

DRAFT  
MINUTES:

of the meeting of the Surrey County Council Local  
Committee held at 10.00 on Friday February 13<sup>th</sup> 2009 at  
the Hythe Centre, Egham.

**Surrey County Council Members**

Mrs Mary Angell (Chairman)  
Miss Marisa Heath (Vice Chairman)  
Mrs Yvonna Lay  
Mrs Elise Whiteley

**Runnymede Borough Council appointed members**

Councillor Anthony J. Davis  
Councillor Chris Norman (substitute)  
Councillor Mrs Linda Gillham  
Councillor Mrs Elaine Gill (substitute)

**PART ONE - IN PUBLIC**

[All references to Items refer to the Agenda for the meeting]  
The chairman advised the meeting of the fire evacuation procedure.

The meeting commenced at 10.00 am.

**01/09 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Terry Dicks, Mr Ray Lowther, Councillor John Furey, and Councillor John Ashmore.

**02/09 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING HELD ON 19TH SEPTEMBER 2008 [Item 2]**

Mrs Whiteley asked for, and received, confirmation that the written answer provided after the June meeting in response to Mr Few's supplementary Public Question had been appended to the minutes for June.

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

**03/09 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

No declarations of interest were received before the meeting.

**04/09 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]**

Two questions had been received:

1. Question on the Tulk Bequest, from Councillor Chris Norman

In relation to the Tulk Bequest:

What was the original name of the Behest (pre-2006) and the 'charitable objects', and may I receive a copy of the report, recommendation and resolution of the Executive meeting that approved the change of the above in 2006?  
Can I be informed of what schools are now eligible under the 'new' terms?  
Is there a reason why the County has not submitted accounts to the Charity Commission since September 2005? Were any of the funds in the original trust allocated between the date of registration in 1962 and the change in 2006, or any allocated and spent since the change in 2006? and can I be advised of the current value of the behest?

**Answer from Surrey County Council's education and legal teams:**

"The name of the original charity was "J A Tulk Playing Field Trust" (charity no. 312006) and is now "The Tulk Fund for School Sports Facilities" (no. 312006).

The bequest of £10,000 was " towards the purchase and layout (but not equipment) of playing fields for any type of Maintained County Secondary School within the administrative County".

The current scheme states:

"The object of the charity is to provide recreational facilities and advance education by providing or assisting in the provision or improvement of outdoor sports facilities (not including equipment) for County maintained secondary schools in Surrey."  
All maintained secondary schools in Surrey are eligible.

The report to the County Council Executive in 2004 is attached. The charity commission scheme was sealed by them in 2006.

The reason that no accounts were submitted to the Charity Commission after September 2005 was that unfortunately, no accountant had been allocated to deal with this charity. This has now been rectified and accounts will be presented as soon as external auditors can validate them.

No funds were deployed before the new scheme was made and none have been deployed since, though an invitation to bid for funds was included in the school bulletin in October and bids are being assessed now. The value of the Bequest as at September 2008 was:

Capital balance £244,070, revenue balance available to spend is £581,360."

*Extract from the Executive report January 20th 2004:*

"It is recommended that application be made to the Charity Commission for a scheme to vary the objects of the JA Tulk Playing Fields Trust (321006) to benefit secondary school sports facilities (not including equipment) within the administrative area of the County Council."

The minutes of this meeting record that the recommendation was agreed."

Councillor Norman asked a supplementary question,

"I understand that an application has gone to the Trust for a new pitch in the grounds at Jubilee High School, and would like to know whether county councillors will pursue this application on behalf of the school?"

The chairman answered that she thought members of the committee would wish to see the school benefit from the Trust, and agreed to advise Councillor Norman as

soon as the exact date of when the County Council's Executive as trustees would make a decision on the application, was known.

## **2. Question from Mr Ray Walker of Virginia Water**

(Please see attached photographs taken 14/1/09 of the location referred to on the north section of Lyne Lane. Mr Walker comments that both sites appear to be used for what are normally considered to be inappropriate green belt activities. He notes "the entrance to the site opposite, last occupied by Hanson for green composting appears to be becoming neglected. There was a broken and hazardous drain grating, a displaced broken kerb and the verge was furrowed by heavy vehicles, probably accessing the SCC sites. Whilst there for an obvious reason the blocks across the entrance do not enhance this supposedly rural road in the green belt".) "Is it possible to improve the appearance of this green belt locality extending from the northern Surrey County Council site to the southern boundary of "the tip", and also to give attention to the opposite side of Lyne Lane, in an endeavour to give it a more rural, rather than an industrial, appearance?"

