

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Reigate AND BANSTEAD LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 2.00 pm on 5 March 2018
 at Reigate Town Hall, Castlefield Road, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0SH.

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 Mrs Rosemary Absalom
- * Cllr Derek Allcard
- * Cllr Rod Ashford
- * Cllr Michael Blacker
- Cllr John Godden
- Cllr Frank Kelly
- * Cllr Steve McKenna
- * Cllr Tony Schofield
- * Cllr Mrs Rachel Turner
- * Cllr Jonathan White

* In attendance

1/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mrs Zully Grant-Duff, Mr Ken Gulati, Mr Nick Harrison and Mr Jonathan Essex.

2/18 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 04 December 2017 were agreed to be a true record.

3/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were received.

4/18 PETITIONS [Item 4]

ITEM 3

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

The petition was presented by Mr Colin Sutherland MBE on behalf of the Park Road Residents Association (Banstead). Petition details and officer response are included in the supplementary agenda papers.

The divisional member (not present) submitted a letter in support, read out by the Chairman, stressing his support in particular for:

- additional signage to reinforce the speed limit and a refresh of existing signs (northern section)
- improved safety of pedestrians
- investigation of a lower speed limit on the southern section and feasibility of advisory signage to deter large vehicles (save for access)
- possible use of developer's contributions from local developments

The AHM confirmed that the location would be added to the speed assessment list on the forward plan.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) agreed to:

- (i) Note the officer's comment

5/18 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

(For questions and responses – see supplementary papers)

Catherine Tully had submitted a written question and received the response in advance of the meeting as well as information on applying for the 'stopping up' of a road.

As supplementary she asked whether it would be possible to carry out some speed monitoring and to enforce the 'No Entry' sign.

The divisional member was not present but the AHM agreed to consult with him on adding the site to the list of potential speed surveys.

The Chairman agreed to discuss with the divisional member, writing to the borough commander to request enforcement action in that location.

Matthew Woods was present on behalf of the group Cycle Redhill and Reigate which had submitted a number of questions and had received

responses in advance of the meeting. (Questions and responses attached to minutes).

He thanked officers for the answers he had received to the questions submitted at short notice.

As a supplementary regarding the A25 Buckland Road gateway scheme he asked for clarification on the 'dedicated' cycle lane that had been referred to.

The AHM explained that the term 'dedicated' in this instance had been used to describe a lane that was just for the use of cyclists and not combined with pedestrians.

The divisional member for Redhill West and Meadvale stressed it was important to acknowledge the amount of work already done to facilitate cycling in the area, but the introduction of further schemes will be limited in part due the county council's difficult financial situation but also the need to balance the needs of other road users.

The divisional member undertook to clarify with Reigate Borough Council the terms of the Public Space Protection that has been implemented in part of Redhill town centre.

6/18 FORMAL MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

(Questions and responses in supplementary papers)

1. Ken Gulati had submitted a written question and had received a written response in advance of the meeting. He was not present to ask a supplementary.
2. Barbara Thomson had submitted a written question and received a written response in advance of the meeting. As a supplementary she asked why, if the whole purpose of the bid to Transport for London was to make safety improvements, this junction (identified as one of the top most dangerous junctions by them) was not treated as a priority?

The AHM explained that it had not been possible to include a proposal to re-design the junction within the funding envelope on offer and it would require the acquisition of a substantial amount of common land. Officers had made some suggestions as to changes in traffic signal timings and modelling of these would be carried out by the end of March 2018.

Officers acknowledged that there had been a lack of communication with local members who had been involved in discussions on this issue some months ago and the AHM agreed to follow up on this and would come back with a response through the local committee.

The junction would remain a priority for when funding might become available.

ITEM 3

7/18 RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 7]

The Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) agreed to note the progress on schemes and to remove from the tracker, those items designated as complete.

8/18 UPDATE FROM CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR INFORMATION] [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key highlights

1. The Chairman asked the Cabinet Member for Highways to pass on the Committee's thanks to officers on the way they handled operations during the recent spell of extreme winter weather.
2. Improved communications during this period had been vital and the Cabinet Member had disseminated information through local members and used social media for key messages.
3. Following his attendance at the meeting in September, the Cabinet Member wanted to provide members with an update on how money was being spent locally.
4. The main report included revised information on defects on the highway, which should be clearer and easier to understand.
5. A revised version of Annex 1 is attached and includes minor amendments to some signal schemes.
6. Information in Annex 1 has been improved to give more detail when schemes have been deferred.
7. Members were invited to advise the AHM by email of any schemes they wanted to query in the 2018/19 programme.
8. The AHM will compile a list of questions and responses which will be made available to the whole committee.
9. This new process still needs to be refined and it is important to start conversations about schemes planned for 2019/20 (Annex 3). The recent spell of bad weather may have changed the priority on roads that have been seriously affected.
10. The list of schemes for 2018/19 will be published on the county council website and reviewed every three months, with reasons given for any deferment.
11. The criteria for spending the new Member Local Highways Fund had not yet been finalised but this new money would enable councillors to react to local issues.
12. To help with this members would be provided with a menu of prices so that they would know the approximate cost of a job.
13. In addition the Cabinet Member would be challenging the council's contractor to deliver some basic schemes within three months.
14. AHM will clarify the meaning of QBC on page 67 of Annex 3.

15. Members highlighted that there were problems with communications on highways matters, particularly with regard to the timeliness and accuracy of messages.
16. The Cabinet Member agreed that communication was key and that messages needed to be clearer and less technical in content. This aspect had improved but further progress was required.
17. He also agreed that more needed to be done around managing contracts that had not been fulfilled. He would continue to challenge on such occasions and would push officers to do the same.
18. Members highlighted the problems regarding the new speed cameras on the A217 where two are already missing. AHM to follow up.
19. In her absence the divisional member for Reigate had submitted a number of written questions/queries on this item, which the AHM will respond to outside of the meeting.

The Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) agreed to:

- (i) Comment on the information

**9/18 HIGHWAYS FORWARD PROGRAMME REVENUE BUDGET 2018/19
[EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION] [Item 9]**

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key highlights

1. Members welcomed the increase in revenue funding for 2018/19.
2. This money cannot be used for LSR, which is a centrally funded capital programme.
3. It was proposed to increase funding of the community gang so that it would operate for 52 weeks instead of one in four; rural areas in particular would benefit.
4. Members were generally unhappy as to the formula for calculating the extra revenue funding and were of the view that Reigate and Banstead should receive a larger share.
5. Previously road length and the population statistics from 2011 had been used to calculate the proportion of funding to be allocated; instead it is being divided equally between the eleven districts and boroughs.
6. Factoring in the additional money from the new Member Local Highways fund the local committee would have approximately the same amount available to it, as it would have had if the previous formula had been applied.
7. Members did not support this view as they felt that the extra allowances did not fully make up the difference.
8. The Area Highways Manager noted the comments and agreed to feed them back.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) resolved to:

- (i) Approve the revised allocation of the Local Committee's devolved revenue maintenance budget as set out in para. 2.2 of this report;
- (ii) Note the Members Local Highways Fund as detailed in para. 2.7 and 2.8 of this report; and
- (iii) Agree that the revenue maintenance budget and the Members Local Highways Fund be managed by the Reigate and Banstead Maintenance Engineer on members' behalf

Reasons for Recommendations:

To agree the allocation of the Reigate and Banstead Local Committee's devolved revenue maintenance budget and how works are going to be managed on members' behalf.

10/18 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES 2017/18 - END OF YEAR UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR INFORMATION] [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) agreed to note the contents of the report.

11/18 LOCAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY AND FORWARD PROGRAMME UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION} [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager
Tamsin Ward, Transport Planner

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion: key highlights

1. Members agreed that there was a need to think more strategically about the road network in light of the amount of development in the borough.
2. The AHM explained that there was much collaborative work going on behind the scenes not only with Highways England but also with neighbouring councils, where their plans impacted on the Borough's local road network.
3. Some members raised concerns about those schemes looking to combine footways with cycle lanes as they believed they posed a risk to pedestrians.

4. Members were invited to put forward any schemes they would like to see added to the strategy/forward programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) agreed:

- (i) To endorse holding a 6 week online public consultation on the updated draft Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme.
- (ii) To delegate authority to the Area Highways Manager, Local Committee Chairman, Vice-chairman and Lead Officer (Transport Policy), to finalise the Strategy and Forward Programme following public consultation and recommend its approval to Cabinet.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Delivering an updated Reigate and Banstead Local Transport Strategy will support the County Council's priorities to promote sustainable economic growth and secure investment in infrastructure. It also supports the Borough Council's objectives to provide effective services, infrastructure and transport options. The Reigate and Banstead Local Transport Strategy will benefit Surrey residents and businesses through accommodating sustainable population growth, driving the economy and reducing impacts on the environment.

12/18 EARLY HELP PRIORITIES FOR REIGATE & BANSTEAD [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION] [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Matt Raleigh, Service Manager, Surrey Family Services

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member discussion – key highlights

1. The Vice-Chair would support a fifth partnership being established in the Woodhatch area.
2. The Service Manager invited members to contact him outside of the meeting to give their feedback on the information provided in the report.
3. In her capacity as Chairman of the Early Help Advisory Board the member for Horley West, Salfords and Sidlow stressed the importance of partnership working particularly in light of the county council's difficult financial position.
4. The Chairman also acknowledged the enthusiasm of partners to work together to take the service forward. Some key organisations were not currently represented on the EHAB and this would have to be investigated.

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) agreed to:

- (i) Provide feedback on the latest early help developments in Reigate and Banstead, including proposed early help priorities for re-commissioning and the location of Local Family Partnerships
- (ii) Endorse the Local Committee representatives to the local Early Help Advisory Board, for the remainder of 2017/18 and 2018/19

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

We want Local Members to be informed about the proposals that we have been developing in partnership for the early help system in Surrey. We believe these proposals will help us realise better outcomes for children and young people within the early help resources we have available. We also know however that early help is most effective when it is planned and delivered locally, so we are seeking the advice of the Local Committee to inform our identified local priorities.

Meeting ended at: 3.31 pm

Chairman