

DRAFT

**Minutes of the meeting of Surrey County Council's
Local Committee in Elmbridge held at
4.00pm on Monday 19th September 2010 at
Elmbridge Civic Centre, Esher, KT10 9SD**

Surrey County Council Members

- ** Mr Michael Bennison (Chairman)
- A Mr Nigel Cooper
- ** Mrs Margaret Hicks (Vice-Chairman)
- ** Mr Ernest Mallett
- ** Mr Anthony Samuels
- ** Mr John Butcher
- ** Mr Peter Hickman
- A Mr Ian Lake
- ** Mr Thomas Phelps-Penry

Elmbridge Borough Council Members

- A Cllr Barry Fairbank
- ** Cllr Jan Fuller
- ** Cllr Ramon Gray
- ** Cllr Stuart Hawkins
- A Cllr Peter Harman Substituted for by Cllr Chris Sadler
- ** Cllr Alan Hopkins
- ** Cllr Dorothy Mitchell
- ** Cllr John O'Reilly
- ** Cllr Karen Randolph

PART ONE

IN PUBLIC

39/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

There were four apologies for absence from Cllr Ian Lake, Cllr Nigel Cooper, Cllr Barry Fairbank and Cllr Peter Harman. Cllr Chris Sadler substituted for Cllr Peter Harman.

40/11 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2010 (reconvened on 11 July 2011) were confirmed and signed as a correct record, subject to the following amendments:

DRAFT

- i. Councillor Michael Bennison be recorded as Chairman;
- ii. Minute item 19/11, it be noted that Councillor Samuels sent his apologies;
- iii. Minute item 30/11, paragraph 3, "Councillor Harman" be changed to read "Councillor Hickman";
- iv. Minute item 32/11, paragraph 1, the following wording be added to the final sentence: "on its own, with a 40mph section to its west";
- v. Annex B, paragraph 4, the word "lead" be changed to "led".

At the request of Members, the Community Partnership Team Manager clarified the way in which the resolution of minute item 28/11 had been arrived at, specifically the order in which motions had been proposed and seconded.

41/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest made.

42/11 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

There were no announcements.

43/11 PETITIONS & LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION [Item 5]

One letter of representation was submitted as follows:

Weston Avenue, Request for Traffic Calming: 71 signatures

Ms Tracey Spreadborough spoke at the Committee on behalf of the residents of Weston Avenue and requested traffic calming and an associated 20mph restriction in Weston Avenue, West Molesey.

The North East Area Highways Team Manager, Matthew Scriven, presented the response to the letter of representation. He stated that based on the collision data for the area, it would not appear to be value for money to install traffic calming features along the route. Without traffic calming measures in place, the introduction of a 20mph zone would not be recommended, as there would likely be non-compliance by drivers. Whilst it was accepted that many drivers used Weston Avenue as a cut-through, it was likely that any action would simply transfer the problem to another nearby area. However, the situation would be monitored.

Resolved:

- i. The Letter of Representation be noted;
- ii. The officer response to the Letter of Representation be noted.

There was one petition submitted as follows:

Hinchley Wood, Request to change parking controls in Station Approach: 665 signatures

Dr Leary spoke at the Committee on behalf of the patients of Lantern Surgery, local shopkeepers and the community to request that parking be allowed in Station Approach between 8:00am and 9:30am for a maximum of 30 minutes. He stated that whilst the current restrictions had been put in place to prevent commuter parking, they prevented patients with early appointments attending the Surgery. Dr Leary stated that modifying the parking controls to allow up to 30 minutes of parking throughout the day would prevent commuter parking whilst allowing patients to attend the Surgery.

The Parking Project Team Leader, Rikki Hill, presented the response to the petition. He stated that the Council was aware of the issue and Station Approach was to be included in an upcoming parking review. The Committee would be provided with the outcome of the parking review at its meeting in November.

Resolved:

- i. The petition be noted;
- ii. The officer response to the petition be noted.

44/11 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]

No Public Questions were received.