### **Reply from Surrey County Council's Mr Keith Barker, Estates and Property :**

"The attached map indicates land owned by Surrey County Council in Lyne Lane on the northern side (adjacent to the sewage treatment works). I can confirm that the county council uses the land to the right (as seen in the photograph) as a highways site for the contractor Ringway to store materials, and leases the other portion of land to the left to a motorcycle club. Land on the opposite side of Lyne Lane is not owned by the county."

Mr Richard Parkinson, contract manager for the Surrey Waste Management recycling site, adds:

"Plans are being taken forward to deter fly tipping by installing a fixed surveillance camera at the entrance to the recycling site in Lyne Lane. Our contractor has planning applications in for the poles required and we are finalising the specification for the cameras with our contractor, Surrey Waste Management, with a view to installation this Spring."

### **Reply from Surrey Highways:**

"The county council will write to its contractor asking them to be mindful of the appearance within the site, giving due consideration to its function as an operational depot."

Mr Walker asked a supplementary question:

"Does the County Council appreciate that the written answer to the question is inadequate because it does not address all the issues raised, and that the state of these sites suggests weak and inadequate SCC management from the chief executive officer downwards?"

The chairman answered that she considered that the response to the question was adequate.

05/09 **WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS** [Item 5]

The following questions were received and answered:

**1. Question from Councillor Mrs Linda Gillham**

“Can you advise the Thorpe councillors who is responsible for the fencing along the bridge over the Medlake ditch and footpath 36? This runs between Wavendene Ave and Ayebridges Ave.

We are concerned about the vandalised fencing, litter and poor state of repair of this area and I have attached some photos. Cllr. Margaret Harnden has approached Anne Woods who in turn has written to the Environment Agency but we have not seen a reply.”

**Response from Surrey County Council’s Countryside Access Officer, Anne Woods:**

“I have now received a reply from the Environment Agency, and unsurprisingly they deny responsibility for the fencing. I am not prepared to supply new chain link fencing from the rights of way maintenance budget, but would be concerned for public safety if the fencing were simply removed. I am therefore prepared to replace the fencing with railings similar to those on the bridge, but will not be able to do so until the next financial year (2009/10)”.

Councillor Mrs Gillham said that she was content with the response and did not have a supplementary question.

**2. Questions from Mrs Elise Whiteley**

“As a follow up to the presentation to the Committee on June 6<sup>th</sup> 2008, by Mr Ian Boast, on Waste Management and Energy from Waste (EFW), I request a reply to the following questions:

- “1. Please state the present situation regarding a planning application for Trumps Farm EFW.
2. Please state if any other applications or any permission has been given to other sites in Surrey for Household Waste Treatment and please name the sites. Please also list sites for composting and treatment of food waste.”

***Response from Surrey County Council’s Environment and Infrastructure directorate:***

“1. The planning application for Trumps Farm EFW is due to be determined by the Planning and Regulatory Committee in March/April 2009. This timetable is dependent on the timely submission of further information by the applicant, which will then have to be publicised.

As the local divisional member you will be notified of the date when confirmed and sent details.

2. There are planning applications for two in vessel composters at Wisley that are currently with the County Planning Authority. These applications have not yet been determined.

Potential sites for composting and treatment of food waste are listed in the Waste Plan under policy WD2.”

Mrs Whiteley asked a supplementary question,  
“Will the Wisley site composters be able to deal with kitchen waste?”

It was agreed that a reply would be pursued outside the meeting with the relevant officer.

## **2. Question from Mrs Elise Whiteley**

“The wigwag lights for Christ Church Infant School, Virginia Water are still out of action. The road passing the school has a 40 mph speed limit so the lights are very important. When will the restoration be effected, what is the reason for the delay and could urgent priority be implemented?”

### **Response from Surrey Highways:**

Most of the wig wag signs in the County were installed many years ago, and now develop intermittent faults. There is no specific budget allocation for the maintenance of these signs.

Earlier this week the Street Lighting Engineer attended Christchurch Road and has confirmed that the lights function, but a problem remains with the programmable timer. Spare parts are being sourced, and when available the repair will be completed.

Transport for Surrey (TfS) have undertaken a survey of wig-wags across the County and identified all in need of replacement. This includes those on Christchurch Road. At present a formal budget has not been agreed, but this is something which is being progressed by TfS. The wig-wags cost approximately £600 each, so Countywide this is a significant sum.”

Mrs Whiteley asked a supplementary question:  
“When will the wig-wags be fully repaired?”

Mr Bolton advised that he could not be specific but estimated that they would be operational within four weeks of the Committee date.

## **4. Question from Mrs Elise Whiteley**

“Residents are very concerned about safety of foot paths during the icy conditions at present. Please may we have a clear indication as to the responsibility for clearing footpaths in all weathers and the priority given during snow conditions. Does Runnymede Borough Council look after footpaths year round or is precipitation a County responsibility?”

### **Response from Surrey Highways:**

This season has seen a high level of demand upon our winter maintenance service, with the snow last week generating real concerns.

Surrey County Council is responsible for the footpaths (pavements) if they form part of the public highway (are not private) although the various District Councils often help us out, including Runnymede Borough Council. In many locations residents

and business owners also choose to assist by clearing the pavements outside of their property.

We do not have sufficient resources both in available staff and rock salt supplies to treat all pavements. In the last week our priority has been on the principal road network to ensure essential services can still get through. There has been some pavement clearance with priority given to those in town centre locations, near hospitals or large schools.

People have to accept that in adverse weather conditions you need to exercise additional caution.

#### 06/09 **PETITIONS** [Item 6]

No petitions were received.

#### 07/09 **AIRTRACK: REPORT FOR INFORMATION** [Item 7]

Mr Iain Reeve introduced himself as Head of Transport for Surrey in Surrey County Council, and also chairman of the Airtrack forum, highlighting that these were two very different roles.

He noted that following the public consultation by BAA about the Airtrack scheme, which closed in December 2008, many responses had been received and were being considered prior to an application to the Secretary of State for Transport and Works Act powers which was likely to be submitted in April. He explained that this application would be published and that there would be a statutory 42 day period during which public bodies and members of the public may submit objections. He noted that, if objections were submitted, it was almost certain that the Government would call a Public Inquiry to be heard in autumn 2009, and would announce its decision on the result in Spring 2010. If all went according to plan the scheme could complete and become operational in 2013.

Mr Reeve noted that the county council had always supported the Airtrack proposals in principle, as they promised to take ten million passengers per year off the roads, but that the county council Executive's response, quoted in his report, had taken a robust position in undertaking to withdraw County Council support for the scheme if certain potential impacts of Airtrack could not be addressed.

Mr Reeve noted that several working groups were examining these possible impacts to help the county council to negotiate with BAA on mitigation measures and to decide what (if any) objections to raise at Public Inquiry. He noted that BAA had agreed funding for impartial third party modelling of level crossing traffic flows.

Mr Peter Sims, Head of Technical Services at Runnymede Borough Council, reported that the working group on level crossings in Runnymede had focused mainly on their existing impact on Egham and Addlestone to find out:

- could current level crossing downtimes be reduced?
- could traffic flow across the crossings be diverted or reduced?
- would bridges or underpasses be a practical solution?

He noted that Network Rail was considering various solutions to reduce existing downtimes, and that the analysis/modelling of level crossing traffic flow was

underway. He gave the example of the Thorpe Road crossing where traffic approaching from the roundabout could be affected by the phasing of traffic lights at Staines Bridge.

Members raised the following points:

- the effect of level crossing downtimes on the response of emergency services;
- the impact on air quality of long traffic queues at the crossings;
- the suggestion of a rail tunnel rather than the Staines chord overground;
- the relationship between the Airtrack proposals and a third runway at Heathrow
- how much weight would be given to Surrey County Council's response by Government;
- the need for a pedestrian bridge at the Thorpe Road crossing (as 3,000 schoolchildren using this road)
- the continued importance of considering a designated signal operator to oversee the crossings at Egham.

It was noted that all the responses sent by public bodies and residents to BAA Airtrack were likely to be retained by them, so that all comments would need to be made separately to Government at the Transport and Works Act stage, so as to be considered and put in the public domain.

The chairman then suspended standing orders and opened the meeting to questions and comments from the public, which included:

- the importance of assessing the impact on local bus users of the Airtrack scheme;
- the need for car parking and cycle storage facilities at Chertsey Station if Airtrack services would stop there, in addition to extending the platform length;
- liaison with neighbouring authorities such as Windsor and Maidenhead which had level crossings which would be affected;
- the possibility that the Airtrack proposals could be implemented partially rather than in full, e.g. by running additional services between Staines and Waterloo but not Reading and Guildford, in order to minimise costs.

Mr Reeve acknowledged all these points, and noted that the next version of the Local Transport Plan would address public transport capacity including rail.

## **08/09 SURREY HIGHWAYS PARTNERSHIP [ former Item 9] FOR INFORMATION**

Mr Jason Russell introduced his report by saying that there was a recognition that the contractor for West Surrey, Ringway, was not performing well at present but he would outline future anticipated improvements.

The main issues being addressed were;

- how to deal with risks
- a payment system which would give a commercial incentive for the contractor to perform more effectively
- how well the contractor performed;
- defining what the relationship was in contractual terms.

To this end, Mr Russell explained that various changes to the contract would take effect from April 2009, most notably an “actual costs” approach which would pass on risks encountered in delivery to the contractor.

He noted that the current contract with Ringway was set to run until 2011, but that the County Council would take a decision in the coming October as to whether to extend the contract until 2013.

Members asked whether the new approach to costs might mean that Ringway would factor in maximum risk when pricing each job, how competition for the existing contractors could be increased by support for smaller companies, and the degree of influence over the contractor exercised by county council engineers. It was noted that a report would be considered by Runnymede Borough Council on March 5<sup>th</sup> regarding the borough council taking on a contract for grass cutting locally.

#### **09/09 ON-STREET PARKING REPORT [former Item 8]**

Mr Roger Evans, Group Manager for Parking Services, explained that his service was relatively new having been established seven months previously to oversee development of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) and to manage agency agreements with boroughs on enforcement of parking restrictions.

He noted that the Traffic Regulation Order group and annual review of on-street parking would be part of his remit, and that consultation on the proposals for a Controlled Parking Zone in Egham and Englefield Green would begin in summer 2009 – this would be the first CPZ to be handled by his team.

Mr Evans undertook to ensure that local members were fully involved in development of the consultation proposals and negotiations with local bodies such as Royal Holloway College.

#### **RESOLVED**

- a) to note the structure and purpose of the PSIG
- b) to note the programme of work for the 2009/10 annual parking review and Controlled Parking Zones project
- c) that discussions were ongoing with Runnymede Borough Council about the future agency arrangements and that recommendations would be brought to the Local Committee on 26 June 2009;
- d) the deferral of the appointment of county councillors to the CPE Joint Member Working Group until 26 June 2009.

#### **10/09 PFI LIGHTING REPORT [Item 10]**

Mr Andrew Forzani (Procurement Manager) explained that the PFI or Private Finance Initiative entailed borrowing approval from the Government to pay for capital infrastructure improvement or replacement. He said that this project had in development for several years because initially the credits on offer were insufficient, but a recent uplift in the finance available had enabled the County Council to take forward the contract to its final stages, and it was expected that the Executive would award the contract in May 2009. The successful contractor would be required to replace 80% of existing street lighting stock within the next five years,



and maintain the overall stock for twenty-five years.

In answer to members' questions, he confirmed that:

- EDF would remain the supplier of electricity but that the contract would incentivise the contractor to manage their service;
- consultation had recently taken place with Surrey Police about particular routes where crime concerns were a factor;
- the new lamp standards would project light downwards and minimise spillage or light pollution;
- existing heritage lamp columns would be replaced with a similar special heritage column, but there was no additional funding to introduce heritage lighting where it did not already exist;
- when new columns were installed they would be placed furthest away from the kerb and all pavements must be fully restored.
- the new technology would allow for the possibility of turning off lighting at specific times to conserve energy, if the County Council decided to do so.

#### **11/09 UPDATE OF LOCAL HIGHWAYS PROGRAMME [Item 11]**

Mr Bolton, Local Highways manager, introduced the update report and a series of photographs showing recently completed work.

He noted that the budget for minor improvements was not confirmed but he would expect it to be at around the same figure as in 2008-9 i.e. £243,000.

He asked members to approve the recommendation on Coldharbour Close, notwithstanding a report from Cllr Mrs Gillham that residents had re-considered their request for footway removal: he undertook to consult with residents, Tasis school and local members before proceeding.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- a) that the Committee noted and approved the rolling feasibility, design and construction programme, and funding arrangements, as contained in the report and annex 1.
- b) that the Local Highways Manager be authorised to enter into appropriate legal agreement with Tasis school (or their approved agent) to facilitate construction works to Coldharbour Close, as described in the report.

#### **12/09 MEMBER ALLOCATIONS FUNDING [Item 12]**

The Chairman noted that the tabled report included a new recommendation to note decisions taken under delegated powers, and a new proposed project at 3.26.

#### **RESOLVED**

- a) to approve the proposed expenditure (described in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.26) from the Members Allocation budget;
- b) to note the decision on funding taken under delegated powers as laid out at 4.1.

13/09 **LOCAL UPDATES** [Item 13]

This item was noted.

[Meeting ended 12.15 pm]

---

Chairman's signature