

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Reigate AND BANSTEAD LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 2.00 pm on 3 June 2019  
at Reigate Town Hall, Castlefield Road, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0SH.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- Mr Jeff Harris (Chairman)
- \* Ms Barbara Thomson (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mrs Natalie Bramhall
- \* Mr Jonathan Essex
- Mr Bob Gardner
- \* Dr Zully Grant-Duff
- \* Mr Ken Gulati
- \* Mrs Kay Hammond
- \* Mr Nick Harrison
- \* Mr Graham Knight

**Borough / District Members:**

- Cllr Gemma Adamson
- Cllr Rod Ashford
- \* Cllr Michael Blacker
- \* Cllr Steve Kulka
- \* Cllr Victor Lewanski
- \* Cllr Kanika Sachdeva
- \* Cllr Ruth Ritter
- \* Cllr Tony Schofield
- \* Cllr Rachel Turner
- \* Cllr Christopher Whinney

\* In attendance

---

**OPEN FORUM SESSION**

The questions and responses are included as Annex A to these minutes.

**1/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mr Jeff Harris, Cllr Rod Ashford and Cllr Gemma Adamson.

**2/19 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [AGENDA ITEM ONLY] [Item 2]**

The vice-chairman, welcomed the new Reigate & Banstead Borough Council co-optees to the committee and on behalf of the Chairman invited them to attend the next informal meeting of the local committee on Monday 15 July. She added that this would include a short induction session.

### **Key points from the discussion**

- Members noted the informal date clashed with a meeting of the cabinet and requested for the date to be amended so members who were required at both could attend. It was noted this had been raised with the Chairman outside the meeting.

### **3/19 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 3]**

The following corrections were made to the minutes:

Minute - 49/19 Chairman's Announcements

3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph to be changed to:

'SCC Cabinet would shortly be taking a decision about the future of Wray Park and **the** closure and relocation **of the training facility.**'

Minute – 52/19d Petition to change the road layout where Orchard Drive and Cross Oak Lane meet

2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph to include the addition:

'She stated the Parish Council had considered the junction could be redesigned **whilst maintaining its integrity and not compromising its over-riding function of preventing traffic avoiding the A23 through rat-running.**'

Minute – 55/19 Annual Parking Review

Point 2 to be amended as follows:

'Carlton Road - **A full review of the entire road was agreed with Mr Rikki Hill owing to the potential removal of a planning condition with regard to St Bedes School Planning Permission for the construction of a new classroom block. The building had now been completed, so it was imperative that a review is carried out so that additional measures can be implemented.**'

*On review of this by the Parking Project Team Leader after the meeting, it was determined the amendment was not a true record of what was said and therefore no amendment should be made to the minutes.*

Subject to the above amendments, the minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

### **4/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]**

There were none

### **5/19 PETITIONS [Item 5]**

One petition was received.

**6/19 PETITION TO: INTRODUCE 20 MPH SPEED RESTRICTIONS ON ROUNDWOOD WAY, BANSTEAD [Item 5a]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager, SCC

**Petitions, Public Questions and Statements:** The petition and officer response was published within the supplementary agenda.

Mrs Ward attended the meeting to address her concerns about the speed of vehicles down the road. She stated that the road was bendy in nature and often drivers would not change their speed to reflect this. She added the road was a popular cut through to avoid traffic lights and that accidents were a frequent occurrence. Mrs Ward noted she had two children and given there were two schools in the vicinity there were other parents who were concerned about their children's safety.

The officer response that had been received was appreciated but Mrs Ward did question whether the handheld speed device was the most effective way to measure speed; arguing that perhaps a seven day average would provide more meaningful results.

**Key points from the discussion:**

- The divisional member agreed with the comments put forward by Mrs Ward and noted that both schools (infant and junior) should be taken in to account when any assessment took place. It was confirmed that the Road Safety Outside Schools Assessment which was planned for Autumn 2019 would take in to account the whole road and not just the area directly outside the school.
- Members questioned whether any signage could be added to indicate there were schools in the area. The Area Highways Manager (AHM) confirmed there should be signage in place but checks would be made first to ensure this was the case.

**Resolution:**

The Local Committee agreed to note:

- i) The officers comment
- ii) That Surrey County Council's Safer Travel Team will carry out a road safety assessment as set out in the policy in the Autumn Term of 2019. The results of the assessment will be reported to the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman and the divisional Member.

**7/19 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager, SCC

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** The question and officer response was published within the supplementary agenda.

Mr Thrilwall attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary question.

The response I have received from officers refers me to the Highways England (HE) website which as a response is very vague and unhelpful. The residents believe the scheme should be stopped. Kate Jackson, HE in her correspondence with residents refers to consultations with SCC but there is nothing available for the public to view. Can we have a proper response to the matters asked in the question?

