access of larger vehicles and stops any mistreatment of the restriction.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 M3 Woodlands Lane Bridge is located to the east of Windlesham where it carries the single carriageway Woodlands Lane (C4) over the M3 motorway. This bridge is a Highways Agency (HA) asset and was constructed in 1971.
- 1.2 In accordance with a European Directive, the United Kingdom has been required to accept 40 tonne vehicles on roads since 1st January 1999 and at the same time a requirement to assess highway bridges designed prior to 1973.
- 1.3 The structure of the bridge was assessed by Mott MacDonald in March 2001 the previous agent for Highways Agency Area 3. Recommendations following the report suggested introducing a weight limit of 25 tonnes on the structure to extend the Records show that the structure is not capable of carrying the full permanent load and that it is therefore not suitable for any live loading. At this point, the permanent 25 tonne weight limit on the bridge was introduced to reflect the structural strength.
- 1.4 The structure is one of five structures (A322, Broadway Road, Highways Lane, and Windsor Road) in the area allowing access across the M3.
- 1.5 The bridge is located near Windlesham and allows traffic to avoid the traffic calming and/or residential roads within the village.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 The latest assessment of the bridge deck on Woodlands Lane, Windlesham, has identified that the 25 tonne weight limit was no longer suitable and that the weight limit should be reduced to 7.5 tonne to reduce the risk of a failure.
- 2.2 Although the report identifies that 7.5 tonne would be suitable, it has been recognised that simply changing the signs does not stop drivers of heavier vehicles from ignoring the restriction and driving across the structure. Surrey Police are unable to permanently enforce the weight limit.
- 2.3 A method of enforcing the weight limit on a permanent basis is to lower the weight limit to 3 tonnes and include a width restriction with physical islands with bollards forcing larger vehicles to seek alternate routes.
- 2.4 The new weight limit on the bridge would require any traffic impeded by the weight limit to go through the village. As such, it is recommended that any lower weight limit is implemented on a temporary basis to allow the necessary repair works to be undertaken to limit the overall impact on the general area.
- 2.5 Following recent meetings with the Highways Agency, SCC have received a written commitment from the Highways Agency to replace the deck of the bridge as part of the M3 Managed Motorway works which are due for completion by June 2017.
- 2.6 The deck replacement will require a road closure at some point during the construction. However, by replacing the deck, the new structure will be sufficient to remove all weight limits over the structure following completion

and potentially reduce the number of larger vehicles using Windlesham as a through route.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 Leave the current 25 tonne weight limit in place. This option is advised against as all the analytical assessment calculations show that this structure can no longer carry the weight of traffic safely.
- 3.2 Implement a new temporary 3 tonne weight limit with 6'6" width restriction to provide permanent enforcement of the restrictions. This is the recommended option.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Before bringing this report to the Local Area Team, Surrey Highways have discussed the proposal with a number of stakeholders, including Cllr Goodman, Surrey Police, and the Highways Agency.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 All costs of implementing the new weight and width restriction, including legal notices, will be covered by the Highways Agency.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

6.1 N/A.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The lower weight limit may temporarily increase the number of large vehicles on local roads in Windlesham. However, due to the nature of the agreement with the Highways Agency, the impact will be for a limited time and will result in the removal of the 25 tonne permanent weight limit and a long term reduction in heavy vehicles driving through the village.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

9.1 To ensure the long term structural integrity of Woodlands Lane Bridge and safeguard the users of both the local highway and the motorway, it is recommended that the current weight limit of 25 tonnes is temporarily replaced by a 3 tonne weight limit and a 6'6" width restriction is also included in the scheme.

9.2 The Area Team Manager, Andrew Milne, is given responsibility, in consultation with the Chairman and Local Member, to resolve any objections to the proposal.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

10.1 Should the Committee approve the new weight limit and width restriction on the bridge, Surrey County Council will progress advertising the temporary removal of the 25 tonne weight limit and replacement with a 3 tonne weight limit and 6'6" width restriction.

10.2 If there are no irresolvable objections to the proposal, the new signage and width restriction will be introduced in line with the activation of the temporary width restriction.

