

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 12th December 2005 at The Jubilee Centre, Thamesmead School, Shepperton

County Council Members:

Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos (Chairman)*

Mr Victor Agarwal*

Mr Ian Beardsmore*

Mr Laurie Burrell*

Mrs Carol Coleman*

Mr Frank Davies*

Ms Denise Turner*

*** = present**

(All references to items refer to the Agenda for the meeting)

45/05 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

46/05 MINUTES (Item 2)

The Minutes of the meetings held on 10th October and 5th December 2005 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

The Chairman referred to the recent decision to introduce an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order in Knowle Green to deal with the parking issues and thanked the Local Transportation Manager for the speedy response to this problem.

In response to a request to the Local Transportation Manager Mrs Coleman received updates on progress in relation to Fordbridge Road traffic and discussions with the London Borough of Hounslow concerning Clockhouse Lane.

47/05 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)

Mr. Agarwal declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 11 as a governor of Ash Technology College.

Mrs Coleman declared a prejudicial interest in item 11 as she was a member of the PA and Gardening Club of Clarendon School and because her son attends the school and because another son is a member of the Ashford Camera Club. Mrs Coleman left the meeting during consideration of those applications for funding. Mrs Coleman also declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 11 as a parent governor of Ash Technology College.

48/05

PETITIONS (Item 4)

A petition was received signed by 71 residents from Town Tree Road, St Michaels Road, Convent Road and Hawley Way, Ashford concerning the insufficient number of controlled crossing facilities in Feltham Hill Road, Feltham Road and Convent Road. It was noted that the petitioners would be advised that Feltham Hill Road between School Road and Church Road was on the assessment list for a traffic management scheme which could include a controlled crossing facility; that Convent Road was on the assessment list for the introduction of a controlled crossing facility; and Feltham Road between Convent Road and Church Road would be added to the list of schemes for assessment.

49/05

MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME (Item 5)

Mrs Coleman asked a question about a replacement tree in Ashford and the answer is appended to the annex to the minutes.

50/05

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (ITEM 6)

Mr. Carruthers asked a question about the use of fire extinguishers in schools; Mr Grose asked a question about road repairs in Manor Farm Avenue, Shepperton; Mr. Kidd asked questions about trees in Rookery Road and an update on surveys of the footpath; Mr. Watts asked a question about gulley cleaning in Green Lane and Laleham Road and the Walton Lane pedestrian scheme; Mr Marsden asked a question about the issue raised in the petition presented to the last Committee about Manor Lane; Susan Wilson asked a question about the difficulty experienced by residents walking along the pavement from Wye Close past the Londis retail shop in Feltham Road; Mr Rushbrook asked a question about the cumulative effect of planning applications and developments in Green Street, Sunbury; Mr Cubitt asked questions about the report being considered by the Committee concerning Manor Farm Avenue traffic calming proposals; and Mrs Nichols asked a question about the TP26 consultation and the answers are appended to the annex to the minutes.

51/05

LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME (ITEM 7)

It was noted that there would be a report on the Decriminalised Parking Enforcement and possibly Manor Lane, Sunbury.

Resolved:

To note the forward programme as amended.

52/05

PROPOSED CHANGES TO SCHOOLS ADMISSION CRITERIA FOR COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS FROM SEPTEMBER 2007 (ITEM 8)

The Chairman thanked Anne Macavoy for attending the meeting who explained the reasons for the consultation which affected voluntary controlled and community schools only.

Resolved:

To note the consultation.

53/05

WASTE PLAN CONSULTATION (ITEM 9)

Mr John Shelton attended to give a presentation. There was a discussion on the waste hierarchy and in particular the need to reduce waste by those manufacturers who double wrapped goods. Reference was also made to how composting material might be disposed of.

Mr Agarwal expressed his concern that some of his residents, particularly those living in Stanwell Moor, were unaware of the current Waste Plan consultation and asked that it be ensured they were properly consulted when the Summer 2006 consultation process took place.

Resolved:

To note the consultation exercise and to respond individually.

54/05

SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN 2006- CONSULTATION (ITEM 10)

Mr Chris Webb attended for this item and encouraged Members to submit their views to the consultation process. Mr. Webb drew Members' attention in particular to the change in fire standards to update these since first introduced in 1947; the Surrey response standards which exceeded the national average; the introduction of high tech equipment and fire engines which reduced the number of fire engines required at particular locations and how the service might respond to an incident similar to the recent fire at Hemel Hempstead fuel depot. Members acknowledged with praise the good work undertaken by the service in schools and youth related arson and the Safe Drive Stay Alive Campaign.

Resolved:

To note the consultation which ends on 19th January 2006.

55/05

MEMBERS' FUNDS (ITEM 11 and addendum report)

It was pointed out that sum in the penultimate line of the text in paragraph 2.13 should read £1,000

Resolved:

- 1. To note the funding approved under delegated authority (paras 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6)**
- 2. To make a contribution of £1000 towards The Revellaires to be drawn equally from the allocation to individual Members.**
- 3. To make a contribution of £4000 towards the costs of an A-Z directory for Spelthorne residents, to be**

drawn equally from the allocation to individual Members.

4. To make a contribution of £800 towards the costs of a digital image projector and laptop computer for Ashford Camera Club, to be drawn equally from the allocation to individual Members.
5. To make a contribution of £2000 towards CCTV for Shepperton High Street, to be drawn equally from the allocation to individual Members.
6. To make a contribution of £2500 for an interactive whiteboard at Echelford Primary School, to be drawn equally from the allocation to individual Members.
7. To make a contribution of £6000 to the Youth Service for provision of a Youth Café in Staines, to be drawn equally from the allocation to individual Members subject to the service being informed that no further revenue funding contribution could be made to this project in the future.
8. To make a contribution of £1000 to the Youth Service to provide Life Skills and Self-Esteem Courses, to be drawn equally from the allocation to individual Members.
9. To make a contribution of £3000 toward Surrey Young Enterprise, to be drawn equally from the allocation to individual Members.
10. To make a contribution of £4000 towards a temporary Project Development Coordinator, to be drawn equally from the allocation to Mr Agarwal, Mr Beardsmore, Mrs Coleman, Mrs Saliagopoulos and Ms Turner
11. To make a contribution of £10000 towards tree and hedgerow replacement to be drawn equally from the allocation to Mr Agarwal, Mr Beardsmore, Mrs Coleman, Mr Davies, Mrs Saliagopoulos and Ms Turner and £20,000 for tree maintenance to be drawn equally from the allocation to individual Members.
12. To note that the previous funding payment of £500 paid to the Sunbury and Shepperton Arts Association had been returned not needed and was reflected in para 1.1.
13. To make a contribution of £1500 from the capital allocation for a greenhouse at Clarendon Primary School.
14. To make a contribution of £1500 from the capital allocation for CCTV at St. Peter's church in Staines.

56/05 PETITION FROM RESIDENTS OF MANOR LANE, SUNBURY (ITEM 12)

Mr Davies supported residents' concern about the use of Manor Lane as a rat run and believed that a permanent traffic calming solution was needed sooner rather than later. Mr. Davies suggested that the report recommendations be deferred to enable the Local Transportation Manager to consider the compromise traffic calming proposals suggested by Mr Marsden and to report back to the next meeting if possible.

Resolved:

To defer any decision on the recommendations to enable the Local Transportation Manager to consider the proposals suggested by Mr Marsden on behalf of the residents and a further report be made to the Local Committee, if possible to the meeting scheduled for 20th February..

57/05 MANOR FARM AVENUE-PROPOSED SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEME (ITEM 13)

The Local Transportation Manager reported that the figure in paragraph 8.5 should read £5,000 and not £2,000.

The meeting was adjourned between 8.20pm and 8.30pm to enable Mr Phil Cubitt, Chairman of Governors of St. Nicholas' School, and Mr. N. Grose on behalf of the residents in Manor Farm Avenue and Borough Councillor Robin Sider to address the Committee.

Mr. Burrell asked that his thanks to Mr. Grose for all of his hard work on behalf of the residents and Mr. Cubitt and the school for their contribution be recorded.

Resolved:

The scheme shown at Annex B be approved for construction during the 2006/07 financial year subject to funding.

58/05 DECRIMINALISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT (ITEM 14)

The Local Transportation Manager reported that some road markings had still to be completed after which the Borough Council would take on the enforcement role in full. The DPE Task Group had agreed a priority list in principle to advertise. The Chairman referred to this as a good example of the Borough and County Councils working well together.

Mr Burrell asked to be informed of the current position on enforcement outside Sweet Inspirations and the adjacent Shop in Laleham Village.

The Local Transportation Manager undertook to provide all Members with a breakdown of the number of penalty notices issued in Staines, Sunbury, Shepperton, Stanwell and Ashford.

Resolved:

To note that

1. Enforcement was not fully operational.
2. Amendments/additions to the waiting restrictions were under discussion.

59/05

LOCAL ALLOCATION 2005/06 (ITEM 15)

The Local Transportation Manager reported that the delegated authority referred to in paragraph 1.3 also included the Divisional Member.

Resolved:

1. The final quarter programme be agreed.
2. The balance of the allocation and any savings from the agreed schemes in the report be directed towards the amendments and alterations to waiting restrictions as set out in item 14.

60/05

LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMME BID 2006/07 – 2011/12 (ITEM 16)

The Local Transportation Manager undertook to provide Mrs Coleman with details of personal injury incidents in Clockhouse Lane.

Resolved:

1. Recommendations 1 and 2 be deferred until the next meeting pending a review of the assessment process.
2. The intermediate scheme for Clockhouse Lane Ashford be resubmitted for 2008/09.

61/05

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

20th February 2006 at 7.00pm at Bishop Wand School, Conference Centre, Layton's Lane, Sunbury on Thames.

The meeting which commenced at 7pm ended at 10.30pm

Chairman.....

**Annex to the Minutes of the SCC Local Committee in
Spelthorne held on 12th December 2005**

AGENDA ITEM 5

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Mrs Coleman asked the following question:

"I understand that the dead Cedar Tree by the memorial in Church Road Ashford, is soon to be removed. Will the tree be replaced, and if so when?"

The Local Transportation Manager gave the following answer:

"The dead cedar tree in Church Road Ashford by the war memorial was substantially felled on 27 November. The trunk and stump are due to be removed within the next two weeks.

The County Council works in partnership with the Spelthorne Tree Warden Group, who would be pleased to provide and plant a suitable replacement. This should be carried out early in the New Year."

AGENDA ITEM 6

QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC

Mr. John Carruthers asked the following question:

"Every school has an Emergency Plan which basically describes the laid down procedures that all staff must follow in the event of an emergency. If a fire happens in one of our schools and the alarm bell sounds, the first duty of all staff is to guide all pupils outside to safety and to control them here. This can take up to 4 or 5 minutes for a whole school. But what of all those fire extinguishers provided at considerable cost at every vantage point in every school and which are so lovingly maintained? In the event of a fire they remain unused, because, as above, the laid down first duty of all schools staff is towards the pupils, and which means that everyone goes outside the building, and by then advised to remain there safely. It has been suggested that the school secretary or admin staff might jump in and use a fire extinguisher. They will not necessarily be adjacent to the fire outbreak or even immediately know where it is, but in any case any action by them would be entirely at their own risk and subject to late censure should anything go wrong or is not in accordance with the school Emergency Plan. Not

recommended. In due course the Fire Brigade attends and puts the fire out. However, what could have been a minor problem such as a waste bin smouldering, is by then at least a whole room on fire, or as with many of our prefabricated buildings now a total loss. The wasted cost of providing but not using the extinguishers is enormous, with high financial fire loss every year. Just ask the County Risk Management and Insurance Manager Ron Bavin.

As a school governor I raised this matter two years ago and have talked to Fire Officers. They agree the problem, but each time defer to necessary senior level input and advice. A request for advice to Wray Park by one school some time ago has received no response. The Local Committee has undoubted influence at high level and I ask therefore the Local Committee to endorse my request for specific advice to be issued to every Surrey school to cover use of fire extinguishers and that this matter is given urgent consideration”

Mr. Chris Webb of the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service gave the following answer:

“The first priority must be to evacuate the school, and take a role call. The Fire Service **must** be called to all fires however small. Extinguishers are there to protect the means of escape if it becomes compromised by fire. Suitable training should be provided to staff that are expected to use this equipment, who may then be confident to tackle a small fire in a waste paper bin for example, if they are in the vicinity. The Fire Authority recommends that on no account do people return to the premises to fight a fire.

If Mr Carruthers requires any additional information he should contact Mick Crewe

Senior Fire Safety Advisor - Surrey Fire and Rescue Service &
Surrey County Council - Risk Management & Insurance section
Tel: 0208541 9873 Mob: 07968 834529
Email: mick.crew@surreycc.gov.uk Web: www.surrey-fire.gov.uk

who deals with fire protection in SCC premises.

Additionally education are running a number of briefing sessions for schools in the Spring term about the new fire safety legislation that comes into effect in April 2006. Mick Crew is our fire safety expert and I am sure that he will reiterate that fire fighting equipment in schools is there to protect people first and foremost but that simple fires, such as the smouldering waste paper bin, could also be dealt with as long as it is safe to do so. We have always provided training and guidance on the use of extinguishers, their capabilities and limitations and will continue to do so. There is likely to be a cost implication for schools on most training they receive because the money is delegated directly to them and it is up to them to decide on what it should be spent. The briefing sessions arranged for next term, however, are without cost and should help schools determine what degree and nature of training they most need.”

Mr Grose of Shepperton gave the following question:

“Can the Area Director inform me why, after some months, and continued enquiries, there is still no action by Surrey County Council to undertake road repairs in Manor Farm Avenue? It was stated in Mr Fishwick's 29th March Shepperton Forum Q and A Report in his answer to the above that a sum of £40,000 had been allocated for remedial work in this road, and this was to be designed during last summer and construction for October 2005. Will this work be completed before any action is taken to implement any road scheme arising from the Safe Route to School Proposals for St Nicholas School which is on the agenda of this meeting?”

The Local Transportation Manager gave the following reply:

“There appears to have arisen some confusion regarding the Area Transportation Director's answer given at The Shepperton Forum to a question relating to highway maintenance along Manor Farm Avenue.

The sum of £40,000 referred to was for a drainage scheme to deal with the flooding problems that occur on the highway in the vicinity of St. Nicholas School. Although originally programmed for implementation in October unfortunately, due to budgetary reasons, the scheme has been deferred to a later date.

This information has been conveyed to Mr Grose by letter”.

Mr Norman Kidd of Rookery Road, Staines asked the following question:

"I am sure there are many Surrey Council Taxpayers, who believe like myself, that many of the Council's spending priorities are not in tune with us who pay the bills and therefore can we be assured that the relevant Senior Council Officials as well as our Elected representatives will be actively seeking funds to be allocated in the 2006/2007 budget round, for long neglected regular tree maintenance. This question is not only relevant to the residents of Rookery Road, where we believe there is a severe problem, but for many other residents in the County who would like the Council to fulfill its responsibilities in this area? "

The Local Transportation Manager gave the following answer:

“Funds are allocated each year for highway maintenance, including specific amounts for arboricultural works, though the budgets have not yet been set for next financial year. However, it must be appreciated that limited resources will always mean that priorities have to be set, and consequently aspirations are not always fulfilled.

In relation to tree maintenance in Rookery Road Staines, I would refer to the Area Transportation Director's answer to Mr Kidd given at the SCC Local Committee in Spelthorne held on 10th October. Item 16 of that meeting

regarding Highway Tree Maintenance and the acceptance of a risk assessment-based priority schedule is also relevant.”

Mr Norman Kidd of Rookery Road, Staines asked the following question:

"At the October Local Committee Meeting one Council Official present, committed to arrange for two surveys, 1) as to the condition of footpaths in Rookery Road damaged by tree roots, and 2) ascertaining the condition, and potential for causing damage, of two trees that were apparently being "strangled" by ivy. What was the result of those surveys?"

The Local Transportation Manager asked the following answer:

“Statutory highway inspections are carried out by the Council’s partnering contractor, Ringway Highway Services. The last such inspection of Rookery Road was carried out on 28 July, and two non-urgent footway defects were noted. The next inspection is due to be carried out in January. It is recognised, however, that the general condition of the footways in Rookery Road is noted as “Poor”. To this end, the road has been added to a list for possible future refurbishment should funds become available.

An arboricultural survey of all 19 trees in Rookery Road was carried out in May. No defects of an urgent nature were noted at that time. However, the County Arborist has agreed to visit Rookery Road within the next week and submit a report on the two trees that are covered in ivy.”

Mr Robert Watts of Shepperton asked the following question:

“As a representative of the Shepperton Residents Association I should like to ask the following questions;

1 If gully cleaning has been carried out in Green Lane and Laleham Road, how many still require further work and when will this be completed?

2 The safety audit on Walton Lane Cycleway was completed in July 2005, but the works are still not finished. Please confirm why the work has not been finished and what is the programme for finally finishing this much needed project.”

The Local Transportation Manager gave the following answer:

“The road gullies in Laleham Road Shepperton were cleaned as part of the annual gully cleansing programme in June this year, and in Green Lane in October. It was reported that two gullies in Green Lane from a total of 43 were not cleaned due to the presence of parked cars. In Laleham Road, five gullies from a total of 112 were found to be inoperative due to blocked outlets.

In general terms, it has to be accepted that in the majority of streets there are obstructions, principally parked vehicles, which prevent every single gully being cleaned each year. Furthermore, some gullies remain inoperative due to blocked outlets. It is impractical to follow up every gully reported as having

a blocked outlet with further high pressure jetting work, as limited resources have to be targeted at areas of greatest need. The current budget for additional highway drain cleaning has already been spent, so it is therefore not possible at present to attend to the inoperative gullies in Laleham Road.

The safety audit included a recommendation that hatched markings be provided to guide drivers away from parked cars. Although the markings were provided those on the southern side were found insufficient for their intended purpose. Revised drawings have been issued to our constructor to alter them to give a greater margin of safety to 'Elm Cottage'.

However, those markings on the northern side appear to have fulfilled their purpose and it is now intended to complete the scheme by providing the necessary signage."

Mr Robin Marsden will ask the following question:

"On behalf of the residents of Manor Lane (whose July Petition was submitted to the Council 10th October by Cllr Davies and is **Item 12** on your agenda) we are attending to provide further information and ask the following written question, together with a follow up, if allowed.

The important information shown in the attached document '**Comments On the Report**' relates to the details you will be considering under Item 12. We would ask that this submission should be considered alongside the report **as part of it**.

There are a number of inaccuracies in the report, which seem to seek to minimise the problems, when we have gone to so much trouble to bring them to your attention.

The time permitted does not allow us to go through these comments in detail, so please consider them carefully on our behalf.

It is unacceptable to us as council taxpayers that the directly expressed wishes of so many residents are simply fobbed off with a palliative solution. Particularly when £20/30,000(?) has been **wasted**, without any **visible taxpayer value**, on the 'Avenue Island design' – without completion of the works.

We understand £20,000 was spent on 'Recommended Cycle Route signing' without any safety measures and £40,000 is to be spent on 'Paramics' computer modelling' for Staines town centre Kingston/London Rd congestion.

Even a layman here can see that the right hand turn under the 'Iron Bridge' into Two Rivers needs to be blocked off to reduce these problems. The £40,000 saved here can be redirected towards our installations please!

Question Can the Committee now agree to bring forward these much needed traffic calming works without further delay and perhaps use funding from the 'Safer Routes To School' initiative as the plans indicate?"

The Local Transportation Manager gave the following answer:

"The provision of Variable Message Signs should be beneficial in reducing speed both in the short term and with lasting impact. However, as will be mentioned later in this meeting, a traffic calming scheme previously programmed for 2005/06 has been rescheduled to 2007/08 due to reduced funding could be implemented if still considered necessary."

Susan Wilson asked the following question:

"There is a development of 6 flats being constructed at the rear of 97 Feltham Road which is a Londis retail shop. Above the retail shop there are also additional flats which have been constructed without planning permission. Surrey county highways authority have stated on three occasions the access road which is alongside the retail shop is a danger to highway users and pedestrians due to its inadequate visibility when emerging from the access road. It is contrary to the Surrey Structure plan policy DN2. I have sent a report which was sent to me from Mr G Devine from County Highways and correspondence from Mr E Josey.

It can be extremely difficult to walk along the pavement from Wye Close past the Londis retail shop due to vehicles being parked up on the pavement which are visiting the retail shop, if you have a pushchair you can be forced to walk into the road. The parked vehicles cause a visibility issue when trying to emerge out from Wye Close on to the Feltham Road and they also block the visibility for those entering and exiting the development. Local residents and I feel there is an accident waiting to happen. A Photograph is attached.

Question

What can Surrey County Council do in order to protect the safety of the pedestrians, highway users and local residents?

Residents Suggestions

Place concrete bollards or double yellow lines from Wye Close up to the Zig Zag lines on the pedestrian crossing to prevent the cars parking up on the pavement. Thus enhancing the visibility for the residents of Wye Close and the access road."

The Local Transportation Manager gave the following answer:

"There appear to be two parts to this question

- 1) Highway observations on the submitted plans were given by SCC's Transportation & Development Section. The actual width of the access is slightly narrower (about 0.1m) than that shown on the plan but there is insufficient variance to the plan to justify objection on highway grounds. However, any further development of the site would be opposed on highway grounds. Any variation to the development that was granted planning permission would be the responsibility of Spelthorne Borough Council to take any action if required.
- 2) With regard to vehicles parking on the footway, waiting restrictions are unlikely to be an effective option as drivers visiting the shop are likely to take a chance for the few minutes they are on the premises. It may therefore be more appropriate to install bollards and this will be investigated."

Mr George Rushbrook member of the Green Street, Sunbury Action Group asked the following question:

"In 2003, following a spate of planning applications and developments in Green Street, Sunbury, I and others met with Caroline Smith, of the S.C.C, Transportation Development Control.

She was made aware, as residents, of our deep concern of the detrimental cumulative impact to traffic of the ever increasing planning applications.

She informed us that that in September 2003 she had written to the Head of Planning at Spelthorne Borough Council, informing him that work had been commenced on the effect of cumulative development in effort to get a Supplementary Planning Guidance.

I quote from her letter:

' One of the main issues that has concerned both local residents and your Members is that of the cumulative impact of a number of developments in the Green Street area. The County Council as Highway Authority can only consider planning the planning application before it, and cannot take into account other future planning applications which may or may not come forward. Work has begun on the production of possible Supplementary Planning Guidances to address the incremental impact issue across the County, but that will not be completed in time to inform your decision on this particular application.'

The planning applications and developments continue apace in Green Street and the surrounding areas but to date we have heard nothing about the result of the work commenced in 2003 by S.C.C. on the cumulative impact of development on traffic.

My question is ' What is the result of the work commenced so long ago. Why

have we not been kept informed? Why has it taken so long?"

The Local Transportation Manager gave the following answer:

"A report titled Development Related Transportation Funding was reported to SCC's Transportation Select Committee on 06 October 2006. The report provided information on government policy, guidance and advice associated with the securing of "Planning Obligations" under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

An outline and update was provided on the proposed Transport Income Supplement initiative that aims to maximize financial contributions from smaller housing developments so as to offset the cumulative impact of numerous smaller housing developments on the transportation network, together with financial information on the projected income from the introduction of Transport Income Supplement.

The report was then presented to all Surrey Chief Executives on 09 December 2005 recommending that the principle of the process set out in the Transport Income Supplement initiative was supported by the Districts. Unfortunately I understand the proposal was rejected.

The reason this matter has taken so long to progress is due to consultation with interested parties, including Districts. It was also considered prudent to wait until Circular 05-2005 was published, as it was anticipated that it would support the principle of the Transport Income Supplement initiative under Planning S106 Agreements."

Mr Phil Cubitt Chair of Governors of St Nicholas School, Shepperton will ask the following question:

" I ask these as Chair of Governors of the school and on behalf the governors and staff, our 550 pupils and their parents (of whom the vast majority are obviously local, Shepperton residents).

I welcome all the proposed safety features to the public highway that are outlined in both annexes to the report before the Local Committee this evening. Crossing points, improved road markings and safety fencing will be of benefit to the hundreds of pedestrians that regularly use this road. The safety of the children is paramount to the school.

I now refer to the proposal shown as Annex C. This incorporates all the features that are in Annex B, and also includes one additional feature, a priority scheme. This meets the wishes of nearly 400 parents, who responded to a questionnaire sent out by the school.

1. Given that public funds are available - under the Safe Routes To School Scheme - to improve this public highway with a priority scheme: which

proposal gives the greater safety improvement to all road users, Annex B or Annex C?

2. Residents of Manor Farm Avenue (and school parents) encourage the use of the "informal one-way system" of vehicle flow towards the High Street. Which proposal offers the greater opportunity to enhance the flow of traffic, with obvious benefits to all, Annex B or Annex C?

3. A significant number of children walking to school enter via - what we refer to as our "back gate" - Black Ditch Path. Funds have been set aside to improve this public footpath (to the benefit of all) that would then encourage even greater numbers to walk along this route to school. Different figures are quoted on different pages as to the amount set aside for this improvement. What is the true figure?"

The Local Transportation Manager gave the following answer:

"1.As stated in paragraph 2.3 of the committee report, there is no evidence of accidents relating to excessive speeds along Manor Farm Avenue. It is considered that both options increase safety levels for pedestrians in Manor Farm Avenue.

2. The priority system may encourage the voluntary one-way system. However, as discussed with the residents' representative at the task group meeting, the priority system could cause more congestion should it occur that a driver who was unaware of the voluntary one-way system was to travel in the "wrong" direction

3. This is a typo and should state £5,000 in paragraph 8.2 as in paragraph 4.2."

Mrs Caroline Nicholls of Sunbury will ask the following question:

"Please would you tell me what public consultation has happened in respect of developing the 'linear park' land TP26?

Background:

As a resident who can see TP26 from my upstairs windows, I have been raising concerns about TP26 with Spelthorne Borough Council for the past 2 years. At the Sunbury Area Forum on 15th June 2005 I was advised by Paul Fishwick that I need take no action because, as a resident living nearby, I would be informed as soon as a public consultation was initiated. So far I have heard nothing.

I am worried because local tree wardens appear to have been allowed to plant trees inappropriately along TP26 and I would be very concerned if the existing planting prevents proper landscaping and development of the routeway."

The Local Transportation Manager will give the following answer:

“A proposed route for a cycle path/footway has been prepared and we will contact the local tree wardens to discuss tree planting options along the route. Once a proposal has been formulated, full public consultation will take place. This is programmed for early 2006.”