

DRAFT

MINUTES:

**of the meeting of the Surrey County Council Local
Committee held at 10.00 on Friday February 26th 2010 at
the Runnymede Centre, Addlestone.**

Surrey County Council Members

Mrs Mary Angell
Mrs Yvonna Lay (Vice Chairman)
Mr Mel Few

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 10.10 am.

10/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr John Furey, Mr Chris Norman and Miss Marisa Heath.

11/10 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING HELD ON 28th JANUARY 2010 [Item 2]

The minutes were approved and signed.

12/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Mrs Lay declared an interest in Item 10, as the report referred to the road in which she lived, and said that she would ask Mrs Angell to take the chair for this item.

Cllr Mrs Gillham declared an interest in Item 14, as the lead applicant for the bid submitted in the annexe.

13/10 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]

Mr Rob Truffitt of Virginia Water had asked the following question:

I understand that some 3000+ extra vehicles during weekday rush hours would be generated in the area as a result of developing 2,500 new homes on the former DERA site at Longcross. What solutions to this have your Surrey County Council traffic consultants come up with, and have they advised others with similar car problems in a Green Belt location?

The following response, from Surrey County Council's Transport Development Control team, was tabled:

The DERA site has been allocated in the South East Plan as a "large-scale mixed-use development". There is, according to the wording of the plan, still the need to test and examine its precise scale and mix of uses through Local Development Documents. The County remains of the view that it is an unsustainable location and therefore unsuitable for a new community as the evidence base has not been provided to support the choice of site. As matters currently stand, we will work with the developers and the Borough to produce an exemplar development. From the outset, we are encouraging the developer to design the transport strategy around the Eco-Towns advice notes/guidance/policy documents, in an attempt at lessening its impact on the local communities and wider travel demand. Notwithstanding that, there will still clearly be an impact on local communities which will need to be modelled and mitigated where possible.

It is premature to judge at this stage the actual volumes of traffic that might be generated by the development, but various scenarios will be considered in the process over future months. There are no proven solutions, as although we have the tools of travel planning, demand management, and various other initiatives that could be used in an attempt at making the site more sustainable, their overall impact needs to be tempered with caution, especially in a location such as this. The County Council has its own Transportation Development Control team, that assesses these issues on all developments in the County. The team was integral to the case against the recent proposals for a new community at Dunsfold in the south of the County, which was dismissed at Public Inquiry. Similar issues will arise at the DERA site, so the team is well placed to proffer advice throughout the process."

Mr Trufitt asked the following as a supplementary:

"I understand The Ministry of Defence had plans for a new junction on the M3 close to the Chobham Common main road bridge near the DERA/defence site. This M3 junction would take tank, military & HGV vehicles off local roads unfit for this type of traffic. Could these Highway plans be "dug out" from the archives & re-examined to see if they could help provide a solution balanced between the needs of the new housing & current road traffic congestion in the Virginia Water & Heathrow Airport catchment area? Here we live in gateway Britain which must remain an attractive base for the City of London, Global & European Headquarters & hosting the London 2012 Olympics & Visit Britain destination".

Mr Healey, Local Highways Manager, gave the following response:

It is true that the Highways Agency has previously looked at the possibility of a new junction on the M3, most recently when proposals to build an Energy from Waste plant at Trumps Farm were consulted upon. On that occasion, they rejected the idea. Their policy is to keep junctions to a minimum on long distance routes, unless they are of strategic significance. A second factor to consider is that new junctions on motorways can have the effect of making local traffic congestion worse as drivers come into the area specifically to join the motorway.

14/10 **WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS** [Item 5]

No questions had been received.

15/10 **PETITIONS** [Item 6]

Two petitions had been submitted.

A petition from residents of Ottershaw with 54 signatories, stating:

"We the undersigned call upon our local and Surrey County Councils to reduce the speed limit along Foxhills Road, and implement traffic calming measures outside the entrance to Ottershaw Memorial Fields."

Mr Few, the local member, introduced the petition, noting that residents were concerned that drivers were not slowing down enough on the approach to the village where the limit was 60mph, and so exceeding the 30mph limit as they reached the recreation ground. Mr Healey confirmed that he had just received speed survey data for this road and would be analysing this and consulting the police. He also noted that Surrey County Council was undertaking a review of its speed limit policy and would report back at the next Local Committee.

Mrs Patel spoke on behalf of the 609 petitioners from Egham Hythe, whose petition stated: "We are writing to raise our objection to the proposed barriers at St Paul's Road and Bowes Road." She said that residents were concerned that one option, proposed as part of a consultation on traffic management in this area, to close off the route from Chertsey Lane, would divide the community and affect users of the local schools, shops and churches. She said that petitioners felt the safety risks had been exaggerated and that residents were not aware of any accidents in recent years, suggesting that to install a barrier would send a message to those bringing their children to the local schools that they were not welcome.

The chairman noted that this scheme would be discussed at Item 9.

16/10 **DRIVE SMART UPDATE – REPORT FOR INFORMATION** [Item 7]

Superintendent Rachel Tills, the lead officer in Surrey Police for the Drive Smart initiative, outlined the main aspects of this £1 million Surrey-wide programme which was announced by Dr Andrew Povey in 2009. She tabled two annexes to the report, detailing time spent on Drive Smart and public confidence levels with reference to anti-social driving. It was noted that a Road Education and Enforcement Day (REED) had been held at Thorpe Park during February half term, and that the Casualty Reduction Officer was building a problem profile for routes showing casualties across the borough, and this had led to enforcement action in New Haw. She highlighted the educational work with young people in Years 7 and 12 using a theatre production, and the opportunity for community speedwatch schemes to be put in place.

Members asked for notification when an event was scheduled in their division, and questioned the significance of the rising confidence data where it did not accord

with their local experience. Superintendent Tills confirmed that cyclists would normally only be breath-tested for alcohol if they were involved in an accident. She advised that the Surrey County Council website included details of people killed or seriously injured (KSI) by area so that monitoring of progress to reduce casualties could be seen.

17/10 INTEGRATED TRANSPORT SCHEMES: FOR DECISION [Item 8]

Mr Nick Healey explained that there was no Local Transport Plan or Local Allocation budget from the County Council for schemes in 2010-11, so that the Forward Programme would have to be suspended. However, he suggested that the programme of work should be maintained and regularly reviewed, in case finance became available during the year. He advised members that as many outstanding works from 2009-10 as possible would be completed by 31st March using existing budget, as it was unlikely that this could be carried forward. He proposed that revenue maintenance funds not required for Controlled Parking consultation be used for tree pruning and other remedial work.

Mr Healey noted an error in recommendation (ii) of item 8, asking that this be amended to read "to bring forward schemes".

Members noted that all service budgets were subject to review in times of limited resources, and asked where finance for schemes might come from – Mr Healey observed that Section 106 funding could become available as part of the borough council's planning process in particular areas. Members asked Mr Healey to look into the standard of work at the jointly funded New Haw Broadway environmental improvements, and to urge Runnymede Borough Council to withhold payment from the contractor until the work was acceptable.

RESOLVED

- i) to note progress with this year's ITS programme;
- ii) to authorise the Local Highways Manager, in consultation with the chairman and relevant divisional members, to implement this year's construction and design programme, and **to** bring forward schemes where possible (as amended)
- iii) to note the ITS programme 2010/11 to 2013/14 as set out in Annex A;
- iv) to note that the ITS programme may have to be suspended indefinitely from 1st April 2010 unless alternative funding can be identified.

18/10 WAPSHOTT ROAD, ST PAUL'S ROAD, BOWES ROAD: RESULTS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION: REPORT FOR DECISION [Item 9]

Mr Healey said that in the light of the current budgetary position, he recommended that the Committee should note the results of the consultation and the petition received earlier in the meeting, but defer a decision until finance was available.

Councillor Parr stated his support for the sentiments expressed in the petition.

RESOLVED

- i) to defer any decision in respect of the Wapshott Road, St Paul's Road and Bowes Road scheme to its meeting of July 2010.

19/10 ANNUAL REVIEW OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS: REPORT FOR DECISION [Item 11 brought forward]

Mr Rikki Hill (Surrey County Council's central Parking Team) introduced the recommendations, noting that most of the districts and boroughs had a joint member group set up to undertake an annual review and make recommendations to the Local Committee for decisions.

RESOLVED

- i) the chairman and vice chairman of the Committee are nominated for membership of the CPE Joint Member Working Group, and that Runnymede Borough Council is asked to nominate two members also;
- ii) the terms of reference for the CPE Joint Member Working Group, as set out in Annex A, are approved.

20/10 CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES IN EGHAM AND ENGLEFIELD GREEN: REPORT FOR DECISION [Item 10]

(Mrs Lay left the room for this item and Mrs Angell took the chair).

Mr Rikki Lake noted that the Local Committee had agreed to commission feasibility studies (attached as annexes to the report) and the results were that only two roads close to Staines Bridge had been identified as in need of controlled parking for residents.

Members asked whether the studies had included capacity in business and supermarket car parks – Mr Hill said they had only taken account of private car parks and on-street spaces – and clarified that new planning regulations require householders to get permission for provision of new hard-standing for cars in front gardens (but not for permeable materials which allow rainwater drainage).

RESOLVED

- a) to note the results of the parking surveys;
- b) to agree that officers carry out public consultations in the two locations (upper end of Chertsey Lane/The Hythe/Farmers Road and Cumberland Street/Hythe Road) where resident permit schemes are recommended to be introduced ;
- c) note that a further report on the outcome of the consultations and the plans for implementation will be brought to the local committee meeting in July.

(Mrs Lay returned to the chair).

21/10 COMMUNITY STRATEGIES IN RUNNYMEDE AND SURREY: FOR INFORMATION [Item 12]

It was noted that there were two reports for this Item: a) Making A Difference – Runnymede Borough Council's strategy and b) Standing Up for Surrey.

Mr Paul Turrell (Chief Executive, Runnymede Borough Council) introduced the strategy, outlining his plan to review the approach to take account of the findings of six thematic reviews of services which he had instigated since coming into post in

autumn 2009. The six themes were: a) Place Shaping, b) Housing c) Leisure d) refuse and recycling e) services to vulnerable people f) workforce planning. He expected to have the results of the reviews over the summer and to undertake public consultation before feeding this into a new Corporate Plan and community strategy. He expressed a desire to work more closely with Surrey County Council and to forge a greater alliance between the two strategies, at a time of financial and resource constraint.

Dr Tim Nimmons explained that “Standing Up for Surrey”, which was being taken forward by the Surrey Strategic Partnership, set out five challenges for the county as described in the report. The forthcoming Have Your Say event at Dorking Halls offered an opportunity for the residents of Surrey to comment. He outlined the latest progress on Local Area Agreement targets, as the key delivery mechanism for the strategy, noting that 24 of the 27 targets were eligible for reward grant if met.

Members suggested that the Have Your Say event was inaccessible for Runnymede residents, and it was confirmed that further events were planned around the county. Mr Turrell was asked why the Runnymede BC strategy did not set a target for increased recycling, and he replied that the next version of the strategy would set a specific and realistic target to improve performance in this area, helped by the negotiation of a new contract in the coming year.

22/10 SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE – LOCAL DELIVERY PLAN: FOR DECISION [Item 13]

Members were asked to note that an updated version of this report had been tabled.

Mr Garath Symonds drew members’ attention to page 5 of the tabled report, which indicated that on nationally set targets, Runnymede services were scoring higher than other parts of the county. He said that it was more difficult to break down Connexions, youth justice and youth inclusion services to borough level, and that the higher rate of NEET (Not in Employment, Education or Training) young people was in part attributable to a smaller 14-19 population having a greater impact on statistics. He confirmed that the community organisations listed at page 11 were in receipt of Surrey County Council grant funding, and that further work was underway to map all the provision with the voluntary and community sector.

Mr Symonds then outlined the strategic approach he proposed, driven by a desire to improve facilities for young people and also by financial imperatives – the total budget for Youth Services would reduce from £18.4 million (2009-10) to £12.4m in 2013-14, and this £6m drop in budget would require a transformation in the way services were delivered. He indicated that the county council should become a commissioner of services, and proposed to bring an options appraisal giving more detail to the next Local Committee.

Members requested information about current targets, the achievability of the financial savings and when and where they would be delivered.

Mr Symonds said the current targets were laid out by the National Youth Agency in “Transforming Youth Work” and he regarded them as too prescriptive and not relevant to Surrey’s circumstances. He indicated that a commissioning approach would begin to yield savings within 18 months, as the voluntary sector could reduce

back-office, business rates and building costs and also time spent in meetings rather than face-to-face. He assured members that there would be no reduction in the £303,000 budget for youth development services in Runnymede in 2010-11.

RESOLVED

- i) to approve the Youth Development Service component of the Services for Young People delivery plan 2010/11;
- ii) to note the transformation strategy for young people.

23/10 CLIMATE CHANGE FUND: FOR DECISION [Item 14]

Miss Sylvia Carter introduced the proposal for a 50% funding contribution towards a solar panel to generate power for the swimming pool at Thorpe school, noting that a Government grant could be expected to cover the remaining 50% if successful.

RESOLVED

- i) to agree the bid attached at annex 1 as the proposal to submit as its application to the Climate Change Fund.

24/10 MEMBER ALLOCATIONS FUNDING: FOR DECISION [Item 15]

The chairman asked to amend 2.19 so that the amount requested was £833 capital, £1000 revenue, and to add Mr Chris Norman as a contributing member.

RESOLVED

- (i) to consider and agree the proposed expenditure (described in paragraphs 2.2 to 2.19 **as amended**) from the Member's Allocation budget;
- (ii) note the projects for which funding had been agreed previously and which have been delayed (paragraph 3).

25/10 FORWARD PLAN: FOR DECISION [Item 16]

RESOLVED

To agree the Forward Programme **with the following additions for July 2nd**:

- **report on Civil Parking Enforcement working group recommendations;**
- **Major Maintenance Report**
- **Airtrack Update**

26/10 LOCAL UPDATES: FOR INFORMATION [Item 17]

Mr Few indicated, in response to a question, that he had been advised that if a Conservative government was elected the South East Plan would become obsolete.

[Meeting ended at 12.10pm]

Chairman's signature _____