

**THESE MINUTES REMAIN DRAFT UNTIL FORMALLY APPROVED AT
THE 7 MARCH 2016 LOCAL COMMITTEE MEETING**

Minutes of the meeting of the
REIGATE AND BANSTEAD LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 2.00 pm on 14 December 2015
at Reigate Town Hall, Castlefield Road, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0SH.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin (Chairman)
- * Ms Barbara Thomson (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mrs Natalie Bramhall
- * Mr Jonathan Essex
- Mr Bob Gardner
- * Mr Michael Gosling
- * Dr Zully Grant-Duff
- Mr Ken Gulati
- * Mrs Kay Hammond
- Mr Nick Harrison

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Michael Blacker
- * Cllr Dr Lynne Hack
- * Cllr Norman Harris
- Cllr David Jackson
- * Cllr Frank Kelly
- * Cllr Roger Newstead
- * Cllr Jamie Paul
- * Cllr Tony Schofield
- Cllr Bryn Truscott
- * Cllr Mrs Rachel Turner

* In attendance

39/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Bob Gardner, Mr Ken Gulati, Mr Nick Harrison and Cllr Bryn Truscott.

Mr Michael Gosling left the meeting at 3.00pm, and Mrs Natalie Bramhall, Cllr Dr Lynne Hack and Cllr Tony Schofield left the meeting at 4.00pm.

40/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 2]

The following correction was made to the minutes of the meeting held on 14 September 2015:

22/15: "He requested follow up from Paul and said he looked forward to the report **requested** in December **2014**."

Subject to the above amendment, the minutes of the meetings held on 14 September 2015 and 19 October 2015 were agreed as a true record.

41/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 3]

None received.

42/15 PETITIONS (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 4]

43/15 THREE ARCH ROAD TRAFFIC LIGHT JUNCTION [Item 4a]

A petition was received from Mr Brian Mayne to change the position of the Give Way sign and road markings on the junction of Three Arch Road traffic light junction.

The Area Highways Manager thanked the petitioner, who was unable to attend the meeting, for his interest and concern, and informed members that she would forward the information to the project team. The Vice-Chairman and divisional Member for Earlswood and Reigate South stated that she was pleased the issue was being looked into as this was a busy route into East Surrey Hospital, much used by ambulances. Members reported witnessing many near misses at the junction, and that the hospital had made requests to the Borough Council for improvements to ambulance access. The Transport Policy Project Manager added that the junction was part of the scope of the Greater Redhill Sustainable Transport Package.

The Committee **NOTED** the response.

44/15 STATION ROAD ROUNDABOUT, REDHILL [Item 4b]

The Committee **NOTED** the response.

45/15 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 5]

One question was received from Ms Gillian Hein. The question and response are attached to the minutes as **Appendix A**.

46/15 FORMAL MEMBER QUESTIONS (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 6]

None received.

47/15 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 7]

Item 4, 14 September 2015 meeting - The divisional Member from Redhill East requested that the outstanding Walkability Survey, requested in December 2014 be added to the tracker.

Subject to the above, the Decision Tracker was **NOTED**.

48/15 EPSOM AND BANSTEAD SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT PACKAGE [FOR DECISION] [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Neil McClure, Transport Policy Project Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

- Clarification was sought regarding the expected 25% local contribution, and which authorities would be contributing. The Project Manager informed Members that the figures in the Expression of Interest had been superseded, and the correct total was £4.8 million, with a £1.2 million local contribution coming from Surrey County Council, Epsom & Ewell Borough Council, Reigate & Banstead Borough Council and private investors such as bus companies. The exact figures from each authority would not be known until the business was finalised in early 2016.
- Discussion took place regarding the involvement of bus operators; it was noted that Tadworth is not currently served by buses at weekends and during the evening, which makes it difficult for staff at the Children's Trust to use public transport. The Project Manager noted that bus operators will be asked to contribute to service improvements. It was also noted that many residents travelled into Sutton for work; it was confirmed that Transport for London were one of the bus operators in the scope of the project.
- Confirmation was sought that all local Members affected would be able to feed their views into the task group; the Chairman informed the Committee that this would be the case. Mr Nick Harrison had agreed to act as an additional substitute Member of the Task Group.
- Concerns were raised regarding the viability of promoting non-car based travel when many local residents owned more than one car. The Project Manager stated that improving bus, pedestrian and cycle routes would provide people with alternatives to using their cars, and would help those without cars to access work.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) AGREED:

- (i) To note the project content being developed for inclusion in the business case submission.
- (ii) To the establishment of the proposed joint Member Task Group and the proposed Members from the Reigate & Banstead Local Committee, to support this project, as set out in Annex 1 to the report submitted, with the addition of Mr Nick Harrison as a substitute.
- (iii) To approve the Terms of Reference for the above Member Task Group, as set out in Annex 2 to the report submitted.

[Mr Michael Gosling asked for his abstention from the vote to be recorded.]

49/15 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR INFORMATION] [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highway Manager and Anita Guy, Principal Engineer

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

- Members requested that divisional Members be sent information regarding issues on the border of their divisions.
- An update on the proposed VMS outside St John's School was requested. The Principal Engineer reported that the signs had been ordered but work was required to supply electricity to the post. She agreed to provide an update outside the meeting.
- Members wished to know whether the Banstead crossroads scheme included the single lane pinch point. The Principal Engineer informed the Committee that this was one of the schemes to be included in the Epsom-Banstead Sustainable Transport Package, and that she would confirm outside the meeting.
- A question was asked regarding the safety measures outside Sandcross School. The Principal Engineer agreed to provide an update outside the meeting.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) NOTED the report.

50/15 HIGHWAYS FORWARD PROGRAMME 2016/17 - 2017/18 [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION] [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highway Manager and Anita Guy, Principal Engineer

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

- Members requested sight of the recent Highways capital assets survey. The Area Highway Manager agreed to circulate the document.
- A question was asked regarding the design brief for a new junction at Buckland Road and Flanchford Road, Reigate. Local Members requested that the scheme be prioritised on safety grounds. The Principal Engineer reported that the design team had the brief, but funding was dependent on accident figures as the Road Safety Team were responsible. There was a possibility of small safety scheme funding being available, but the total cost of the scheme was unknown at this stage. She agreed to update local Members outside the meeting.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead):

- (i) **NOTED** that the Local Committee's devolved highways budget for capital works has been reduced as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan, to £390,338 in 2016/17 and to £334,575 in 2017/18, and that it has been assumed that the revenue budget for 2016/17 remains the same as for 2015/16, at £217,180.
- (ii) **NOTED** that a further report will be presented to the March 2016 meeting of the Reigate & Banstead Local Committee to agree a

revised programme should the devolved budget vary from these amounts.

- (iii) **AGREED** that the capital improvement schemes allocation for Reigate & Banstead be used to progress the Integrated Transport Schemes programme set out in Annex 1 to the report submitted.
- (iv) **AUTHORISED** that the Area Highway Manager, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, be able to vire money between the schemes agreed in Annex 1 to the report submitted, if required.
- (v) **AGREED** that the capital maintenance schemes allocation for Reigate & Banstead be divided equitably between County Councillors to carry out Local Structural Repair, and that the schemes to be progressed be agreed by the Area Maintenance Manager in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local divisional Members.
- (vi) **AUTHORISED** the Area Maintenance Engineer, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant local divisional Member, to use £67,180 of the revenue maintenance budget for 2016/17 as detailed in Table 2 of the report submitted.
- (vii) **AGREED** that £5,000 per County Councillor be allocated from the revenue maintenance budget for Highways Localism Initiative works, and that if bids for this funding have not been received by the end of May 2016, the monies revert to the relevant Member to use to fund Community Enhancement works.
- (viii) **AGREED** that Members should contact the Area Maintenance Engineer to discuss their specific requirements with regard to any Community Enhancement allocation and arrange for the work activities to be managed by the Area Maintenance Engineer on their behalf.
- (ix) **AGREED** that the remaining £100,000 of the revenue maintenance budget be used to fund a gang to carry out minor maintenance works throughout Reigate & Banstead, managed on Members' behalf by the Area Maintenance Engineer.

