

DRAFT

MINUTES:

**of the meeting of the Surrey County Council Local
Committee held at 5.00pm on Monday February 7th 2011 at
the RBC Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Addlestone.**

Surrey County Council Members

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

Runnymede Borough Council appointed members

Councillor P. Roberts
Councillor A Alderson (apologies)
Councillor Mrs Linda Gillham (substituted)
Councillor D. Cotty
Councillor R. Edis
Councillor D Parr
Councillor P. Francis

PART ONE - IN PUBLIC

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

The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm.

1/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Yvonna Lay, Mrs Mary Angell and Cllr Alan Alderson.

**2/11 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING HELD ON NOVEMBER 1st 2010
[Item 2]**

The minutes were approved and signed.

3/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None received.

4/11 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4]

Question from Mrs Diana Seaman, Secretary of the Friends of Virginia Water Library:

“We understand that Surrey County Council is proposing cutting support to the branch library at Virginia Water, what action are our councillors involved in by way of protecting the current level of service? “

Response

Mr Mel Few (County Councillor for Foxhills & Virginia Water)

I have a briefing on the detail of the Library Public Value Review arranged with the Deputy Leader, Mr David Hodge, for Tuesday 8th February. When I have the full information from that meeting, I will arrange to meet with the Friends of Virginia Water to explain the rationale for the decisions and work through alternative options that might be available going forward.”

In addition, Mr Peter Milton, Head of Libraries, Surrey County Council has provided some contextual information on the Library Public Value Review (PVR):

The recent PVR has recognised that the Library Service is a high performing service that is popular with residents but Surrey County Council, like all other local authorities, faces budget pressures over the next 4 years and across the country, libraries and the model of delivery are being redesigned. The County Council is keen to maintain the network of 52 libraries and the report advocates the maintenance of a core network of libraries run by the authority but, in line with the aspirations of the 'Big Society' agenda, it also recommends opportunities for communities to become involved with the sustainability of the network through the model of community partnered libraries.

Libraries suitable for community partnering have been identified through application of a set of 12 factors covering use, cost and social need. It is inevitable that the smallest also have low levels of use, which will remain so while Surrey County Council can only fund limited opening hours. Community partnering could open the way to extending opening hours, making better use of the resources in the library and increasing access to the benefit of the local community ... hence the County Council wish to invite communities to get involved and take on the management of these local libraries through a partnership relationship with the County Council. The county would provide a building, IT and stock; the community would take on responsibility for staffing, either directly or through sponsorship....and, where not already installed, the council will also install self-service to further assist the development of community libraries. The County Council believes that its local model for arrangements for community partnered libraries is much more comprehensive than many of the arrangements that you may have heard about in the national press.

The Friends of Virginia Water have put a lot of time and effort into working to support the library and the County Council greatly appreciate that. The county is now looking to expand this support and county councillors are keen to have conversations with any local community organisations who might be interested in learning more about the proposal for a community partnered library in the community.

5/11 **WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS** [Item 5]

No questions had been received.

6/11 **PETITIONS** [Item 6]

No petitions had been received.

7/11 **LOCAL UPDATES – FOR INFORMATION** [Item 14]

a) **Library Public Value Review**

Mr Peter Milton (Head of Libraries) gave a brief outline of the Library Public Value Review (PVR) discussed at the Cabinet meeting of 2nd February 2011. He highlighted two recommendations from the PVR: one was to close the mobile library service from mid-year, and the second to adopt a community partnering approach to 11 of the 52 libraries in Surrey. He noted that on a local level this would affect New Haw and Virginia Water libraries, and explained that if community partners were identified their primary role would be to staff the libraries whilst Surrey County Council continued to fund all premises/utility, stock and information technology costs. He said that consultation with local groups would begin shortly, and that a further report would be considered by the Cabinet in June 2011.

Members asked about the minimum number of volunteers required to keep a library open, the total savings across the 11 libraries proposed for community partnering, the expected outcome if no community partners came forward, and the support on offer for such volunteers.

Mr Milton advised that:

- two volunteers per open session would be required for safe opening;
- approximately £400,000 would be saved across 11 libraries;
- the Cabinet would make a decision in June about what to do if community partners had not come forward in sufficient numbers;
- training would be offered to volunteers as well as transitional support, and coverage by the county council's indemnity insurance.

b) **Airtrack**

Mr Iain Reeve (Head of Transport for Surrey) advised members that the promoters of the Airtrack scheme had put back the date for a Public Inquiry under the Transport and Works Act application indefinitely, and an announcement on the future of the project was expected around Easter 2011. He said that BAA were considering funding options, and that they may decide to abandon or scale down the project (including omitting the South West section) or to proceed as originally proposed. He confirmed that a meeting had taken place between senior officials of BAA, SCC, RBC, Network Rail and the local MP in which potential solutions to the level crossings problem were considered but no resolution was reached. He advised members that no public consultation about a mitigation package could be scheduled until it was known whether BAA intended to proceed, but a further update would be provided to the Local Committee's June meeting.

8/11 THE OLYMPIC ROUTE NETWORK IN SURREY [Item 7]

This item was presented by two guest speakers from the Olympic Delivery Authority, Ms Karen Agbabiaka and Mr Oscar Akintoye, who tabled their presentation.

Ms Agbabiaka advised that from mid-June 2012 onwards the world's media would arrive in England, and subsequently the Games officials and athletes numbering 1350 in total would be accommodated at the Royal Holloway College designated athletes' village (housing rowing and canoeing competitors for Eton Dorney). She noted that one key reason why the UK was awarded the Games was its offer of guaranteed journey times from accommodation to event venue, and for this reason the Olympic Route Network was needed. She explained that the proposed route was detailed in a map (tabled as Annex 2 to the report) showing how the A30 Egham Bypass and Runnymede roundabout junctions would be affected, and confirmed temporary traffic signals were proposed on Egham Hill (A30) to facilitate access to and from the Royal Holloway campus. She said that the ODA wished to engage key interest groups, and would be holding drop-in public engagement sessions in Egham on 24 and 26 February.

Councillor Roberts indicated that, at a consultation meeting with the borough in summer 2010, councillors had been advised that the ODA were not planning to put a dedicated lane on the Egham bypass, and asked why this had changed.

Ms Ababiaka said that subsequent surveys had indicated that the original proposal would not achieve guaranteed journey times, falling short by four minutes, hence the change. Mr William Bryans (Strategy, Transport and Planning team) advised that the summer meeting had discussed "no dedicated lanes" as the preferred options, but there were other options on the table at that time which the ODA were now saying they needed to implement.

Members asked about the times of operation for the measures outlined and dates, and the consultation period for the proposals. It was also suggested that travelling via Old Windsor would be a quicker route to the venue.

Ms Agbabiaka said that most Games family movements would be during the early morning peak to guarantee arrival before 8.30am at Eton Dorney, but operation may also be required for the return journey in the afternoon, subject to ongoing consultation between February and the statutory consultation on Traffic Regulation Orders in April. She advised that the ODA would take account of feedback received, and report issues to the International Olympic Committee if there was seen to be a problem in achieving the promised journey times. Mr Akintoye said that the ODA would be happy to share with members the modelling they had undertaken with Surrey County Council engineers.

Members asked that the dates of operation of the proposed measures be supplied to them as soon as possible, and suggested that it would be preferable if no traffic measures were implemented until the school holiday period in July 2012. They also recommended that public engagement be held closer to Englefield Green village.

Mr Andrew Milne (Area Highways Manager) answered questions on the Update report. He acknowledged that the cost range for the various estimates of scheme costs was quite wide, adding that it was difficult to achieve accurate estimates as the contractor would be changing from May onwards. He said that Highways had a scheme prioritisation mechanism which had not always been applied consistently in the past but that this would change in future.

Mrs Gillham (councillor for Thorpe) questioned why the Thorpe bypass was listed as complete when only half had been resurfaced. Mr Milne advised that on assessment it was found that the treatment originally planned would not be effective and so an alternative had been used over half the bypass, and the remainder would be done when funds allowed.

The chairman proposed an amendment to recommendation v) which was agreed.

RESOLVED

- i) to note progress with delivery of highways schemes;
- (ii) to note the position of its highways schemes and revenue maintenance budgets;
- (iii) to authorise the Area Team Manager to reallocate any residual 2010/11 revenue maintenance funds as necessary within the approved categories to prevent any potential underspend.
- (iv) to authorise delegation of authority to the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the LC Chairman and Vice Chairman, to determine which schemes to progress in the 2011/12 financial year from the list previously approved by Committee, should funding become available for the next financial year.
- (v) to authorise the Area Team Manager to use any allocated revenue maintenance budget for 2011/12, as detailed in section 3.3 of this report, **following discussion with the LC Chairman and Vice Chairman.**
- (vi) to note commencement of the new highways contract on 28 April 2011, and the potential for variation of indicative scheme costs resulting from this.
- (vii) to receive a further Highways update report at the next meeting of the Committee.

