

North Mid Sussex County Local Committee

25 June 2019 – At a meeting of the Committee at 7.00 pm held at Bramble Hall, Bramble Hill, Balcombe, West Sussex, RH17 6HR.

Present:

Mrs Brunson (Chairman) (Imberdown;), Mr Lea (Lindfield & High Weald;), Mr Acraman (Worth Forest;), Mrs Bennett (East Grinstead Meridian;) and Mrs Russell (East Grinstead South & Ashurst Wood;)

Officers in attendance: Adam Chisnall (Democratic Services Officer), Gulu Sibanda (Principal Community Officer) and Richard Speller (Area Highways Manager)

1. Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman

1.1 Resolved – That:

- Mrs Brunson is elected as Chairman of the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee for the 2019/20 municipal year.
- Mr Lea is elected as Vice-Chairman of the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee for the 2019/20 municipal year.

2. Welcome and introductions

2.1 The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting noted that the meeting was well attended by the public. Members and Officers introduced themselves.

3. Declarations of Interest

3.1 Mrs Bennett declared a personal interest as she has two daughters who attend Imberhorne School, in relation to an application to the Community Initiative Fund.

3.2 Mrs Brunson declared a personal interest as she has a daughter in Sixth Form at Imberhorne School, in relation to an application to the Community Initiative Fund.

3.3 Mr Lea, Mrs Bennett and Mrs Brunson declared interests as Mid Sussex District Members.

4. Minutes

4.1 Resolved – that the minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. **Progress Statement**

5.1 The Committee considered the progress statement on matters arising from previous meetings (copy appended to the signed minutes).

5.2 Mr Speller talked through the highways elements of the Progress Statement and reported that the Annual Delivery Programme for the Mid Sussex area had been included which represented a wish list for the area. Planned use for Section 106 funds would be released soon following discussions with Mid Sussex District Council.

5.3 Mr Speller gave an update on trees on the A264 and reported that there were no plans to replant the trees at the present as there was no planning condition on the developer to do this. Mr Speller resolved to update the committee if the situation changed.

5.3 The Committee made comments including those that follow.

- Sought clarity on the publicity plan for the delayed Lindfield Road surfacing works. – *Mr Speller confirmed that the plan had gone to the developer and resolved to update the committee members when the road space was booked. The works were expected to take place during school holidays.*
- Asked for an update on Railway Approach. – *Mr Speller confirmed that whilst this was a high priority scheme, it had not been selected for this year's programme. Mr Speller hoped to add the scheme to the programme for next year.*
- Queried the delay in the release of Section 106 funds. – *Mr Speller explained that this was linked to a governance issue from Mid Sussex District Council who were keen to ensure that usage was appropriate and that there would be no challenge from developers. Mrs Brunsdon confirmed that she had spoken to the Mid Sussex District Council Leader on this issue.*
- Requested an update on the Road Space Audit. – *Mr Speller reported that he planned to speak to colleagues to clarify the consultation arrangements. The Committee requested that the consultation be scheduled for an appropriate time that would ensure responses.*

5.4 Resolved – That the Committee notes the progress statement.

6. **Proposed Traffic Regulation Order - Calluna Drive, Copthorne (NMS01(19/20))**

6.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning & the Head of Highway Operations (copy appended to the signed minutes).

6.2 Mr Speller introduced the report and explained the background and history of the order.

6.3 Mr Acraman apologised for his absence at the last meeting which had led to a delay in the Committee making a decision; and apologised for the confusion on which scheme was being considered.

6.4 Mr Acraman informed the Committee that he had received a 100+ petition in support of the larger scheme in Appendix A. Mr Acraman felt the officer recommended scheme at Appendix C did not go far enough to resolve the problems in the area.

6.5 Mr Speller commented that it was possible to reduce a scheme after a six month review, in this case reducing lineage, but not increase an order without re-advertising the scheme. Mr Acraman felt this made it more practical for the Committee to support the larger scheme at Appendix A.

6.6 The Committee were sympathetic to the parking issues and commented that this highlighted the need for the Road Space Audit.

6.7 The Committee noted that Appendix A was not the officer recommended scheme, but felt it was better to proceed with the larger scheme which could be reduced in the future if required.

6.8 Resolved – That the Committee, having considered that the resulting benefits to the community outweigh the objections raised, agree to authorise the Director of Law and Assurance to make the larger Order as detailed in Appendix A.

7. A22 Lewes Road, East Grinstead Pedestrian Crossing - (NMS02(19/20))

7.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning & the Head of Highway Operations (copy appended to the signed minutes).

7.2 Mr Speller introduced the report and explained that the scheme would be funded from section 106 and not the County Council's capital budget. The scheme would incorporate cycle crossing which would assist cyclists who were not permitted to use the underpass.

7.3 Mrs Russell commented that there had been strong feelings from local residents on the scheme, but felt that the signalised crossing would improve safety as it was not possible to force people to use the underpass. Children would be able to cross safely and the crossing would compliment the underpass. With regard to air quality concerns, Mrs Russell reported she was working on bus, walking and cycling strategies.

7.4 The Committee made comments including those that follow.

- Queried why double yellow lines had not been incorporated into the scheme. – *Mr Speller commented that yellow lines would require re-advertisement of the scheme and that it was better to submit a new Traffic Regulation for these, or wait for the Road Space Audit.*
- Asked if bike racks could be included in the scheme. – *Mr Speller agreed to look into this and commented that it would depend on the available budget.*

- Sought clarity on the reported confusion of the scheme's origin. – *Mrs Russell confirmed that the Business Manager from Sackville School was supportive. Mr Speller explained that the scheme had come via the School Travel Plan and the Safe Routes to School team. Mr Speller resolved to check this.*
- Queried the maintenance costs of the scheme. – *Mr Speller explained that capital budgets were used for installations and revenue budgets were used for maintenance. It was estimated that traffic signals cost £1,500 per year for maintenance.*
- Asked if a lollypop person had been considered for the site. – *Mr Speller reported on the current difficulty with appointing to these roles.*
- Queried why the underpass was underused. – *Mrs Russell explained that teachers were currently escorting children through the underpass at peak times.*
- Sought confirmation that statutory consultees were supportive of the scheme. – *Mrs Russell confirmed that the bus company and emergency services were happy with the scheme.*

7.5 Resolved – That the Committee, having considered that the resulting benefits to the community outweigh the objections raised, agree to authorise the Director of Law and Assurance to make the Order as advertised and install the pedestrian crossing and associated new cycleway.

8. **Allocation of the Community Initiative Fund**

8.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Law and Assurance (copy appended to the signed minutes).

8.2 Mr Chisnall introduced the report and explained that the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities had made a decision to introduce a micro fund following feedback received from groups relating to small projects. Applications to the micro fund would be for projects with a total cost of £750 and would not be made on the West Sussex Crowd. Applications would come to the County Local Committee (CLC) meetings for a decision. CLCs were expected to allocate 30% of their budget to micro fund applications, but this was discretionary.

8.3 The decision had cleared call-in and was now live so the fund was available for applications.

8.4 Resolved – That the Committee note the report.

9. **North Mid Sussex Community Initiative Funding (NMS03(19/20))**

9.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Law and Assurance (copy appended to the signed minutes).

9.2 The Chairman informed the Committee that following a decision by the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities the Community Initiative Funding budget had been reduced from £280,000 to £140,000. The decision was linked to the CLC Review Working Group. Pending

budget consideration from the CLC Review Working Group, the Committee had £8,400 for allocation for the year.

9.3 Resolved -

That the following award be made:

- 352/NMS – Imberlink, Imberhorne: at the heart of our community, up to £3,000, towards installing four defibrillators at Imberhorne School and provide students with first aid training.

The Committee also agreed to additionally pledge the final amount required to complete the project at the end of the fundraising campaign.

10. **Nominations for Local Authority Governors to Maintained Schools and Academy Governing Bodies (NMS04(19/20))**

10.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Education and Skills (copy appended to the signed minutes).

10.2 Resolved – that the following nomination for reappointment under the 2012 Regulations be approved:

- Nick Hodges to St Peter’s Catholic Primary School, East Grinstead for a further four year term.

11. **Talk With Us Open Forum**

11.1 The Chairman introduced the item and advised that the open forum was an opportunity for comments and questions to be raised on items not already on the agenda, and over which the County Council has a reasonable interest. The following issues were raised and responses made.

- Four questions had been submitted in advance.
 - One concerning Railway Approach design progress which had been resolved during the Progress Statement.
 - One concerning traffic calming at Imberhorne lane, which had been resolved during the Progress Statement.
 - One concerning increased traffic volumes in and around Haywards Heath, Burgess Hill, Handcross, Pease Pottage, etc due to housing developments. - *Mrs Brunsdon explained that this question should be for the Central and South Mid Sussex CLC area. Mr Speller agreed to provide a response to the query which would be provided to both CLCs.*
 - One raising concerns on the Road Space Audit report that increased development would impact demand for on street parking. - *Mrs Russell confirmed that she was involved with Bus Strategies which would promote public transport options. Mr Speller explained that the County Council was not the planning authority, but the highway authority, and resolved to respond directly to the member of the public.*

- Queried the lack of cycle connections on the South Side of the A22 and what could be done. – *Mrs Russell explained that she had passed this issue to the design team and would chase it. Mr Speller agreed to speak to the design team to investigate cycle connections.*
- Raised concerns on the parking issues at the Queen Victoria Hospital and Blackwell School. – *Mr Speller acknowledged the lack of parking at the hospital and reported that plans were in place for a planning application. Mrs Bennett confirmed that the plans hoped to include a multi-storey car park. Collaboration with the hospital was required.*
- Question from the East Grinstead Society querying the different sources of budgets available at West Sussex County Council, and how the A22 Pedestrian Crossing had first come to the CLC. – *Mr Speller confirmed that the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) had come via Safe Routes to School. It was confirmed that only the Highway authority could consider TROs. They could come via developers, CLCs, or as part of wider schemes. Officers could also raise TROs.*
- Queried the feasibility of introducing the old Tram line from Tunbridge Wells to Crawley to assist with traffic. – *The Committee felt the proposal was good, but the County Council was not in a position to consider this further as it would be for Tram operators to implement.*
- Discussed the length of TRO consultation periods as they should be shorter for smaller schemes.
- Queried the progress with Ship Street. – *Mr Speller confirmed that this was on the forward programme, but work had not started yet.*
- Raised concerns on areas covered by district parking enforcement officers – particularly with lorries parking on double yellow lines in the outskirts of town. – *Mrs Bennett reported that she had raised this issue with MSDC. Mr Speller reported that Clare Onslow was responsible for enforcement at Mid Sussex District Council and is happy to send staff to investigate areas if she is informed.*
- Raised concerns that some people who had responded to the A22 Pedestrian Crossing TRO had not been responded to by the TRO team. – *Mrs Brunsdon requested that this matter was investigated.*
- Queried if a temporary crossing would be installed for the A22 crossing before a permanent one so the impact could be considered. – *Mr Speller informed the resident this would not happen. Mrs Brunsdon reported that algorithm modelling was undertaken at the design stage.*
- Commented that the Pedestrian Crossing was being introduced to replace the existing unmanned bollard crossing which had initially stopped people using the underpass. – *Mrs Brunsdon confirmed that the decision had been taken.*
- Queried where buses will park after the A22 scheme had been introduced. – *Mrs Russell confirmed that buses would fit in the allocated layby.*

12. CLC Review Discussion

12.1 The Committee considered the request from the County Local Committee Review Working Group to discuss the purpose and format of CLCs.

12.2 Mrs Brunson encouraged members to complete the CLC survey if they had not already done so.

12.3 Members were asked to comment on CLCs and raised the following ideas/points.

- Proposed three tier authority attendance at CLCs.
- Commented that CLCs served 2 purposes i. A private meeting in public for the public to observe and ii. The Talk With Us forum for the public to ask questions. The committee felt this distinction should be made clearer for the public to manage expectations on agenda items.
- Bringing Talk With Us to the beginning of the agenda could improve the flow of the meeting and assist the attending public.
- Promoted the moving around of CLC venue.
- Raised concerns on the size of the Mid Sussex CLCs (Central and South too large, North too small).
- Supported CLCs as they brought issues to the public.

12.4 Mrs Brunson asked the public for their comments on CLCs which included the following.

- Commented that the public should be allowed to speak on issues on the agenda.
- Felt that more awareness should be raised for CLC meetings. - *Mr Chisnall highlighted Gov Delivery system.*
- Members having informal meetings with residents. - *Members commented that contacting their local member should always be first port of call for residents. Members also confirmed that they had individually met informally with residents in the past.*
- Generally supported CLCs and wished them to continue.

13. **Date of Next Meeting**

13.1 The Committee noted that the next meeting would take place on Monday 21 October 2019 at a venue to be confirmed.

Chairman

The meeting closed at 9.08 pm