Contact Officer: Peter Orchard (0300 200 1003)

Consulted: Local County Councillor, Surrey Police, Highways Agency

Annexes: Annex 1: Letter from Highways Agency

Sources/background papers: NA

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)****DATE: 2nd October 2014****LEAD OFFICER: Leigh Middleton, Lead Youth Officer (West Surrey)****SUBJECT: Creating Opportunities for Young People – Early Help****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Services for Young People is re-commissioning services for 2015-2020 and the new service model will be presented to Cabinet on 23 September 2014. The current Local Prevention commission ends on 31 August 2015 and new funding agreements will be awarded for provision to start on 1 September 2015, subject to Cabinet approval of the new service model.

The Youth Task Group (YTG) has developed a set of priorities for Local Prevention in Surrey Heath which is based on local needs. Providers who bid for Local Prevention will be asked to respond to the local needs and priorities identified.

The Local Committee is asked to approve the Surrey Heath local priorities so that the procurement exercise can start in October.

RECOMMENDATIONS:**The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to :**

- (i) Approve the local priorities (Annex 1), to be considered by providers, focusing on the identified needs of Surrey Heath and the geographical neighbourhoods prioritised by the Youth Task Group.
- (ii) Note that approval is subject to approval of the Services for Young People model by Cabinet on 23rd September 2014.
- (iii) Note the changes to the council scheme of delegation which provides increased decision making to local commissioning in relation to youth work and Surrey Outdoor Learning and Development (SOLD) (Annex 1A).

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Local Prevention has been in place across Surrey Heath since 1 April 2012. It has contributed significantly to the reduction in young people becoming Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET). It is therefore recommended that this early help commission is re-commissioned for 2015-20.

These recommendations will:

- a) Support the Council's policy of Creating Opportunities for Young People.
- b) Support the Council's priority to provide early help for children, young people and their families.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

Local Prevention is a commission which aims to reduce risk factors and increase protective factors for young people who are identified as being most at risk of becoming Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET). Local Prevention commissions preventative opportunities for young people in school years 8 to 11. The commission is delivered outside of core school hours all year round.

- 1.1 The first Local Prevention was awarded to Collingwood College and Surrey Clubs for Young People and ran until 31st August 2013.
- 1.2 Re-commissioning took place in 2013 and a funding agreement was awarded to Eikon to deliver the provision.
- 1.3 Current provision is delivered outside youth centres but the new provision will be linked more closely to youth work delivery to provide a seamless service for young people at risk of becoming NEET.
- 1.4 In the last bidding round providers could bid for any amount above 25% of the funding available. Providers will now be able to bid for any amount above 10% of the funding available to encourage smaller providers of specialist niche services to bid.
- 1.5 The amount allocated to each of the eleven Boroughs and Districts is reviewed each commissioning cycle and is based on the needs of each area based on the NEET and Risk of NEET Indicator (RONI) cohorts.
- 1.6 Local Prevention targets priority neighbourhoods with the highest numbers of young people at risk of becoming NEET, who are NEET or who have offended. Providers must operate in these neighbourhoods.
- 1.7 The new provision will place a stronger emphasis on Early Help referrals and will build the role of the Lead Professional into the commission.
- 1.8 Services for Young People previously came to the Local Committee in summer of 2014 to seek views on increased delegation in relation to Centre Based Youth Work (CBYW) and SOLD. The Local Committee welcomed this change which is now being formally put to Cabinet for approval on 23rd September. Changes will be made to council delegation. Please see Annexe 1A.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 Services for Young People's strategic objective is for all young people to be employable. Local Prevention contributes to this by reducing risk factors that may lead to a young person becoming NEET.
- 2.2 This provision improves outcomes for young people in response to the priorities identified by the YTG.
- 2.3 It supports localism by providing highly targeted services in the Borough of Surrey Heath.
- 2.4 The drop in minimum bids from 25% to 10% of funding available will open up the market for smaller organisations.