45/11 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 7]

There was one Member question received as set out in Annex A with the answer.

46/11 PETITION RESPONSE: OXSHOTT SPEED LIMITS & HGV RESTRICTION [Item 8]

The Committee received a response to a petition received at its meeting on 20 June 2011. The petition had requested a HGV ban for vehicles over 18 tons, a speed limit reduction to 20mph in the centre of the village and an extension of the 30mph restriction to the north and south of the village.

DRAFT

The North East Area Highways Team Manager introduced the report, addressing each key element of the petition as follows:

- Approximately 20,000 vehicles passed through the village during the day and, of these vehicles, around 200 were HGV weighing over 18 tonnes;
- There had been a number of collisions in the area, but only one had been identified as being speed related and there was no clear pattern. Combined with the fact that the Department for Transport had issued guidance stating that 20mph restrictions should not be implemented on roads of strategic nature, the introduction of such a limit in the centre of the village would not be recommended;
- When introducing a HGV restriction a relevant Traffic Regulation Order was required. The Council would have to be confident of winning the case at any Public Inquiry given the resource implications involved, both in Officer time and financial cost. In this particular case, officers felt that there was not sufficient evidence to justify such action;
- Extending the 30mph restriction to the north and south of the village was possible, but this would require a new traffic regulation order and this would cost in the region of £10,000;

Members thanked the North East Area Highways Team Manager for providing a thorough analysis of the issues and made the following comments:

- Officers should give serious consideration to extending the 30mph speed limit to the north of the village and the introduction of a hard standing area to assist mobile enforcement and improved footway by the butchers shop;
- The methodology used when determining diversion routes needed to be looked at carefully as Oxshott had been disproportionately affected when the M25 was closed;
- The introduction of rumble pads to calm traffic was generally unpopular amongst residents as they generated considerable noise;
- The introduction of a HGV ban would likely prompt opposition from other areas. Residents needed to accept that roads of strategic nature, such as A roads, would be used by HGVs. If a ban was introduced, a similar ban would also be needed in Cobham as it would be unable to cope with the increased traffic flow;

DRAFT

- It would be useful for the North East Area Highways Team Manager to initiate dialogue with the Department for Transport to seek clarification on its policy regarding the designation of A roads;
- A Member stated that the relevant authorities had failed to consult residents and Councillors in relation to M25 closures and utility work;
- The introduction of a low emission zone on the A243 had increased the number of HGVs passing through Oxshott. This was something that needed to be looked at by officers.

The Chairman stated that he was surprised that the petitioners had not attended the meeting to listen to the discussion. He stated that this would have been useful.

Resolved:

- i. The contents of the report be noted and the suggestions considered when determining the 2011/12 Programme;
- ii. The Area Highways Manager initiate dialogue with the Department for Transport to seek clarification on its policy regarding the designation of A roads.

47/11 PETITION RESPONSE: HILLCREST, WEYBRIDGE [ITEM 9]

The Committee received a response to a petition received at its meeting on 20 June 2011. The petition had requested that Hillcrest be left as a resident parking area with no restrictions on the time that residents could park.

The Parking Project Team Leader introduced the report and stated that it was believed that the petitioners had misunderstood recent proposals to introduce new parking bays in Hillcrest. He stated that residents or visitors displaying a valid parking permit would still be permitted to park during operational hours without a time limit. Drivers paying to park using the pay and display or mobile payment scheme would however only be permitted to park their vehicles for up to 2 hours.

A Member stated that it was important that the County Council clearly explained changes to parking arrangements to residents, to prevent confusion.

RESOLVED: The report be noted.

48/11 PETITION RESPONSE: STREET LAMPS, LONG DITTON [ITEM 10]

The Committee received a response to a petition received at its meeting on 20 June 2011. The petition had argued against the proposed removal of the Edwardian / Victorian swan necked lamp posts in Long Ditton, and their replacement with modern standard lighting columns.