10/10 **YOUTH SERVICE DELIVERY PLAN 2011-12** [Item 9]

Mr David Waine (Area Manager, Youth Service) noted that the budgetary reductions anticipated for 2011-12 would impact on service capacity so that the plans outlined in the report were subject to the detail of the budget, to be confirmed shortly.

The chairman thanked Mr Waine for the service co-operation with Early Years in Englefield Green youth centre to enable Sure Start to operate there, and asked why work with NEET young people was operating in Chertsey and Addlestone but not Egham. The local member for Chertsey expressed satisfaction with the range of provision in his area and the work to develop services in Egham Hythe, looking forward to further progress on the Transformation Project.

Mr Waine confirmed that the youth service was working with NEET young people who had left Magna Carta school and transporting them to Chertsey.

He advised that the key priorities for Runnymede would be:

- young people who are not in employment, education or training

- provision of safe places to meet
- support for teenage parents

RESOLVED

- (i) to agree the targets and priorities for youth service delivery in Runnymede in 2011-12 as outlined in section 2 of this report.

11/11 FIRE & RESCUE: DRAFT PUBLIC SAFETY PLAN 2011-2020 [Item 10]

Members of the Committee were asked to comment on the draft Plan before a 4 March deadline. Mrs Kay Hammond (Cabinet Member for Community Safety) introduced the draft Plan, noting that Surrey had a relatively low cost and high performing fire authority at present, and highlighting the need to balance responsive resources across the county. She explained that efficiency savings had already been achieved through gradual reduction in staff numbers from 712 to 635, and that further savings of £2.7 million were planned by 2014. Mrs Liz Mills (Senior Manager, SFRS Service Support) noted that the draft proposed no significant alterations to the resource and service in the Runnymede area, as summarised at Appendix 1.

Members' comments on the draft were as follows:

Runnymede Borough Council co-opted members thanked Surrey Fire and Rescue for the service and reassurance currently provided and asked that the current emergency response provided to all parts of Egham on either side of the level crossings be maintained. They also asked if assistance provided by way of waterborne support in the event of flooding could be continued. It was noted that there was no statutory duty to provide such assistance, but the SFRS had recently purchased an additional boat for use in flooding incidents. They asked about the impact of the EU working time directive on shift patterns, including for retained fire fighters.

County members commended the draft Plan. Mr Norman, who had participated in the Public Value Review, said he considered that there was a gap in the middle part of the county's resources, and that the draft Plan had gone a long way towards addressing this, agreeing with the proposals as drafted. He said he hoped there would be more work undertaken to identify opportunities for income generation. The chairman asked about the incidence of false alarms, (for example at Royal Holloway College) and the possibility of imposing penalty charges for repeat offenders. She was advised that as a Category 1 responder this would not be possible, but that SFRS may be able to charge householders who call for help with burst pipes before engaging a plumber to fix the problem.

Members also asked for clarification of the requirement for five crew for each fire appliance. Mr Furey noted that the Government had withdrawn funding to councils for flood alleviation and replaced it with funding for emergency response only.

The chairman summarised members' comments as follows

“the Local Committee supports the draft Fire Safety Plan 2011-20 and the need for transformation. Members would like to thank Surrey Fire & Rescue for the thoroughness of their consultation, and agree that the emphasis on fire prevention is valuable. They recognise the ongoing work needed to achieve savings and feel that work on future income generation should continue.

Members are grateful for the help given with flooding, which is an issue for Runnymede, and for the training provided on this.”

12/11 MEMBER ALLOCATIONS FUNDING: FOR DECISION [Item 11]

Ms Sylvia Carter (Local Committee & Partnerships officer) advised members of an update to paragraph 4.2 of the report. Following advice that St Peter’s Church was unable to display the Tudor glass window, the Chertsey Museum had agreed to take on the project and include the window in a permanent display, so the funding need not be returned to the budget, but would be paid to the Museum to commission the display case.

RESOLVED

- i) to consider and agree the proposed expenditure (described in paragraphs 2.2 to 2.16) from the Member Allocations budget 2010-11;
- ii) to note the expenditure approved by the Area Director under delegated powers, as described at 3.0.

13/11 SMALL DISADVANTAGED AREAS FUNDING [Item 12]

Members noted the report, and Councillor Roberts thanked Miss Marisa Heath for her support in submitting the successful proposal for the Village Centre, Englefield Green.

14/11 FORWARD PROGRAMME: FOR DECISION [Item 13]

RESOLVED

to agree the Forward Programme as contained in the report, with the addition of a presentation on Adult Social Care.

[Meeting ended at 18.44 pm]

Chairman’s signature _____