

Minutes of meeting

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)

Date: Monday, 26 September 2005
Time: 4.00pm
Place: Lecture Hall, Weybridge Library

Members present:

Surrey County Council

Mr Michael Bennison (Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott)
Mr Peter Hickman (The Dittons)
Mrs Margaret Hicks (Hersham)
Mrs Dorothy Mitchell (Cobham) – In the Chair
Mr Timothy Oliver (East Molesey & Esher)
Mr Thomas Phelps-Penry (Walton)

Elmbridge Borough Council (for transportation matters)

Mr David Archer (Esher)
Mr Hugh Ashton (Claygate)
Mrs Rosemary Dane (Walton South)
Mr Glenn Dearlove (Weybridge South)
Mr Roy Green (Hersham North)
Mr Peter Heaney (Esher)
Mr Alan Hopkins (Molesey North)
Mrs Janet Turner (Hinchley Wood)

Also present:

Frank Apicella, Local Transportation Team
Richard Bolton, Principal Engineer
Mary Burden, Deputy County Emergency Planning Officer
Tony Gould, Strategic Policy and Information, Planning and Countryside
Nia Griffiths, Local Transportation Team
Kay Mackay, Director of Planning and Redesign, North Surrey PCT
Mark Newman, District Emergency Planning Liaison Officer
Theresa Ricketts, Local Committee and Partnership Officer
Chris Smith, Local Transportation Director
Dave Weeden, Station Manager, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service
Chris White, Area Director

All references to items refer to the agenda for the meeting.

PART A: County and Borough Members

IN PUBLIC

58/05 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTICES OF SUBSTITUTIONS (Item 1)

Apologies for absence had been received from County Councillors Ian Lake and Roy Taylor.

Apologies for absence had been received from Borough Councillor Derek Denyer, who was substituted by Borough Councillor David Archer and Borough Councillor Torquil Stewart, who was substituted by Borough Councillor Hugh Ashton.

59/05 MINUTES OF LAST MEETING (Item 2)

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of Surrey County Council's Local Committee (Elmbridge Area) held on 18 July 2005 were approved and signed as a correct record.

60/05 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)

In accordance with the Standing Orders, Mr David Archer declared a prejudicial interest in item 14 in view of his membership of a local resident's association. Mr Peter Heaney also declared an interest in item 14.

61/05 PETITIONS (Item 4)

A petition had been received from Long Ditton Residents' Association with 143 signatories objecting to changed parking arrangements in Surbiton.

RESOLVED

That the petition be noted.

62/05 PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION (Item 5)

The Revd William Allberry had requested in advance that he be allowed to speak to item 14, as a resident of Esher Place Avenue and Rector of Esher.

RESOLVED

That the request be noted.

63/05 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (Item 6)

No questions had been submitted.

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS

PART B: County Members

64/05 WEYBRIDGE HOSPITAL (Item 7)

Kay Mackay explained that North Surrey Primary Care Trust (PCT) is at the beginning of a process of reviewing the services delivered by Weybridge hospital. The PCT recognises the need to consult on options, once these have been formulated, and she referred to the proposed timetable set out in the paper.

Ms Mackay explained that the objective of the review is to develop sustainable services for North Surrey. She set the review in the context of a recent Government paper entitled "Commissioning for a Patient Led NHS", which envisages that from 2008, PCTs will no longer be seen as service providers, except in exceptional circumstances. This review is therefore seeking to find a sustainable long term provider of specialist palliative care beds in North Surrey.

Ms Mackay explained that, as part of a strategy for vulnerable adults and older people, 10 rehabilitation beds were moved from Weybridge to Walton last year. At the same time, Esher's Princess Alice Hospice was looking for accommodation while undergoing a rebuild, and the Corrie Brown ward of Weybridge hospital was leased to the hospice. This arrangement is due to come to an end around June 2006 when the refurbishment will be complete. North Surrey PCT is aiming to develop the services involved in specialist palliative care, and recognises that 8 beds neither meets the community's needs, nor is it sustainable. There is a need for around 15-16 beds, for which there is no current facility.

Mrs Mitchell read a statement on behalf of Mr Lake, recommending that the item be moved to Surrey County Council's Health Select Committee. Mr Lake emphasised that the processes and decisions of the PCT need to be transparent, and suggested that there is currently a confidence deficit between the public and Health Trusts.

Mr Dearlove suggested that the PCT is concentrating on short term care at the expense of hospital care, and this is detrimental to the people of Weybridge. He asked whether Weybridge hospital is suffering as a result of the health service's financial deficit. The walk in centre and hospital were opened relatively recently, and Mr Dearlove asked how the PCT could have to re-think in such a short time. Since those visiting Weybridge patients are often elderly, the localness is important.

Ms Mackay explained that further information will be provided as part of the options appraisal, but assured the Committee that, in spite of the Health Service's financial deficit, the intention here is not to reduce funding. Indeed, there are currently only 8 palliative care beds to serve the entire North Surrey population, and this is considered insufficient.

Mr Ashton suggested that North Surrey PCT should await the decisions concerning PCT reorganisation before taking this decision. Ms Mackay sympathised, but explained that the current uncertainty for staff is untenable, and the hope is that the PCT will achieve better buy-in and local involvement now.

RESOLVED

That the item be moved for consideration by Surrey County Council's Health Select Committee.

65/05 EMERGENCY PLANNING: EMERGENCY PLANNING UNIT - GOLD (Item 8a)

Mary Burden explained that dealing with major incidents requires the co-operation of responding agencies. Those agencies have been meeting regularly for many years, but such meetings are now a statutory obligation, formalised as the Local Resilience Forum. Working groups comprise joint services, and performance is monitored by the inter-services liaison group. In the event of a major incident, GOLD is set up to provide strategic command.

66/05 EMERGENCY PLANNING: SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE - FIRE SERVICE ROLE AT TERRORIST INCIDENTS (Item 8b)

Dave Weeden outlined Surrey Fire and Rescue Service's response to major incidents.

Mrs Mitchell asked about cross border co-operation in the event of a major incident. For example, if London were to be evacuated, who would decide where to direct traffic. Ms Burden explained that, whenever a major incident takes place, it is the responsibility of the local resilience teams in the area of the incident to take the lead. In the case of the most major incidents, the Cabinet Office briefing room will lead. She explained that there are regular cross-border meetings of emergency planning teams, and tests have been run involving up to three counties. Access and egress roads for the evacuation of London have already been identified, and it has been agreed that the links with highways and social care teams are done at a local level. For Surrey, this means that it is the responsibility of the central emergency planning team at County Hall to link up with internal teams.

Mrs Hicks suggested that an explanatory leaflet, available to the general public, would be welcome. She asked about the engagement of multi-cultural organisations. Ms Burden explained that on 7th July, Surrey Police requested advice from the Islamic community. The emergency plans include considerations such as prayer rooms in emergency accommodation and recognition of religious practices.

RESOLVED

1. That the contents of both reports be noted.
2. That Surrey Fire and Rescue Service's commitment to mitigating the effects of a large scale terrorist incident in the County be noted.

67/05 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE – LIMITED BOROUGH AUTONOMY (Item 9)

Dave Weeden introduced this report, explaining that Limited Borough Autonomy will take effect from 3rd October.

RESOLVED

That the move to LBA made by the Fire and Rescue Service be noted, and the Local Committee continue to support the Service in driving down risk in the area.

68/05 SOUTH EAST PLAN (PART 2) (Item 10)

By way of context Tony Gould explained that the South East England Regional Assembly is now responsible for preparing the strategic overview for Local Plans. Progress has been made, and the Assembly is now looking at sub-regional strategies and in particular allocations to districts. The figure for Surrey is that contained in the Structure Plan, namely 2360 per annum. Particular consideration is being given to urban focus and protection of the green belt.

RESOLVED

1. That the preferred option for housing distribution across Surrey, which is based on housing potential within urban areas to protect the Green Belt, be endorsed.
2. That the Executive be asked to consider making surplus land available at below full market value to facilitate the development of more affordable housing.

69/05 PROPOSALS FOR EXPENDITURE OF LOCAL REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET (Item 11)

Richard Bolton introduced this proposal for the installation of two permanent interactive safety signs on Burwood Road.

RESOLVED

That the proposal for expenditure from the Local Capital Budget be agreed as follows:

1. £6,000 for the introduction of two interactive safety signs for the C152 Burwood Road

PART C: County and Borough Members

70/05 **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS: COBHAM AND HERSHAM (Item 12)**

Richard Bolton introduced this item, explaining that local traders have requested the limited waiting because both roads concerned are being parked all day, to the detriment of their business. Where no waiting is proposed, the concern is that parked vehicles are impeding traffic flow. Mr Bolton set out two minor amendments to the original recommendations.

RESOLVED

That:

1. The advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order introducing 'Waiting Limited 1 hour – no return for 2 hours Mon-Sat 0800 to 1800hrs' be approved, as detailed below:

Oakdene Parade, Cobham – on the northern side of the carriageway from a point two metres southeast of the northwest boundary of number 1 for a distance of 59 metres south eastwards

Oakdene Parade, Cobham – on the western side of the carriageway from a point adjacent to the common boundary of numbers 18 and 19 for a distance of 85.5 metres in a northerly direction

Molesey Road, Hersham – on northern side of the carriageway from a point 3.5 metres to the east of the southwest boundary of number 13 eastwards for a distance of 28 metres.

2. The advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order introducing 'No Waiting at Anytime' be approved, as detailed below:

Oakdene Parade – for the entire southern and eastern side of the carriageway from its junction with Between Streets through to Anyards Road, a distance of approximately 179 metres

Between Streets – for both sides of the carriageway from a point 1.5 metres west of the common boundary of numbers 35 and 37 for a distance of 397 metres in a northwest direction. Restrictions to extend into the entrance of Painshill Park (both sides of the carriageway) for the entire section of public highway (25 metres).

3. The Local Transportation Director be authorised, following consultation with the Chairman and Divisional Member, to consider and, if possible, resolve any objections received.

71/05 **PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING FACILITY: A245 STOKE ROAD, STOKE D'ABERNON (Item 13)**

Frank Apicella set out the background to this recommendation for the installation of a puffin crossing on the A245 Stoke Road.

RESOLVED

That:

- (i) The scheme set out in the report be approved.
- (ii) The Local Transportation Director be authorised to undertake the necessary statutory process required to enable scheme construction.

72/05 Esher Green Junction Improvement (Item 14)

The Revd William Allberry was invited to speak.

Chris Smith introduced this item, explaining that Esher Green Junction is the worst single accident site in North Surrey. A number of options have been considered, and various barriers have been encountered, not least because Esher Green is common land, and any change of status requires referral to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). The current proposal represents a compromise, but a positive way forward, which should not only improve safety, but also improve traffic flow.

The Committee requested that there would be a recorded vote and the vote was taken with those voting in favour Mrs Hicks, Mr Hickman, Mr Bennison, Mrs Turner, Mr Oliver, Mr Hopkins and Mrs Mitchell and those abstaining Mr Phelps-Penry, Mr Ashton and Mr Green.

RESOLVED

That:

- (i) The scheme for the junction of A244 Lammas Lane with Church Street and More Lane shown on Drawing No.5477/15, Annexe A be approved.
- (ii) The construction of signal controlled pedestrian crossings on both Lammas Lane and Church Street be considered for early phased implementation, funded from the Local Transportation Service devolved LTP budget be agreed, and that the LTD be authorised to carry out the statutory notification procedures when appropriate.
- (iii) The progression of a Traffic Regulation Order and any necessary adjustments to kerb layouts required for the implementation of banned right-turn movements at the junction of Lammas Lane with Esher Place Avenue, as part of initial Phase 1 works be agreed.

- (iv) The promotion of any other Traffic Regulation Orders considered necessary for the scheme be approved, with any objections received being reviewed initially with the Chairman and Divisional Member.
- (v) The submission of an application for Planning Permission for the footway across Esher Green and for the relocation of the War Memorial be agreed, working in partnership with Elmbridge Borough Council.
- (vi) The Executive be asked to approve the use of Statutory Procedures to:
 - a) acquire the common land necessary for the scheme using Compulsory Purchase powers;
 - b) undertake alterations to the affected side roads using a Side Roads Order;
 - c) allow the promotion of any other Orders, permissions and consents necessary for the scheme.
- (vii) The funding of 25% of the main scheme costs (not including any earlier phased works) from the Local Transportation Service devolved budget, spread over a two-year period be approved.

The meeting closed at 6.40pm

.....(Chairman)