51/15 ON STREET PARKING ENFORCEMENT UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR INFORMATION] [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager and Jacquie Joseph, Parking Services Manager (Reigate & Banstead Borough Council)

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

- The Chairman wished to know why the service was no longer making a profit as it had done previously. The Parking Services Manager informed the Committee that enforcement of on-street parking is a costly activity, but in order to make savings, a cap had been placed on property costs, and the service was looking to make the most efficient use of its existing property. Discussion took place around this point. The Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager added that the Parking Task Group had looked at costs and compared Reigate & Banstead with other boroughs/districts; however, there were certain differences that made it more difficult for Reigate & Banstead to make a profit.
- Members requested more detailed financial information, setting out the difference between the position three years ago and today.
- Concerns were raised that yellow lines were not visible due to leaf fall and other debris. The Parking Services Manager agreed to look into this.
- Concerns were raised that the report omitted to mention enforcement activity at Earlswood, Woodhatch and Salfords shopping parades. The Parking Services Manager informed the Committee that she was aware of issues in Salfords and Earlswood. She also noted that the service was reviewing the timing and frequency of operations outside all schools.
- In light of the need for further information, the Chairman did not feel that it was possible for the Committee to note the report as it currently stood, and requested officers to produce a new report for the next meeting of the Local Committee.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) REQUESTED that a further, detailed report setting out the financial information requested above and details of activity at all the borough's shopping parades be brought to the next meeting of the Committee in March 2016.

52/15 EAST SURREY COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP - UPDATE [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Gordon Falconer, Senior Manager, Community Safety; Inspector Angie Austin, Surrey Police; Ben Murray, Licensing and Regulation Manger, Reigate & Banstead Borough Council

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

- Members wished to know how the funding provided by the Local Committee had been spent within the borough. The Licensing and Regulation Manager reported that a considerable amount had been spent on covert mobile CCTV and signage for a flytipping project; as well as cameras in vehicles and environmental changes to help reduce drugs and criminality on the Cromwell Estate in Redhill.
- Members welcomed the input of the Clinical Commissioning Groups to the CSP as it was felt useful to have a representative from the health service. Similarly the involvement of the housing associations was welcomed.
- The Local Member for Redhill West stated that she was more than happy to contribute Member Allocation funding to the Cromwell Estate project as she was contacted frequently by residents regarding drug issues there.

She asked how local Members could feed in such concerns to the CSP. The Senior Manager reported that he was in the process of producing a guidance note for Members regarding the Community Incident Action Group (CIAG) and Joint Action Group (JAG) which would enable Members to report concerns. The Inspector directed Members to ask residents to report concerns, and assured Members that any issues reported to the Council or Police would be dealt with appropriately.

- Members were reminded that they could also direct residents to Surrey Crimestoppers (0800 555111) if they were reluctant to phone the Police. The Chairman asked that Raven Housing Trust be instructed to provide this information to their tenants.
- A request was made to share the content of the CSP review. The Senior Manager agreed to distribute the information.
- Discussion took place regarding the provision of borough-specific information. It was noted that all three Local Committees in the area covered by the East Surrey CSP were receiving the same, strategic report. It was also noted that due to the fact that much funding from the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) is distributed on a countywide basis; for example, the commissioning of domestic abuse outreach work. It is therefore impossible to say how much each borough/district received. However, it was noted that none of the East Surrey CSP's bids to the PCC had been refused.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) NOTED the report.

53/15 EARLY EDUCATION AND CHILDCARE SERVICES AND CHILDREN'S CENTRE SERVICES [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 13]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Phil Osborne, Head of Early Years and Childcare Service

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

- The Chairman thanked the Head of Service and his team for their excellent work.
- Clarification was sought regarding the statistics on the number of children registered with a children's centre and the number of children seen. The Head of Service explained that children had to be seen at least once to be recorded in this statistic.
- Members wished to know what the success rate was of outreach activities. The Head of Service explained that outreach work depended on the size of the catchment area; some children's centres had a large catchment area with some families unable to access the physical centre. Staff would visit the family and register them. The children's centres identify those families requiring additional support. Work is being carried out on assessing outcomes, but anecdotally, parents and other agencies value the service provided.
- A question was asked regarding the entitlement to free childcare, and whether this could be taken at children's centres. The Head of Service explained that only two children's centres within the borough offered this

service (Epsom Downs and Red Oak); the others do not provide early education and childcare services. He noted that there is a lack of childcare provision in some parts of the borough.

- Concerns were raised that some parents were not registering their child with any services (GP, education, children's centre). The Head of Service reported that around 1% of any cohort do not attend pre-school in Surrey. Research into this would be carried out, asking parents why they do not take up places.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) NOTED the report.

54/15 BUCKINGHAMSHIRE AND SURREY TRADING STANDARDS WORK IN REIGATE & BANSTEAD 2015 [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 14]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: David Bullen, Senior Trading Standards Officer

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

- Members thanked the officer for his comprehensive report. It was noted that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service already had a successful volunteer scheme, and many of these volunteers may wish to take on a Trading Standards role.
- Members wished to know whether the service had achieved any success regarding the Proceeds of Crime Act. The officer reported that c. 0.25 million had been confiscated recently from a couple convicted of doorstep crime. Both had been given custodial sentences, and all victims identified would be compensated for the money they had paid out and for any remedial work required.
- Members asked whether the Buy With Confidence (BWC) website had been rebranded following the move to Checkatrade. The officer reported that the website was still running as not all authorities had withdrawn from the scheme. BWC members in Surrey were given the opportunity to transfer to Checkatrade or to the Hampshire BWC scheme. Checkatrade operates a national website. All local Checkatrade members should be Surrey Trading Standards approved and will be able to display a logo. It was noted that businesses are subject to enhanced checks by Trading Standards and if they do not meet standards they will be removed from the scheme. It was also noted that Checkatrade members distribute feedback cards to clients.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) NOTED the report.

55/15 LOCAL COMMITTEE TASK GROUPS [FOR DECISION] [Item 15]

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) AGREED to appoint Cllr Michael Blacker to the vacancy on the Greater Redhill Sustainable Transport Package Task Group.

Meeting ended at: 4.03 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (REIGATE & BANSTEAD)

DATE: 14 DECEMBER 2015



LEAD OFFICER: DAVID CURL, PARKING STRATEGY AND IMPLEMENTATION MANAGER

SUBJECT: FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

DIVISION: TADWORTH, WALTON AND KINGSWOOD

One formal public question has been received from Ms Gillian Hein:

The Council has recently proposed a number of parking changes in Tadworth but these are piecemeal and there have been strong objections from residents. Is it possible to have an overall plan for Tadworth which takes into account problems of through traffic using inappropriate residential streets, commuter parking pressures and congestion points? The current parking proposals to deter commuter parking will increase traffic speeds and push commuter parking further out onto streets currently unaffected.

David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager responds:

As part of the 2015/16 Reigate and Banstead Parking Review we included a number of proposals around Tadworth intended to help manage parking in the village. We have been reviewing the consultation responses and do not plan to go ahead with any where there are a significant number of objections. The feedback we have received from this consultation process will help us shape any further proposals and the council's parking team will work with the county councillor and residents' groups to achieve the best balance of restrictions in the village through our borough wide parking review process.

This page is intentionally left blank