

# Agenda

Tandridge  
Local Committee

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

## Discussion

To include:

- Changes to opening hours at Caterham Hill Library
- Update from the Countryside Access Officer for Tandridge
- Update on Highways Schemes 2015/16



## Venue

**Location:** Tandridge District

Council Offices, Station  
Road East, Oxted,  
Surrey, RH8 0BT

**Date:** Friday, 26 June 2015

**Time:** 10.15 am



**SURREY**

# Get involved

# You can get involved in the following ways

## ***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.

## **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: [sarah.woodworth@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.woodworth@surreycc.gov.uk)

Tel: 01737 737422

Website: <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/tandridge>



Follow @TandridgeLC on Twitter



**SURREY**



## SURREY

---

### Surrey County Council Appointed Members

Mr Nick Skellett CBE, Oxted (Chairman)  
Mr Michael Sydney, Lingfield (Vice-Chairman)  
Mr David Hodge, Warlingham  
Mrs Sally Ann B Marks, Caterham Valley  
Mr John Orrick, Caterham Hill  
Mrs Helena Windsor, Godstone

Chief Executive  
**David McNulty**

Mr Nick Skellett (Chairman) Oxted	Mr Michael Sydney (Vice-Chairman) Lingfield	Mr David Hodge Warlingham
Mrs Sally Ann B Marks Caterham Valley	Mr John Orrick Caterham Hill	Mrs Helena Windsor Godstone

**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 Sarah Woodworth, Community Partnership and Committee Officer on 01737 737422 or write to the Community Partnerships Team at Tandridge District Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted, Surrey, RH8 0BT or [sarah.woodworth@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.woodworth@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.**

**MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE**

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

*Thank you for your co-operation*

**1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

To receive any apologies.

**2 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

(Pages 1 - 12)

To approve the Minutes of the previous meeting as a correct record.

**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 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.

**5 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

To answer any questions from residents or businesses within the Tandridge District 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.

**6 MEMBERS QUESTIONS**

To receive any written questions from Members under Standing Order 47. Notice should be given in writing to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer of formal questions by 12.00 noon four working days before the meeting.

**7 LOCAL COMMITTEE & MEMBERS ALLOCATION FUNDING UPDATE (FOR INFORMATION)**

(Pages 13 - 20)

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 2015/16 the County Council has allocated £10,296 revenue funding to each County Councillor. This report provides an update on the projects that have been funded since April 2015 to date.

*(Report and annex attached).*

**8 LIBRARY OPENING HOURS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION)**

(Pages 21 - 30)

In its search for continuous improvement, and to reduce costs, the library service has recently completed a review which achieves a reduction in the library service's staffing budget of £227,000 for 2015-16 while seeking to retain and improve current levels of service.

In addition to other elements, the review looked at the opening hours for all the Group C community libraries, which for Tandridge, includes Caterham Hill library.

The opening hours of the Community Partnered Libraries (CPLs) are out of scope, as opening hours are set by local steering groups, within an agreed framework with local committees as set out in the county council's Constitution.

*(Report and annex attached).*

**9 REPRESENTATION ON YOUTH TASK GROUP, COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP AND FUNDING (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION)**

(Pages 31 - 38)

The Local Committee is asked to review and agree the terms of reference and membership of the Youth Task Group for 2015-16 and appoint representation to the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership.

The Local Committee (Tandridge) has been delegated £3,337 to support community safety work in the district; this money requires Local Committee agreement to be delegated for use by the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership.

*(Report and Annex attached).*

**10 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES UPDATE 2015/16 (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN)**

(Pages 39 - 54)

At the 12<sup>th</sup> December 2014 Local Committee, Members agreed a programme of revenue and capital highway works in Tandridge. An amended programme of works was agreed on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2015 to take account of the reduced revenue budget. Delegated authority was given to enable the forward programme to be progressed without the need to bring further reports to the Local Committee for decision. This report sets out recent progress. The report also updates Members on the number of enquiries received from customers.

*(Report and Annex attached).*

**11 REVIEW OF COLD WEATHER PLAN AND WINTER SERVICE ARRANGEMENTS (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN)**

(Pages 55 - 58)

Surrey undertakes an annual review of the Highways Cold Weather Plan and winter service at the end of each winter season, including the effectiveness of network coverage, operational improvements, organisational changes and partnership working arrangements. This report seeks the views of the (Tandridge) Local Committee on the delivery of the Winter Service operations in the 2014/15 season, to feedback into the annual review.

*(Report attached).*

**12      ROLE OF COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS MAINTENANCE AND ENFORCEMENT TEAM IN TANDRIDGE (FOR INFORMATION)**

An Officer from the Countryside Access Maintenance and Enforcement Team will provide information on the team's role with regards to the maintenance and protection of Public Rights of Way/Countryside Access in Tandridge.

This page is intentionally left blank

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Tandridge LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 10.15 am on 20 March 2015  
at Victoria Sports & Social Club, Lingfield RH7 6AA.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Mr Michael Sydney (Chairman)
- \* Mr Nick Skellett CBE (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mr David Hodge
- \* Mrs Sally Ann B Marks
- \* Mr John Orrick
- \* Mrs Helena Windsor

\* In attendance

---

**96/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

No apologies were received.

**97/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes of the previous meetings held on the 12 December 2014 and 13 February 2015 were agreed as an accurate record of the meetings.

**98/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

None received.

**99/14 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

Four received.

The petitions and responses (which were provided to the petitioners) are attached to the minutes as **Appendix A**.

Petition 1 – Mr Owen Flaherty presented a petition of 133 signatures, asking for the adoption of service road leading to Audley, St Francis and Sunnydown School, Caterham.

The Chairman referred the Petitioner to the written response.

Mr Flaherty was in attendance and presented the petition. He raised concerns that this is a health and safety issue for the schools. The schools have grown in size considerably since being built to accommodate the local population and so the road is being used more.

## ITEM 2

Divisional Member Mr Orrick suggested that Section 106 monies could be used for this matter as the schools are expanding to meet the growing need of a larger population locally.

Mr Hodge felt it important that the Headteachers and Governors of the school consider all the implications of the adoption of the road by SCC. In becoming a public highway all road users are able to use the road, not only those using the schools.

Members discussed that although De Stafford school had a separate entrance it is close by and may wish to join in to try and resolve access issues.

Mr Orrick offered to meet with the schools outside of the meeting to discuss a way forward on this matter.

Petition 2 – Mr Mark Salter was in attendance and presented a petition signed by 36 local residents to reduce the unrestricted speed limit on Westerham Road (A25).

Mr Salter advised the Committee that since submitting the petition an additional 41 signatures had been collected making the total 77. The Petitioner thanked the Chairman for the response but asked if more could be done other than reducing to 50mph such as providing a crossing as there is currently no safe way to cross the road.

Divisional Member Mr Skellett confirmed that he would be supportive of the 50mph limit although has not looked at the detail.

Members felt that although supportive of the reduced speed limit they would have reservations in a pedestrian crossing as not enough usage to justify the cost. Members agreed to look into this request in further detail.

Petition 3 – Mr Piers Clark was in attendance and presented a petition on behalf of resident in Grange Road, Caterham requesting parking restrictions.

The responding officer advised the petitioner that a proposal of yellow lines with gaps is due for consideration by the Committee as part of the parking item at the meeting. The officer raised that parked cars do slow traffic and reduce speeds on a road, and by removing all parking on Grange road speeds are likely to increase. A balance has to be found in this matter that removing parking on Grange Road would push the issue to another road. The three hour time limit restrictions in Harestone Lane are to be removed and it is hoped that this will alleviate some parking issues.

The Divisional Member Mrs Marks felt that Network Rail, should have a responsibility to provide adequate parking for commuters and rail users. This matter must be addressed as an issue for a number of roads in the Caterham area.

Petition 4 – Mrs Rosemary Brown submitted a petition of 27 signatures requesting a stile be changed back to a kissing gate on footpath 21, Tatsfield.

Mrs Brown was not able to attend the meeting. The Divisional Member Mr Hodge supported the officer's written response.

## **100/14 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

Three formal public questions were received. The written responses are attached to the minutes as **Appendix B**.

### Question 1

Dr John Nathan asked if anything could be done to deal with the speeding traffic in Detillens Lane, Limpsfield. Dr Nathan asked a supplementary question asking how the speed survey was carried out by Surrey. The Senior Highways Engineer advised that an officer sits in a parked car not standing on the pavement, so would not be obvious to the driver that their speed was being recorded. In accordance with the SCC policy the mean speed for a 20mph request would be 24 mph.

### **Member Discussion – Key points**

- Divisional Member, Nick Skellett asked the Parking Team Manager to review Detillens Lane and use parked vehicles as a way of slowing traffic. Mr Skellett also confirmed that a Neighbourhood Plan was being developed in the area and CIL money could possibly be available to assist with this matter.

### Question 2

Mr Peter Forbes asked for an update on the issue of speeding vehicles on the A25 into Nutfield and to reduce the speed limit on Mid Street. The Senior Highways Engineer confirmed that the Committee would be asked to approve the Integrated Transport Scheme Programme for 2015/16 - 2016/17 in Item 13 of the agenda. This included speed management for A25 Nutfield Road and Mid Street.

### Question 3

Parish Councillor Harry Fitzgerald asked for a progress update on the feasibility of a speed reduction table at Dormansland cross roads. The Senior Highways Engineer confirmed that the Committee would be asked to allocate funding for a design to be carried out in Item 13 of the Agenda.