- 2.5 The Surrey Heath Youth Task Group has identified local priorities for commissioning which are included in Annex A.
- 2.6 The local priorities are based on an assessment of the local needs which are summarised below:
- Old Dean had the highest number of young people who were NEET during 2013-14 (17), followed by St Michaels (12) and Frimley (9). Old Dean also had the highest number of young people who were identified as at risk of becoming NEET at 62, followed by St Michaels (38) and Watchetts (16).
 - At 10, Frimley had the highest number of young people who received substantive outcomes or Youth Restorative Interventions (YRIs) as a result of offending behaviour, followed by Old Dean (9).
 - The 4 most deprived super output areas in Surrey Heath are in Old Dean, St Michaels and Watchetts (Surrey Heath 008A, 004C, 004A and 2D, 008F).
 - Almost 1 in 5 of the young people who were NEET had previously had school action plans when they were in school.
 - Young people with a moderate level of special educational needs and/or disabilities are overrepresented in Surrey Heath's RONI cohort, alongside 1 in 4 who have experienced a fixed term exclusion from school.
 - Surrey Heath's 10-19 year old population is estimated at 10,200 in 2014 (7.7% of Surrey's 10-19 population). This is forecast to remain the same for the next five years.*

*ONS 2012-based Subnational Population Projections

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The Surrey Heath set of local priorities have been developed by the Youth Task Group and identifies the key priorities for Surrey Heath to prevent young people from becoming NEET.
- 3.2 The recommendations focus on key geographical neighbourhoods and community priorities. The Youth Task Group agreed that there should be borough-wide access to any commissioned services particularly for Early Help referrals.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 The proposals for re-commissioning Services for Young People including Local Prevention were published on the 1st July 2014 for response by 31st July 2014 in the document Creating Opportunities for Young People, Re-commissioning for 2015 to 2020, Engagement Paper.

ITEM 10

- 4.2 During July 2014 engagement events were run to obtain feedback from all Services for Young People staff (full and part time), partners, providers, elected members and young people in target groups.
- 4.3 A survey was carried out on the Surrey Says website.
- 4.4 A Provider Conference was held for existing and potential new providers to get feedback on the Engagement paper.
- 4.5 Over 170 people attended the events listed above.
- 4.6 The Engagement Paper feedback was presented to the Creating Opportunities for Young People Project Board and as a result of this the decision to closely align Local Prevention to Youth Work provision was made.
- 4.7 On the 23rd September 2014 the Services for Young People model will be presented to Cabinet for approval.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

5.1 The re-commissioning of service addresses planned savings included in the MTFP 2014-2019. The model also includes flexibility in the eventuality of future savings being required either for 2015-16 or subsequent years. All contracts include standard break clauses and the ability to revise funding level if budget changes occur.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 Surrey Heath's devolved commissioning budget is targeted to groups who are vulnerable or at risk of becoming NEET.
- 6.2 Young People are expected to benefit from a holistic service model which has been developed and informed by experience, good practice and feedback from a range of stakeholders.
- 6.3 An Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) has been prepared for the new Commissioning model and this will accompany the report to be presented to Cabinet for approval on 23rd September 2014.
- 6.4 The EIA has highlighted that localised decision-making might disadvantage those who have protected characteristics because of the small number of young people with protected characteristics in each borough / district resulting in their needs being missed. It is proposed, therefore, that priority is given to young people with protected characteristics, where this impacts negatively on their employability when allocating individual grants and youth small grants. This would enable specialist organisations to secure funding to provide services for these young people.

7. LOCALISM:

The following areas have been identified by the Youth Task Group as communities which would benefit from Local Prevention delivery: James Road Estate, St Michaels, Old Dean Estate, Brookleys Estate Chobham, Heatherside, Lightwater,

Bristow Road Estate, Frimley, Mytchett and Deepcut, Gypsy Roma Traveller sites near Swift Lane and Chobham.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:	
Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	Set out below.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	Set out below.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	Set out below.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	Set out below.
Public Health	Set out below.

8.1 Crime and Disorder implications

Evidence shows that young people who are participating in education, training or employment are less likely to commit crime

8.2 Sustainability implications

By commissioning local organisations, it is anticipated that there will be a reduction in the need for travel. This will contribute to the reduction in carbon emissions.

8.3 Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications

Young people who are looked after are a key target group for Services for Young People.

8.4 Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

Services for Young People plays a key role in safeguarding vulnerable children and young people in Surrey.

8.5 Public Health implications

Services for Young People deliver a number of services that improve the health of young people in Surrey, in particular providing them with information so that they make informed choices about healthy lifestyles, including sexual health.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The local specification has been developed in consultation with the Youth Task Group to ensure that bids are tailored to meet local needs.

The Local Committee is asked to:

- a) Approve the Surrey Heath specification (Annex A) to be considered by providers focusing on the identified needs of Surrey Heath and the geographical neighbourhoods prioritised by the Youth Task Group.

b) Note that approval is subject to approval of the Services for Young People model by Cabinet on 23rd September 2014.

c) Note the changes to the council scheme of delegation which provides increased decision making to local commissioning in relation to youth work and Surrey Outdoor Learning and Development (SOLD).

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 The Services for Young People model will be presented to Cabinet on 23rd September for approval.
- 10.2 Subject to approval by Cabinet, officers will develop a prospectus to provide those organisations who wish to bid with the necessary local information.
- 10.3 Officers will invite organisations to submit bids which will be short-listed by the Commissioning and Development Team.
- 10.4 Bidder presentations will take place where the short-listed providers will present their proposals to the Youth Task Group.
- 10.5 A recommendation to award Surrey Heath Local Prevention funding agreements will be brought to the first meeting of the Local Committee in 2015 for approval.
- 10.6 It is anticipated that the new provider(s) will be in place for 1 September 2015.

Contact Officer:

Leigh Middleton, Lead Youth Officer (West Surrey)
07854 870393

Consulted: Officers, members, public, stakeholders, partners.

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Surrey Heath Local priorities

Annex 1A - Proposed amendments of Constitution Part 3. Executive Functions of Local Committees.

Sources/background papers:

N/A

Local Early Help Priorities – Surrey Heath

Funding available: TBC

Young people who are NEET and identified as at risk of becoming NEET

In July 2014 30 young people were classed as NEET and 1 young person was at risk of becoming NEET (RONI). Almost half the young people who are NEET have been NEET before.

Overview of Local Prevention in Surrey Heath

The priority for Local Prevention in Surrey Heath is to prevent young people of secondary school age from becoming NEET by removing barriers to participation for young people who are identified as most at risk of becoming NEET and building their resilience.

Prevention activities should be co-produced with young people and delivered in the local community. Preventative services must demonstrate high-quality delivery and a focus on meeting the individual needs of young people identified as being at Risk of NEET (RONI).

Local Prevention activity must take place outside the school day and be delivered from premises other than the Youth Centres in Surrey Heath. Initial contact can be made in schools.

Identified Neighbourhoods

Based on knowledge of local need, the Surrey Heath Local Committee Youth Task Group have identified the following neighbourhoods as being in need of this type of provision. Providers must deliver from one or more of these areas of Surrey Heath:

- James Road Estate
- St Michaels
- Old Dean Estate
- Brookleys Estate, Chobham
- Heatherside
- Lightwater
- Bristow Road Estate
- Frimley
- Mytchett and Deepcut
- Gypsy Roma Traveller sites near Swift Lane and Chobham

Local Needs

- Young people with special educational needs and/or disabilities (SEND) to anticipate their needs as they prepare for participation in education, training and employment post-16
- Teenage parents – a need to prevent teenage pregnancy, but also support those who do become young parents to remain in education and able to participate
- Drugs and alcohol –support for young people where substance misuse (legal highs and cannabis use are a particular problem) is impacting on their future employability and resilience to remain in mainstream education
- Travellers –some Traveller young people have mental health needs, including social skills and low self esteem, as well as low aspirations and motivation

ITEM 10

- Anti-social behaviour for example noise and litter is an issue, therefore there is a need for an increase in activities for older young people (14-17yrs) in order to reduce boredom

Priority Outcomes:

- Numeracy and literacy improved
- Physical wellbeing improved
- Emotional wellbeing improved
- Mental wellbeing improved
- Social wellbeing improved
- Offending and anti-social behaviour prevented
- Young people's safety in communities is improved
- Transport for young people is improved
- Informed decisions made about use of free time

Local ways of working:

- Work should be done in a way that builds relationships with young people over a prolonged period of time rather than just a series of short-term (6 week) projects.
- Projects should work with young people and communities to reduce young people's isolation for those communities.
- Projects should be preventative and not just positive activities

Annexe 1a

Proposed Amendments to Constitution Part 3

Executive Functions of Local Committees

Changes to Section 1 Paragraph 7.2

Proposed additions are shown in italics and proposed deletions are shown in brackets in bold.

b) Decisions on local services and budgets

In relation to the District or Borough they serve each local committee will take decisions delegated to them by the Leader and/or Cabinet on the following local services and budgets, to be taken in accordance with the financial framework and policies of the County Council, within a framework of agreed performance and resources:

(iv) In relation to youth services:

a) The approval of prevention priorities for Young People (**not in education, employment or training (NEET)**), for the relevant borough or district area after consideration of any local needs assessment.

b) To apportion the delegated funding for young people between Local Prevention (**Framework**), Grants and Individual Prevention Grants categories of funding, in accordance with the allocated budget.

c) Approve the award of Local Prevention (**Framework**) *funding agreements* for the provision of local prevention services for the relevant borough or district in accordance with the allocated budget (**and to pre-qualified providers**).

This power to be exercised by the Portfolio Holder in the event that the relevant local committee is unable to award a (**grant(s)**) *funding agreement(s)* (due to the presence of conflicts of interest which result in the body being inquorate).

d) To approve Youth Task Group advice on the allocation of Community Youth Work and SOLD Local Offer resources to meet local priorities for young people in the local area.

Changes to Section 1 Paragraph 7.3

Service Monitoring, Scrutiny & Issues of Local Concern

The Local Committees may:

xii) Scrutinise the impact of Local Prevention (**Framework**), *Community Youth Work and SOLD Local Offer* in accordance with prevention priorities for Young People (**not in education, employment or training (NEET)**) in the local area.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (Surrey Heath)****DATE:** 2 October 2014**LEAD OFFICER:** MICHELLE COLLINS**SUBJECT:** LOCAL COMMITTEE & MEMBERS' ALLOCATION FUNDING - UPDATE**DIVISION:** ALL**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Surrey County Council Councillors receive funding to spend on local projects that help to promote social, economic or environmental well-being in the neighbourhoods and communities of Surrey. This funding is known as Members' Allocation.

For the financial year 2014/15 the County Council has allocated £10,300 revenue funding to each County Councillor and £35,000 capital funding to each Local Committee. This report provides an update on the projects that have been funded since April 2014 to date.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to note:

- (i) The amounts that have been spent from the Members' Allocation and Local Committee capital budgets, as set out in Annex 1 of this report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The allocation of the Committee's budgets is intended to enhance the wellbeing of residents and make the best possible use of the funds. Greater transparency in the use of public funds is achieved with the publication of what Members' Allocation funding has been spent on.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 The County Council's Constitution sets out the overall Financial Framework for managing the Local Committee's delegated budgets and directs that this funding should be spent on local projects that promote the social, environmental and economic well-being of the area.
- 1.2 In allocating funds councillors are asked to have regard to Surrey County Council's Corporate Strategy 2010-14 Making A Difference that highlights five themes which make Surrey special and which it seeks to maintain:
- A safe place to live;
 - A high standard of education;
 - A beautiful environment;
 - A vibrant economy;
 - A healthy population
- 1.3 As with all expenditure by the Council, spending of members' allocations should:
- Be directed to activities for which the County Council has legal powers;
 - Meet demonstrable local needs;
 - Deliver value for money, so that there is evidence of the outcomes achieved;
 - Be consistent with County Council policies;
 - Be approved through a process that is open and transparent, consultative, accountable, and auditable;
 - Where appropriate, allow opportunities to be taken to pool funds with partner organisations.
- 1.4 Member Allocation funding is made to organisations on a one-off basis, so that there should be no expectation of future funding for the same or similar purpose. It may not be used to benefit individuals, or to fund schools for direct delivery of the National Curriculum, or to support a political party.