The PFI Contract Manager, Paul Smith, introduced the report and stated that, following a meeting with residents and Councillors, work in the roads in question had been placed on hold. In early August residents had provided notification to the PFI Contract team that they would be looking to fund the replacement of the current street lamps with swan neck additions for 57 columns. Once payment was made, works would be scheduled and residents advised of the dates.

A Member stated that this was an excellent example of the community working with the Council to identify issues and find solutions.

RESOLVED: The report be noted.

49/11 LETTER OF REPRESENTATION RESPONSE: THE WOODLANDS / WOODEND / GROVE WAY [ITEM 11]

The Committee received a response to a Letter of Representation that had been received at its meeting on 20 June 2011. The Letter of Representation had requested Surrey County Council to undertake road safety improvements to the crossroads of Woodend, The Woodlands and Groveway.

The Parking Project Team Leader introduced the report and stated that, following a site visit, it was agreed that there was scope to improve signing and lining and that this work had been ordered. Give Way signage was being renewed at the junction, as was the notification of the Weight Restriction. Directional signage for the industrial estate was also to be introduced on the B3379. Whilst petitioners had requested "Stop Lines and Signs", such work would require Department for Transport authority and permission was unlikely to be given due to the low numbers of personal injury collisions. However, the site would continue to be monitored once improvements had been made. In particular, there was potential scope for a HGV restriction signage review.

RESOLVED: To note that work will be undertaken to improve the clarity of road markings and improve signage installed to provide suitable warning to highway users of the junction.

50/11 INFORMATION REPORT – YOUTH TRANSFORMATION AND LOCAL PREVENTATIVE FRAMEWORK [ITEM 12]

The Committee received a report from the Head of Youth Justice, Ben Byrne, which provided an update on the progress of the Youth Task Group. It was explained that the Youth Task Group had been established by the Local Committee at its meeting on 20 June 2011 to advise on youth issues and the future delivery of youth provision locally.

It was explained that Surrey County Council Services for Young People was in the process of implementing its Fit for the Future Transformation Programme, which placed a greater emphasis on the development of local youth provision overseen by Local Committees. The Youth Task Group would continue to work with the Elmbridge Local Committee to make recommendations about the use and development of youth resources in the Borough. The budget for the Local Prevention Framework in Elmbridge was £117,000 and a further £26,000 would be available from April 2012 in the form of a small grants programme for youth organisations.

The Head of Youth Justice stated that the Youth Task Group had held its initial meeting on 5 September and that a Youth Needs Assessment Workshop was due to take place on 12 October. The purpose of the Workshop was to bring young people from across the borough together with representatives from a wide range of partners, to discuss key priorities for young people in Elmbridge. It was intended that any priorities would meet Surrey County Council's strategic objectives for young people of full participation in education, training and employment and staying safe from crime.

Following questions from Members, Councillor Margaret Hicks, Chairman of the Youth Task Group, and the Head of Youth Justice clarified the following:

- It was the aim of the Task Group to work with non-Council run youth clubs to better join up services;
- The purpose of the Local Prevention Framework was to identify gaps in service provision;
- All areas of Elmbridge would be considered, including Oxshott and Cobham;
- No young people arrested during the recent riots had been from Elmbridge;
- A wide range of young people were being invited to the Workshop in October. It was acknowledged that those invited

DRAFT

had to be representative of a range of demographics and cultural backgrounds;

- If it was felt necessary, additional young people would be invited onto the Youth Task Group.

RESOLVED:

- i. The progress made by the Youth Task Group be noted;
- ii. Recommendations be provided at the next meeting of the Local Committee in respect of local priorities.

51/11 INFORMATION REPORT – HIGHWAYS SCHEMES PROGRESS REPORT [ITEM 13]

The Committee received a report from the North East Area Highways Team Manager which updated the Local Committee on the progress of highways schemes in Elmbridge.

The North East Area Highways Team Manager outlined the report and, following questions from Members, clarified the following:

- Members would be provided with an updated table of Elmbridge Major Maintenance Schemes, once available;
- Officers would ensure that relevant divisional Members were consulted when developing the Highways Scheme.

