

**DRAFT MINUTES: of the meeting of the Surrey County Council Local Committee held at 7.00pm on Monday July 5th 2010 at the Runnymede Centre, Addlestone.**

**Surrey County Council Members**

Mr Mel Few  
Mr John Furey  
Miss Marisa Heath (Chairman)  
Mrs Yvonna Lay  
Mr Chris Norman (Vice Chairman)

**Runnymede Borough Council appointed members**

Councillor P. Francis  
Councillor P. Roberts  
Councillor A Alderson  
Councillor D. Cotty  
Councillor R. Edis (apologies)  
Councillor D Parr (apologies)

**PART ONE - IN PUBLIC**

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

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm. The chairman noted that Item 12: Heathrow Airtrack report had been withdrawn as it was not possible to provide a verbal update on progress at this time.

**27/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Mary Angell, Councillor D. Parr.

**28/10 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING HELD ON FEBRUARY 26<sup>th</sup> 2010 [Item 2]**

The minutes were approved and signed.

**29/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

None received.

**30/10 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]**

No questions had been received.

**31/10 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

No questions had been received.

### 32/10 **PETITIONS** [Item 6]

Two petitions had been submitted at the previous meeting in February, and the Committee considered formal responses to these petitions.

The report for Item 6a followed a petition from residents of Ottershaw with 54 signatories, calling for a reduction in speed limit along Foxhills Road and traffic calming measures beside the entrance to the Memorial Field recreation ground. Mr Nick Healey reported that speed assessment surveys of Foxhills Road and Chobham Road had indicated that speed limit changes may be desirable. Mr Mel Few asked about the estimated costs of implementing these changes, and Mr Healey indicated a figure of between £2,000 and £3,000 to cover legal advertising, minor design work and re-siting of signs.

#### **RESOLVED**

- i) to note the results of the speed assessments undertaken;
- ii) **to add** speed limit reduction schemes for Foxhills Road and Chobham Road to the approved list of Integrated Transport Schemes in anticipation of future funding/development.

For item 6(b) the petition signed by 609 residents from Egham Hythe was considered. Mr Healey advised that there was no funding available to implement the traffic management measures previously proposed for St Paul's Road, and recommended that the area should be looked at afresh as and when further funding became available.

The local member asked what had happened to the Section 106 development funding which had been negotiated when housing in Wapshott Road was due to be developed, and was advised that this funding was lost because the development was only given planning approval on appeal at a Public Inquiry.

#### **RESOLVED**

- a) to formally abandon any proposed changes to Wapshott Road, Bowes Road and St Paul's Road;
- b) to keep the Wapshott Road, Bowes Road and St Paul's Road scheme in the forward programme;
- c) to re-assess the scheme on its technical merits, re-assess what options would be feasible, and consult a much wider catchment before promoting a scheme.

### 33/10 **COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP REPORT** [Item 7]

Miss Carolyn Rowe introduced the report, noting that as of April 1<sup>st</sup> there had been two changes to the Partnership, the first being that the Probation Service had become one of the statutory partners, and second that the partnership had been renamed the Community Safety Partnership (formerly the Crime and Disorder Partnership). She asked members to note section 2.5, which highlighted the effectiveness of the problem-solving tactical groups, 2.7 which described recent successes, and 2.11 which outlined the plan for 2010-11. The two partners present, Mrs Wendy Roberts and Neighbourhood Inspector Roger Nield, highlighted the police panel meetings, the Street A Week initiative, the anti-social behaviour reporting system through Runnymede Borough Council and the ability to receive

texts at Safer Runnymede control centre, as well as the Partnership Action Days held in various parts of the borough in 2009 and 2010.

Members asked about the impact of budget reductions, the increase in rape offences recorded in local crime statistics, the nature of vehicles causing obstruction, and the amount of resources devoted to the Drive Smart initiative in the borough.

## **RESOLVED**

- i) to delegate responsibility for expenditure of the County Council's local community safety funding of £2,500 to the Area Director, and note that as a domestic abuse outreach service is provided, a further £12,000 is contributed to the Community Safety Partnership funds;
- ii) endorse the importance of the contribution of all services towards community safety and progress made;
- iii) to nominate County Councillor Mr Chris Norman to attend the CSP in the coming year, as in 2009-10.

### **34/10 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE REPORT: FOR INFORMATION** [Item 8]

Mr Les Dodd, Area Manager (North) for Surrey Fire and Rescue Service, answered questions from members of the Committee on funding for the service, any contributions requested of residents where a garden fire required attendance by the Service, the incidence of arson, and the impact of level crossing downtimes on the Service's ability to respond to calls in the borough.

### **35/10 ANNUAL REVIEW OF ON-STREET PARKING: REPORT FOR DECISION** [Item 9]

The chairman noted that the budget identified for the changes proposed in this report was £20,000, but in Item 10 the budget allocated and recommended was only £15,000.

Mr Jack Roberts said that the report outlined the first central parking team review in the Runnymede area, and that officers had looked at all the requests received from residents to determine which were feasible, before discussing these to arrive at a shortlist with the joint parking task group. The chairman noted that she, Mrs Lay, Councillor Roberts and Councillor Cotty were the members of the task group, and asked what would be the impact if a budget of £15,000 was all that was available for the changes. Mr Roberts said that a budget reduction of £5,000 could mean that the proposals in drawings 3, 15, 18, 20, 23 and 27 would not be implemented.

Mr Few and Mr Roberts expressed support for the proposals in drawing 24 having heard from local residents. Mr Few said that he would like to know the breakdown of costs amounting to £20,000, and proposed that the recommendation i) be amended to add "subject to individual costings for the sites being provided".

## **RESOLVED**

- i) that the proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Runnymede as described in Section 3 of this report and shown in detail on drawings attached (as Annex A) are approved **subject to individual costings for each site being provided;**
- ii) that the intention of the County Council to make an Order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and onstreet parking restrictions in Runnymede, as shown on the drawings in Annexe A, be advertised and that if no objections be maintained, the Orders made.

### 36/10 LOCAL HIGHWAYS UPDATE: REPORT FOR DECISION [Item 10]

Mr Nick Healey noted that Table 3 in the report included the suggested budget for various items, and indicated that the Committee could allocate the requested £20k for parking changes (discussed in Item 9) by reducing the budget for “low cost measures” (for minor improvements such as kerbs, bollards etc) by £5k, and this was supported.

He explained that he recommended the maintenance of a Forward Programme having been advised by Runnymede Borough Council that this would assist planning officers in making a case for development contributions: however some feasibility work would be needed to ensure that schemes were realistic.

Mr Norman questioned whether schemes in Chertsey described at 2.18 (Guildford Street) and 2.24 (Green Lane junction) should remain on the programme and was supported by Councillor Cotty. Mrs Lay asked whether there was any provision for repainting lines, for example a yellow box at the approach to Staines Bridge, which may help manage congestion. Mr Healey said that this came under the West Area central budget, and agreed to send members the list of proposed roads to be covered in due course. He said the cost of re-lining the Staines Bridge roundabout would be £1000-2000 including traffic management.

Mr Few questioned why the Woodham Lane and St Peter’s Way fence projects had not progressed by the end of the financial year. Mr Healey said that these were partnership projects with the borough council, and Mr Furey added that the former scheme had been delayed by cabling work and disputed ownership of the pavement. He supported the need to maintain a forward programme and suggested a development project in Chertsey may provide funding for the scheme at 2.18 which the local member had questioned. Councillor Roberts and Councillor Alderson supported retention of the Englefield Green parking zone as an aspiration in the Forward Programme, in light of Royal Holloway College’s development plan.

### RESOLVED

- i) to approve the proposed allocation of Committee’s £100k revenue maintenance budget **as amended**, but authorise the Local Highways Manager to re-allocate funds in consultation with the Chairman should an urgent need arise;
- ii) to note the list of approved ITS schemes **with the exception of the scheme at 2.24 (first bullet point);**
- iii) authorise the Local Highways Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Divisional member, to progress feasibility work as staff resources allow
- iv) authorise the LHM to commission detailed design and construction of any

scheme in the approved list, in consultation with the Chairman and Divisional Member, should alternative funding be identified.

**37/10 ANNUAL SUMMARY OF MEMBER ALLOCATIONS FUNDING: REPORT FOR INFORMATION [Item 11]**

Ms Sylvia Carter noted that the report showed a significant proportion of the member allocations budget had been awarded to community fairs and events in 2009-10, as well as to equipment and activities of benefit to young people. The chairman thanked officers for the photographic display illustrating some of the activities supported. Mr Norman suggested that members should bring forward projects for funding over the coming months, as it seemed unlikely that unspent balances would be carried forward into 2011-12.

**38/10 PROPOSED UPDATED SPEED LIMIT POLICY: FOR COMMENT [Item 13]**

Mr Will Ward introduced the report and asked members for their comments, noting that he had presented to five other Local Committees to date on the proposed policy. He advised members that following legal advice that an unreasonable decision on speed limits could be challenged in court, Section 4 of the report included the safeguard that the minutes of the meeting at which the decision was taken should include all factors considered in reaching the decision, and where changes were proposed, the police and county council portfolio holder would be invited to a site meeting at the location.

Members made comments as follows:

- one member suggested that the draft policy was a "hand me down" with no power and his comment was seconded by others;
- it was considered that the Local Committees would be given the opportunity to decide on speed limits at a time when there were no funds to implement a new policy;
- concern was expressed that the exercise of re-drafting the policy has been costly in terms of officer time – Mr Ward answered that the time reviewing the policy had involved a small amount of time in consultation with the Police and county officers, and that the proposed changes to the 2006 policy were small in number to enable local committees to take greater account of residents concerns about traffic speeds and safety;
- there was general sympathy with the view expressed by the Waverley Local Committee (which was read out) - that the proposed new policy would unjustifiably raise the expectations of the public that significant changes to speed limits would be implemented.

The chairman summarised the general view of the Committee as being that the proposed draft speed limit policy should not be adopted at present.

**39/10 LOCAL PROTOCOL FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT: FOR DECISION [Item 14]**

Ms Sylvia Carter confirmed that the report outlined a protocol with minimal changes

from the protocol adopted by the Local Committee for 2009-10. She noted that members had already agreed to trial evening meetings of the Local Committee in 2010-11 with the hope that this may increase attendance by residents. Members asked about publicity to local businesses concerning their opportunity to raise petitions and questions suggesting that the Chambers of Commerce should be advised of this, and whether evening meetings increased the cost of Local Committee administration through the payment of overtime. Miss Carolyn Rowe explained that there was no increase in costs, as officers were given time off in lieu rather than pay. It was suggested that the Committee may need to review the number of signatures required for e-petitions as the system was implemented.

## **RESOLVED**

- i) that the committee will offer an opportunity for public engagement and informal questions for half an hour before each formal Local Committee meeting commences (subject to annual review);
- ii) that written public questions, dealt with as part of the formal agenda, may be accepted up to 12 noon four working days before the day of the meeting;
- iii) that the committee will accept a petition carrying 50 or more signatures, although in exceptional circumstances the Chairman may use his/her discretion to accept petitions with fewer signatures in cases where it would not be appropriate to get 50 signatures, for example where a proposed scheme affects fewer than 50 properties.
- iv) that the Committee notes the County Council's standing orders concerning public participation on Rights of Way applications, which also apply to Local Committees (at Annex A).

## **40/10 COUNTY COUNCIL FUND FOR SMALL DISADVANTAGED AREAS: FOR INFORMATION [Item 15]**

Ms Sylvia Carter introduced the report, noting that there were four small disadvantaged areas in Runnymede as highlighted by statistical data, and recommended that local members promote this opportunity and ensure that applications were submitted by the end of September for consideration at the next Local Committee.

Mr Norman noted that there were multi-agency groups already meeting to consider the needs in Chertsey St Ann's and Englefield Green West, which would be well-placed to put forward partnership bids. Councillor Roberts suggested that these groups should consider the impact of housing policy in concentrating disadvantage in areas such as Englefield Green West.

## **RESOLVED**

- i) to promote the availability of the fund amongst relevant organisations and partnerships in Runnymede;
- ii) to note the generic guidance (at Annex 1) on the criteria for successful applications
- iii) to consider and prioritise applications for submission, at the next meeting of the Local Committee on November 1<sup>st</sup> 2010.

**41/10 MEMBER ALLOCATIONS FUNDING: FOR DECISION [Item 16]**

The chairman noted that the report had been tabled, with an additional late proposal for decision at 2.7. It was also agreed to remove the limit of 10% in (ii) as being unnecessary.

**RESOLVED**

- (i) to agree to divide the capital funding of £30,000 between the six county councillors when making proposals for allocations expenditure;
- (ii) to delegate the power to approve revenue bids up to £1000 to the Area Director, subject to provision of reasons for urgency and consultation with members.
- (iii) to agree the proposed expenditure (described in paragraphs 2.2 to 2.7) from the Member Allocations budget 2010-11.

**42/10 APPOINTMENT TO EXTERNAL BODIES: FOR DECISION [Item 17]**

**RESOLVED**

- a) to nominate County Councillor Marisa Heath to represent the County Council (with the Area Director) on the LSP for Runnymede;
- b) to nominate County Councillor Yvonna Lay to be the youth lead.

**43/10 FORWARD PLAN: FOR DECISION [Item 16]**

**RESOLVED**

To agree the Forward Programme **with the following additions for November 1<sup>st</sup>:**

- **Voluntary/Community Sector report**
- **Airtrack Update**

**and the removal of the Major Maintenance item.**

**44/10 LOCAL UPDATES: FOR INFORMATION**

The information was noted.

[Meeting ended at 20.45 pm]

Chairman's signature \_\_\_\_\_