**Key points from the discussion:**

- It was noted that the A23 was a trunk road that was managed by HE and therefore any decisions about works happening on the road were outside the remit of the local committee and Surrey Highways. That was therefore why the response provided was in relation to a freedom of information request to gather the sought after information.
- Members of the local committee suggested that a response to the question would be best answered by the SCC Cabinet Member for Highways. It was requested that the question therefore be passed on to him for answering.

**8/19 FORMAL MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 7]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager, SCC

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** The question and officer response was provided within the supplementary agenda.

Mr Essex asked the following supplementary question.

Thank you for the response, if I were to go back to the head teacher at the Warwick School may they have the formal assessment done to see about adoption?

**Key points from the discussion:**

- The AHM confirmed it was an expensive process to get a road adopted, but if the school decided they wanted to do this they could put in the application, pay for the assessment and the road could be adopted.

**9/19 LOCAL COMMITTEE COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 8]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Gordon Falconer, Community Safety Manager, SCC

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

The Community Safety Manager introduced the report noting that since the publication of the report, further enquiries has been made with the recipient of the funding to investigate the lack of expenditure for 2018/19. It was confirmed that there had been an issue with staffing; an employee had left and recruitment was needed to continue the work. It was reported however that the recruitment had since taken place and almost all the money allocated in 2018/19 had been spent.

The Community Safety Manager made the amendment that in recommendation i) of the report, it should read Community Safety Team and not Community Partnership Team.

**Key points from the discussion:**

- Members noted that in previous years the Community Safety money had been allocated to the East Community Safety Partnership (ECSP) to enable a greater amount of work in a larger area than just Reigate & Banstead. The work still had a significant impact on residents living in the borough though. The Community Safety Manager stated that other boroughs in Surrey had previously pooled funds to make it go further, he added there was large scope for what community safety projects could be funded.
- It was noted by members there was a concern over the spending of funds from 2018/19 and whether measures were in place for 2019/20 to ensure the expenditure took place in good time. It was confirmed there was a new application form this year and the timescales would be clearly laid out. It was noted that the plan for this year was to award the funding in September 2019; allowing enough time for full spend by the end of the financial year.
- Some members continued to raise concerns over the monitoring of the spending, stating they needed certainty the funds would be spent in the given time. Other members urged their colleagues to not delay in agreeing the recommendations, as this would have led to further delays and the likelihood of the funding not being spent.
- It was suggested the application form should include a focus on partnership working; asking applicants about the groups they hoped to work with on their projects. This would ensure resources were used efficiently and duplication of work was avoided.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) agreed that:

- i. The committee's delegated community safety budget of £3,000 for 2019/20 be retained by the Community Partnership Safety Team, on behalf of the local committee, and that the Community Safety Partnership and/or other local organisations be invited to submit proposals for funding that meet the criteria and principles set out at section 3 of the report.
- ii. Authority be delegated to the Community Safety Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the local committee and divisional members as appropriate, to authorise the expenditure of the community safety budget in accordance with the criteria and principles stated in section 3 of this report.
- iii. The committee receives updates on the project(s) that are funded, the outcomes and the impact it has achieved.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) noted:

- iv. The update from the YMCA East Surrey regarding the use of the funds in 2018-19 and SCC Community Safety Manager response.

#### **Reason for decisions**

The above decisions were made to set out a process for allocating the committee's delegated community safety budget of £3,000 to local organisations.

### **10/19 REPRESENTATION ON TASK GROUPS AND EXTERNAL BODIES [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Jess Edmundson, Partnership Committee Officer, SCC

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

The Partnership Committee Officer introduced the report, asking for additional nominations for the various task groups.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) agreed:

- i. The terms of reference for the Parking Task Group and the membership of this task group as set out in Annex 1 with the addition of Cllr Ritter, Mrs Bramhall, Cllr Turner, Mr Gulati, Cllr Sachdeva, Cllr Blacker and Cllr Whinney
- ii. The terms of reference for the Greater Redhill Sustainable Transport Task Group and the membership of this task group as set out in Annex 1 with the addition of Cllr Sachdeva, Cllr Blacker, Cllr Schofield and Mr Essex.
- iii. The nominations to outside bodies (Community Safety Partnership) as set out in Annex 1.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) noted:

- iv. That the representative nominated by the committee in June 2018 (Kay Hammond) will remain as the local committee representative on the Early Help Advisory Board pending review of this board (Paragraphs 2.7 – 2.8 of this report).

### **Reason for decisions**

The above decisions were made in order to update the list of representatives on Task Groups and nominations to outside bodies.

## **11/19 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION] [Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager, SCC

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

The Area Highways Manager (AHM) introduced the report adding there were no decisions for the committee to make and the report was for noting.

### **Key points from the discussion:**

- The AHM thanked members who had taken the time to go out and meet with the new Maintenance Engineer and urged anyone who hadn't, to do so.
- Several members questioned the AHM about specific scheme details that were listed in the report.
- Members raised concerns about work being allocated to the Revenue Maintenance Gang, stating they and their residents were requesting work and not receiving a confirmation of the requests or schemes that were on the list. They also said they didn't know when any work had been completed. The AHM confirmed the Maintenance Engineer would shortly be sending members a document of works completed and outstanding. She hoped this would then make things clearer for members.
- There was some confusion over the various scheme lists and the work that appeared on each. The AHM confirmed the map on the horizon web page should include all programmed works. It was confirmed that the Asset Management Team were likely to attend a future local committee informal meeting to discuss with members about the prioritisation of work and various scheme lists.