## **101/14 MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

There were two member questions submitted and no member questions were asked informally at the meeting.

The written responses are attached to the minutes as **Appendix C**.

### **Member Discussion – key points**

- With reference to question 1, from Sally Marks, she highlighted concerns that drivers can continue along the A22 towards Caterham

from the M25 roundabout and without having to physically stop at lights, drive in to a residential area. She asked if signage could be reviewed and additional signs erected if necessary to highlight to drivers to slow down on the slip road. The Senior Highways Engineer advised that this would be looked at.

- With reference to question 2, Nick Skellett stated that Surrey County Council policy would not support a reduction in a speed limit to 30mph as the mean speeds are 38 and 35 mph. Mr Skellett asked if the environment could be altered to reduce speeds as just a sign would not be enough. The Senior Highways Engineer advised that once the crossing on the A25 at the top of Snatts Hill, Oxted was completed, speed surveys would be carried out on the A25 west of Limpsfield High Street would be carried out. If these surveys supported a speed limit reduction, then it may be possible to extend this to outside the school. Mr Hodge supported the request to reduce the speed limit outside of the school.

#### **102/14 MEMBERS ALLOCATIONS SUMMARY (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 7]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Sandra Brown, Community Partnership Team Leader – East

**Petitions, Public Question, Statements:** None

#### **Member Discussion – Key Points**

- Members agreed to note the report.
- Mr Hodge advised all that the unspent money from Member Allocations across the whole of Surrey amounted to £22,000 and this would be given to Surrey Save.
- Mrs Marks highlighted the good work that Members had done this year in making a difference in their divisions especially with regards to education. She gave an example of Caterham Children's Centre and the work they have done with young parents and building skills.
- Mr Hodge highlighted the work of Farm Buddies and the success of the 12 young people who took part on this project this year.
- Mr Orrick also highlighted the Looked After Children Bursary and how the money from Members is helping children and young people.
- All Members wished to thank the Community Partnership team for their hard work this year in ensuring that local groups received the funds.

#### **Resolution:**

The Committee NOTED:

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

**103/14 YOUTH- LOCAL PREVENTION TASK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS  
(FOR DECISION) [Item 8]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Jeremy Crouch, Contracts Performance Officer Youth Work

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** None

**Members Discussion – Key Points**

- The Officer presented the report, highlighting to Members that the Youth Task Group felt that there was not a suitable provider to award the Local Prevention in Neighbourhoods contract so in order that timescales are met asked the Committee to approve recommendation (ii).
- Mr Orrick asked for clarification on the 20% reduction to services, the Officer confirmed that this only applied to the neighbourhood element.
- Mr Skellett as Chair of the Youth Task group felt it important that there is continuity and not a gap in the service so suitable option to agree recommendation ii.

**Resolution:**

The Local Committee (Tandridge):

- i). APPROVED the Youth Task Group recommendation to award a contract for a 36 month period for One to One Work from 1 September 2015 to Learning Space for the value of £43,000 per annum (subject to future changes in SYP budgets). Within the contract there is the opportunity to extend the service for further two years, subject to budget changes, provider performance and any changes in the needs of young people.
- ii). APPROVED the delegation of final decision on the award of the Local Prevention in Neighbourhoods grant for a 36 month period from 1 September 2015 to Frank Offer, Head of Commissioning for Young People, in consultation with the Chair of the Youth Task Group.

**104/14 ALLEGED PUBLIC FOOTPATH SOUTH OF TENCHLEYS WOOD,  
BETWEEN FP55 AND BW54, LIMPSFIELD (FOR DECISION) [Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Daniel Williams, Countryside Access Officer

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** None

The Chairman introduced the item for the alleged Public Footpath South of Tenchleys Wood between FP55 and BW54, Limpsfield. Four members of the public had registered to speak on the application. All four spoke in support of the recommendation, the applicant Mr Duncan Ferguson, Mr Robert Neil

## ITEM 2

Mackay, Mrs Helen Ellson and Mr Tony Pearson. Mr Ferguson advised the Committee that he walked the route since the 1960s when he discovered the path had been fenced off five or six years ago. Mr Ferguson wrote to the landowner in 2011 to ask that the gate be unlocked but the letters remained unanswered. Mr Mackay and Mrs Ellson confirmed they had walked the route for the past 40 years and all stated that the route provided wonderful views for local residents and walkers.

The Countryside Access Officer, outlined the duties of the Committee and presented the report, asking the Committee to agree the recommendations. The Officer highlighted that 17 user forms provided for this application, evidenced that they had used this path since 1940s and 16 people used this path during the 20 years between 1987-2007. There is no evidence that they had been stopped before 2007.

### Members Discussions – Key Points

- Members asked in the future if a contextual map could be provided within the written report to show clearly the surrounding area.
- All Members were able to see a clear map at the meeting to establish the location of the alleged footpath.

### Resolution

The Local Committee (Tandridge):

- i. AGREED that public footpath rights are recognised over the route 'A' – 'B' on Drawing No. 3/1/28/H43 and that the application for a MMO under sections 53 and 57 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to modify the DMS by the addition of the footpath is approved. The route will be known as Public Footpath No. 637 (Limpfield).
- ii. AGREED a MMO should be made and advertised to implement these changes. If objections are maintained to such an order, it will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for confirmation

## **105/14 PARKING REVIEW 2014/15 AND UPDATE ON PARKING ENFORCEMENT (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager and Adrian Harris, Assistant Engineer

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** None

The Parking Manager presented the report, highlighting the main aim in the parking review is to improve road safety.

### **Member Discussion – key points**

- Mr John Orrick, stated that if we are putting in yellow lines that parking restrictions are enforced by Reigate and Banstead Borough Council. The Committee agreed with this point.
- Mrs Marks, raised concern that on Edgeworth Close, Caterham that there is a Tandridge District Council owned car park however there are no lines to identify where cars should park therefore drivers are not parking considerately and reducing the number of cars that can use the facility. The Committee agreed a discussion should be held with Tandridge District Council to see if they would be able to carry out improvements the car park.
- Mrs Marks stated in her area many residents want to stop the all day commuter parking, as an example Grange Road. She felt that National Rail had a duty to provide adequate parking for commuters who use their service. Many commuters drive in from other areas to take advantage of cheaper rail travel from the stations in Caterham as part of Transport for London, Zone 6. The Committee agreed that a letter should be sent to the Chief Executive of Tandridge District Council to request a meeting to address the commuter parking issue in Caterham Valley. The Parking Manager stated that care has to be taken not to move the 'issue' to another road and by reducing car parking restrictions in other roads it may ease pressure.
- Mr Skellett asked the Parking Team to review and if appropriate install double yellow lines outside of Provide outside Limpsfield School on the A25 near the access and around the bend to prevent parking as this currently limits sightlines for pedestrians using the crossing point east of the school. Mr Skellett also asked if a natural calming measure in the form of yellow lines or parking could be installed on Detillens Lane, Limpsfield.
- The Committee asked when the works would be completed, the Parking Manager advised by the end of December 2015.
- Michael Sydney advised that the Committee were still waiting upon information and data from Reigate and Banstead Borough Council's parking enforcement team from the December Local Committee meeting. The Parking Manager advised this would be followed up.

**Resolution:**

The Local Committee (Tandridge)

- (i) AGREED that the proposals in Annexes 1 to 7 are agreed, including:
  - a. Proposed parking controls.
  - b. Proposed bus stop clearways on Godstone Road, Lingfield outside approximately no's 30 – 40, and opposite no 18.
  - c. Informal consultation with residents of Edgeworth Close and Godstone Road, Whyteleafe, on a potential resident permit parking scheme for Edgeworth Close. **Additionally, undertake discussions with the District Council to see what they can do to improve parking in the car park.** Subsequent advertisement of a Traffic Regulation Order if informal consultation shows support for such a scheme.
  - d. Amendment of traffic orders covering existing permit schemes in Tandridge to introduce 'Carer's permits' and revise the role of 'Operational Permits'

- (ii) AGREED if necessary, adjustments can be made to the proposals agreed at the meeting by the Parking Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local Member prior to statutory consultation.
- (iii) AGREED the intention of the County Council to make Traffic Regulation Orders under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on street parking restrictions in Tandridge as shown in the Annexes (and as subsequently modified by ii) is advertised and that if no objections are maintained, the Order is made.
- (iv) AGREED 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 this committee and the appropriate county councillor.
- (v) AGREED if necessary the Parking Team Manager will report the objections back to the local committee for resolution.
- (vi) AGREED to allocate funding of £10,000 in 2015/16 to implement the parking amendments.
- (vii) **AGREED that the Chairman would write to the CEO of Tandridge District Council to request a meeting to address commute parking issues in Caterham Valley.**
- (viii) **AGREED that the Parking Team consider, and if appropriate**
  - a. **Provide double yellow lines on the A25, Limpsfield (outside Limpsfield School) near the access and around the bend to prevent parking which currently limits sightlines for pedestrians using the crossing point east of the school.**
  - b. **Amend existing yellow lines on Detillens Lane, Limpsfield in order to provide an enhanced traffic calming effect.**

**106/14 GODSTONE ROAD, LINGFIELD - SEWER LEAK UPDATE (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Anita Guy, Senior Highways Engineer

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** None

The report was requested by Members at the Local Committee meeting on the 13 February 2015. The Senior Highways Engineer provided a verbal

update further to the written report in the agenda. Southern Water have informed officers that they carried out a dye test on the 14 February 2015, which indicated that the sewage was from the Bay Trees Development. Surrey County Council has asked Southern Water to provide a full report evidencing this information so Tandridge District Council Environmental Health could take action. At the time of the meeting this has not been produced. Asprey Homes the developer of Bay Trees responded to a letter from the Committee on the 4 March and indicated that their dye test concluded that it was not from the development and await further evidence from Southern Water and will act accordingly upon this.

