

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**TANDRIDGE LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
 held at 10.15 am on 12 December 2014  
 at Tandridge District Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted, Surrey,  
 RH8 0BT.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

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

\* In attendance

---

**31/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

No apologies were received, however Mr John Orrick was due to arrive late to the meeting.

**32/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

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

**33/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

None received.

**34/13 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

Three received.

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

The Local Committee Chairman decided to take the Pinch Points petition, x2 Pinch point's related public questions and Item 7 at this point in the meeting and to hear discussion on the items after hearing the petitions, questions and report.

Petition 1 - Mrs Pamela Erskine submitted a petition with 1060 signatures from local residents requesting that the pinch points on Godstone Road in Lingfield are demolished.

Mrs Erskine was in attendance and presented the petition.

The Chairman then moved on to hear the related public questions.

**35/13 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

Five formal public questions were received. The written responses (which were provided to the questioners) are attached to the minutes as **Appendix B**.

Two questions were received from members of the public regarding the pinch points on Godstone Road, Lingfield.

Chris D'avray, from Lingfield Parish Council (Question 2) and District Councillor Brian Perkins (Question 5) submitted their public questions to the meeting; they received the response prior to the meeting.

Question 2 - Mr D'avray asked a supplementary question; he stated that in the last two years of monitoring, there were partial records in place due to the equipment on Station Road not working properly. He continued that he would like the pinch points nearest to the village removed however he would like to request a year's further monitoring to be carried out at the other pinch point.

The Transport Development Planning Team Manager responded that the Section 278 agreement with the developer is a legal agreement with a monitoring period of a year which ended in September 2014. There is no scope in the legal agreement to change this other than to attempt to renegotiate with the developer. Therefore further monitoring could be at the expense of Surrey County Council not the developer.

**Member Discussion – key points:**

- Members inquired what the cost of further monitoring for a year would be. The Transport Development Planning Team Manager responded that the approximate cost would be £2,000 for the monitoring, then (if appropriate) the cost of removal of the pinch points and then replacement with another measure would be around £20,000.

Question 5 - Cllr Brian Perkins asked a supplementary question; he stated that in the question response received, the Transport Development Planning Team Manager said that the signs were clear and comply with legislation. However although he agrees, he believes the sign at the furthest pinch points requires illumination at night. He continued that he believed the pinch points were not wide enough which was resulting in many vehicles hitting the pinch points therefore he requests that these modifications be made.

The Transport Development Planning Team Manager responded that the pinch points furthest from the village have no illumination as per the planning conditions imposed on them. She continued that the pinch points meet the 3.5m requirements given for Fire Vehicles to be able to pass through. There could be scope to remove and replace the pinch points however this cannot be at the expense of the developer which is her recommendation.

**Member Discussion – key points:**

- Members asked the Transport Development Planning Team Manager to remind them of the criteria. She responded that the criteria set were congestion, traffic speed, traffic diversion and recorded personal injury accidents.

The Chairman then moved on to the related Item 7.

**36/13 REVIEW OF THE OPERATION OF THE DEVELOPER FUNDED SPEED MANAGEMENT MEASURES IN GODSTONE ROAD, LINGFIELD [FOR DECISION] [Item 7]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Caroline Smith, Transport Development Planning Team Manager East

The Transport Development Planning Team Manager reported that the Parish council did some work in monitoring congestion; however they stopped monitoring in March 2014 as they felt their information did not fully represent the main concerns. Surrey County Council monitors journey times as opposed to just congestion and the journey time data is derived from sat nav information supplied by the Department for Transport.

Sat Nav data is only available up until August 2013. The latest data will not be available until the new year. The data showed average journey times increased by 23 seconds north bound and 20 seconds southbound during peak times. The increase in journey times does not constitute congestion.

The Transport Development Planning Team Manager relayed concerns expressed by the Parish council regarding traffic diverting from this route to Lingfield Common Road/Station Road and/or Saxby's Lane. Therefore traffic counters were placed in Station Road and Saxby's Lane, in order to monitor this. Unfortunately there have been significant problems with the Station Road counter and there is very little data available. However traffic levels in Godstone Road and Saxby's Lane have fluctuated during the monitoring period and mirror each other. If one drops, so does the other therefore there appears to be no trend in traffic diverting.