2. RECENT COMPLETED PROJECTS:

- 2.1 Several projects have been taken place within the last 3 months, here are a couple of the projects

Bagshot Centenary Garden

A grant of £979.10 has contributed to the successful installation of a Centenary Garden in Bagshot Cemetery. A raised bed has been built in the shape of a cross – to represent the sacrifice of the men of Bagshot, Lightwater and Windlesham who lost their lives in the war. A carved stone sits in the centre of the bed engraved with the words

*Lest We Forget
1914-2014
WWI Centenary*

Wooden Benches for West End

A contribution £550 has enabled the replacement of two wooden benches next to the pond at the West End Recreation Ground.

The original benches, much used by the local community, had needed to be removed for safety reasons. They are now able to continue sitting and enjoying the beauty of the surroundings.

3. ANALYSIS:

- 3.1 All the bids detailed in Annex 1 have been considered by and received support from the local county councillor and been assessed by the Community Partnerships Team as meeting the County Council's required criteria.

4. OPTIONS:

- 4.1 The Committee is being asked to note the bids that have already been approved.

5. CONSULTATIONS:

- 5.1 In relation to new bids the local councillor will have discussed the bid with the applicant, and Community Partnerships Team will have consulted relevant Surrey County Council services and partner agencies as required.

6. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 Each project detailed in this report has completed a standard application form giving details of timescales, purpose and other funding applications made. The county councillor proposing each project has assessed its merits prior to the project's approval. All bids are received and scrutinised by officers in the County's Community Partnership Team. We also contact officers from other services and departments for advice if we require additional information or specialist knowledge to assess the suitability of projects. We ensure that bids comply with the Council's Financial Framework which contains the financial rules and regulations governing how Members' Allocations funding can be spent .
- 6.2 The current financial position statements detailing the funding by each member of the Committee are attached at **Annex 1**. Please note these figures will not include any applications that were approved after the deadline for this report had passed.

7. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 7.1 The allocation of the Members' Allocation and Local Committee's budgets is intended to enhance the wellbeing of residents and make the best possible use of the funds. Funding is available to all residents, community groups or organisations based in, or serving, the area. The success of the bid depends

entirely upon its ability to meet the agreed criteria, which is the same for all projects.

8. LOCALISM:

- 8.1 The budgets are allocated by the local members to support the needs within their communities.

9. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report

10. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 10.1 The spending proposals put forward for this meeting have been assessed by officers in the Community Partnerships Team, against the County standards for appropriateness and value for money within the agreed Financial Framework.

11. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 11.1 Payments to the organisations have, or will be paid to the applicants, and organisations are requested to provide publicity of the funding e.g posters, leaflets, articles in newsletters. We also require evidence that the funding has been spent within 6 months e.g receipts, photos, invoices.

Contact Officer:

Jenny Harvey, Local Support Assistant, 01483 518111.

Consulted:

- Local Members have considered and vetted the applications
- Community Partnership Team have assessed the applications

Annexes:

Annex 1 – The breakdown of spend to date per County Councillor, including the breakdown of spend to date per County Councillor of the Local Committee Budget.

Sources/background papers:

- All bid forms are retained by the Community Partnerships Team
-

Surrey Heath Members Allocations Expenditure - Balance Remaining 2014-2015

County Councillors have £10,300 to spend on projects to benefit the local community, the local committee has £35,000 capital funding.

Bill Chapman	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE	DATE PAID
				£10,300.00	
		Eagle Radio	Radio workshops for schools (bid form not yet received)	£1,000.00	
	EF800238135	Boccia England	Training costs for ten people who will then coach this form of seated bowls	£460.00	
	EF800240116	Surrey Heath Neighbourhood	Help with costs of 'Heathwatch', home / neighbourhood security publication	£1,000.00	
BALANCE REMAINING				£7,840.00	

Denis Fuller	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE	DATE PAID
	EF800227729	Kings International College	Initial building work for a wildlife pond to be constructed by the pupils	1347.37	13/06/2014
BALANCE REMAINING				£8,952.63	

Mike Goodman	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE	DATE PAID
	EF700225949	Windle Valley Youth Project	Road name signs for 'Badger Swift Way' - named by the local community.	£640.00	12.05.2014
		SCC, Corporate Parenting	Contribution towards the Bursary Fund for projects for Looked After Children	£250.00	
	EF700247190	Windlsham Parish Council	Creation of a Memorial Garden in Baghot Cemetary	£979.10	
BALANCE REMAINING				£8,430.90	

David Ivison	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE	DATE PAID
	EF700245921	Surrey Heath Museum	Archeological audit	£10,300.00	
		Heather Ridge School	Kindles for use by the pupils (bid form not yet received)	£500.00	
		Frimley Scouts	Support of the making of a promotional video (bid form not yet received)	£1,000.00	
	EF800236414	Prior Heath School PTA	one-off contribution to assist with overheads	£1,500.00	
		SCC, Corporate Parenting	Contribution towards the Bursary Fund for projects for Looked After Children	£250.00	19.08.2014
	EF700248312	St Francis' Church, Frimley	Assistance with replacement front boundary fence	£500.00	
		Heatherside Senior Citizens	Christmas lunch (bid form not yet received)	£1,000.00	
BALANCE REMAINING				£400.00	
				£5,150.00	

Surrey Heath Members Allocations Expenditure - Balance Remaining 2014-2015

County Councillors have £10,300 to spend on projects to benefit the local community, the local committee has £35,000 capital funding.

Adrian Page	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE	DATE PAID
	EF800238667	West End Parish Council	Two replacement wooden benches next to pond on West End recreation ground.	£10,300.00	
	EF800238276	West End Village Hall Manag	Replacement of fire exit doors at Tringham Hall, West End	£550.00	
		SCC, Corporate Parenting	Contribution towards the Bursary Fund for projects for Looked After Children	£2,500.00	
				£500.00	
BALANCE REMAINING				£6,750.00	

Chris Pitt	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE	DATE PAID
				£10,300.00	
BALANCE REMAINING				£10,300.00	

Local Committee Capital Funding	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	LC CAPITAL	DATE PAID
				£35,000.00	
BALANCE REMAINING				£35,000.00	

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)****DATE:** 2 October 2014**LEAD OFFICER:** Nikkie Thornton-Bryar**SUBJECT:** Forward Plan**DIVISION:** All**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

This report is produced for each meeting of the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) so that members can review the forward plan. The reports that are currently anticipated will be received by the committee are outlined in paragraph 3.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to note and comment on the forward plan contained in this report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The report contains an updated version of the Local Committee's forward plan.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) may receive a forward plan at each meeting setting out the anticipated reports for future meetings. The forward plan will be used in preparation for the next committee meeting. However, this is a flexible forward plan and all items are subject to change.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 No analysis was required for this report.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 In addition to the following, requests from Members for other reports will be welcomed.

Thursday 11 December 2014

1. Petition - The Hatches Path improvements
2. Petition – A30 Bus Lane
3. Petition response – Pine Ridge School
4. Highways Update
5. Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme
6. Surrey Fire & Rescue Service Annual Report
7. Members Allocations Update
8. Forward Plan

Thursday 12 March 2015

1. Petition responses (if applicable)
2. Highways Update
3. Members Allocations Update
4. Forward Plan

4. CONSULTATIONS:

Members and Surrey County Council officers have been consulted.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 There are no financial implications of the forward plan.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 There are no equality and diversity implications arising out of the forward plan.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 Future reports and discussion topics for the Local Committee are included in the forward plan, giving all residents and businesses in the Surrey Heath area notice of topics on future agendas.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 The committee is asked to note the forward plan contained in this report.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 No further action is required.

Contact Officer: Nikkie Thornton-Bryar, Community Partnerships and Committee Officer (Surrey Heath)
01276 800269

Consulted: Members and Surrey County Council officers have been consulted.

Annexes: None

Sources/background papers: None

This page is intentionally left blank