### **Resolution:**

The local committee noted the contents of the report.

**12/19 PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE A23 THREE ARCH ROAD JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR INFORMATION] [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Neil McClure, Transport Strategy Project Manager

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** The chairman reminded members that information with regards to the A23 Three Arch Road junction had previously been received by the committee, and lengthy discussions had occurred. She requested members to only ask questions or make comment on information that was new.

**Key points from the discussion:**

- Members commented that they were supportive of the scheme but noted the estimated costs of £2.8 - £3.3 million and questioned what money was already in place and how much was needed to be found. It was confirmed that approximately 2/3 of the funding had been found and the Coast2Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) advised funding was likely to become available this year for schemes that were in a position to go ahead. These schemes must have already had 50% of the total funding in place.
- A question was asked about the timescales of the project. The information on this was provided to the local committee in September 2018 and can be found within those agenda papers.
- Concerns were raised over the proposal for the removal of the parking bays on the A23 and the impact this would have on the residents who used and needed them. It was confirmed that although some residents were against the removal there was also a lot of support for their removal. It was stated that without the removal and implementation of two lanes of traffic the scheme would be unable to provide its full benefits. It was confirmed that efforts were being made to look at suitable alternatives to the current parking bays.
- A question was raised about the consideration given to pedestrians and cyclists using the junction as the focus was very much on improving the junction for vehicles. It was confirmed that the aim of the scheme was to increase the capacity at the junction as the need for the junction was there. Consideration was being given to connections in and around the junction too.

**Resolution:**

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) noted the results of the analysis of the public engagement on the proposed A23 Three Arch Road junction improvement scheme.

## **13/19 RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 12]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Jess Edmundson, Partnership Committee Officer, SCC

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

### **Key points from the discussion:**

- A question was raised with regards to Frenches Road petition showing as 'open' on the tracker. The action column seemed to indicate there was no action to take place as the item was now on the Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) list. It was questioned whether this would then remain on the list as open until it took place. The AHM confirmed there were two ITS lists – the long list that contained all schemes and a short list that contained the schemes the local committee agree on each October, to be prioritised in the next financial year. This scheme was currently sat on the long ITS list.
- A question was raised about the length of time the advertising of any Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) was taking following the agreement from the local committee in March 2019 as part of the parking review. It was confirmed that this was a normal amount of time and in previous years the process had taken 18 months – 2 years to complete.

### **Resolution:**

The local committee noted the decision tracker and agreed to remove all items marked as 'complete' and highlighted in grey.

## **14/19 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 13]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Jess Edmundson, Partnership Committee Officer, SCC

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

### **Key points from the discussion:**

- Members requested that an item on Youth Service Provision be brought to a future local committee meeting. It was suggested that this may be best provided at an informal meeting first.
- Members questioned why the forward plan didn't include items for informal meetings. It was confirmed that only the formal meeting, where members of the public could attend, were made public but the informal forward plan could be circulated to the local committee outside the meeting if they'd like to see it.

**Resolution:**

The local committee noted the forward plan of items expected to be received at future meetings.

Meeting ended at: 4.01 pm

---

**Chairman**

## **Open Forum Session**

### **Reigate & Banstead Local Committee – Monday 3 June 2019**

#### **Question 1: Mr Martin Saunders, The Acres Residents' Association**

I attended the last meeting in March where the petition to change the layout of the junction at Cross Oak Lane/Orchard Drive was heard by the committee. What considerations have been made up to this point to make any changes?

**Response from Zena Curry:** This junction is being looked at with the divisional members and with the Road Safety Team Manager. There are many requests for work and when prioritising such works the personal injury accidents need to be taken in to account. Areas where there is a higher accident rate are prioritised higher. This is not the case at this junction.

**Response from Kay Hammond:** The two divisional members have met with officers at the junction. The junction is complex and would be expensive to make changes to. Accidents happen at the junction because people are ignoring the signage and making illegal turnings, not because the junction is unsafe.

**Response from Jim Blackmore, Salfords and Sidlow PC:** We still object to any changes being made to the junction as the junction has been put there for a reason.

Response from Graham Knight: The number of illegal turnings that we witnessed whilst onsite was unbelievable. I understand the concerns of the Parish Council and we need to look at options. Officers are looking at potential proposals to find the middle ground.

#### **Question 2: Mr Rolph**

I am here on behalf of Mr Cliff Lee, a wheelchair user who was unable to attend today with a letter for Mrs Curry about the difficulties of travelling around the borough as wheelchair user due to the state of the pavements.

[Letter handed to Zena Curry]

**Response from Zena Curry:** Thank you for the letter, I will take a look and respond to this outside the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank