

**THESE MINUTES REMAIN DRAFT UNTIL FORMALLY APPROVED AT
THE 12 SEPTEMBER 2016 LOCAL COMMITTEE MEETING**

Minutes of the meeting of the
REIGATE AND BANSTEAD LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 2.00 pm on 6 June 2016
at Albert Rooms, 92 Albert Road, Horley, Surrey RH6 7HZ.

Surrey County Council Members:

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

Borough / District Members:

- Cllr Derek Allcard
- * Cllr Michael Blacker
- * Cllr Dr Lynne Hack
- * Cllr David Jackson
- Cllr Frank Kelly
- * Cllr Roger Newstead
- * Cllr Tony Schofield
- * Cllr Mrs Anna Tarrant
- * Cllr Mrs Rachel Turner
- * Cllr Jonathan White

* In attendance

70/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Allcard and Cllr Kelly.

[Mr Jonathan Essex gave apologies for lateness and arrived at 14.32]

71/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 2]

The minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting held on 7 March 2016.

[Members noted Annex 1 to the minutes.]

72/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 3]

None received.

73/16 PETITIONS (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 4]

A petition with 195 signatures entitled 'We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to provide a year round safe and usable path on Alma Road at the exit to Holmesdale School and up to Beverley Heights' was received from Mrs Lara Sheard. Mrs Sheard sent apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, but sent a query via email:

"The Surrey County Council website states that pavement maintenance programmes are prioritised using a number of criteria and that priorities are based upon a number of further factors. With respect to this criteria, the petition response provided to us refers solely to the reported personal injury collisions. Are you able to provide us with a breakdown of the report which details the other factors considered when determining the priority of maintaining the stretch of pathway in question?"

The Area Highway Manager responded that the petition was requesting a new footway, rather than maintenance. There were more requests than available budget to deliver, and the requests have to be prioritised, but Members could choose to add the request to the list of possible future schemes awaiting funding priority. There was a possibility of using local funds under delegated powers to maintain the verge; Safe Routes to School could also consider funding the scheme.

During discussion with the Committee, the following key points were raised:

- The Divisional Member for Reigate noted that building works on Alma Road had added to the deterioration of the grass verge. In addition, Holmesdale School had recently expanded its pupil numbers which meant the use of the verge had become heavier. Members asked whether developer funding could be secured. The Area Highway Manager confirmed that this would require a separate bid for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding.
- It was suggested that school funds could be used to reconfigure the front of the school, as happened at Walton on the Hill Primary School. The Divisional Member for Reigate noted that this had been discussed with the headteacher but no school funds were available as they had chosen to prioritise provision within the school grounds.
- Members sympathised with the petitioner and the problems caused by the deterioration of the verge; it was noted that there were similar problems elsewhere in the borough. The Chairman hoped that some funding could be found but was not optimistic in the short term.

74/16 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 5]

None received.

75/16 FORMAL MEMBER QUESTIONS (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 6]

None received.

76/16 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 7]

The Decision Tracker was noted.

[A request was made for an update on the current position regarding the Parking Review. It was noted that this was due to come to the 12 September 2016 Local Committee meeting.

Members wished to know if the replacement lighting poles for the Croydon Road Zebra Crossing would be funded centrally or by the Local Committee. The Area Highway Manager noted that she was seeking prices for new illuminated posts and halo lights, and once received, the decision would be taken under delegated authority. Due to the priority level of the scheme, it was not likely to meet the criteria for central funding, and would therefore be funded from the Local Committee's budget.]

77/16 SURREY FIRE & RESCUE AUTHORITY - DRAFT PUBLIC SAFETY PLAN 2016-2025 (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Sally Wilson, Service Improvement Manager and Bob Weldon-Gamble, Group Commander, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

- Members were extremely supportive of the proposals in the draft Public Safety Plan (PSP), and particularly welcomed the proposals for greater collaborative work with other emergency services.
- Members wished to know if the proposals would mean a change in response times. The Service Improvement Manager stated that the current PSP referred to how quickly a fire engine could attend an incident, but in future this could mean a co-responder or a fire officer in a car, depending on the type of incident. The priority would be getting the right people and equipment to the incident; however, there were no proposals to change response times.
- Discussion took place regarding the issue of false alarms, particularly from automatic systems. The Group Commander informed Members that the number of automatic alarm calls had halved in the last 5-10 years following a review of how such calls were handled. He hoped that the service could go even further on this reduction, and noted that Surrey was at the forefront of this issue nationally.
- The Chairman asked whether the service looked at how fire and rescue services outside the UK operated, noting that co-responding with other emergency services was well-established in France. The Group Commander noted that the FBU linked to other unions in Europe, and that professional bodies looked at other international examples of best practice.
- A question was asked regarding the possibility of a centralised base for all emergency services to work together. The Service Improvement Manager informed the Committee that the service was looking at how they could work with Surrey Police and South East Coast Ambulance

ITEM 2

Service (SECamb) to respond together from their current estates (this is already happening in the case of SECamb). Opportunities regarding vehicle servicing and fuel purchase were also being considered.

- It was noted that SECamb can forecast where they are likely to be required, and Members wished to know if Surrey Fire and Rescue Service were also able to do so. The Service Improvement Manager informed Members that the Dynamic Cover tool enables them to do this; this informed the response standard.
- Members wished to know if the options appraisal on collaboration was a paper exercise. The Service Improvement Manager reported that it was a mixture of a practical pilot and a paper based options appraisal looking at all options. There were also practical examples of work with Surrey Police, e.g. responding to heart attack and drug overdose victims; minor Road Traffic Collisions (RTCs) and animal rescues.
- The Service Improvement Manager reported that the PSP would be coming for approval at Cabinet on 20 September 2016 (rather than July as stated in the report). She encouraged the Committee to complete the questionnaire in response to the consultation.

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

78/16 TRAVEL SMART - END OF PROGRAMME REPORT (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR INFORMATION) [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Marc Woodall, Sustainable Transport Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

- Members were generally pleased with the outcomes of the project and felt that overall, it had been a success.
- A question was asked regarding the proposed Visible Message Signs (VMS) and when they were likely to be installed. The Sustainable Transport Manager reported that they would be installed by the end of summer 2016. There had been a delay owing to a water resistance failure during factory testing. He agreed to check on the latest position regarding the electrical works with Skanska.
- Concerns were raised regarding the Travel SMART Hub, the opening of which was delayed by 14 months and which closed very abruptly having been rarely open. The Sustainable Transport Manager reported that this experience had been covered in two “lessons learned” exercises.
- A question was asked regarding the evaluation of the impact of the project, particularly in light of the fact that the schemes in Guildford and Woking were larger initiatives. The officer explained that there were two main areas of evaluation; outputs – what was delivered, and impact – the Department for Transport (DfT) was collating reports from all Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) programmes and would

be reporting back at the end of 2016. Data regarding public transport use, cycling and pedestrians would be collected locally. It was possible to demonstrate that sustainable transport schemes have resulted in an increase in cycling, and noted that the Travel and Transport Team were working with the University of Surrey to improve the marketing of bus services.

- Members wished to know how any increase in bus usage, following the improvements, was being measured. The Sustainable Transport Manager explained that data from the bus operators was being collected and analysed annually.
- Members wished to know if all the proposed electric vehicle charging points had been delivered. The officer reported that two charging points had already been installed at East Surrey College and Reigate Hill, and that bidding for two more was taking place in conjunction with Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
- Members wished to see a disaggregation of the results so that the local benefits could be demonstrated. The officer reported that the Redhill and Reigate element of the programme had been selected by the DfT for a “deep dive” evaluation study in comparison with Telford, which had a similar programme.
- Concerns were raised regarding the funding of the remaining schemes, and whether there were budgetary implications. The Area Highway Manager assured the Committee that the Design Team would be working on these schemes; anything additional would need to be prioritised alongside other schemes. The Sustainable Transport Manager reported that the design and construction costs would be covered by Section 106 funding; as there was no longer a LSTF project management team, these would be taken forward with Highways.
- Members welcomed the fact that the programme had enabled more young people to access work opportunities, and that Redhill town centre was now safer to walk around. The success of the Redhill Balanced Network was also noted.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead):

- (i) **NOTED** the content of the report and the outcomes of the project.
- (ii) **AGREED** that the remaining schemes in Redhill and Reigate programme will now be delivered through the most appropriate department, as set out in paragraph 4.4.

79/16 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR INFORMATION) [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highway Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

- Members wished to know if the new Greater Redhill package would look at HGV movements. The Area Highway Manager noted that this was an issue, and that she was working with the Central Team to look into it. A site visit was being organised with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Divisional Members. An update would be brought to the September 2016 Local Committee meeting.
- Members asked whether the role of Local Highways Officers was being considered as part of improvements to customer service following complaints. The Area Highway Manager agreed to check with the Maintenance Engineer and report back. A process of continual improvement when dealing with customers was in place.
- Members were asked to email the Area Highway Manager with individual requests for their divisions, copying in the Community Partnerships and Committee Officers.
- Discussion took place regarding the Carriageway Horizon programme. Members expressed concerns that the list of roads was inaccurate, and wished to know how often it was checked. The Area Highway Manager explained that the original Horizon programme list was based on inspections made in 2011, prior to the adverse weather during winter 2013-14 which had caused many roads to deteriorate rapidly. She reported that surveys would be repeated, but urged Members to send her their priority roads in the meantime; she emphasised that this did not necessarily mean that they would be included in the next tranche of works, but would ensure they were on the list for future consideration.
- The Area Highway Manager reported that the timetable for the Langshott bus route was accurate and that she would keep the committee updated.
- Members felt that Reigate & Banstead received a disproportionate amount of road maintenance compared with its status as the second highest net contributor to Surrey County Council. The Chairman agreed to put these points forward in a letter to the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding, and the Leader of the Council.
- Discussion took place regarding the A217 Resilience Scheme. The Area Highway Manager confirmed that Transport for London (TfL) had assisted with the scheme, and that the London Borough of Sutton had provided some support with funding and diversions.

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

80/16 PAVEMENT HORIZON - 5 YEAR PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR INFORMATION) [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highway Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

- Members were reminded that the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding had written to them requesting suggestions from their divisions. She emphasised that sealing and waterproofing of pavements would continue as normal; works under the Horizon programme involved full reconstruction of pavements.
- Clarification was sought as to what constituted a 'pavement'. The Area Highway Manager clarified that a pavement was a surfaced footway - either a footway at the side of a road or a town path. Footpaths (rights of way) were not covered. Requests for new pavements would not be considered as part of this programme.
- Concerns were raised regarding the footway alongside the A217 in the northern part of the borough, which was overgrown with grass and the surface of which had eroded in places.
- It was reported that the pavement at Washington Close, Reigate, had already been resurfaced. The Area Highway Manager explained that this had been a preventative waterproofing overlay to extend the life of the pavement.
- Members wished to know if a separated process was in place for footways requiring functional improvements. The Area Highway Manager reported that extensive inspection of pavements, including footfall, was taking place, and there was a full scheduled programme of preventative schemes going ahead. She undertook to check whether this had been sent out to Members.
- Concerns were raised that certain pavements, such as Bonser Drive, Tadworth, only experienced heavy footfall at school times, but had still deteriorated.
- Members wished to know what would happen to paving slabs where these were in place. The Area Highway Manager noted that over time, paving slabs rattle and cause trip hazards. Disabled groups prefer tarmac as it is a smoother surface. Although the cost of reconstructing the lower layers of the pavement is the same with slabs as for tarmac, the cost of relaying slabs is considerably greater. However, in some heritage areas, communities have requested this instead of tarmac.
- Members felt that Community Payback would be an effective way of getting overgrown pavements cleared. The Area Highways Manager noted this, but advised that it can be time consuming as close supervision is required.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) NOTED:

- (i) The list of potential Pavement Horizon needs based schemes, for the 5 year programme, generated from the Footway Network Survey for Reigate & Banstead, as set out in Annex 1.
- (ii) The request to identify schemes that are: 1. High priority and should remain on the 5 year programme; 2. Lower priority and could be deferred to a future programme; 3. Currently not on the high priority list and should be considered for addition to the list.

ITEM 2

- (iii) The process outlined in part 1 to verify that the schemes in Annex 1 meet local and community needs.

81/16 MASONS BRIDGE ROAD, REDHILL - SPEED LIMIT ASSESSMENT (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highway Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

- Members noted their support for the proposal. The Chairman reported thanks on behalf of Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead):

- (i) **NOTED** the results of the speed limit assessment undertaken.
- (ii) **AGREED** that, based upon the evidence, the speed limit be reduced from 40mph to 30mph in the section of Masons Bridge Road between the existing 30mph speed limit terminal signs 13m south of the southern boundary of 74 Masons Bridge Road and a point 25m south east of the eastern kerb line of Kings Mill Lane; and in the section of Kings Mill Lane between the junction with Masons Bridge Road and a point 40m north of that junction, in accordance with the current policy.
- (iii) **AUTHORISED** the advertisement of a notice in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to implement the proposed speed limit change, and, subject to no objections being upheld, that the order be made.
- (iv) **AUTHORISED** delegation of authority to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and the local divisional Member to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposal.

82/16 A240 REIGATE ROAD, BURGH HEATH - SHARED PEDESTRIAN CYCLE PATH (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 13]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highway Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

- The Area Highway Manager reported that the funding for this scheme was no longer guaranteed due to the bidding process for CIL funds; therefore the proposal was recommended for approval subject to the necessary funding being available.
- Members raised concerns regarding the location of the shared paths in paragraph 3.1; it was suggested that this should read “west side” then “east side”. The Area Highways Manager agreed to check this.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) APPROVED the change from a footway to a shared pedestrian cycle path on that section of the A240 Reigate Road, Burgh Heath between the path across Burgh Heath to Chetwode Road and Church Lane, as shown in Annex 1 to the report submitted, subject to the necessary funding being available.

83/16 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT - SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE 2015/16 (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR INFORMATION) [Item 14]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Matthew Raleigh, Youth Support Service (YSS) Team Manager (Reigate & Banstead)

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

- Members thanked the YSS Team Manager for an excellent and informative report.
- Concerns were expressed that the number of young people unknown to the service had shown an increase in the past year. The YSS Team Manager explained that efforts had been made to bring this number down, but that due to budget reductions and new areas of work, the amount of resources required may not have been sufficient. He emphasised that the service’s tracking team made calls to young people and their parents.
- Members wished to know if the contract performance target referred to on page 83 of the agenda pack was likely to be met. The YSS Manager noted that this referred to the hours provided by Learning Space as part of the 1-to-1 Local Prevention contract, and that the figures were going up. The Early Help Offer meant that a recommissioning of services would be taking place, and that this was likely to result in a 25% increase in hours.
- It was noted that the report did not mention the Youth Engagement Scheme (YES) operated by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service. Members wished to know how many young people from Reigate & Banstead had participated in the scheme. The YSS Manager explained that the YES was not included in the report as it was not part of the YSS offer, but agreed that it was clearly an excellent scheme, and that it would be useful to have a co-ordinated network of all local services.
- Discussion took place around the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) offer for local young people. Members were concerned about an increase in self-harm and suicide amongst young people, and that young people were not being assessed by CAMHS in

a timely manner. The YSS Manager noted that there were difficulties in getting the correct mental health support for young people, and that these services needed to be accessible, e.g. appointments at youth centres rather than in a clinical setting. It was noted that CAMHS was currently undergoing a recommissioning process, and the YSS Manager noted that he was happy to take Members' concerns to CAMHS colleagues and to ensure that Members fully understood the new offer. The Chairman asked the YSS Manager to set up a meeting with CAMHS to put forward these issues.

- Concerns were raised regarding usage of the new Phoenix Centre in Preston. The YSS Manager agreed that facilities needed to be used, but noted that new responsibilities for the Early Help offer presented challenges. He reported that other services, such as Children's Services and CAMHS operated from Banstead Youth Centre, and hoped that this could also happen at the Phoenix Centre.
- Members noted the 70% decrease in the number of first time entrants into the youth justice system since 2011-12, raising concerns that this may be due to cutbacks in neighbourhood policing and a low detection rate. The YSS Manager maintained that the service was proud of the statistic in the report and that it had gained a level of national interest. It was representative of a reduction in offending by young people across Surrey. The service had been working with Surrey Police on tackling anti-social behaviour in Redhill town centre, and offered a number of diversionary activities aimed at helping young people to find alternatives to offending, including restorative justice work, which had a high level of satisfaction for victims.
- Discussion took place regarding the new Redhill youth centre and the number of hours offered. The YSS Manager agreed to provide Members with a response outside the meeting.
- Members noted that they were impressed by the case study on page 77 of the agenda pack, and asked what the success rate is with these type of interventions. The YSS Manager reported that it was difficult to provide a meaningful success rate as all young people have different issues, and that some outcomes are easier to evaluate than others. However, he noted the success achieved by YSS having integrated a number of different functions into one service.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) NOTED how Services for Young People has supported young people to be employable during 2015/16, as set out in the appendix to the report submitted.

84/16 LOCAL COMMITTEE TASK GROUPS 2016-17 (FOR DECISION) [Item 15]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Sarah Quinn, Community Partnership and Committee Officer

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key points:

- It was proposed that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman be removed from the membership of the Parking Task Group, and for the membership to consist of 4 County Councillors rather than 3.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) AGREED:

- (i) The terms of reference of the Youth Task Group, the Greater Redhill Sustainable Transport Package Task Group, the Epsom-Banstead Sustainable Transport Package Task Group and the Parking Task Group as set out in Annex 1 to the report submitted and amended as above.

- (ii) The membership of these task groups for 2016-17 as set out below:

Youth Task Group: Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin, Ms Barbara Thomson, Mr Ken Gulati, Mrs Natalie Bramhall; Cllr Mrs Rachel Turner; Cllr Michael Blacker; Cllr Mrs Anna Tarrant; Cllr David Jackson.

Greater Redhill Sustainable Transport Task Group: Ms Barbara Thomson; Mrs Natalie Bramhall; Mr Jonathan Essex; Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin; Cllr Tony Schofield; Cllr Michael Blacker; Cllr Frank Kelly.

Epsom-Banstead Task Group: Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin; Mr Bob Gardner (Substitutes: Mr Nick Harrison; Ms Barbara Thomson).

Parking Task Group: Mrs Natalie Bramhall; Ms Barbara Thomson; Mr Nick Harrison; Dr Zully Grant-Duff; Cllr Dr Lynne Hack; Cllr Tony Schofield; Cllr Roger Newstead.

- (iii) To nominate Mrs Kay Hammond to represent the Reigate & Banstead Local Committee on the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership in 2016-17 and for Mrs Barbara Thomson to act as substitute.

[A secret ballot took place to determine the membership of the Parking Task Group.]

Meeting ended at: 4.44 pm (adjourned 4.35 pm to 4.40 pm)

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank