

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Reigate AND BANSTEAD LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
 held at 2.00 pm on 2 November 2020  
 at VIRTUAL.

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

**Surrey County Council Members:**

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

**Borough / District Members:**

- Cllr Gemma Adamson
- \* Cllr Rod Ashford
- \* Cllr Michael Blacker
- \* Cllr Mark Brunt
- \* Cllr Keith Foreman
- \* Cllr Steve Kulka
- \* Cllr Ruth Ritter
- \* Cllr Tony Schofield
- \* Cllr Rachel Turner
- \* Cllr Christopher Whinney

\* In attendance

**12/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Bob Gardner and Cllr Gemma Adamson

**13/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes of the previous meeting on 2 March 2020 were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

**14/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none

**15/20 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [AGENDA ITEM ONLY] [Item 4]**

The Chairman gave the following announcements:

## ITEM 2

- **Thank you** – A thank you to Jeff Harris, the former Local Committee Chairman, for all his hard work, dedication and efforts over the past few years as Chairman.
- **MCA** – Applications for Members' Community Allocation are currently open. Each County Councillor has £5000 funding for 2020/21 to help residents, voluntary and community organisations deliver activities that benefit local people in their neighbourhoods. Online applications are open until 29 January 2021.
- **Reigate Hill Works** – Divisional member, Dr Zully Grant-Duff provided an update on the works. The presentation is attached as Annex A to these minutes.

### 16/20 PETITIONS [Item 5]

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM), SCC

**Petitions, Public Questions and Statements:** There were four petitions received before the deadline. The full wording of the petitions and officer responses were available to view within the supplementary agenda.

#### 5a: Petition to: Petition to: Include Woodhatch Crossroads in planned Safety measures A217, Horley to Reigate

The lead petitioner, Miss Pryor did not attend the meeting to present the petition.

The divisional member noted she fully supported the petition and that it was a high priority for her. She added she was pleased that Highways were still actively seeking opportunities for funding. The AHM acknowledged there was a long standing problem with vehicles making right hand turns at the junction. She confirmed the outcome of a Department for Transport (DfT) bid was still awaited. If successful, the right hand turn issue was to be addressed within this project.

#### **Resolution:**

The Local Committee noted the officer's comment.

#### 5b: Petition to: Install a Zebra Crossing on the Linkfield Ln/Flint Cl corner

The lead petitioner, Mr Jasinkas did not attend the meeting to present the petition.

The divisional member thanked officers for their comment and welcomed the recommendation to carry out work to identify the suitability of an informal crossing in the vicinity, when funding permitted.

#### **Resolution:**

The Local Committee agreed:

- i. To note the officer's comment.
- ii. That initial investigation and design work to establish the viability for an informal crossing on Linkfield Lane (between the junctions of Flint Close and the entrance to St Joseph's Roman Catholic Primary School) be added to the Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) List for consideration for future funding.

**Reason for Decisions:**

The above decisions were made in order to add the scheme to the ITS list for consideration for future funding

5c: Petition to: place speed humps, a camera and 20mph speed limit on Gatton Park Road Redhill

The lead petitioner, Ms Hymas did not attend the meeting to present the petition. She however provided a statement that was read by the local divisional member, on her behalf.

The statement began with Ms Hymas' disappointment at the response. She explained that the proposed measures in the officer response did not go far enough; adding it should be a priority to make the road safer. She said there was clearly evidence the road was dangerous and the 2017 survey was out of date because speeding had increased since then. It was noted that the speeding along the road was intense, particularly out of rush hour and at night when motorists believed they were less likely to be caught. She concluded by saying that if nothing was done then someone would be killed.

**Key points from discussion:**

- The divisional member stated there had recently been what was considered a very positive meeting with officers on this issue. She asked the AHM to provide some updates for the actions agreed at that meeting. These included conducting a new speed survey with new speed cameras and the cutting back of vegetation to make the road lighter during daylight hours.
- The AHM noted that the cutting back of vegetation had been requested and would be taking place shortly. She added she had yet to receive any update from Surrey Police on their actions. This issue however, would be highlighted at the next Road Safety Working Group (RSWG) and Speed Management Meeting.
- An issue was raised about cars parking on the grass verge and blocking the vehicle-activated sign (VAS) sign. The AHM confirmed the first step in relation to the parking was to bring this up at the RSWG so possible solutions could be looked at.
- A question was asked about the effectiveness of the ITS list. To which, the AHM noted that officers worked closely with colleagues across SCC

## ITEM 2

and RBBC to look for suitable funding opportunities in order to get schemes up and running.

- The members concluded by saying the Police needed to do more in instances like these.

### **Resolution:**

The Local Committee agreed:

- i. To note the officer's comment.
- ii. To note the work being carried out during this financial year to upgrade the existing Vehicle Activated Sign and install an additional Vehicle Activated Sign on the section of the A242 Gatton Park Road between the junction of the A23 London Road and Colesmead Road.
- iii. That initial investigation and design work to establish the viability of traffic calming measures for the A242 Gatton Park Road (between the junctions of the A23 London Road and Colesmead Road) be added to the Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) List for consideration for future funding.

### **Reason for decisions:**

The above decisions were made in order to add the scheme to the ITS list for consideration for future funding

### 5d: Petition to: Completely resurface Wellesford Close

The lead petitioner, Dr Harvey attended the meeting and addressed the committee with his concerns.

He stated he had lived in the cul-de-sac for three years and had always noted the poor condition of the road. He added that there had recently been 32 potholes that had been filled in and that even the longest standing resident of the road could not recall a time when the road surface was any different.

Dr Harvey noted that a recent Freedom of Information (Fol) request had shown the road had never been resurfaced. The officer response clearly acknowledged the road needed to be surfaced and it was questioned when that would be. It was noted by the residents that the road was of low priority for work due to its classification and its good accident history, but they questioned whether there should be a time limit on how long a scheme could remain on a list without adequate action being taken.

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

- The divisional member stated he had raised this issue from time to time and noted it was probably one of the worst roads in his division. He added that being on a slope made the road – in its condition – much more dangerous in cold and wet weather. He accepted the road was not a priority because of its little use but argued it should be prioritised due to

the amount of time it had been waiting.

- The AHM noted it was disappointing for residents to have to wait so long for the resurfacing work; adding the concrete surface beneath the tarmac was still strong and wasn't causing a safety hazard. She acknowledged however that the road was not aesthetically pleasing. She advised that the current surface treatments available only lasted for a short period; 2-5 years and that a full resurface would be expensive. She concluded that currently there was no viable cost-effective treatment to complete the resurfacing work.

**Resolution:**

The Local Committee noted the officer's comment

**17/20 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM), SCC

**Petitions, Public Questions and Statements:** One written question was received before the deadline. The question and officer response were available to view within the supplementary agenda.

Mr Jessup attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary question;

*My supplementary question is in relation to the part of my question that wasn't answered. In 2014 SCC adopted its Cycling Strategy. Since then we have been pushing for more cycling infrastructure but always told there is no funding available. Are there likely to be improved travel links to the newly acquired SCC site at Woodhatch?*

**Key points from discussion:**

- The AHM noted a similar member question had been asked and answered previously. She advised that active travel links were still being considered through the planning process but all suggestions had and would be put forward.

**18/20 FORMAL MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 7]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM), SCC

**Petitions, Public Questions and Statements:** One member question was received before the deadline. The question and officer response were available to view within the supplementary agenda.

Cllr Whinney asked the following supplementary question;

*Thank you for the reply. I have been told repeatedly by residents that the uncontrolled crossing holds up the traffic more than the level crossing does.*

## ITEM 2

*At peak school times there can be a continuous flow of mothers crossing that stops traffic moving.*

*Can you tell me when the crossings were last checked? What check was done? What time of day was the check done? And is there a video recording of this? Residents would like reassurance that something is being done.*

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

- The AHM acknowledged there was often a constant flow of traffic at this point. But added that the crossings close proximity to the railway line meant it was well respected.
- It was advised the crossing outside the Co-op was installed as part of the planning conditions for the Co-op and if the crossing wasn't there, people would cross at any point and make it far less safe.
- It was noted there had been conversations with Network Rail, but there was not any of the specific aforementioned data available.
- During informal discussions with colleagues, the AHM had asked about the delays at the location if a controlled crossing replaced the zebra crossing. She noted they had concluded that the delay from the zebra crossing would be less than that of a controlled crossing. This was because people had generally cleared the zebra crossing before the level crossing had risen.
- In conclusion, it was noted it would be unlikely a signalised crossing would pass safety audits and therefore was not something that would be pursued for this location at this time.

### **19/20 REIGATE TOWN CENTRE - SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION FROM 30MPH TO 20MPH [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 8]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM), SCC

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

The AHM introduced the report, noting there was one amendment to make in the report in relation to the cost of the scheme. She explained the scheme had been piloted as part of the Active Travel measures implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic. She added that an online consultation had remained open and this scheme had been popular with residents to be made permanent.

She stated that the report quoted the cost of £6,000 to permanently implement the scheme. She noted that this figure was the cost for the temporary scheme and the actual cost was £13,000. The increased cost came about as some permanent signs would need to be mounted on illuminated posts, which weren't required temporarily.

**Key points from the discussion:**

- The local divisional member stated she was in support of the scheme and that it was also supported by residents.
- Some members raised concerns about the already poor air quality on Reigate High Street. They questioned whether any investigations had already taken place as it was known that lower speeds meant poorer air quality as more carbon was emitted.
- It was noted that Reigate town centre was focussed on because it was already an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). And that some data suggested lower speeds encouraged more cycling and walking by creating a better and safer environment for these users.
- It was questioned whether the Police would enforce this lower speed limit and that perhaps money could be better spent elsewhere. It was confirmed that the was enforceable by the Police as it met with SCC's setting speed limits policy.
- The AHM confirmed that none of the costs for this scheme were to be met by Local Committee delegated budgets. The funding had been set aside from Emergency Active Travel Funding (AETF) for Reigate and was well supported by local residents and businesses in the online consultation.

**Resolution:**

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) agreed:

- i. To note the results of the speed assessments undertaken, shown in Table 1.
- ii. That, based upon the evidence, the speed limit be reduced from 30mph to 20mph on the following roads in Reigate town centre;
  - A25 Church Street, from the eastern property boundary of number 46 Church Street to its junction with the A217 Bell Street.
  - A25 High Street, from its junction with A217 Bell Street to a point 4m to the west of the junction with D1304 Park Lane.
  - A217 Bancroft Road, its entire length.
  - A217 Bell Street, from its junction with A25 Church Street to the southern property boundary of 109B A217 Bell Street.
  - D131 Access from A217 Bell Street to Morrisons, from its junction with A217 Bell Street to end of the publicly maintained section of highway (a distance of 60m).

## ITEM 2

- iii. To authorise 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, revoke any existing traffic orders necessary to implement the change, and, subject to no objections being upheld, that the order be made;
- iv. To authorise delegation of authority to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and the local divisional member to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposal.
- v. To note that if the scheme has not been successful, then further engineering measures or a return to the original higher speed limit may be necessary.

### **Reason for Decisions:**

The above decisions were made to enable the change in the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph, on the selected roads above within Reigate town centre in accordance with Surrey County Council's Speed Limit Policy.

## **20/20 EASTGATE PROPOSED ONE WAY SYSTEM [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION [Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager (AHM), SCC

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

The AHM introduced the report, asking for support from the Local Committee to advertise the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the one way system in order to allow additional parking. She noted the scheme was to be funded using Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money from Reigate & Banstead Borough Council (RBBC).

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

- The divisional member welcomed the report and was supportive of the scheme despite the additional costs. He noted that the North West CIL Panel were in the process of consulting and if there was agreement to fund the scheme, the money would come from Neighbourhood CIL.

### **Resolution:**

The Local Committee (Reigate & Banstead) agreed:

- i. To note the reasons for the one-way system required to support the creation of echelon parking bays in Eastgate, Nork as set out under sections 2.1 & 2.2.
- ii. That a one-way system be installed on Eastgate, Nork in order to support the creation of additional on street parking spaces in the form of echelon parking bays.



- iii. To authorise the advertisement of a notice in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to implement one-way working in Eastgate, revoke any existing traffic orders necessary to implement the change, and, subject to no objections being upheld, that the order be made;
- iv. To authorise delegation of authority to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and the local divisional member to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposal

**Reason for Decisions:**

The above decisions were made to install the one-way within Eastgate, Nork so that changes can be made to the existing on street parking so that additional on street parking within Eastgate is provided.

**21/20 ANNUAL PARKING REVIEW [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION]  
[Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** Rikki Hill, Parking Project Team Leader (PPTL), SCC

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

The PPTL introduced the report noting that there had been over 350 requests received for amendments to parking restrictions. He added it was a tough job to go through them all and reduce down to the final list, detailed in the report. He noted that the majority of proposals recommended for implementation were for safety reasons.

He asked to draw members attentions to section 2.4 and 2.5 of the report in relation to large schemes. Noting that it wasn't possible to produce large schemes in smaller roads in isolation as these schemes would only cause displacement to other roads and not resolve the issues. He suggested a job for the Parking Task Group would be to have a look at major parking controls in towns to recommend some possible solutions.

In addition to the proposals detailed in the report, the PPTL requested to add an additional proposal for Banstead. This was the introduction of a goods vehicle loading bay in place of the current taxi rank outside Waitrose and a prohibition of loading at any time in front of the new assisted crossing point outside 98-100 in Banstead High Street.

**Key points from the discussion:**

- Members acknowledged that it was becoming more and more difficult to find places to park, particularly as restrictions continued to be implemented. They recognised work needed to be done to find solutions and it was suggested that perhaps the towns could all benefit from new multi storey car parks
- There was some concern expressed about the Banstead High Street proposal. As it was believed that the goods vehicle drivers would not use the designated loading bay because the location of this was less

## ITEM 2

convenient. It was requested this be kept under review in the case it did not have the desired outcome.

- A specific question was raised about the proposals in Oakwood Road, Horley, because residents were expressing concern over the amount of double yellow lines (DYL) being proposed. It was confirmed that individual schemes could be tweaked following the 28 day public consultation and that residents views would be taken in to account.
- It was noted there was likely to be a delay in advertising the proposals, given the latest Government announcement about a second lockdown. The PPTL stated it would not be fair to put up adverts in locations where people currently weren't parking because of the lockdown, but otherwise would be. This would not allow them the opportunity to respond to a consultation or be aware of any change until the change was implemented.
- The divisional member made a request for some intervention on Woodroyd Avenue, Horley. He explained that residents were having a torrid time in respect of taxis. He noted that there were some DYLS in place but these were not being respected. He added it was well known that displacement was a problem with taxi drivers in the town, particularly due to being in close proximity to Gatwick Airport. Taxis frequently parked in the suburban areas and waited around. He explained that the residents had been subjected to antisocial behaviour from taxi drivers at all times of night and there needed to be a further deterrent to improve matters for residents. He concluded there was sufficient off road parking in the roads of Woodroyd Avenue and Oldfield Road for full DYLS to be considered all over.
- Members thanked the officer for all this work and the comprehensive report, but noted that improved enforcement was needed otherwise any implemented restrictions were pointless.

### **Resolution:**

The Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) agreed:

- i. That the county council's intention to introduce the proposals described in Annex 1, with the addition of the introduction of a goods vehicle loading bay in place of the current taxi rank outside Waitrose and a prohibition of loading at any time in front of the new assisted crossing point outside 98-100 in Banstead High Street, and the introduction of double yellow lines in all of Woodroyd Avenue and Oldfield Road, Horley, is formally advertised, and subject to statutory consultation.
- ii. That if necessary, minor adjustments can be made to the proposals by the parking team manager in consultation with the chairman, vice-chairman and relevant county councillor prior to advertisement.

- iii. That if no objections are received when the proposals are advertised, the traffic regulation orders are made.
- iv. That if there are unresolved objections, they are dealt with in accordance with the county council's scheme of delegation by the parking team manager, in consultation with the chairman/vice chairman of the committee and the appropriate county councillor.

**Reason for decisions:**

The above decisions were made because changes to the highway network, the built environment and society mean that parking behaviour changes and consequently it is necessary for a highway authority to carry out regular reviews of waiting and parking restrictions on the highway network.

It was agreed that the waiting restrictions in the report are progressed for a number of reasons, including that they will help to:

- Improve road safety
- Increase access for emergency vehicles
- Increase access for refuse vehicles, buses and service vehicles
- Ease traffic congestion
- Better control parking

**22/20 APPOINTMENTS TO TASK GROUPS AND EXTERNAL BODIES 2020-21 [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] [Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** Jess Lee, Partnership Committee Officer (PCO), SCC

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

The PCO presented the report, noting that it was an annual report of the committee. She noted the only change from 2019-20 was that the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership had now disbanded and a nomination was therefore to be sought for the newly formed Reigate & Banstead Community Safety Partnership.

**Resolution:**

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.
- 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.
- iii. The nominations to outside bodies (Community Safety Partnership) as set out in Annex 1.

**Reason for decisions:**

## ITEM 2

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

### **23/20 DECISION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 12]**

There were some queries about actions from the meeting on 2 March 2020 that did not appear on the tracker.

It was confirmed by the AHM that some of the items in question had been completed and the information circulated to the Local Committee.

It was noted that some of the actions that were not included did not form formal decisions of the Local Committee and therefore would not be included on this tracker. However it was noted this had been raised and would be reviewed for future decision tracker reports.

The Local Committee noted the explanation on the tracker and agreed to remove items marked as complete and closed from the decision tracker for future meetings.

### **24/20 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 13]**

The Local Committee noted the forward plan of items expected to be received by the committee.

Meeting ended at: 4.07 pm

---

**Chairman**