

DRAFT
MINUTES:

of the meeting of the Surrey County Council Local
Committee held at 10.30 on Thursday January 28th 2010 at
the Hythe Centre, Egham.

Surrey County Council Members

Mrs Mary Angell
Miss Marisa Heath (Chairman)
Mrs Yvonna Lay (Vice Chairman)
Mr Mel Few
Mr Chris Norman

Runnymede Borough Council appointed members

Councillor P. Francis
Councillor A.J. Davis
Councillor J. Ashmore
Councillor D. Parr
Councillor D. Cotty

PART ONE - IN PUBLIC

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

The meeting commenced at 10.30 am.

1/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mrs Linda Gillham and Mr John Furey.

2/10 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING HELD ON 2nd OCTOBER 2009 [Item 2]

The minutes were approved and signed.

3/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were received before the meeting.

4/10 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]

No written public questions had been received.

5/10 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 5]

No questions had been received.

6/10 **PETITIONS** [Item 6]

No petitions were received in time for the meeting.

7/10 **HEATHROW AIRTRACK: OBJECTIONS TO THE TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT ORDER 1992 - REPORT FOR COMMENT** [Item 7]

Mr Iain Reeve (Head of Transport for Surrey) explained that whilst the Public Inquiry into the TWA application had been scheduled for Spring 2010 (and therefore the Cabinet had been due to finalise its response at a meeting on 2 March) the county council had just been informed that the Inquiry had been postponed until autumn, "to allow more information into the public domain". He advised that this could mean a delay in reporting to the Cabinet and County Council. He noted that the report included the best information available at the time of writing, based on latest discussions with BAA. Mr Reeve also noted that the report recommended delegation of authority to himself as lead officer in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader, as during the Public Inquiry stage there would not be time to go back to committees on every point although Local Committee chairmen would be kept informed on key developments. He highlighted the recommendation that the Council maintain its objection(i) on the timetable until an indicative timetable was provided as this was critical to assessing which stations would see an improved service (and if any suffered detriment). He noted that legal counsel had been appointed and discussions on mitigation measures to date had identified a package of up to £40million was required, including an underpass at one level crossing. Whilst Surrey County Council was incurring legal and administrative costs in respect of Airtrack, there was no intention that the county council should pay for any capital measures required to mitigate the scheme, for which the main sources would be BAA, the Government and third parties such as regional or 2012 Olympics (the A30 being a designated route from the Royal Holloway athletes' village to Dorney Lake).

Members commented that:

- given BAA's environmental impact study noting a significant impact on traffic movement in the area it was vital that Surrey County Council should press for the costs of an underpass as mitigation (Mr Reeve confirmed that the county council's position was that this must be resolved before they would withdraw the objection);
- that 3.4 should include a reference to movement of freight trains;
- that 3.21 should be retained in order that the point should not be lost as the secondary stage of franchise operation was reached (on these two points, Mr Reeve explained that the existing objections lodged could not be amended, but undertook that these concerns would be reflected at the appropriate stage i.e. in evidence to the Inquiry and in negotiations at the implementation phase of services)
- at (xvii) it should be noted that the impact on level crossings included Addlestone as well as Egham (Mr Reeve said that this would be highlighted at the evidence stage of the Inquiry)
- the recommendation on Runnymede level crossings (xvii) referring to a mitigation package should be strengthened to read "must" rather than "could".

[The chairman suspended standing orders so that members of the public could ask questions of the officers. Mr Reeve gave the following information:

- rail operators have no legal obligation to consult on changes to services and may increase frequency of trains at will
- Network Rail had suggested that there may be some improvement in level crossing downtimes through signalling changes but this could not be relied upon for a significant impact at this stage;
- freight trains do not run to fixed timetables like passenger services
- traffic impacts associated with the proposed Eco Centre in Spelthorne would be modelled as part of the Surrey infrastructure project currently underway.]

RESOLVED

- a) to note and comment on the status of the County Council's objections based on information available to date and negotiations with the promoters of the Heathrow Airtrack scheme, and to note and comment on the objections that the County Council should continue to pursue at the Public Inquiry;
- b) to note the agreement being sought from Cabinet to delegate authority to the Head of Transport for Surrey, in discussion with the Cabinet Member for Transport, Deputy Leader and Leader of the Council to negotiate with the scheme promoters and to represent the County Council at the Public Inquiry should the objections not be resolved, taking into account the resource implications involved.

8/10 MEMBER ALLOCATIONS FUNDING: FOR DECISION [Item 8]

Members considered the proposals in the report.

RESOLVED

- (i) to consider and agree the proposed expenditure (described in paragraphs 2.2 to 2.12) from the Member's Allocation budget;
- (ii) to note the expenditure approved by the Area Director under delegated powers, as described at 3.1 and agree the request from Carer's Support Runnymede at 3.3.

9/10 LOCAL UPDATES, FOR INFORMATION (NO REPORT) [Item 9]

The items were noted, and Councillor John Ashmore added further comments on a minerals planning application at Egham due for decision on March 24th, noting that local councillors disputed the suggestion that noise arising from the processing plant would be "unnoticeable", considered that cement dust should be described not as "inert" but as hazardous to health, and argued that the applicant's intention to mount the site office on raised stilts indicated that they acknowledged that the proposed gravel workings would increase the likelihood of flooding in the area.

[Meeting ended 11.10am]

Chairman's signature