#### Member Discussion – key points

- Mrs Marks stated she was appalled that this had taken so long and asked if the Committee Chairman could write to the local MP to highlight this matter and asked for his assistance in resolving this matter swiftly. The Committee agreed and asked that it also be sent to SCC Cabinet Member, the Strategic Director, Tandridge District Council, Ofwat, Southern Water and the Developer, Asprey Homes.
- Mrs Windsor asked if Tandridge District Council could take samples in case it showed evidence of E.Coli or Norovirus.

#### Resolution

The Local Committee (Tandridge)

- i). NOTED the contents of the report
- ii). **AGREED the Chairman would write a letter to the Local MP, Tandridge District Council, Southern Water and the Developer to ask what action can be taken to resolve this matter. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure at Surrey CC and OFWAT to receive a copy of the letter.**

#### **107/14 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES END OF YEAR 2014/15 UPDATE REPORT (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 12]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Anita Guy, Senior Highways Engineer and Philippa Gates Assistant Engineer

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** None

The Senior Engineer presented the report to the Committee.

#### **Members Discussion – Key Points**

- Mrs Marks raised concerns on the level of drainage and gully funding, how can we ensure that drains are kept clear and we able to redirect funds for gully clearing. Mr Skellett confirmed that allocation for this has doubled for next year and as Chairman and Vice Chairman they are able to work with the Engineers to vire monies between the funds.

- Mr Orrick sought confirmation that works that were due to be completed by the end of March were on course to be completed. The Officer confirmed this would be the case.

### **Resolution**

The Local Committee (Tandridge)

- (i) NOTED the contents of the report.

## **108/14 REVISED HIGHWAYS FORWARD PROGRAMME 2015/16 AND 2016/17 (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 13]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Anita Guy, Senior Highways Engineer and Philippa Gates Assistant Highways Engineer.

**Petition, Public Questions, Statements:** None

The Senior Engineer presented the report to the Committee, referring Members to Annex 1 and highlighted that capital budgets remain unaltered.

### **Members Discussion – Key Points**

- Mr Nick Skellett thanked Anita Guy and the team for their hard work this year and managing challenges such as a senior member of staff absence due to illness and the flooding in the District.
- Mrs Marks referred to Annex 1- New Schemes and the inclusion of Station Road, Station Approach in Whyteleafe. The Officer advised that should the consultation show that there is no support for the scheme then all further work will stop and the necessary arrangements are in place to allow funding to be reallocated to another scheme. This is reflected in recommendation (ii). It was suggested by Members that perhaps the Parish Council could assist or carry out the consultation.

### **Resolution**

The Local Committee (Tandridge)

- (i) NOTED the contents of the report;
- (ii) AGREED that the capital Integrated Transport Schemes budget be allocated as set out in Annex 1 of this report; **subject to the removal of the Station Road scheme, Whyteleafe.**
- (iii) AGREED that capital maintenance funding dedicated to drainage schemes be allocated on a priority basis, to be agreed by the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman;

- (iv) AGREED that the revenue maintenance budget be allocated as set out in Annex 2 of this report; and
- (v) AGREED that bids for Localism/Community Enhancement Initiative funding should be received by the end of May 2015, after which date any unallocated funding reverts to the relevant divisional Member.

Meeting ended at: 1.00pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 26 JUNE 2015



LEAD OFFICER: SANDRA BROWN, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS TEAM  
LEADER EAST  
  
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 2015/16 the County Council has allocated £10,296 revenue funding to each County Councillor. This report provides an update on the projects that have been received since April 2015 to date.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Local Committee (Tandridge) is asked to note:**

- (i) The Members' Allocation applications received and amounts spent, where indicated, 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 2015-20 Confident in Surrey's Future that highlights three themes which make Surrey special and which it seeks to maintain:
  - Wellbeing;
  - Economic prosperity;
  - Resident experience

- 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 PROJECTS:**

- 2.1 Two examples of projects that have received funding:

### **Roverdene Scout Camp**

The camp site was severely effected in the bad weather of winter 2013, resulting in a number of trees being blown over. The Caterham and District Scout Council have raised money for tree surgeons to deal with the larger trees. A contribution of £500 has been made towards chain saw courses for two adults to be trained and have required personal protection equipment to be able to work on smaller trees.

The woodland site is of benefit to a number of local community groups, schools and scouts. Without this essential work, the site would be closed due to an adverse risk assessment of potential danger.

### **St John's Hurst Green Churchyard Project**

A contribution of £1734 has been made to improve access to the Church by the removal of a rockery that has become an obstacle for family cars and hearses. The existing drive, which was designed 100 years ago, will be replaced with tarmac and kerbstones. This will widen the entrance and protect the grass island.

There are many visitors to the church. People attend church services and funerals, as well as meetings and events such as concerts held in the church. There are also frequent visitors to the Memorial Garden.

**3. ANALYSIS:**

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

**4. OPTIONS:**

- 4.1 The Committee is being asked to note the applications that have already been received.

**5. CONSULTATIONS:**

- 5.1 In relation to new applications the local councillor will have discussed the project 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 applications 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 applications 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 Members' Allocation budget 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 application 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:** Diana Ambrose Local Support Assistant([diana.ambrose@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:diana.ambrose@surreycc.gov.uk))

**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.

**Sources/background papers:**

- All application forms are retained by the Community Partnerships Team

**Tandridge Members Funding - Balance Remaining 2015-2016**  
Each County Councillor has £10,296 to spend on projects to benefit the local community.

REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE DATE PAID
David Hodge			£10,296.00
BALANCE REMAINING			£10,296.00

REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE DATE PAID
Sally Marks			£10,296.00
BALANCE REMAINING			£10,296.00

**Tandridge Members Funding - Balance Remaining 2015-2016**

Each County Councillor has £10,296 to spend on projects to benefit the local community.

<b>REFERENCE</b>	<b>ORGANISATION</b>	<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>REVENUE DATE PAID</b>
EF800264967	Caterham District Scout Council	Chain Saw Courses for work at Roverdene Scout Camp	£10,296.00 £500.00 17/04/2015
EF700272422	East Surrey Carers Support Association	Carers day trip to Brighton Summer 2015	£1,500.00 17/04/2015
EF800267779	CADDYS & Chaldon Youth Choir	CADDYS Summer Project & Formation of Chaldon Youth Choir	£1,500.00 01/06/2015
EF800268618	SATRO	Purchase of Mobile Classroom	£1,000.00 01/06/2015
EF800273016	Peer Productions	'Hidden: a play about self harm and mental health' at De Stafford School	£550.00
EF800273155	Caterham and district carnival committee	Hire of band to lead the Caterham Carnival procession	£700.00
<b>BALANCE REMAINING</b>			<b>£4,546.00</b>

<b>REFERENCE</b>	<b>ORGANISATION</b>	<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>REVENUE DATE PAID</b>
Nick Skellett			£10,296.00
<b>BALANCE REMAINING</b>			<b>£10,296.00</b>

**Tandridge Members Funding - Balance Remaining 2015-2016**  
Each County Councillor has £10,296 to spend on projects to benefit the local community.

COUNCILLOR	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE	DATE PAID		
				£10,296.00	£1,000.00		
Michael Sydney	EF800269998	Felbridge Village Hall	Creation of Felbridge Village Hall patio				
	EF800269998	Felbridge Village Hall	Plaque				
<b>BALANCE REMAINING</b>				<b>£9,288.00</b>			

Page 19

COUNCILLOR	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE	DATE PAID
				£10,296.00	£3,000.00
Helena Windsor	EF700281689	Grange Meadow	Improvement to Grange Meadow Sports & Recreation Ground		
<b>BALANCE REMAINING</b>				<b>£7,296.00</b>	

ITEM 7

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**

**DATE:** 26 JUNE 2015



**LEAD OFFICER:** KELLY SAINI BADWAL, SENIOR MANAGER, CUSTOMER NETWORK  
**SUBJECT:** LIBRARY OPENING HOURS  
**DIVISION:** CATERHAM HILL

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

In its search for continuous improvement, and to reduce costs, the library service has recently completed a review which achieves a reduction in the library service's staffing budget of £227,000 for 2015-16 while seeking to retain and improve current levels of service.

In addition to other elements, the review looked at the opening hours for all the Group C community libraries, which for Tandridge, includes Caterham Hill library.

The opening hours of the Community Partnered Libraries (CPLs) are out of scope, as opening hours are set by local steering groups, within an agreed framework with local committees as set out in the county council's Constitution.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Local Committee (Tandridge) is asked to agree:**

- (i) the proposed changes to opening hours for Caterham Hill library, as set out in section 9 of this report and Annex One.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Customer feedback, including from "lapsed user" surveys, shows that it is easier for residents to remember standardised hours across libraries. There was positive feedback after introducing standardisation at Group A and B libraries in 2008. (See table one in this report).

The library service review identified changes in the patterns of use in Group C community libraries. The recommended changes to opening hours reflect how local residents are now using these libraries.

**1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

1.1. There are 5 libraries in Tandridge, as shown below. Caterham Hill Library is the only 'Group C' library in Tandridge and as such is the only library affected by the proposals in this report.

*Table One – Tandridge Libraries and their 'group'*

Library	Group A	Group B	Group C	CPL
Caterham Hill			X	
Caterham Valley		X		
Lingfield				X
Oxted		X		
Warlingham				X

1.2. The public library service in Surrey is part of the everyday lives of those living, working or studying in Surrey. The library service is a pivotal service for Surrey County Council – not least because of increasing demands due to changing demographics and diminishing resources. The library service will continue to support the council's priorities such as wellbeing, economic prosperity and resident experiences. The library service's overall objective continues to be to develop effective and cost efficient services with which increased numbers of residents will engage, and to increase the variety of ways in which it touches and supports their lives. To do this the library service is doing four things:

- a) Continuing to provide an excellent core library service with a strong emphasis on reading, literature and literacy in all its forms.
- b) Providing increasing opportunities for residents to access or participate in cultural experiences of all kinds, in and through the library service.
- c) Developing the service's role further in supporting wellbeing, ageing well and combating social and technological exclusion. Working more with the county council to provide cost effective services in or through libraries, which support the council's efforts to cope with rising social care and education costs. Increasingly the library service works collaboratively with partners, to face and manage these challenges.
- d) In the complex environment within which the library service needs to operate successfully in order to survive, the service needs to re-focus resources from a functional delivery model to one which emphasises place and locality, and become even more integrated and seamless with the wider agendas of Surrey.

1.3. Since the last library service restructure in 2008/9 much has changed within libraries and the county council. Savings and efficiencies are a part of the review, but not the main purpose.

1.4. A reduction in the staffing establishment has not been the main driver of the review although some roles are significantly affected. The main emphasis

has been to look at what the library service is doing and see if it is fit for the future, to ensure the right arrangements are in place to develop an even stronger and better integrated service. While the recommendations of this report concentrate on the front line, the review also took the opportunity to look across the whole of the library service staffing, also implementing changes and efficiencies in other teams which deliver the work of the library service, including the stock and digital teams, and the team which delivers the council's priorities through the library service, for example: children's services, avoiding digital exclusion, and helping people live and age well. From the local perspective, the two key changes are a new way of managing and staffing libraries, and proposed new opening hours, in order to increase efficiencies in how the service staffs libraries on a daily basis.

## **2. ANALYSIS:**

### **Efficiencies and cost savings through standardisation of hours and an altered infrastructure.**

2.1. Libraries are currently divided into three levels of service offer:

- Group A – main town libraries
- Group B – town libraries
- Group C – community libraries

- 2.2. Across the 17 Group C community libraries there is a huge disparity of opening hours.
- 2.3. The Library review identified patterns of use in the Group C community libraries and have retained the most well used opening periods as a core of the new proposed opening hours. There are 3 levels of standardisation in Group C community libraries due to the wide variation in current opening hours, size and location of building and use.
- 2.4. Libraries will be grouped into clusters of 6 - 8 geographically close libraries, under the management of a Cluster Manager. This will help ensure the service has sufficient frontline cover across libraries, with relevant staff in the right place at the right time. The libraries within Tandridge will fall under the 'East 2' cluster, along with libraries in Reigate and Banstead.

*Table two: The 'East 2' cluster of libraries*

East 2	
Horley (B) Lingfield (CPL) Merstham (C) Redhill (A) Reigate (B)	Caterham Valley (B) Caterham Hill (C) Oxted (B) Warlingham (CPL)

- 2.5. For day to day management, and to support and provide continuity to close shared local relationships with users, partners and stakeholders, libraries are then managed in sub-cluster of 3-4 libraries by small teams of duty managers who will be the key contacts for those libraries, with stakeholders,

partners and local organisations including schools, Friends groups and Local History groups having a named local contact. The Library Service will provide activities across the Cluster ensuring there is an activity running every day from Monday to Saturday.

**Better customer care through standardised processes and new roles that focus on the customer experience, supported by training.**

- 2.6. In line with the library services' strategy, systems and processes are being standardised. The aim is that a customer will experience the same level of customer service excellence from any Surrey library they visit.  
Standardisation will also support staff to be able to work at any library.

**Retaining and developing good quality staff.**

- 2.7. In carrying out the staffing restructure the library service followed the council's Managing Change Procedures closely, starting with a substantial staff engagement exercise through which staff were able to feed back their views on what they thought were the strengths and areas for development for the current service and its structure. Staff were given opportunities to express preferences for where they work, and the service also takes into account caring responsibilities and health issues. However it must be recognised that any period of major change can be stressful and every effort has been made to support staff through this.
- 2.8. The number of hours Caterham Hill library opens will not change and the opening times will be altered to include opening on Mondays and a reduction on Tuesdays, Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays. Please see attached Annex 1 for opening hours.
- 2.9. The impact of the review on customers is expected to be very positive. The library service is developing in order to build resilience and flexibility, to deliver new services and provide a better customer experience. The alterations in opening hours – and the infrastructure behind them – is part of this change.

**3. OPTIONS:**

- 3.1 **Option 1:** Make the proposed changes to the opening hours of Caterham Hill library. The changes will enable the library service to manage local timetables and staffing across the service, within the budget, to ensure cover. This will also help residents with standardised hours which are easier to remember.
- 3.2 Efforts will be made to minimise inconvenience for users in the change period. This will be mitigated as much as possible by communicating widely to library users using all media available and making clear the availability of online renewals and requests, drop-boxes at libraries, and other ways of helping users settle into the new patterns of hours
- 3.3 **Option 2:** Leave the opening hours as they are currently. The impact of this is that the local community will not benefit from standardised opening hours; the current confusion over opening hours will continue; the library service will not be able to make the necessary staffing changes across the board; and the target cost savings will not be achieved.

**4. CONSULTATIONS:**

- 4.1 Staff, Unison and GMB were engaged in line with the council's 'Change Management' policy, and the library service is working closely with HR. A succession of staff engagement sessions and workshops has been held throughout the review period.
- 4.2 Library service "lapsed user" surveys, and our ongoing customer satisfaction surveys in libraries have also informed this work.

**5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:**

- 5.1 Across the service the new structure and ways of working resulting from the library review will achieve annual staffing savings of £227,000.
- 5.2 The change in opening hours recommended by this report, were costed into the library review funded by the overall savings achieved. There is therefore no financial pressure created by the recommended change in opening hours.
- 5.3 The proposed staffing budget has been agreed with the Section 151 Officer and included within the 2015/20 Medium Term Financial Plan.

**6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:**

- 6.1 The change in pattern at Caterham Hill Library will impact on users having reduced early opening on Tuesdays, Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays and a reduction in late opening on Fridays but other local libraries (Caterham Valley and Oxted) are open.
- 6.2 Library renewals, fines and fees will be revised in line with the new patterns of hours. There is also a wide range of digital transactions and information from within the libraries' digital services which can be accessed 24/7.
- 6.3 Local consultation with current users will be undertaken to ascertain the best time to run activities. Each library will continue with a range of activities such as rhymetimes and computer skills sessions. A range of activities will be run every week day across libraries within the borough. There may be an impact on staff whose individual timetables and location may need to change. The library service is consulting with individual staff to manage any change in hours or location of work. Clusters and sub-clusters have been set up to minimise travel and make use of public transport networks where possible.

**7. LOCALISM:**

- 7.1 There will be impact on the local Caterham communities, but research shows that library users tend to access more than one local library.
- 7.2 Library users will benefit from an increase in opening hours on Mondays. An earlier closure on Fridays and a later opening on Tuesdays, Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays will have minimal impact on the community, as anecdotally and statistical data shows that libraries are less busy before 10am and after 5pm.

## ITEM 8

- 7.3 The library service has had a massive increase in digital use, and users will continue to benefit from a wide range of digital services including online renewals and online information.

### **8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	Continuing accessible provision of libraries locally will reduce possible travel to other libraries
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	Continuing accessible provision of library services to children and carers locally will support the council's aim of giving every child a good start in life.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report
Public Health	Continuing accessible library provision locally will allow libraries to continue to contribute to health and well being as they do now

### **9. CONCLUSION:**

- 9.1 The number of hours open for Caterham Hill library will not change.
- 9.2 The library will open on Mondays but close earlier on Fridays and open later on Tuesdays, Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays.

### **10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

- 10.1 The new library staff structure is now in place. The proposed changes to opening hours will be implemented for September 2015.
- 10.2 The library service will give at least six weeks' notice to customers of amended opening hours. Staff will be briefed and notices will be put up locally and online. Emails and social media will be used to alert users to the change. All of the Council's communication channels will be used to positively communicate the recommended changes. Any concerns raised by residents will be addressed.

---

#### **Contact Officer:**

Kelly Saini Badwal, Senior Manager, Customer Network  
E: kelly.sainibadwal@surreycc.gov  
M: 07968 832372

#### **Consulted:**

Library Service Staff  
HR  
Unions

**Annexes:**

Annex 1 – Current and Proposed opening hours

**Sources/background papers:**

Library Service Review Consultation Report

---

This page is intentionally left blank

## Current and Proposal Opening Hours for Group C Community Library Tandridge

### Caterham Hill Library

*It is proposed that the opening hours for Caterham Hill Library are changed to open on Mondays when the Library is currently closed.*

*The hours on Tuesdays, Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays will be reduced to bring the opening hours for Caterham Hill Library in line with other Group C Community Libraries of a similar size. The reduction for these days is offset by the extra opening day on Mondays.*

	Mon	Tues	Wed	Thurs	Fri	Sat	Hours Open
<b>Current</b>	Closed	9.30am to 5pm	Closed	9.30am to 5pm	9.30am to 6pm	9.30am to 4pm	<b>30</b>
<b>Proposed</b>	2pm to 5pm	10am to 5pm	Closed	10am to 5pm	10am to 5pm	10am to 4pm	<b>30</b>
<b>Daily change in hours</b>	+ 3 hours	- 0.5 hours	No change	- 0.5 hours	- 1.5 hours	- 0.5 hours	No change

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**

**DATE:** 26 JUNE 2015



**LEAD OFFICER:** SARAH WOODWORTH, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP AND COMMITTEE OFFICER

**SUBJECT:** REPRESENTATION ON, YOUTH TASK GROUP, EAST SURREY COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP AND FUNDING

**DIVISION:** ALL TANDRIDGE DIVISIONS

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

The Local Committee is asked to review and agree the terms of reference and membership of the Youth Task Group for 2015-16 and appoint representation to the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership.

The Local Committee (Tandridge) has been delegated £3,337 to support community safety work in the district; this money requires Local Committee agreement to be delegated for use by the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Local Committee (Tandridge) is asked to agree :**

- i). The terms of reference of the Youth Task Group, as set out in Annex 1.
- ii). The appointment of membership of the Youth task group and a representative on the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership for 2015/16.
- iii). That the community safety budget of £3,337 that has been delegated to the Local Committee, be transferred to the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership for the purpose of addressing the criteria and monitoring requirements detailed in paragraphs 2.3 to 2.7 of this report; and that the Community Partnership Manager authorises its expenditure in accordance with the Local Committee's decision.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The Local Committee's task groups enable the Local Committee to carry out its work in an efficient and expedient manner.

Surrey County Council is a Responsible Authority on Community Safety Partnership and has a responsibility to be represented at their meetings. Contributing delegated

funding will help to ensure that there is a sufficient budget to fund projects aimed at reducing crime and anti-social behaviour within the district.

The Local Committee has delegated authority over a small budget of £3,337 of Surrey County Council funding. The purpose of this funding is to address local areas of concern in relation to community safety.

## **1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

### **Youth Task Group**

1.1 In 2011-12, the Local Committee established a Youth Task Group. The terms of reference were last reviewed and the task group was re-established on 27 June 2014. Due to the success of the Youth Task group it is recommended that it continues to operate in 2015/16. Please note that the task group of the Local Committee have no formal decision-making powers, but make recommendations to the Local Committee.

### **Community Safety Partnership**

- 1.2 The Surrey County Council Local Committee (Tandridge) can make appointments to various outside bodies. The representatives appointed to these outside bodies will be representing Surrey County Council and will be expected to informally report on the work of these groups as and when necessary.
- 1.3 The County Council has in the past made available to Local Committees a budget for use in conjunction with the Community Safety Partnerships. This year, the Local Committee has a delegated budget of £3,337 for general community safety purposes which it is proposed to allocate to the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership as its contribution towards projects and activities.

## **2. ANALYSIS:**

### **Youth Task Group**

- 2.1 The task group has been successful and contributed to efficient decision making by the Local Committee in a range of areas. Due to this success, the recommendation is to re-establish the task group for 2015-16 with the terms of reference set out in **Annex 1**.
- 2.2 The terms of reference states that the number of appointees required for the Youth Task Group will be a minimum of 2 County Members and 2 non County Council Members.

### **Community Safety Partnership**

- 2.3 Following negotiations between Tandridge, Mole Valley and Reigate & Banstead CSPs, a merger was agreed to form a single ES CSP. The inaugural meeting was held in September 2014 where priorities for the

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/tandridge](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/tandridge)

coming year were agreed based on commonalities across the area based on the previous Strategic Assessments. These were: Serious Acquisitive Crime, Domestic Abuse, Substance Misuse, Antisocial Behaviour and Rural Crime. Local delivery of location specific issues continue through the current structures of borough based Community Incident Action Groups (CIAGs) and Joint Action Groups (JAGs).

**2.4 The Community Safety Partnership Priorities for 2014/15 were as follows:**

1. Reduce Anti social behaviour (with an increased focus on victims)
2. Tackling substance misuse (Alcohol and drugs)
3. Reducing domestic burglary
4. Tackling domestic abuse

**2.5 The Committee is asked to confirm that it wishes to transfer its budget of £3,337 to the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership and to delegate authority to the Community Partnership Manager to oversee the expenditure of this budget in accordance with the criteria below.**

**2.6 The Local Committee Community Safety Fund is designed to support projects and initiatives in Surrey that:**

- Are evidence based
- State aims and objectives clearly and concisely
- Clarify project outputs and outcomes
- Demonstrate wider benefits to the community
- Demonstrate how they support the delivery of local Community Safety Partnership plans
- Document proposed evaluation mechanisms
- Demonstrate value for money

**2.7 Community Safety Partnerships will be asked to report back to the Local Committee on how the funding was used and will be asked to provide the following information:**

- A description of the project
- What was done
- The issue or need the project addressed and how it was identified
- The outcomes that were expected and if they were achieved
- How the project benefitted the wider community
- The objectives in the local Community Safety Partnership Plan that the project supported
- How the outcomes were monitored and evaluated

<b>3. OPTIONS:</b>
--------------------

**3.1 It is recommended that the Local Committee agrees to re-establish the Youth task group, in order to continue the successful work carried out in previous years.**

3.2 The Committee may choose to approve or not approve the transfer of the budget of £3,337 to the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership. By delegating its Community Safety budget to the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership, the Local Committee can contribute to the reduction of crime and anti-social behaviour in East Surrey by funding activity aimed at delivering against the locally identified community safety priorities.

#### **4. CONSULTATIONS:**

- 4.1 Consultation has taken place with relevant officers from Services for Young People.
- 4.2 Consultation has taken place with the Community Safety Senior Manager, Surrey County Council.

#### **5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:**

##### **Youth Task Group**

- 5.1 There are no specific financial implications arising from the recommendations. Work to support the recommendations will be undertaken within current resources, and the task groups have no decision making powers.

##### **Community Safety Partnership**

- 5.2 The amount of delegated funding is £3,337. This funding is ring-fenced for use within East Surrey, and expenditure from this fund will be agreed by the members of the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership and the Community Partnership Manager will authorise its expenditure in accordance with the Local Committee's decision. All bidders must provide detailed information about the purpose and aims of the proposed project and timescales. Decisions are taken with particular attention to value for money, and bids may be refused or further information sought if this is not evident.

#### **6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:**

- 6.1 Successfully tackling crime and anti-social behaviour is of benefit to the entire community.

#### **7. LOCALISM:**

- 7.1 The establishment of youth task group enables officers to draw upon the local knowledge of County and District Councillors, ensuring that specific local needs and priorities are considered
- 7.2 If agreed, the recommendations will benefit all residents and businesses in East Surrey by helping to reduce crime and anti- social behaviour in the area.

**8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	Set out below.
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.

**8.1 Crime and Disorder implications****Youth Task Group**

The Youth Task Group is involved in the commissioning process for the Local Prevention Framework which is aimed at preventing young people from becoming NEETs (not in education or employment) or entering the Youth Justice system.

**Community Safety Partnership****8.1 Crime and Disorder implications**

By contributing delegated funding and ensuring that the Local Committee is represented on the partnership, the Local Committee will contribute to the success of the East Surrey CSP in addressing the local priorities for the reduction of crime and disorder in the district of Tandridge during 2015-16.

**9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

9.1 The purpose of this report is to enable the Local Committee to be represented on relevant outside bodies and for the appointed members of the task group to be informed to enable them to make appropriate recommendations to the Local Committee. It is recommended that

- the terms of reference of the Youth Task Group, as detailed in Annex 1 are agreed.
- the appointment of the Members to the Youth task group and the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership for 2015/16 are agreed.
- It is agreed to transfer the £3,337 community safety budget East Surrey Community Safety Partnership.

**10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

10.1 The Local Committee will next be asked to review the task group terms of reference and membership in June 2016.

## ITEM 9

10.2 The East Surrey Community Safety Partnerships will be asked to report back to the Local Committee on how the funding was used and will be asked to provide the following information:

- A description of the project
  - What was done
  - The issue or need the project addressed and how it was identified
  - The outcomes that were expected and if they were achieved
  - How the project benefitted the wider community
  - The objectives in the local Community Safety Partnership Plan that the project supported
  - How the outcomes were monitored and evaluated
- 

**Contact Officer:**

Sarah Woodworth, Community Partnership and Committee Officer, 01737 737422

**Consulted:**

Previous and Current Local Committee Chairmen; relevant officers in Services for Young People and Environment and Infrastructure

**Annexes:**

Annex 1 – Youth Task Group Terms of Reference

---

**ITEM 9 ANNEX ONE - YOUTH TASK GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE****1      Objective:**

- 1.1 The Local Committee (Tandridge) agreed on the 24 June 2011 that a Youth Task Group is established to assist and advise the Local Committee in relation to Youth Issues and the future delivery of Youth Provision locally.

**2      Membership**

- 2.1 The Task Group will contain four appointees – a minimum of two County Council members and two non County Council Members.  
The appointment of the two non County Council members to be delegated to the Chairman of the Local Committee and the Chairman of the Youth Task Group.
- 2.2 In addition the Task Group can invite up to four young people and up to four local partners from the district, all with equal status. The Task Group may also consult with other relevant members of the Committee.

**3      General**

- 3.1 It is proposed to establish a Youth Task Group. The Task Group shall exist to advise the Local Committee. It has no formal decision making powers. The Task Group will:
- i. Unless otherwise agreed, meet in private
  - ii. Develop a work programme
  - iii. Record actions,
  - iv. Report back to the Local Committee on progress.
- 3.2 The Task Group's function is to assist and advise the Local Committee in relation to Youth Issues and the future delivery of Youth Provision locally.
- 3.3 Officers supporting the Task Group will consult the Group and will give due consideration to the group's reasoning and recommendations prior to the officer writing their report to the parent Local Committee.
- 3.4 The Task Group can, should it so wish, respond to an officer report and submit its own report to the Local Committee.
- 3.5 The Task Group terms of reference and membership is to be reviewed and agreed by the Local Committee annually.

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)****DATE:** 26<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2015**LEAD OFFICER:** JOHN LAWLOR, AREA TEAM MANAGER**SUBJECT:** HIGHWAY SCHEMES UPDATE**DIVISION:** ALL**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

At the 12<sup>th</sup> December 2014 Local Committee, Members agreed a programme of revenue and capital highway works in Tandridge. An amended programme of works was agreed on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2015 to take account of the reduced revenue budget. Delegated authority was given to enable the forward programme to be progressed without the need to bring further reports to the Local Committee for decision. This report sets out recent progress. The report also updates Members on the number of enquiries received from customers.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Local Committee (Tandridge) is asked to note the contents of the report.**

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

To update the Local Committee on the progress of the highway works programme in Tandridge.

**1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

1.1 In December 2014, Local Committee agreed its forward programme for both Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS) Capital Improvement Schemes and ITS Capital Maintenance Schemes. Local Committee also agreed the allocation of its revenue budget for maintenance works. A revised works programme was agreed in March 2015 to take account of the reduced revenue budget devolved to the Local Committee.

1.2 To allow flexibility in the delivery of the Local Committee's highways work programme, delegated authority was given so that works could be progressed without the need to bring further reports to the Local Committee for decision.

1.3 In addition to the Local Committee's devolved highways budget, developer contributions are used to fund, either wholly or in part, highway improvement schemes to mitigate the impact of developments on the highway network.

The Road Safety Team also have a small Countywide budget which is used, on a priority basis, to address sites with an identified collision problem.

## **2. ANALYSIS:**

**2.1 Capital Highway Schemes:** Progress on the approved programme of highway works in Tandridge is set out in **Annex 1**. It also provides an update on schemes being progressed using developer contributions and the Road Safety Team's schemes for Tandridge.

**2.2 Customer Enquiries:** **Table 1** shows the number of enquiries received during the first quarter of 2015.

Period (2015)	Surrey Highways: Total enquiries (no.)	Tandridge: Total enquiries (no.)	Local Area Office: Total enquiries (no.)
Jan-March	35,467	3,587	1,143

**Table 1: Customer Enquiries**

Of the enquiries received by the local area office, 95% have been resolved, a rate slightly above the countywide average of 93%. The County continues to work with its contractors to improve this response rate.

2.3 The reduction in customer contact has also been reflected in the volume of complaints received, as shown in **Table 2**.

Period (2015)	Surrey Highways: Complaints (no.)	South East Area: Stage 1 Complaints (no.)
Jan-March	110	28

**Table 2: Complaints**

The main reason for these complaints is poor communication service delivery.

2.4 The Service has recently undergone its annual Customer Service Excellence (CSE) review. This recognised the improvements that have been made and has recommended retention of the award. It is recognised that there is still some way to go but CSE is a continuous improvement tool, and this is being used to drive up performance and the customer experience.

2.5 Examples of improvements made over the last year include the introduction of the new Works Manager System and changes to the Roadworks web page. A project to improve communication of Horizon schemes is ongoing.

2.6 To increase our understanding of customer satisfaction it has been arranged for customer service questions to be included in the annual National Highways & Transport survey. This will provide a new opportunity for benchmarking the service we provide and input to future business planning. A Member survey will run in parallel to this giving councillors the opportunity to have their say. More information will be provided through the CSE Member Reference Group

**3. OPTIONS:**

3.1 Not applicable.

**4. CONSULTATIONS:**

4.1 Not applicable

**5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:**

5.1 Budgets are closely monitored throughout the financial year and monthly updates are provided to the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman. The Local Committee have put in place arrangements whereby monies can be viwed between different schemes and budget headings.

**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. The needs of all road users are considered as part of the design process for highway schemes.

**7. LOCALISM:**

7.1 Local issues can be addressed through the Member's Community Enhancement Budget.

**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	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

**8.1 Crime and Disorder implications**

A well-managed highway network can contribute to reduction in crime and disorder.

**8.2 Sustainability implications**

The use of sustainable materials and the recycling of materials is carried out wherever possible and appropriate.

**9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

9.1 Progress on the programme of capital highway works in Tandridge is set out in Annex 1. Local Committee is asked to note the contents of this report.

**10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

10.1 Delivery of the highway works programme will continue and a further update report will be presented to the next meeting of the Local Committee.

---

**Contact Officer:**

Anita Guy, Senior Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

**Consulted:**

Not applicable

**Annexes:**

Annex 1: Summary of Progress

**Sources/background papers:**

- Report to Tandridge Local Committee, 12<sup>th</sup> December 2014, Highways Forward Programme 2015/16 – 2016/17
  - Report to Tandridge Local Committee, 20<sup>th</sup> March 2015, Revised Highways Forward Programme 2015/16 – 2016/17
-

<b>CAPITAL ITS IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES</b>			
<b>Project:</b> A22/M25 J6 Junction Improvement			
<b>Detail:</b> Improvements to road markings	<b>Division:</b> Godstone		<b>Allocation:</b> £10,000
<b>Progress:</b>			
The original proposal to change the road markings on the circulatory carriageway included amendments to the road markings on the M25 slip roads. The Highways Agency required modelling of the junction to be carried out to assess the impact of the proposed changes on the M25 slip roads. Without this in place, the HA would not agree to the markings to be changed. The cost of carrying out the modelling was estimated at £18,500. The Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman have agreed that this cost cannot be justified and have agreed that this scheme will not progress in its current format.			
An alternative road marking scheme has been developed to improve safety at the junction without requiring changes to be made to the road markings on the M25 slip roads. Resurfacing of the roundabout circulatory carriageway is planned to be carried out as part of Operation Horizon in 2015/16. It is proposed that the changes to the road markings are carried out as part of the resurfacing scheme.			
<b>Project:</b> A25 East Hill, Oxted			
<b>Detail:</b> Pedestrian crossing	<b>Division:</b> Oxted		<b>Allocation:</b> £50,000
<b>Progress:</b>			
Implementation of a puffin crossing on the A25 East Hill in the vicinity of Uvedale Road started on site on 23 <sup>rd</sup> February 2015, with the cost being spread across two financial years. Scheme completed. Stage 3 Road Safety Audit to be carried out.			
<b>Project:</b> Farleigh Road/Harrow Road, Warlingham			
<b>Detail:</b> Junction improvement	<b>Division:</b> Warlingham		<b>Allocation:</b> £25,000
<b>Progress:</b>			
Introduction of a mini-roundabout at the junction of Farleigh Road/Harrow Road to be carried out as part of the scheme to replace the existing traffic calming in Farleigh Road with a combination of road tables and cushions. Implementation to be coordinated with the Operation Horizon works to resurface Farleigh Road this financial year.			

<b>CAPITAL ITS IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES</b>			
<b>Project:</b> <b>Byers Lane, South Godstone</b>			
<b>Detail:</b> Speed Limit Reduction	<b>Division:</b> Godstone		<b>Allocation:</b> £10,000
<b>Progress:</b> Speed limit assessment to be carried out to determine if a reduction in the speed limit in the vicinity of the cottages complies with Surrey's Speed Limit Policy.			
<b>Project:</b> <b>A25 Nutfield Road and Mid Street, Nutfield</b>			
<b>Detail:</b> Speed Limit Reduction	<b>Division:</b> Godstone		<b>Allocation:</b> £10,000
<b>Progress:</b> Possible reduction in the speed limit to 40mph on the A25 Nutfield Road between the boundary with Reigate and Banstead and Nutfield. Consideration also to be given to reducing the speed limit in Mid Street from 40mph to 30mph, between the A25 and the existing 30mph limit. Speed limit assessments to be carried out in June 2015.			
<b>Project:</b> <b>Redehall Road, Smallfield</b>			
<b>Detail:</b> Alternative Traffic Calming Measures	<b>Division:</b> Lingfield		<b>Allocation:</b> £5,000
<b>Progress:</b> Design only – alternative traffic calming measures to replace existing speed cushions.			
<b>Project:</b> <b>Stanstead Road, Caterham</b>			
<b>Detail:</b> Speed Reducing Measures	<b>Division:</b> Caterham Hill		<b>Allocation:</b> £5,000
<b>Progress:</b> Design only – initial design of kerb build-outs with priority give-way, to reduce traffic speeds.			
<b>Project:</b> <b>Station Road East, Oxted</b>			
<b>Detail:</b> 20mph Zone and Pedestrian Facilities	<b>Division:</b> Oxted		<b>Allocation:</b> £5,000
<b>Progress:</b> Design only – speed limit assessment to determine feasibility of introducing a 20mph zone and investigation of pedestrian crossing facilities.			

CAPITAL ITS IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES			
<b>Project:</b> Station Road/Station Approach, Whyteleafe			
<b>Detail:</b> One-way Working <b>Division:</b> Caterham Valley <b>Allocation:</b> £15,000			
<b>Progress:</b> Request from Whyteleafe Village Council to make Station Road/Station Approach one-way. Consultation to be carried out with residents directly affected. Results of the consultation to be reported to the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and divisional Member for decision as to whether to progress the proposal.			
<b>Project:</b> Tithepit Shaw Lane, Hamsey Green			
<b>Detail:</b> Hamsey Green Infants Safer Routes to School	<b>Division:</b> Warlingham		<b>Allocation:</b> £20,000
<b>Progress:</b> Initial report being produced looking at existing provision of guard railing and feasibility of providing a pedestrian crossing facility outside the Infants School. Report to be shared with Chairman, Vice-Chairman and divisional Member.			
<b>Project:</b> High Street/Plough Road/Dormans Road, Dormansland			
<b>Detail:</b> Junction Improvement	<b>Division:</b> Lingfield		<b>Allocation:</b> £5,000
<b>Progress:</b> It is hoped to use section 106 funding to implement a scheme to improve safety at the High Street/Plough Road/Dormans Road junction. However, the wording of the s106 agreement is very specific and has to be spent on build-outs in the High Street (the scheme that was stopped a couple of years ago). In seeking Tandridge District Council's agreement to use the s106 funding on an alternative scheme, an initial design is required. Local Committee has agreed to fund the initial design of a road table at the junction to present to Tandridge DC as part of this application.			
<b>Project:</b> Small Safety Schemes			
<b>Detail:</b> To be identified	<b>Division:</b> All		<b>Allocation:</b> £13,573
<b>Project:</b> Signs and Road Markings			
<b>Detail:</b> To be identified	<b>Division:</b> All		<b>Allocation:</b> £5,000

<b>CAPITAL ITS IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES</b>			
<b>Project:</b>	<b>Stage 3 Road Safety Audits</b>		
<b>Detail:</b>	To be carried out as required	<b>Division:</b>	All
			<b>Allocation:</b> £5,000

<b>CAPITAL ITS MAINTENANCE SCHEMES (LSR/FOOTWAYS)</b>		
<b>Project</b>	<b>Division</b>	<b>Update</b>
		Update to be provided at meeting

<b>POTENTIAL DEVELOPER FUNDED SCHEMES</b>		
<b>Project:</b>	<b>Oak Grove (Oaklands Hospital Site)</b>	
<b>Detail:</b>	Pedestrian Crossing Improvements	<b>Division:</b> Caterham Hill
<b>Progress:</b>		
Section 106 funding was collected from the Oak Grove (Oaklands Hospital) site to provide improvements to pedestrian crossing facilities in the immediate vicinity of the development. Possible measures are to be identified and submitted to Tandridge District Council as part of an application for the release of the funding.		
Any s106 funding remaining following completion of the above works could be used to meet a request from Chaldon Village Council to investigate the feasibility of providing measures to assist pedestrians in Rook Lane near Chaldon Common Road, subject to the agreement of Tandridge District Council.		

POTENTIAL DEVELOPER FUNDED SCHEMES		
<b>Project:</b>	<b>High Street/Plough Road/Dormans Road, Dormansland</b>	
<b>Detail:</b>	Junction Improvement	<b>Division:</b> Lingfield
<b>Progress:</b> See above – initial design to be funded from Local Committee ITS allocation.		

ROAD SAFETY TEAM SCHEMES		
<b>Project:</b>	<b>B2029 Ray Lane/Lingfield Common Road, Lingfield</b>	
<b>Detail:</b>	Signs and road markings	<b>Division:</b> Lingfield
<b>Progress:</b> Signing and road markings to address loss of control and head-on collisions at bend on Ray Lane south of Lingfield Common Road and to improve give-way junction..		
<b>Project:</b>	<b>Stanstead Road/White Hill Lane, Caterham</b>	
<b>Detail:</b>	Signs	<b>Division:</b> Caterham Hill
<b>Progress:</b> Provision of Steep Hill warning signs, displaying 10% gradient and Keep in low gear plates.		

## PARKING

**Progress:**

The 2013-14 parking review works have been completed with the exception of Westerham Road, Oxted, where significant Traffic Management is required, currently scheduled for 4 June 2015.

The 2015 review site visits have taken place and the report with recommendations went to the March meeting of Tandridge Local Committee. Consultation about possible permit parking in Edgeworth Close, Whyteleafe closed on 1 May 2015, the outcome of which is due to be discussed with divisional Member shortly. The Notice and amendment TRO are being prepared for advertisement in June/July 2015.

**Note:** Information correct at time of writing (02/06/15)

<b>CAPITAL ITS IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES</b>			
<b>Project:</b> A22/M25 J6 Junction Improvement			
<b>Detail:</b> Improvements to road markings	<b>Division:</b> Godstone		<b>Allocation:</b> £10,000
<b>Progress:</b>			
The original proposal to change the road markings on the circulatory carriageway included amendments to the road markings on the M25 slip roads. The Highways Agency required modelling of the junction to be carried out to assess the impact of the proposed changes on the M25 slip roads. Without this in place, the HA would not agree to the markings to be changed. The cost of carrying out the modelling was estimated at £18,500. The Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman have agreed that this cost cannot be justified and have agreed that this scheme will not progress in its current format.			
An alternative road marking scheme has been developed to improve safety at the junction without requiring changes to be made to the road markings on the M25 slip roads. Resurfacing of the roundabout circulatory carriageway is planned to be carried out as part of Operation Horizon in 2015/16. It is proposed that the changes to the road markings are carried out as part of the resurfacing scheme.			
<b>Project:</b> A25 East Hill, Oxted			
<b>Detail:</b> Pedestrian crossing	<b>Division:</b> Oxted		<b>Allocation:</b> £50,000
<b>Progress:</b>			
Implementation of a puffin crossing on the A25 East Hill in the vicinity of Uvedale Road started on site on 23 <sup>rd</sup> February 2015, with the cost being spread across two financial years. Scheme completed. Stage 3 Road Safety Audit to be carried out.			
<b>Project:</b> Farleigh Road/Harrow Road, Warlingham			
<b>Detail:</b> Junction improvement	<b>Division:</b> Warlingham		<b>Allocation:</b> £25,000
<b>Progress:</b>			
Introduction of a mini-roundabout at the junction of Farleigh Road/Harrow Road to be carried out as part of the scheme to replace the existing traffic calming in Farleigh Road with a combination of road tables and cushions. Implementation to be coordinated with the Operation Horizon works to resurface Farleigh Road this financial year.			

<b>CAPITAL ITS IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES</b>			
<b>Project:</b> <b>Byers Lane, South Godstone</b>			
<b>Detail:</b> Speed Limit Reduction	<b>Division:</b> Godstone		<b>Allocation:</b> £10,000
<b>Progress:</b> Speed limit assessment to be carried out to determine if a reduction in the speed limit in the vicinity of the cottages complies with Surrey's Speed Limit Policy.			
<b>Project:</b> <b>A25 Nutfield Road and Mid Street, Nutfield</b>			
<b>Detail:</b> Speed Limit Reduction	<b>Division:</b> Godstone		<b>Allocation:</b> £10,000
<b>Progress:</b> Possible reduction in the speed limit to 40mph on the A25 Nutfield Road between the boundary with Reigate and Banstead and Nutfield. Consideration also to be given to reducing the speed limit in Mid Street from 40mph to 30mph, between the A25 and the existing 30mph limit. Speed limit assessments to be carried out in June 2015.			
<b>Project:</b> <b>Redehall Road, Smallfield</b>			
<b>Detail:</b> Alternative Traffic Calming Measures	<b>Division:</b> Lingfield		<b>Allocation:</b> £5,000
<b>Progress:</b> Design only – alternative traffic calming measures to replace existing speed cushions.			
<b>Project:</b> <b>Stanstead Road, Caterham</b>			
<b>Detail:</b> Speed Reducing Measures	<b>Division:</b> Caterham Hill		<b>Allocation:</b> £5,000
<b>Progress:</b> Design only – initial design of kerb build-outs with priority give-way, to reduce traffic speeds.			
<b>Project:</b> <b>Station Road East, Oxted</b>			
<b>Detail:</b> 20mph Zone and Pedestrian Facilities	<b>Division:</b> Oxted		<b>Allocation:</b> £5,000
<b>Progress:</b> Design only – speed limit assessment to determine feasibility of introducing a 20mph zone and investigation of pedestrian crossing facilities.			

CAPITAL ITS IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES			
<b>Project:</b> Station Road/Station Approach, Whyteleafe	<b>Detail:</b> One-way Working	<b>Division:</b> Caterham Valley	<b>Allocation:</b> £15,000
<b>Progress:</b> Request from Whyteleafe Village Council to make Station Road/Station Approach one-way. Consultation to be carried out with residents directly affected. Results of the consultation to be reported to the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and divisional Member for decision as to whether to progress the proposal.			
<b>Project:</b> Tithepit Shaw Lane, Hamsey Green			
<b>Detail:</b> Hamsey Green Infants Safer Routes to School	<b>Division:</b> Warlingham	<b>Allocation:</b> £20,000	
<b>Progress:</b> Initial report being produced looking at existing provision of guard railing and feasibility of providing a pedestrian crossing facility outside the Infants School. Report to be shared with Chairman, Vice-Chairman and divisional Member.			
<b>Project:</b> High Street/Plough Road/Dormans Road, Dormansland			
<b>Detail:</b> Junction Improvement	<b>Division:</b> Lingfield	<b>Allocation:</b> £5,000	
<b>Progress:</b> It is hoped to use section 106 funding to implement a scheme to improve safety at the High Street/Plough Road/Dormans Road junction. However, the wording of the s106 agreement is very specific and has to be spent on build-outs in the High Street (the scheme that was stopped a couple of years ago). In seeking Tandridge District Council's agreement to use the s106 funding on an alternative scheme, an initial design is required. Local Committee has agreed to fund the initial design of a road table at the junction to present to Tandridge DC as part of this application.			
<b>Project:</b> Small Safety Schemes			
<b>Detail:</b> To be identified	<b>Division:</b> All	<b>Allocation:</b> £13,573	
<b>Project:</b> Signs and Road Markings			
<b>Detail:</b> To be identified	<b>Division:</b> All	<b>Allocation:</b> £5,000	

<b>CAPITAL ITS IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES</b>			
<b>Project:</b>	<b>Stage 3 Road Safety Audits</b>		
<b>Detail:</b>	To be carried out as required	<b>Division:</b>	All
			<b>Allocation:</b> £5,000

<b>CAPITAL ITS MAINTENANCE SCHEMES (LSR/FOOTWAYS)</b>		
<b>Project</b>	<b>Division</b>	<b>Update</b>
Update to be provided at meeting		

<b>POTENTIAL DEVELOPER FUNDED SCHEMES</b>		
<b>Project:</b>	<b>Oak Grove (Oaklands Hospital Site)</b>	
<b>Detail:</b>	Pedestrian Crossing Improvements	<b>Division:</b> Caterham Hill
<b>Progress:</b>		
Section 106 funding was collected from the Oak Grove (Oaklands Hospital) site to provide improvements to pedestrian crossing facilities in the immediate vicinity of the development. Possible measures are to be identified and submitted to Tandridge District Council as part of an application for the release of the funding.		
Any s106 funding remaining following completion of the above works could be used to meet a request from Chaldon Village Council to investigate the feasibility of providing measures to assist pedestrians in Rook Lane near Chaldon Common Road, subject to the agreement of Tandridge District Council.		

## POTENTIAL DEVELOPER FUNDED SCHEMES

<b>Project:</b> <b>High Street/Plough Road/Dormans Road, Dormansland</b>	
<b>Detail:</b> Junction Improvement	<b>Division:</b> Lingfield
<b>Progress:</b> See above – initial design to be funded from Local Committee ITS allocation.	

## ROAD SAFETY TEAM SCHEMES

<b>Project:</b> <b>B2029 Ray Lane/Lingfield Common Road, Lingfield</b>	
<b>Detail:</b> Signs and road markings	<b>Division:</b> Lingfield
<b>Progress:</b> Signing and road markings to address loss of control and head-on collisions at bend on Ray Lane south of Lingfield Common Road and to improve give-way junction..	
<b>Project:</b> <b>Stanstead Road/White Hill Lane, Caterham</b>	
<b>Detail:</b> Signs	<b>Division:</b> Caterham Hill
<b>Progress:</b> Provision of Steep Hill warning signs, displaying 10% gradient and Keep in low gear plates.	

## PARKING

**Progress:**

The 2013-14 parking review works have been completed with the exception of Westerham Road, Oxted, where significant Traffic Management is required, currently scheduled for 4 June 2015.

The 2015 review site visits have taken place and the report with recommendations went to the March meeting of Tandridge Local Committee. Consultation about possible permit parking in Edgeworth Close, Whyteleafe closed on 1 May 2015, the outcome of which is due to be discussed with divisional Member shortly. The Notice and amendment TRO are being prepared for advertisement in June/July 2015.

**Note:** Information correct at time of writing (02/06/15)

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**



**SURREY**

**DATE:** 26 JUNE 2015  
**LEAD OFFICER:** SIMON MITCHELL,  
**MAINTENANCE PLAN TEAM LEADER**  
**SUBJECT:** REVIEW OF COLD WEATHER PLAN AND WINTER SERVICE ARRANGEMENTS  
**DIVISION:** ALL

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Surrey undertakes an annual review of the Highways Cold Weather Plan and winter service at the end of each winter season, including the effectiveness of network coverage, operational improvements, organisational changes and partnership working arrangements. This report seeks the views of the (Tandridge) Local Committee on the delivery of the Winter Service operations in the 2014/15 season, to feedback into the annual review.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Local Committee (Tandridge) is asked to:**

- (i) Consider the current highways cold weather provision and operations in their area and provide feedback, via their Local Committee Chairman, on any change requests.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

To give the (Tandridge) Local Committee the opportunity to provide feedback into the annual review of winter service operations.

**1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

1.1 At the meeting on 23 September 2014 Cabinet recommended that each Local Committee should be consulted on the delivery of Highways Cold Weather operations following the 2014/15 season. In order to do this an item should be included on the summer agenda for members to provide feedback into the annual review.

**2. ANALYSIS:**

2.1 The trend of relatively mild winters continued with only one short period of snow with no significant accumulations, the winter service has been effectively managed.

2.2 By the end of the season Kier had completed 58/65 precautionary salting runs in the west/east of the county respectively with a further 23 runs on the cold routes which is comparable with an “average” (56 runs per season)

Surrey winter. The priority 2 salting network was also treated on 4 occasions during the cold snap from 28 January which brought in a number of snow flurries but no significant accumulations. Salt supplies have regularly been replaced throughout the winter period in accordance with Cabinet's agreed recommendations.

- 2.3 Throughout their fourth year as the Council's contractor, Kier worked with officers and members on all elements of the winter service to maximise efficiency and reduce costs. This also included the operation to be fully in line with the new Appendix H guidelines with continuous dynamic checks of the spreaders throughout the season resulting in ability to target spread rates more effectively leading to savings on salt usage.
- 2.4 The footway priority snow clearing schedules have been updated and aligned with new Surrey Priority Network (SPN) maintenance hierarchy.
- 2.5 Kier have addressed last year's shortfall in the provision of grit bins and had sufficient resilience, provided a timely response to member requests.

### **3. DISCUSSION:**

- 3.1 With the approach to Winter Service now well established no major changes are proposed, but the annual review nevertheless provides the opportunity for Local Committees to inform this year's review:
  - The precautionary salting network will generally remain the same as in 2013/14 with only minor alterations resulting from the implementation of the new Surrey Priority Network (SPN) and subject to any comments from local members, residents and officers.
  - The opportunities for partnership working arrangements with Parish and Town Councils will again be available on enquiry, providing a wider network of volunteers for pavement clearance in towns and villages not currently covered by the District and Borough arrangements. Parishes participating in the scheme currently cover Tandridge, Mole Valley, Waverley and Surrey Heath.

### **4. CONSULTATIONS:**

#### **Gritting Routes**

- 4.1 The annual review provides the opportunity for the Local Committee to raise change requests to the priority salting network. Where the need for further minor changes is identified the Local Committee is able to accommodate this on a 'like for like' basis provided it does not impact on the strategic gritting network.

#### **Grit Bins**

- 4.2 The trend towards milder winters has seen a reduction in restocking frequencies. As a result it is proposed that the cost of a grit bin, including annual refurbishment and filling in line with county standards, is now £947 for a 4 year period. At the end of this period where a Member or community continue to support a grit bin an extension charge of £639 would be applied to cover the next 4 year period.

4.3 Grit bins that are not supported at the end of the four year maintenance period will be redistributed to other locations on the network as part of annual refurbishment programme.

## **5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:**

5.1 The Winter Service will be fully funded by Surrey Highways Medium Term Plan and no financial contribution is required from the local committee budget.

5.2 It is, however, recognised that members and communities have the ability to fund additional grit bins on the network.

## **6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:**

6.1 An equalities and diversity impact assessment is in place for the winter service. The winter service priority is, as far as is reasonably practicable, to safeguard the movement and well-being of all Highway users, both the residents of Surrey and those passing through the County.

6.2 The recommendations in this report will have no material impact on existing equality policy so the need to complete a full assessment was not considered necessary.

## **7. LOCALISM:**

7.1 The Highways Service is mindful of localism, remains committed to “self help” and community lead opportunities for winter service provision and assistance. The Local Committee has the flexibility to influence minor changes to the salting network and promote further engagement with volunteer groups to assist during severe weather events etc.

## **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 Local Committee (Tandridge) is asked to provide feedback on the 2014/15 winter service, and any proposed changes to the salting network locally. Change request and comments will be taken into account prior to the

annual winter service plan being submitted to the County Council's Cabinet for approval in September.

**10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

10.1 The annual review will consider opportunities for continuous improvement following the 2014/15 winter season and reflect feedback received from members through their Local Committee Chairman. The proposed engagement timetable is as follows:

End of season wash up meetings – Local Highway Service Teams, Service Provider, Operations and Asset Planning	March - April
Task Group Review Meeting (including progress on the 2013/14 recommendations)	April
Local Committee Chairmen advised of any changes to salting network	May - July
Environment & Transport Select Committee – Winter Service Report & Plan	September
Cabinet – Winter Service Report & Plan	September
Local Committees – Update on winter service arrangements	Autumn meetings
Winter service information pack and communications campaign	September onwards
Stakeholder and Local Committee feedback on winter service (Agenda item to be included on spring round of Local Committees)	Oct - March

**Contact Officer:**

Simon Mitchell, Maintenance Plan Team Leader, Tel, 03456 009 009

**Consulted:** **David Harmer Chairman E&TSC**  
**E&TSC Winter Service Task Group Members**  
**Local Highway Services Team**  
**Kier**

**Sources/background papers:**

Report of the Task Group to the Cabinet – 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2014  
Highway Cold Weather Plan for 2014/15