

MINUTES:

**of the meeting of the Surrey County Council Local Committee
in Runnymede held at 10.00 on Friday 28th January 2005 at the
Runnymede Centre, Chertsey**

Surrey County Council Members

Mrs Moira James - Chairman
Miss Susan Bruce – Vice Chairman
Mr Terry Dicks
Mr R A N Lowther
Mrs Elise Whiteley

PART ONE - IN PUBLIC

[All references to Items refer to the Agenda for the meeting]

The meeting commenced at 10.03 am.

01/05 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

No apologies received.

02/05 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING HELD ON 10 DECEMBER 2004 [Item 2]

The Minutes were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

03/05 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

A declaration of interest was received from Mr Ray Lowther for Item 16 (Egham Farmers Market).

04/05 PETITIONS [Item 4]

A petition had been received from Simon's Walk residents but did not carry the required number of names for consideration, so this was withdrawn.

05/05 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

No formal public questions were received.

An informal public question time had taken place prior to the formal meeting. The minutes of this session are available separately from Sylvia Carter, Surrey County Council Local Committee and Partnerships officer for Runnymede.

06/05 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 6]

Mrs Moira James, Mr Ray Lowther and Mrs Elise Whiteley asked member's questions.

1. Question from Councillor Moira James

New Haw Road, New Haw

“Aware of concerns of local residents on the safety record and issues as regards New Haw Road, New Haw, within my Division, I should like to ask for an indication of any practical measures proposed or in place to improve the situation”.

Answer from Runnymede Local Transportation Service

The Runnymede Accident Working Group (AWG) is overseeing the introduction of two Vehicles Activated Signs (VASs) on New Haw Road, and the installation of anti-skid surfacing at the junction with Moat Farm Drive. The AWG comprises representatives of Surrey County Council and Surrey Police. For their part Surrey Police have designated New Haw Road as a “red road”. This means that New Haw Road is at the highest possible priority level for speed enforcement.

The VASs are due to be installed before the end of the financial year, although this will depend on provision of an electrical connection. The effect of these signs will be monitored carefully. If they are successful in reducing average traffic speeds, then it is highly likely that the number and severity of accidents will also reduce. However if the new VASs are not successful in reducing average vehicle speeds and the pattern of accidents persists, then Surrey County Council will consider further measures.

A feasibility report into provision of a new cycleway between Addlestone and New Haw is due to be reported to a future meeting of the Local Committee for Runnymede. As part of the process of conducting the necessary feasibility study and consultation for this scheme, safety improvements for pedestrians as well as cyclists will be identified and considered.

It is important to note that the dashed white lines on either side of New Haw Road are not advisory cycle lanes. These lines were installed as a psychological traffic calming measure: they are intended to make the road space seem narrower to drivers, encouraging drivers to take more care when travelling along the route.

2. Question from Mr Ray Lowther

Guildford Street, Chertsey

“Bearing in mind the extreme inconvenience to residents and possible hardship to shopkeepers, were all statutory requirements - especially relating to time notification of intention – fulfilled by the gas company, which intends to dig up Guildford Street, Chertsey for pipe laying?”

- Is the whole of the highway to be reconstructed and not just a trench width when the laying is completed and in this respect, will the gas company accept that it has a moral as well as a legal responsibility?
- Has that company been made fully aware of the anger this will cause locally?
- Will the public be made fully aware that the County Council and Runnymede Borough Council fully observed the protocol in respect of notifying the statutory authorities when the reconstruction of Guildford Street was being proposed and undertaken; that is, of course, assuming that was the case?
- What special steps are to be undertaken to minimise the inconvenience to residents and shopkeepers?”

Answer from Runnymede Local Transportation Service

The New Roads and Streetworks Act requires Transco to give a minimum of 3 months notice of their intention to carry out major works. The project will not start on site until at least May 2005.

An extensive list of possible works was submitted to the Borough Council (as agents of Surrey County Council) at a street works coordination meeting in April 2001. It included Guildford Street but the extent of any works was not stated nor any programme for construction. Transco did not raise this matter with the Borough or County when the street enhancement scheme was being planned.

The Act denies a Statutory Authority entry into a street for a period of only 12 months after substantial completion of street works. This embargo period has now expired.

Transco is fully aware the local concern over these works. The timing is unfortunate but the works are essential to avoid the potential for future service failures and escapes. Transco has every intention to consult with all parties to minimise the disruption and inconvenience to shopkeepers and visitors to the town.

Transco is unable to pursue detailed discussions until it's new maintenance contractors are appointed in April. Surrey County Council and Runnymede Borough Council will then ask for an early meeting to talk through the project to influence methods of working and timescales. Transco have already indicated their willingness to meet all reasonable conditions.

The gas main is located below the footway so a proper reinstatement of the high quality footway paving should obscure any evidence of the visit in these areas. However there will be a number of road crossings which may be a little more obvious in the carriageway. The Highway Authority cannot insist on full width reinstatements.

Mr Lowther asked a supplementary question:

In view of the hardship this work will cause, is Surrey County Council prepared to press Transco to postpone for two years, and now we know it is the footpath not the highway, is Transco aware of the Black Cherry Fair in July when large numbers of pedestrians use this route?

Response from Runnymede Local Transportation Service

It is possible to ask for a two year delay but the County Council cannot insist on it: the Transportation Service will advise of the importance of Black Cherry Fair. The contractor has a legal right to access its plant and the County Council will try to ensure that they do so with minimal disruption – we will keep local members informed.

3. Question from Mrs Elise Whiteley

"Having recently noticed old refrigerators at the entrance to the Lyne Lane Civic Amenity Centre, I would like to ask what progress has been made, since a visit by councillors last summer, to improve the site, encourage recycling and deal with fly tipping?"

Answer from Surrey County Council Waste Management

Since the Site meeting on 5th August 2004, the following progress has been made to deal with the issues at Lyne Lane.

1) Parties have still to reach agreement on responsibility for removing fly-tipped waste outside the entrance to the sewage treatment works and civic amenity site. However at the request of the County Council, Surrey Waste Management have been continuing to remove the waste from outside the entrance to the site until responsibility can be established.

2) Quotations have been obtained for the installation of a remote monitoring system at the site entrance , with the aim of discouraging fly -tipping. Further discussions will take place shortly with Surrey Waste Management and Thames Water to progress this and subject to agreement between parties, we would aim to introduce this as soon as practically possible.

3) Consultants, appointed by the Government have been undertaking a study of all Surrey's Civic Amenity Sites. An interim draft report was received at the end of November 2004 and the final report is expected at the beginning of February. The report will include a number of recommendations for increasing recycling levels at the Civic Amenity sites. When the report has been received, discussions will take place between the County Council and Surrey Waste Management about implementing the recycling improvements.

Mrs Whiteley asked a supplementary question:

I note the response but I would like to know why there are still refrigerators outside the entrance to the site.

Carolyn Rowe agreed to forward this supplementary question to Surrey Waste Management.

07/05 MEMBERS INDIVIDUAL FUNDING ALLOCATION [Item 7]

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed the proposed expenditure from the Members' allocations budget at Annexe 1.

08/05 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT ON ADULT AND COMMUNITY LEARNING IN RUNNYMEDE [Item 8]

Judith Dey, Area Manager for Adult and Community Learning (ACL) in NW Surrey, noted that ACL was a successful business in terms of user satisfaction levels, and gave a brief outline of the position for planning the service in the coming year. She noted that the service was not dependent on the County Council for funding the service as this came from a Learning and Skills Council grant, plus enrollment fees and college contributions. Depending on the content of a forthcoming Government consultation paper on Learning and Skills Council monies (to be released in February 2005), there may be a decline in resources for the sector. There was also an uncertainty about the venue for classes because of the long-term plans for the future of the Runnymede Centre.

Members asked about the timing of classes and the potential impact of the closure of the Runnymede Centre. Judith Dey said that alternative settings were being considered.

RESOLVED

The Committee considered and commented on the report.

09/05 ADULTS AND COMMUNITY CARE PERFORMANCE REPORT [Item 9]

Jon Muller, the Area Manager for Adults and Community Care for North Surrey, explained that he had just moved across from North West Surrey and was pleased to join the service in North Surrey. He introduced the report and noted that the judgement from the Inspectorate in November 2004 was that this was a two star service with good prospects for improvement. Furthermore, in December the fortnight-long inspections of the Older Persons' service and Supporting People service had found that users were well served and were either satisfied or very satisfied with provision. As evidenced in the performance indicator data in the appendix to the report, more people were being helped to remain at home or supported in extra care housing.

Members asked about assisted technology, plans for day care provision, facilities for older people who are lonely in the evenings, and assistance for people being discharged from hospital where the main carer is temporarily unwell.

Jon Muller said that the Columba project for assisted technology at Brockhurst had now attained mainstream funding and was increasingly successful – it was anticipated that the Department of Health would be making additional funding available which could lead to a project manager being appointed to develop this area of work.

Day care services at Queen Elizabeth House (provided by Runnymede Borough Council) were under discussion with all partners, in the light of the Langham Buisson report which laid out population trends and needs.

Janet Haynes, Partnership officer for North Surrey, acknowledged the need and referred to a project in Scotland (www.goodmorning.org.uk) which addressed this – in Runnymede individuals might be advised to contact Age Concern for support.

Jon Muller noted that there was an intermediate care service in North Surrey for situations where the main carer was temporarily unable to offer care.

The Chairman thanked Jon Muller for his report and also thanked Janet Haynes for all her work in the area, as she moved on to work for the Primary Care Trust.

RESOLVED

The Committee noted and commented on the performance of the North Surrey Adults and Community Care Service.

10/05 CHILDRENS' SERVICE PERFORMANCE REPORT [Item 10]

Jane Clarke, who joined the service in September 2004, introduced the report by noting the boundary changes in the area covered and the achievement of fully staffing the service, which made North West Surrey very fortunate. The service had introduced a new multi-agency referral system which had improved information and planning. The Government's agenda for greater integration and joined up working with Health and

Education would mean that, locally, there would be more partnership and preventative working in the coming year. Further developments were likely to include community safety protocols and more childrens' centres at locality level.

Members asked about support for young carers, and whether there might be a representative from the Childrens' Service at the Local Strategic Partnership task group "Healthy and Vibrant". Jane Clark noted that the Government had promised more money for supporting young carers, and that once this was allocated the service would look to work with existing providers for this group, such as the Princess Royal Trust. As there was financial provision for preventive work in the service budget for 2005-6, there may be some scope to see with partners if resources could be given to groups such as the Oasis Trust. She agreed to look at the scope for team managers in the area to present to existing groups such as that mentioned about the children's agenda.

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed to note the performance of the service countywide, by area and locally; to provide comment and feedback on the operation of the service; and to consider opportunities for further familiarisation and engagement with the service.

11/05 REPORT AND DRAFT PLAN FOR SURREY YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SERVICE [Item 11]

David Waine, the Area Youth Manager for North West Surrey, introduced the report. He was pleased to anticipate a better year for the area as all the full-time and part-time youth worker posts were filled which would contribute to improving provision. The service was working with Ofsted already and was scheduled for it's formal inspection in March. The draft plan attached to the report had been worked up in consultation with local stakeholders, and incorporated key drivers from the Government.

Members asked a number of questions, including about watersports activities with the Addlestone Canoe Club and Thames Young Mariners – David explained that although the service has used the Thames Young Mariner facility it would like to run sessions within the borough at Addlestone CC. He was also asked about liaison with Surrey Arts, and responded that he had met with the head of that service to discuss running joint activities and facilitating building use. A recent live band session at Egham youth centre had attracted over 200 young people. He noted that the Gogmore Farm Park youth facility will be opening in early March and that members would receive invitations. In response to questions, he stated that the youth development worker for Runnymede had not returned to work but it was hoped that this could be addressed very soon and it would not be appropriate to comment further. At Englefield Green youth club, talks had been held with the faith group East 2 West and as a result there was a possibility of further evening sessions run in partnership.

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed to note the achievements in 04/05 and commented on the draft Borough Plan for 2005/6.

12/05 INJURY ACCIDENT TRENDS AND SPEED MANAGEMENT IN RUNNYMEDE (Item 12)

Nick Healey, Engineer, of Runnymede Transportation Service introduced this information report, noting that half of all enquiries from residents concern speed, and that speed was the single most important factor in reducing accidents and addressing public fears about walking and cycling. He noted that the Runnymede district was on target for a reduction in overall casualties, and although the target for child casualties (killed or seriously injured) was set very low at two per year there were still four or five in the area. He also noted that whilst the majority of casualties were in cars, this was related to the high proportion of journeys by car in the borough and in fact the number of pedestrian and cyclist casualties were disproportionate to the number of journeys made by that method of transport.

Members acknowledged the impressive work undertaken in schools by road safety officers, and asked about how parents could be educated better about unsafe and inconsiderate parking around schools. Will Ward, Local Transportation Director, agreed that this presented a risk to children, noting that zigzag lines adjacent to school entrances were enforceable by wardens and that the joint County/Borough member partnership could give consideration to the need for additional waiting restrictions around schools as part of its review later in 2005.

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the report.

13/05 BROX ROAD TRAFFIC SAFETY FEASIBILITY STUDY [Item 13]

Nick Healey, Engineer, introduced the findings of this report and noted the welcome presence at the meeting of several Ottershaw residents who had already made helpful comments about the proposals. He said that the scope of the study centred on excessive speed and rat-running through the area, in which there had been six accidents in a two year period. Although this was not a high rate, a high proportion of vulnerable road users were at risk because of the residential/school nature of the area. Through journeys constituted only 14% of all journeys in the village, and there was an insufficient case for physical traffic calming measures, but the report outlined more subtle measures such as parking bays which could have a similar impact on speed as chicanes. Additionally, improvements to street lighting, street furniture and bus stops were proposed together with the option to examine the possibility of a new pedestrian crossing. The package of measures set out would be subject to detailed public consultation.

Members highlighted existing problems with parking on both sides of Brox Road, which caused difficulty for delivery vans manoeuvring through – this might also affect safety if emergency vehicles had the same difficulty. The exit from the Murray Road car park was also raised as a problem area. There was some support for measures to address excess speed on the upper part of Brox Road. Nick Healey noted that the review of parking enforcement later in 2005 could address the parking issues and consider yellow lines, and highlighted RBC improvements to Murray Road car park (which was free of charge). David Mitchell confirmed that the County Council was looking at the car-park

entrance problem. The Ottershaw Society had conducted its own capacity survey of car park use and identified an average of fourteen free spaces available per day, roughly equivalent to the number of cars parked on the street by the shops.

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed:

- a) that the improvements detailed in Section 4 of the report be progressed to detailed design and construction in consultation with the local member, local residents and emergency services;
- b) that the traffic order notice for the proposed new controlled pedestrian crossing be advertised and the Local Transportation Director was authorised to consider any objections received, in consultation with the Chairman and Local Member.

14/05 COMMUNITY SPEED WATCH [Item 14]

David Mitchell, Principal Engineer, presented this report, noting that this was a Surrey Police initiative which was already being piloted in the North East area. It was proposed that, following the pilot evaluation, the initiative could be introduced in Runnymede. The merits of introduction were that it would increase highways monitoring and enable residents to observe the gap between individual perceptions of speed and the objective reality. It was suggested that the Transportation Service could work in partnership with the police on this.

Members expressed concern about the possibility that this scheme would encourage residents to monitor other residents' driving behaviour and collect sensitive data, raising questions about how this would be stored. It was considered that it would also be a further area of overlap with what many considered to be a police responsibility. Some members thought that fixed speed cameras were a more appropriate response to the problem of speeding. A reduction in the speed limit to 20mph in villages such as Thorpe was also suggested.

Will Ward explained that there was no intention to hand the job of speed enforcement to the public, and that training in personal safety would be offered to volunteers to prevent road rage responses to monitoring. He suggested inviting a police officer to the Local Committee to explain the scheme further. There were no fixed speed cameras in Runnymede at present because no locations met the Government guidance on where they could be positioned.

RESOLVED (by 3 votes in favour to none against)

That the officer recommendation "that any Community Speed Watch scheme be taken forwards by Surrey Police is applied as a partnership between Surrey Police and Surrey County Council in the Runnymede borough area" be rejected.

15/05 SURREY HIGHWAY PARTNERSHIP CONTRACT: 18 MONTH PROGRESS REVIEW [Item 15]

The report was presented by Will Ward, Local Transportation Director, with Steve Lee (Assistant Head of Surrey County Council Transportation Service) and George Kovacs (Contracts manager for West Surrey) in attendance to answer questions.

Will Ward explained that the Local Committee had considered the Highways Contract in July 2004, and agreed that an update would be brought in Spring 2005. The views given by the Local Committees for the six areas covered by the contract would be considered by the Select Committee in summer 2005. The Local Committee in Runnymede was the first committee to see the data outlined in Annex 2 of the report, some of which related to 2003 and some to 2004.

The main difficulty in delivering the contract over the preceding 12 months, aside from the vagaries of the weather, had been poor communication with sub-contractors and a lack of co-ordination of different types of work. The December outturn showed expenditure of £120,000 above the projected spend which meant that the budget needed adjustment, a not unusual position. Positive developments, including completion of the Magna Carta school lay-by on time and to budget, and new Customer Guidance procedure which would improve communication with the public.

Members were concerned that the contractor was not available at the meeting to answer questions, and cited examples of poor performance causing traffic disruption over the period of the contract to date. It was noted that 11 out of 26 schemes completed required some improvement, and several members commented that they were unhappy with this performance, asking whether the Assistant Head of Transportation would include an option to terminate the contract in his report to the Select Committee.

Steve Lee said that it was quite common for there to be a difference between projected spend and actual spend because of the uncertainties of scheduling work and the need to respond to weather conditions. There was always the option to terminate a contract if key performance data showed the contract terms were not fulfilled, but this data would not be available until the summer. The Executive would take that decision. He acknowledged that there had been examples of poor performance at the beginning of the contract, but that the local transportation service had been working with the contract manager and main contractor to prevent a repeat of such errors. The problems with using sub-contractors who were not local arose because of the local labour shortage due to demand from Terminal 5, and to require a high proportion of local labour would increase the cost of the contract significantly.

RESOLVED (by 3 votes in favour to 1 against)

a) That the officer recommendation as set out in the report be rejected.

The Committee commented that it was dissatisfied with some aspects of the officer report and therefore:

RESOLVED:

b) that the Select Committee should consider fully the option of not renewing the

contract, including all financial implications.

c) that if the contractor is re-appointed, the Select Committee should require Ringway to appear before Local Committees on a regular basis i.e. at every other meeting;

d) that Ringway should not employ sub-contractors who are in any way linked to the main contractor.

Each clause of the recommendation was voted on separately, (b) and (c) were approved by 4 votes for to none against, and (d) was approved by 3 votes for and 1 against. Mrs Whiteley asked that her vote against clause (d) be recorded in the minutes.

16/05 LOCAL TRANSPORTATION UPDATE REPORT [Item 16]

Mr Lowther declared a personal interest in section 5 of the report, as a Feoffee of Chertsey Market. He did not take part in the decision regarding section 5.

An addition to annexe 1 to Item 16 was tabled, outlining further locations for the street lighting PFI bid for new lamp standards.

One member asked Will Ward to report on use of the Walking Bus and cycleways in the borough. He said that a report will be brought to the March Local Committee meeting on the results of monitoring cycle use.

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed:

Section 1

- a) to approve the list of schemes identified in Annex 1 and to make any further comments or suggestions which would be helpful in finalising the bid for the additional lighting units that would help to reduce the fear of crime.

Section 4

- b) to indicate Members' support for the Business Improvement District proposal;

Section 5

- c) that a temporary traffic order is advertised to extend the pedestrianisation order in Egham Town Centre to cover the period from 06.30am to 11.00am on the second Thursday in each month;
- d) that details of the permanent traffic order be delegated to the Local Transportation Director in consultation with the Chairman and Local Member.

Section 6

- e) to the updated programme of transportation schemes as indicated in Annex 4.

[Meeting ended 13.05 pm]



Chairman's signature