Prior to the introduction of the scheme, the 85%ile traffic speed on Godstone Road adjacent to the site access was around 41 mph with a mean speed of 35/36 mph. The most recent data, from October 2014, shows that the 85%ile speed has reduced to 35 mph and the mean speed to 30 mph N.W bound and the 85%ile speed to 34 mph and the mean speed to 27/28 mph S.E bound. Consequently mean speeds are now at or below the 30mph speed limit.

According to the County Council's records of personal injury accidents, there have been none reported related to the pinch points.

**Member Discussion – key points:**

- The Local Committee Vice Chairman stated that Surrey County Council (SCC) has a responsibility to monitor the roads. Therefore when action is required it comes back to the County or Local Committee. So as a highways authority SCC would continue to have a responsibility.
- Members agreed that the positive outcome was that the speed limit had been reduced and that there had been no recorded personal injuries.

## ITEM 2

- Mrs Sally Marks enquired whether, although part of the planning permission was to have no illumination at one of the pinch points, can a request be lodged to request illumination. Mrs Marks commented that it seems to be poor driving that could be causing the issues. She continued in asking whether the signage could be improved.
- Members agreed that the latest traffic monitoring results were needed and that drivers should apply better judgement and patience.
- Members agreed that HGVs should also take a share of the blame and that they should be written to in order to ask them to improve their code of conduct within the district.

The Transport Development Planning Team Manager responded that as the highways authority SCC may be able to go against the planning permission and provide illumination at the pinch point but this would be at their own expense. She added that the signage in place meets the relevant criteria and was improved. However this is something that can be looked at again.

- Mrs Sally Marks requested that the officer pursues the illumination option and looks again at the signage which the Transport Development Planning Team Manager agreed to do in liaison with the South East Area Team.
- Mr David Hodge proposed that the Transport Development Planning Team Manager return to the March Local Committee meeting in order to present options on what additional measures could be provided and to present further monitoring data.
- Members were reluctant to see the pinch points removed. However it was agreed to defer the decision until the March 2015 meeting where a new report will be brought to the Committee.
- Members requested that a copy of that report be shown to the Lingfield and Dormansland parish councils and that SCC also ask if the parishes will consider financing VAS.
- All members agreed to the proposed recommendation to defer the decision to the March 2015 Local Committee meeting.

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** Chris D'avray from Lingfield Parish Council asked whether a video camera could be installed for the further monitoring.

The officer responded that she would be happy to continue with the monitoring. However there is no budget available and does not consider it appropriate to ask the developer to fund it.

The Transport Development Planning Team Manager agreed to return to the March Local Committee meeting and confirmed that under the terms of the S278 agreement, there is a 6 month period following monitoring after which the developer is not obliged to undertake further work.

- Mr David Hodge agreed to speak with the officer outside of the meeting to take this further and members discussed that a special formal local committee meeting may need to take place in February in order to make the decisions before the legal 6 month time period elapses.

**Resolution:**

The Committee AGREED:

**To defer the committee decision until the next meeting of the local committee.**

The Chairman returned to Item 4 to hear the remaining 2 petitions received.

### **37/13 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

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

Petition 2 – Mr David Chambers submitted a petition with 12 signatures from local residents regarding HGVs out of Lambs Business Park causing significant noise and vibration.

Mr Chambers was in attendance and presented the petition. He also referred to the speed of the vehicles and a drain collapse outside Orme House

The responding officer elaborated from her answer to the petitioner and informed him that a scheme to improve the junction of A22 Eastbourne Road/Tilburstow Hill Road is on a list of possible future works for which no funding has been allocated.

She continued that they were unable to install any traffic calming measures in roads that have no street lighting, such as this one, and that a reduction in the speed limit in Tilburstow Hill Road would not meet the speed limit policy criteria. The officer agreed to speak with the petitioner outside of the meeting regarding the drain.

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

- Members agreed that HGVs travelling at unsociable hours in the district are a big problem and discussed whether the District Council could do anything about it.
- There is a move to get HGVs to drive on main A roads therefore signage perhaps needs to be changed to reflect this.
- Members asked the highways officers whether signage could be improved to provide advance warning of the low bridge in Tilburstow Hill Road.
- Mrs Sally Marks requested that the highways team contact the HGV companies (after hearing that the average speed in the area is 47mph). She also requested that the team look at the junction to see if anything can be done there to improve things.
- The highways officer responded that in the Local Transport Strategy it mentions junction improvements however it would need more funding. Enforcement of the current speeds would be a matter for Surrey Police.
- Mr David Hodge highlighted that while there is a large wish list of works to be done, there are often problems with land ownership and utilities also which in turn raise the cost significantly.
- The Chairman suggested the damaged bus stop and phone box in that location could be removed in order to improve sight lines.

