

**Minutes of the meeting of Surrey County Council's
Local Committee in Elmbridge held at
4.00pm on Monday 3 March 2008 at the
Elmbridge Civic Centre, Esher**

Members Present – Surrey County Council

Mr Michael Bennison	Mr Peter Hickman
Mrs Margaret Hicks	Mr Ian Lake
Mr Ernest Mallett	Mrs Dorothy Mitchell (Chairman)
Mr Thomas Phelps-Penry	Mr Roy Taylor

Members Present – Elmbridge Borough Council

Cllr David Archer	Cllr Bartlett
Cllr Derek Denyer	Cllr Alan Hopkins
Cllr Chris Sadler	Cllr Torquil Stewart
Cllr Janet Turner	Cllr James Vickers

PART ONE

IN PUBLIC

[all references to items refer to the agenda for the meeting]

**16/
08 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sheldrick and Councillor Bartlett was nominated to substitute.

**17/
08 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21st January 2008 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

**18/
08 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

None were received.

**19/
08 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]**

The Chairman announced that the Post Office is currently out to consultation regarding the possible closure of Post Offices in Surrey. The Post Office is proposing that the Claygate branch, 1 High Street, Claygate, KT10 0JG, be closed. It was agreed that the Local

Committee would write to express their concerns about the possible closure.

The Chairman asked that if anybody wished to express their individual concerns they do so directly by contacting the National Consultation Team, Post Office Ltd, Freepost Consultation Team. The consultation period started on 29 January 2008, and will end on 10 March 2008.

**20/
08** **PETITIONS [Item 5]**

The Committee received a petition requesting a safe crossing on Station Road, Thames Ditton. The petitioner attended the meeting and spoke to the item.

The Local Highways Manager responded explaining that the area had been reviewed approximately eight to nine years ago and extensive traffic calming measures were introduced including a 20mph speed limit. Unfortunately there is not a suitable location to put a crossing in place as the width of the pavement would not allow this. However, the Chairman asked that the area be looked at again and a report be presented to the next Local Committee meeting.

**21/
08** **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 6]**

There was one public question received as set out in Annex A. There was no supplementary question.

**22/
08** **MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]**

There were no Member questions received.

**23/
08** **YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SERVICE [Item 8]**

The Local Committee received a presentation on the Youth Development Service and the impact it has on local young people. As part of this presentation several young people spoke to the Local Committee on the role the Youth Development Service had played in their lives and the positive experiences that they had taken from this.

The key points taken from this presentation was that young people wanted places to go and things to do. There was strong support for keeping the local Youth Centres and making them accessible to young people.

The Local Committee thanked the young people for attending the meeting and speaking to them about their experiences.

**24/
08** **HEATHROW AIRPORT [Item 11]**

The Chairman announced that there would be a change in the order of business as the item on Heathrow airport would be taken next.

The Local Committee received a presentation on the proposed third runway and sixth terminal at Heathrow airport. The implications of this proposal were explained to the Local Committee. The proposal had already been out to consultation and it was reported that Surrey County Council had drafted their response to this proposal accordingly. The response had been that Surrey County Council could not support any further expansion at Heathrow airport on the basis of the proposals set out by the Government in its consultation document.

**25/
08 VOLUNTARY ACTION ELMBRIDGE [Item 9]**

The Manager of Voluntary Action Elmbridge, Carole Ann Roycroft attended the meeting and explained the role of her organisation. The funding structure of the organisation was explained including the contribution of £26,000 from Surrey County Council which was match funded by Elmbridge Borough Council. The Primary Care Trust also contributed a small sum of funding. It was stressed that small voluntary organisations need a focal point otherwise they were unable to survive and that Elmbridge Voluntary Action works hard to support these organisations.

Mrs Hicks and Councillor Denyer declared personal interests in this item as they were both trustees of Voluntary Action Elmbridge.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee agreed that it values the work of the Council Voluntary Service (CVS), Voluntary Action Elmbridge, with its integrated volunteer Centre, and that future support to develop the organisation should be encouraged.

**26/
08 SURREY RESILIENCE FORUM UPDATE [Item 10]**

The Contingency Planning Manager, Ian Good, attended the meeting and explained the current emergency planning arrangement in place in the Borough and County. The Local Committee expressed particular concern in relation to flooding issues and it was agreed that this would be investigated further.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee agreed to note the report for information.

27/08 BARNES WALLIS DRIVE – PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING [Item 12]

The Local Highways Manager introduced the report and confirmed that Surrey County Council's Local Committee in Woking would fund the scheme.

RESOLVED:

- i) A Toucan crossing should be constructed on Barnes Wallis Drive, Brooklands, as outlined on drawing 12486 revision A (attached to the report).
- ii) The necessary Notice under Section 23 of The Road traffic Regulation Act 1984, advertising the Council's intent to construct the crossing be published.
- iii) Any objection(s) will have to be considered by the Chairman of the Local Committee (Woking), the divisional member and the Local Highways Manager.

28/08 MEMBERS' ALLOCATIONS REPORT [Item 13]

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee agreed to:

1. Note the criteria and Guidance Note for the use of Member's Funds as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.
2. Note the funding approved under delegated authority.
3. Approve an application for funding of £1,337 for Elmbridge Rentstart for the development of a website. (Tim Oliver)
4. Approve an application for funding of £3,000 for Manby Lodge for Entrance Hall Improvements. (Ian Lake)
5. Approve an application for funding of £3,517 for Friends of Thames Ditton Junior School for playground equipment. (Peter Hickman).
6. Approve an application for funding of £5,000 for Surrey County Council's Highways Service for the provision of a parking bay at Winter's Bridge, Thames Ditton. Subject to conditions as set out in the report. (Peter Hickman)
7. Approve an application for funding of £8,000 for the Bridge Partnership towards roll out of Value LED Education Programme. (Roy Taylor)
8. Approve an application for funding of £2,073 towards a Relate Outpost in Walton Health Centre. (Tom Phelps-Penry)
9. Approve an application for funding of £4,000 towards new lighting at Bell Farm School, Hersham. (Margaret Hicks)
10. Approve an application for funding of £2,000 towards Concern & Help for East Elmbridge Retired (CHEER) – Holiday Club, Volunteer Training and Lunch and Tea Parties. (Michael Bennison)
11. Approve an application for funding of £1,500 for central heating in Beaver Lodge, Hersham Girl Guides. (Margaret Hicks)

12. Approve an application for funding of £2,000 for the restoration of 4th Walton Scout Headquarters' roof. (Tom Phelps-Penry)
13. Approve an application for funding of £2,000 for the Elmbridge & Runnymede Talking Newspaper. (Margaret Hicks & Tom Phelps-Penry)
14. Approve an application for funding of £1,211 towards Child Sponsorship Saturday Club, Elmbridge Crossroads. (Michael Bennison)

**30/
08** **DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 14]**

The Committee noted that the next Local Committee meeting was on Monday, 16 June 2008. The venue for this meeting was to be confirmed.

Meeting Ended: 5.40pm

AGENDA ITEM 6**PUBLIC QUESTIONS****Question 1 – Mr Paul Wolstenholme****Used Car Posters**

I tabled a question at the Local Committee meeting of 26 March 2007 asking when a serious effort was to be made to remove the many hundreds of disfiguring and distracting used car posters which originate from the same source and appear on street furniture throughout all the neighbouring boroughs of Surrey. I was told (rather dismissively) that the following May (2007) would see an increase in the number of officers, which would enable this matter to be dealt with. By the time of the next Local Committee meeting over a year will have passed and not only did this not happen but the situation is now worse than ever. Furthermore, Colin Flexman from Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC), together with colleagues, have between them been undertaking to remove large numbers of these – even though, being posted on street furniture, it is not an EBC responsibility.

Mr Flexman has even liaised with Surrey Police (Inspector Paul Yearwood) to organise for the mobile phone numbers used in these illicit commercials to be repeatedly rescinded. Inspector Yearwood assures me that he is only awaiting a written request from Mr Flexman (or SCC) to implement this action, but in the meantime Mr Flexman has been instructed by the EBC legal department that, since it is not an EBC responsibility, he is not empowered to remove the notices or covered by insurance if he met with an accident in the process. Rescinding the mobile phone number should therefore be undertaken by SCC, combined with widespread removal of the notices, and again repeated when new notices appear (with a new number) to make the process commercially non-viable.

If it is to be believed that SCC has an anti-fly posting policy then why have efforts not been made to do the above and to identify and prosecute the perpetrator(s). Examination of CCTV coverage must surely reveal the number plate of vehicles placing these notices? Since the advertised mobile phone number only records messages, it must surely be possible to pose as a potential customer with a suitably old vehicle “for sale” to arrange a viewing and identify the source? Or is this enterprise operating with the sanction of SCC?

Since this is strictly an SCC responsibility when is this Council going to meet its responsibilities?

Officer Response:

Thank you for your further question on this issue of fly posting, which Mr Roger Archer Reeves, the East Area Highways Group Manager, continues to support.

Following the many reorganisations of the service, and the 'Go live' date of the new revised service on the 7th May, the recruitment of the Community Highway Officers (CHO's) followed, culminating with the third and final appointment commencing as recently as December. Undoubtedly many of these officers have arrived at varying levels of ability, and hence training is an ongoing and important issue to ensure consistency, but this does mean that other activities are not as effective as we would like at this stage.

That being said, in a genuine attempt to embrace the culture of partnership working, between Surrey County Council and Elmbridge Borough Council, officers have been forging informal working relationships, to address the various issues around the Elmbridge area. Regular officer meetings are taking place between the two authorities to improve the service generally and tackle many important issues.

This has been achieved outside the political and bureaucratic spectrum, and over recent months has achieved many outcomes, which would otherwise remain unaddressed by both Authorities. This is a far more acceptable way of conducting our respective obligations rather than pigeon boxing individual responsibilities.

Both Colin Flexman and Robert Freeman, the Borough enforcement officers, have been partnering the Highway Authority, whilst they are going about their Borough business, removing illegal signs, which are blighting the area, ably assisted by the three CHO's from Surrey County Council.

The Borough Council have not informed Surrey County Council that they are unwilling or unhappy to carry on this activity. Moreover, Anthony Jezioski, the Divisional Head, responsible for both of these officers has requested formal authority from Surrey County Council, to enable his officers to continue to carry out this important function. This requested information has already been provided to him.

The Borough Council is able to use The Town & Country Planning (Control of Advertisements)(England) Regulation 2007 to continue to carry out this function, both on and off the highway, as the signage is not restricted to highway furniture only, and hence worthy of a two pronged attack.

With regards to the issue of rescinding telephone numbers, this is a question that Surrey County Council has already asked its Head of Legal, and we await their advice on this. As for the other issues that you have raised regarding insurance, and Police advice to Mr Flexman, this has yet to be shared with the Highway Authority, but I suspect, the formal authority given to the Borough Council may have covered this.

Along with the above, we are also partnering with the Borough on co-ordinating the litter picking activities, prior to grass cutting. In addition whilst we are carrying out works on the highway utilising traffic management, the works are then also being co-ordinated with the Borough Council for litter picking, grass cutting, such as is occurring on the A309 Kingston Bypass.

Below I have incorporated some extracts from the 'The Control of Fly-Posting: A Good Practice Guide' published by Communities & Local Government.

A Corporate Approach

Research for the DETR indicates that it is advantageous if Highways and Planning departments work together to maximise the use of their legislative powers. In London Boroughs and Unitary authorities this involves inter-departmental working arrangements whereas for other authorities this will involve liaison between county (highways) and district (planning) authorities. In some cases the powers under the Highways Act are delegated to districts in order to enable a single authority to maintain control. As a general rule, district authorities are encouraged to seek delegated powers from the county to remove unauthorized advertisements under the 1980 Highways Act.

Removal

The removal of posters is probably the most common method of controlling fly-posting used by local authorities. One of the attractions of controlling fly-posting in this way is the ability to very quickly achieve discernible results. In addition a policy of poster removal can provide a disincentive to fly-posting companies when they realise that the posters are not displayed for any length of time.

However, under the existing provisions of the 1990 Planning Act, authorities need to make sure they are not themselves acting outside the statutory limits when removing posters. Immediate removal can be carried out where there is no information about the person who displayed the poster and they cannot be identified after reasonable inquiries. Where this information is given on the poster, two days notice of removal is required. Posters on street furniture can be removed without notice under the 1980 Highways Act. This provision is regularly used by authorities, often through street cleaning contracts.