A Member stated despite assurances from officers, there remained a lack of consultation with divisional Members. The North East Area Highways Team Manager stated that he would ensure that this was addressed.

RESOLVED: The report be noted.

52/11 INFORMATION REPORT – ANNUAL REVIEW OF MONITORING OF APPLICATIONS FOR GOODS VEHICLE OPERATORS LICENCES [ITEM 14]

The Committee received a report from the Transport Development Planning Manager (East), Caroline Smith, which provided details of applications for Good Vehicle Operator Licences (VOLs) for the period April 2010 to the end of March 2011.

The Transport Development Planning Manager explained that, with few exceptions, any person who operated vehicles weighing over 3.5 tonnes needed an operators "O" licence. These licences were granted by the Traffic Commissioner and all Local Authorities had a statutory right to object to applications if they had valid concerns.

DRAFT

County Council Members were consulted on VOL applications within their division and the Local Committee Chairman was able to receive notification of all applications in Elmbridge, at his request.

The Chairman stated that he and other Members were not always being informed of VOL applications and requested that officers ensure that this was done without fail.

RESOLVED:

- i. It be noted that there is now an established system in place for notifying and consulting Members of applications in their Divisions;
- ii. It be noted that Training for Members was carried out in September and November 2009. This was made available to all County Councillors;
- iii. The contents of the Annual Information Report be noted.

53/10 MEMBERS' ALLOCATIONS REPORT [ITEM 15]

The Committee received a report from the Community Partnership Team Leader (East) which outlined the proposed criteria and process for the use of Members' Allocations and made recommendations on a number of proposals.

The Community Partnership Team Manager stated that the Member Allocations process would now be administered centrally and provided contact details for Members. The Chairman requested that the Community Partnership Team send out new Member Allocation forms to Members.

RESOLVED:

- (i) To note the Criteria and Guidance Note for the use of Members' Allocations as set out in Annex A and B;
- (ii) To note the allocations approved under delegated authority by the Community Partnership Manager and Community Partnership Team Leader (East Surrey) in consultation with the Chairman;
- (iii) To note that the Local Committee approved an application for funding from Oatlands Infants School, Weybridge for £2,000 towards its Values Tree Sculpture from Mr Samuel's allocation at its meeting on 11 July 2011;

DRAFT

- (iv) Agree an application for funding of £2,398 from the West Elmbridge Neighbourhood Team to be funded from Mrs Hicks's allocation;
- (v) Agree an application for funding of £5,320 from Dittons Library for the installation of atrium blinds. To be funded from Capital, sponsored by Mr Hickman;
- (vi) Agree an application for funding of £2,500 from Ashley Primary School for the purchase of permanent play equipment. To be funded from Capital, sponsored by Mr Samuels;
- (vii) Agree an application for funding of £1,000 from Long Ditton Residents Association for the replacement of street lighting. To be funded from Capital, sponsored by Mr Hickman.

The meeting concluded at 17:38.

Chairman's signature

Annex A

MEMBER QUESTIONS

Question 1 : Cllr Barry Fairbank – Long Ditton

Long Ditton has a number of hedges on highway verges on Manor Road North; Rectory Lane; Church Road; Chalcott Gardens etc. Whilst action is taken from time to time to cut back the flanks of the hedges to avoid overhanging on footways and highways, no action has been or is being taken to keep top growth in check. Can you please advise me as to the policies which are applied by Surrey County Council in this context and when residents might expect action to cut back the top growth?

The Chairman will give the following response:

In this situation Surrey County Council would typically only cut back the sides of the hedges to avoid encroachment of the highway. Cutting back the top can encourage side growth increasing the need for cutting back in the future.

We will inspect and if necessary seek a quote for the cutting back. This will be in two parts, one for just doing the standard approach, ie. sides of the hedges, and one for doing the tops. If the cost of cutting back the tops is prohibitive discussion will take place with the Local Member in the first instance to ascertain if any additional funds can be found.