## ITEM 2

Petition 3 – Mr Craig Anderson submitted a petition with 29 signatures from local residents asking to reduce the speed limit on Stafford Road to 20MPH.

Mr Anderson was unable to attend the meeting but had been sent the response in advance of the meeting.

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

- Mrs Sally Marks informed the committee that this particular road was very challenging with regards to parking. She continued that while she had every sympathy with the resident's perception of the road, that she was unsure how vehicles could build speed down the road due to the parking.
- Members believed the situation of the road and its parking problems could be due to the flats and suggested that perhaps the District council could be contacted in order to request that off-street parking on District Council land in the area is created. Tandridge District council have often given planning permission to blocks of flats with inadequate parking provision.
- Mrs Sally Marks however pointed out to the committee that the district council in one instance refused planning permission but were overruled by the Planning Inspectorate.
- Members agreed that the district should still look at creating more parking near to Stafford Road to alleviate some of the problems there.
- Although the County Council are consulted and has the opportunity to comment on planning proposals, some members believed that elected members views are not sufficiently taken into account.

Members asked that they are made aware of planning applications with transport implications at an early stage in order to give them the opportunity to comment. It was agreed that the Local Committee Chairman write to the District Council to this effect.

The Chairman continued with Item 5 – Public written questions.

### **38/13 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

Five formal public questions were received. The written responses (which were provided to the questioners) are attached to the minutes as **Appendix B**.

Questions 2 and 5 were discussed earlier in the meeting (received from members of the public regarding the pinch points on Godstone Road, Lingfield).

Question 1 - Mr Piers Clark asked a supplementary question; he asked how the committee would address resident concerns over safety caused by commuter parking on Grange Road. He explained that with the recent housing development and with Caterham being the last stop in Zone 6 there has been a constant increase in parking on the road from 7am to approximately 8pm. He expressed concerns over safety and being unable to drive out of their properties safely due to the sight lines being obstructed by the parking. He continued that there have been accidents where emergency vehicles have been obstructed also.

The Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager responded that he was sorry to hear of the difficulties and advised the residents to call the Reigate and Banstead Parking team if any of their drives are physically obstructed (in the short term). Longer term the parking review will be in March 2015 and this particular issue will be raised with the divisional member (Mrs Sally Marks) in the new year.

Question 3 - Mrs Claire Knight asked a supplementary question; she stated how dangerous the situation was as the residents have to come out of their properties blind and asked how the parking wardens proceed when called. Do residents need to take a picture and send it to the team or do the wardens come out to the location straight away.

The Reigate and Banstead Parking manager responded that the residents should call her team who will come out within 24 hours or if there is an officer located nearby then they will be sent to the road.

Mrs Knight requested that one of the team come to her property and experience trying to come out of her driveway.

The Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager agreed that he would try to do this at some point.

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

- Mr David Hodge reminded the residents that if somebody is parked across their drives they can also call the police. This happened to him personally and the police came and prosecuted the driver and issued a £300 fine to the driver.

Question 4 – Cllr Bob Milton from Chaldon Village Parish Council was unable to attend the meeting. Mr John Orrick asked two supplementary questions on his behalf (which the Chairman granted).

The supplementary questions were that the response to his question stated the need for a feasibility design to include consideration of traffic speeds, volume etc. Can active consideration be given to the installation of traffic monitoring equipment in Rook Lane by SCC Highways to collect the necessary data?

He also suggests that 106 funding could be available to carry out a feasibility study once other works in the immediate vicinity of the development have been completed. Would the Local Committee endorse this offer and ensure that it is revisited at the appropriate time?

The Highways officers noted the requests.

### **39/13 MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

There were no member questions submitted. However there were 3 questions asked informally at the meeting.

Question 1 – Received from Mr Nick Skellett  
Following representations from concerned residents the Highways Service is requested to introduce a 50mph speed limit from Ballards Lane, Limpsfield to

## ITEM 2

the Kent boundary. A petition has been submitted by the residents which I support.

This is the only part of the A25 in East Surrey which remains unrestricted. The danger of speeding traffic on this stretch of the A25 is exacerbated by slow moving HGVs emerging from or entering the Sandpits and other traffic using the nearby lay-by. Also on this road are several houses, road junctions and the Grasshopper which is one of the largest pubs in the area. With its 200 vehicle car park there is a continuous stream of visitors leaving and entering onto a busy and fast road.

A response will be available for the next meeting.

Question 2 – Received from Mrs Sally Marks.

Mrs Sally Marks informed the committee that due to the constitutional limit of 3 petitions per local committee meeting the Grange Road residents' petition could not be accepted.

Therefore Mrs Marks wanted to bring it up with the parking team also and asked them to inspect the parking restrictions which she had already asked for over a year ago, on their behalf.

A response will be available for the next meeting.

Question 3 – Received from Mr Nick Skellett

Would Highways confirm that the position on Jackass Lane is as follows?

- 1) In order to make the lane safe for all users the service has cut back the vegetation prior to repairing the potholes by jet patching and whilst this work is in progress the lane will be closed on a temporary basis
- 2) Next year the lane will be reassessed to see whether surface dressing or other repairs are needed.
- 3) Surrey highways will continue to keep the lane open to vehicle traffic and if closure were ever to be considered there would be a full public consultation.
- 4) A25 traffic will not be stopped entering Jackass lane but this may be looked at in future if with experience it is deemed necessary to do so on safety grounds

The highways officer confirmed that this was correct.

The questions (and responses where available) are attached to the minutes as **Appendix C**. Any outstanding responses will follow.

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

- Mrs Sally Marks requested to make a statement. Mrs Marks wanted to thank District Officer Steve Hyder for all of his work and dedication during the flooding crisis in the district. Many individuals from the district worked without a day off for 6 weeks to support the residents. Mrs Marks continued that she was disappointed that he did not win an award and that we owe him and his colleagues a huge debt (including Scott Coughlan also). Mrs Marks also wanted to note the outstanding work of County officers also.
- The Local Committee Chairman agreed to write to the Tandridge Chief Executive in order to relay their gratitude.

- Mr John Orrick inquired whether the St Francis School petition had been received by the Community Partnership and Committee Officer. The petition has been received and will be coming to the next Local Committee meeting.

#### **40/13 ON STREET PARKING ENFORCEMENT UPDATE [FOR INFORMATION ONLY] [Item 8]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** David Curl, SCC Parking Team Manager and Jacquie Joseph, Parking Manager

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

The SCC Parking Team Manager and Tandridge Parking Manager presented the report.

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

- Mr David Hodge informed the committee that he had recently attended the Reigate and Banstead Local Committee meeting and was shocked at the deficit.
- Members agreed to note the report however they asked for the SCC Parking Team Manager and Tandridge Parking Manager to return and update members on the outcome of the Reigate and Banstead findings once investigated.
- Mr Nick Skellett inquired regarding two areas of enforcement; off street and on street enforcement and how the officers split their time between them.
- The Parking Manager for Tandridge responded that within the agreement they are required to allocate 11 hours per week for this enforcement. Every day officers go to Tandridge and look at both of those areas however if there is any more need identified for on street enforcement then they can change accordingly.
- Mrs Sally Marks highlighted the area of Woldingham where the area by the village stores which serve the local community need more monitoring as many are abusing the parking restrictions.
- Members agreed there were many incidents such as this across the district which were a threat to the local shops and communities.
- The Parking Manager for Tandridge responded that the officers are aware and have been fully briefed and that she would personally go and visit the areas in order to see the impact first hand.
- Members inquired when last year's changes to parking will be finally completed. The SCC Parking Team Manager responded that they were 99% complete and road marking crews were working their way around the district and they should be totally complete by Xmas – dependant on the weather.
- Members inquired whether enforcement took place over the weekend and whether there is a higher 'hit rate' then.

## ITEM 2

- The Parking Manager for Tandridge responded that they vary the visiting times in order to have a balance throughout the day and will get back to him about the 'hit rate'.
- The Parking Manager for Tandridge shared some parking data with the committee and agreed to run a report with the data and circulate to all members.
- Members agreed to note the report however also requested that the Parking Manager updates them on the outcome of the Reigate and Banstead investigations.

### **Resolution:**

The Committee:

- (i) Noted the contents of the report.

## **41/13 LOCAL COMMITTEE & MEMBERS' ALLOCATION FUNDING - UPDATE [FOR INFORMATION ONLY] [Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

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

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

- Members agreed to note the report.
- Mrs Sally Marks informed the committee that she had made contact with the Caterham food bank and was told that the Lions Club made a generous contribution and therefore they are sufficiently stocked currently.

### **Resolution:**

The Committee NOTED:

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

## **42/13 INFRASTRUCTURE RESILIENCE WORKS UPDATE - A22 AND CATERHAM BOURNE [FOR INFORMATION ONLY] [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Zena Curry, Infrastructure Team Leader

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

- The Infrastructure Team Leader presented the report to the committee. She explained that the bids currently in are for flooding only and covered what works they include and went through the financials also.

**Member Discussion – key points:**

- Members were disappointed with the details in the report as they felt it did not sufficiently represent what the bids were for and what the money will accomplish.
- Members all agreed they would have liked to have all been consulted and shown the drawn up plans prior to the bud submission. In addition they do not believe the report has illustrated the amount of work that has gone into the bid.
- They continued that they believed the figures to be misleading as £800,000.00 has already been spent for the water storage areas and there is no mention regarding the work in negotiating with land owners either.
- Members requested to see a copy of the plan, full cost breakdown including Croydon's costs and what it covers.
- Members inquired what responsibilities DEFRA, Thames Water and the Environment Agency covered in the district.
- Members discussed the drainage in the area and the strain that new homes put on the local area.
- Local Committee members agreed to write to the District Council in order to explain the situation and request a moratorium on the building in these sites as it is vital that more homes are not built and add to the problem. Information needs to be gathered from the environment agency and all other partners in drafting the letter. They agreed to send a copy of the letter also to the planning inspectorate.
- Mr David Hodge also requested advice and input from Mark Borland and Zena Curry for the letter.
- The Infrastructure Team Leader continued that the plan would be circulated and that the off road water storage areas were being funded by DEFRA.
- She confirmed that the LEP bid was actually a 'light touch' bid for damage caused to A22 because it's all they can bid for through the LEP.
- Of the £5.9m requested, £1m is DEFRA funding; the rest is the LEP bid. Croydon are also putting in a bid to the London LEP.
- Mrs Sally Marks inquired whether Thames Water would be improving the drainage system. The Infrastructure Team Leader said that the Thames investment is a different scheme and that they have also requested this from Thames Water.
- Members suggested that the Infrastructures team should attend a future informal Local Committee meeting with all of the plans as it is not clear how they have got to this position and it is a complex matter where a private discussion is required. The Infrastructure Team Leader agreed they would attend a future meeting. Members also requested that all partners (Environment agency, Thames water, Croydon etc are all involved also)
- Members agreed to write to the SCC Chief Executive and ask him to get in touch with Thames Water.

## ITEM 2

### **Resolution:**

The Committee:

(i) NOTED the contents of the report

### **43/13 HIGHWAY SCHEMES UPDATE [FOR INFORMATION ONLY] [Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

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

- The Senior Engineer presented the report to the committee. She referred the members to the tabled Annex 1.

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

- Members wanted to thank the team for all of their hard work and for the Senior Engineer who stepped up over the past 9 months to cover the Area Team Manager post temporarily.
- Mr Nick Skellett thanked the team for their quick response to Titsey Road/Titsey Hill speed limit reduction. He asked that they engage with the police again and ask them to consider a double white line system on the bends as the camber is dangerous and the double line would encourage drivers not to drift across the road through the bends.
- Members queried the number of customer enquiries in the first half of the year and were informed that this was due to the severe winter weather. The Senior Engineer continued that regarding the double white lines, she will suggest to the police that they all drive the route together. The Police have commented that they would prefer that the speed limit is reduced before any consideration is given to amending the road markings.
- Members discussed the weather patterns in Tandridge and agreed that in the east of the district it is more similar to Kent than the rest of the county and that this is evidenced by the gritting that takes place on those routes.

### **Resolution:**

The Committee:

(i) NOTED the contents of the report

### **44/13 HIGHWAY FORWARD PROGRAMME 2015/16 – 2016/17 [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 12]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

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

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

- The Assistant Engineer presented the report to the committee.

**Member Discussion – key points:**

- Members discussed the increase in the number of weeks in which they get extra drainage.
- Mr David Hodge informed the committee that the Secretary of State will announce shortly local council's grant allocations for 2015/16.
- Members were concerned regarding the impact on drainage being compromised when equipment breaks down.
- Mr Nick Skellett updated members and informed them that they get a service centrally and also have the local flexibility from the Local Committee to have 5 weeks extra gully cleaning and that another £20,000 has been allocated from the local budgets.
- Members enquired whether they could look at specific drains where debris and leaves create major problems.
- The Engineer responded that the centrally funded service monitor silt levels and some gullies are emptied more frequently as a result. She continued that they now have a small centrally funded drainage budget to carry out investigation and minor works, supervised by the Community Highways Officers.

**Resolution:**

The Committee AGREED:

General

- (ii) Note that it has been assumed that the Local Committee's devolved highways budget for capital, revenue and Community Enhancement works for 2015/16 remains the same as for 2014/15, at £648,586;
- (iii) Authorise that the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman be able to amend the programme should the devolved budget vary from this amount;

Capital Improvement Schemes (ITS)

- (iv) Agree that the capital improvement schemes allocation for Tandridge be used to progress the Integrated Transport Schemes programme set out in Annex 1;
- (v) Authorise that the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, be able to vire money between the schemes agreed in Annex 1, if required;
- (vi) Authorise that the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local divisional Members, agree which additional scheme(s) from Annex 2 are to be progressed for design and/or construction during 2015/16.

Capital Maintenance Schemes (LSR)

## ITEM 2

- (vii) Agree that the capital maintenance schemes allocation for Tandridge be divided equitably between County Councillors to carry out Local Structural Repair, and that the schemes to be progressed be agreed by the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local divisional Members;

### Revenue Maintenance

- (viii) Authorise the Area Maintenance Engineer, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant local divisional Member, to use £100,000 of the revenue maintenance budget for 2015/16 as detailed in Table 2 of this report;
- (ix) Agree that £5,000 per County Councillor be allocated from the revenue maintenance budget for Highways Localism Initiative works, and that if this funding is not distributed by the end of October 2015, the monies revert to the relevant Member's Community Enhancement allocation;
- (x) Agree that the remaining £152,110 of the revenue maintenance budget be used to fund minor maintenance works throughout Tandridge, as identified by the Area Maintenance Engineer in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant divisional Member.

### Community Enhancement Fund

- (xi) Agree that the Community Enhancement Funding is devolved to each County Councillor based on an equitable allocation of £5,000 per division; and
- (xii) Agree that Members should contact the Area Maintenance Engineer to discuss their specific requirements with regard to their Community Enhancement allocation and arrange for the work activities to be managed by the Area Maintenance Engineer on their behalf.

## **45/13 TANDRIDGE LOCAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY AND FORWARD PROGRAMME [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] [Item 13]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** David Stempffer and Peter Hitchings, Major Schemes Manager and Engineer

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

- The Major Schemes Manager and Engineer presented the report to the committee.

**Member Discussion – key points:**

- Members were happy with the recommendations however wanted to change the wording of the second recommendation to clarify that the forward programme should be considered in the future by the chair, vice chair and divisional members. Members also wanted to ensure

any decisions made take into account available resources (such as funding for example).

- The recommendation change was proposed by Mr Nick Skellett and agreed by all.
- Members asked if it was a live document (it is) and when it can be reviewed.
- The Major Schemes manager responded that the list of schemes can be reviewed annually and the main document every three years.
- Members asked if they could communicate any concerns with the current list. The Major Schemes manager welcomed this and would be happy to accept any changes. He explained that the list of schemes were put together following a 6 week consultation and the document forms an evidence base for future bidding opportunities.
- The Major Schemes Engineer drew the committee's attention to the amended section of the Transport Strategy showing changes to the rail section. Although members were pleased with the additional paragraphs they still felt it was not strong enough and required further work and a response from Network Rail.
- Members agreed they would like to invite Network Rail to a future informal local committee meeting.

**Resolution:**

The Committee AGREED:

- (i) Approve the Tandridge Local Transport Strategy and its suggested objectives
- (ii) **Accept** the list of schemes provided in the Forward Programme (Annex of the Local Transport Strategy) **for future consideration by the divisional member, Local Committee Chairman and Vice Chairman, taking into account available resources.**
- Members thanked Michelle Starr, Community Partnership and Committee officer for her work while covering maternity leave of Sarah Woodworth.

Meeting ended at: 12:48 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank