

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 19th June 2006 St David's Parish Centre, Stanwell

County Council Members:

**Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos
Mr Victor Agarwal*
Mr Ian Beardsmore*
Mr Laurie Burrell* (Chairman)
Mrs Carol Coleman*
Mr Frank Davies*
Ms Denise Turner***

Borough Council Members:

**Councillor Gerry Ceaser*
Councillor Denise Grant*
Councillor M Hyams*
Councillor Jack Pinkerton*
Councillor Robin Sider*
Councillor Caroline Spencer*
Councillor George Trussler***

*** = present**

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

- 1/06 CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN**
It was noted that Mrs Saliagopoulos and Mr Burrell had been appointed by Council as Chairman and Vice Chairman respectively for the ensuing Municipal Year.
- 2/06 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (ITEM 2)**
Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Saliagopoulos, Councillors Culnane and Forsbrey.

In Mrs Saliagopoulos' absence Mr. Burrell chaired the meeting.

Mr. Burrell welcomed Councillors Hyams and Spencer as substitute members for the Borough Council.
- 3/06 MINUTES (ITEM 3)**
The Minutes of the meeting held on 20th March 2006 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

The Chairman circulated papers concerning the proposals to merge the Surrey and Sussex Police Services and reminded Members that the comments could still be submitted as part of the consultation process.

4/06 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM 4)

Councillor Sider declared a personal interest in respect of agenda items 11, 18 and 20 having received correspondence concerning each item.

5/06 PETITIONS (ITEM 5)

The Committee received a petition signed by 155 people seeking safety measures outside Chennestone School, Sunbury and a petition in the form of a letter signed by 14 people seeking improved parking at Belgrave Road, Sunbury. Both petitions would be the subject of reports to the 25th September meeting of the Local Committee.

6/06 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME (ITEM 6)

Two Members' questions were received as set out in the annex attached together with the answers given.

In response to a supplementary question from Mr. Agarwal the Chairman undertook to inquire of the Police Divisional Commander if there would be any possibility of a police station office being established in Stanwell.

7/06 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (ITEM 7)

Nine public questions were received as set out in the annex attached together with the answers given.

The Chairman referred to Standing Order 65 and advised that in future only one question per member of the public would be accepted with a maximum of six public questions altogether.

8/06 REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES AND APPOINTMENTS TO TASK GROUPS (ITEM 8)

Resolved:

1. Mrs Saliagopoulos, as Chairman of the Local Committee, be appointed to the Local Strategic Partnership.
2. Mrs Saliagopoulos, as Chairman of the Local Committee, be appointed to the Crime and Disorder Reduction partnership/Safer, Stronger Spelthorne Partnership.
3. Mr. Davies be appointed to the Thriving Spelthorne Partnership sub group of the LSP.
4. Councillor Grant be appointed as the Local Committee's representative on the Health and Social Care Partnership sub group of the LSP.
5. Mr. Burrell be appointed to the Spelthorne Younger People Partnership.

6. Mr. Davies and Mr. Burrell be appointed to the Walton Bridge Task Group.
7. Mrs Saliagopoulos and Mr. Burrell, as Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Local Committee, be appointed to the Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Group.
8. Mrs Coleman be appointed to the Spelthorne Cycle Forum.
9. Ms Turner be appointed to the Thames Flood Forum.

9/06 LOCAL COMMITTEE TIMETABLE AND FORWARD PROGRAMME (ITEM 9)

Resolved:

1. The dates and venues for the formal and informal meetings for 2006/07 be noted with a commencement time of all meetings of 7pm with the exception of 5th February 2007 which would commence at 4.30pm.
2. The proposed Forward Programme be noted.

10/06 LOCAL COMMITTEE PROTOCOL (ITEM 10)

It was suggested that as meetings of the Local Committee commenced at 7pm, a guillotine be applied on occasions where the duration of a meeting had reached three hours and that this be included in the Committee's protocol.

Resolved:

The Local Committee protocol attached as Appendix A be approved for 2006/07 subject to the inclusion of a guillotine at 10pm i.e. after a three-hour duration of the meeting.

11/06 RUSSELL ROAD, SHEPPERTON PETITION FROM RESIDENTS (ITEM 11)

Resolved:

1. A feasibility study be undertaken to establish the appropriateness of introducing a different traffic calming scheme to the present one.
2. The study be funded from the Local Allocation at a cost of £5,000.
3. Should the study find a viable alternative to the present speed reducing features a scheme be developed for Committee approval.
4. A further report be submitted to the Local Committee at their 11th December meeting.

12/06 KENYGTON DRIVE, SUNBURY - PETITION (ITEM 12)

Resolved:

1. The report be noted
2. No action be taken at the present time.

13/06 TRANSPORTATION POST BDR FOR SPELTHORNE (ITEM 13)

The Chairman welcomed Mr Bob Moodie, West Area Transportation Group Manager.

It was noted that some Members were receiving an average of one transportation complaint per day from residents. Mr Beardsmore undertook to raise at County level the concerns about the public not receiving replies to the issues they reported and to inquire if there could be a dedicated phone line to report highways matters.

Resolved:

1. That the report be noted and that all enquiries from the public should be referred to the SCC Contact Centre on 08456 009 009 or to the website at www.surreycc.gov.uk
2. The Local Transportation Manager should remain the principal contact for Members.

14/06 MANOR LANE, SUNBURY PROPOSED SPEED REDUCTION MEASURES – RESPONSE TO PUBLIC OCNSULTATION (ITEM 14)

Resolved:

1. The proposed traffic calming scheme shown at Annex A be approved for construction in 2007/08 or earlier if funds became available as requested by the majority (52%) of the residents who were consulted.
2. If an underspend were to occur the scheme could be brought forward as a priority.

15/06 TP26 – PROPOSED SHARED PEDESTRIAN CYCLE ROUTE (ITEM 15)

The Local Transportation Manager tabled the results of the public consultation exercise. Members also noted the comments from Mrs C Nicholls. It was agreed that The Friends of Sunbury Park would also be consulted on future TP26 issues.

Members hoped this scheme could be progressed speedily and received reassurances from the Local Transportation Manager that their concerns for public safety, protection of junctions, etc would be taken into account.

Resolved:

The proposed shared pedestrian/cycle route be approved.

16/06 CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES (ITEM 16)

Members asked that the publicity be handled sensitively as previously residents had wrongfully believed that the proposals

to introduce parking zones were being introduced for the purpose of generating income.

Resolved:

1. The County and Borough Councils work together to introduce the first Controlled Parking Zone to Staines.
2. The Proposal be funded from the Local Allocation at a cost of £20,000 for the current financial year 2006/07 and £10,000 for 2007/08.

17/06

STAINES TOWN CENTRE TRAFFIC MODEL (ITEM 17)

The Chairman welcomed Gemma Thomas who gave a presentation of the report and the S-Paramics model of Staines Town Centre being developed. Various views were expressed about the issues affecting traffic flow through the town centre including the two schemes proposed for testing using the Staines Town Centre traffic model.

Resolved:

To note the contents of the report and to have a further report at the 25th September or the 11th December meeting of the Local Committee.

18/06

52 WESTERN DRIVE – STOPPING UP THE HIGHWAY (ITEM 18)

There was a discussion about who owned the land and officers would need to ensure clarity on this point to overcome any uncertainty.

Resolved:

1. Should the owner of the land adjacent to No 52 Western Drive make a formal application to have the land stopped up as public highway Legal Services commence the required procedure
2. Should a formal application be made, the costs of the stopping up application be borne by the applicant.

19/06

156 CHURCH STREET, STAINES – STOPPING UP THE HIGHWAY (ITEM 19)

Resolved:

1. Should the owner of No 156 Church Street, Staines make a formal application to have the land stopped up as public highway, Legal Services be instructed to commence the required procedure.
2. Should a formal application be made, the costs of the stopping up order be borne by the applicant.

20/06

TAXI RANKS IN STAINES (ITEM 20)

Councillor Sider, as Chairman of the Borough's Licensing Committee expressed his concerns about this issue and asked officers to reconsider reducing the 20 days referred to in paragraph 3.1 (ii). The Local Transportation Manager advised that 20 days was the maximum time. Councillor Ceaser referred

to his sense of frustration about the issue and the concerns of taxi operators that the existing rank adjacent to the bus station could not be seen easily. Councillor Ceaser hoped that there would not be delays in the partner discussions about the Elmsleigh redevelopment.

Resolved:

1. The report be noted.
2. A further report be made to the 25th September meeting if delays concerning the redevelopment of the Elmsleigh bus station or if problems with taxi stands were to occur.

21/06

MEMBERS' FUNDS (ITEM 21)

It was noted that there would be a review of the use of delegated authority for Members funds, rules and criteria and whether applications for retrospective funding could be accepted.

Resolved:

1. Recommendations 1 and 2 be not approved.
2. The criteria for 2005/06 be applied for consideration of those applications on the report.
3. Delegated authority to the Area Director be suspended pending a review of the rules and criteria and retrospective funding relating to Members funds.
4. Recommendation 3 be noted.
5. Recommendation 4 be noted.
6. Recommendation 5 be approved with funding being shared equally between all Members except Mr Agarwal.
7. Recommendation 6 - £250 be funded from Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Burrell, Ms Turner, Mr. Agarwal and Mr Beardsmore allocations.
8. Recommendation 7 be approved with funding shared equally between all Members.
9. Recommendation 8 be approved with funding being shared equally between all Members except Mr Agarwal.
10. Recommendation 9 be approved with funding shared equally between all Members except Mr Agarwal and Mrs Coleman.
11. Recommendation 11 be approved with funding shared equally between Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Burrell, Mr Davies Ms Turner, Mr Beardsmore.

22/06

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting would be held on Monday 25th September at 7.00pm at St. David's School, Church Road, Ashford

The meeting which commenced at 7pm ended at 10.06pm

Chairman.....

**Annex to the Minutes of the SCC Local Committee in Spelthorne held on
19th June 2006**

Agenda Item 6

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Mr Agarwal asked the following question:

"Is there any truth in the rumour that Ashford police station is to close?
If so what is the current position?"

The Area Director gave the following reply:

"I have consulted the Surrey Police Divisional Commander about this who has advised "The rumour comes from a newspaper article which hypothesised that because the Borough Council were considering charging us rent of £5k a year (we are currently rent-free), we might be tempted to move out.

Two key points are that:

- 1) there is a facility to apply for a grant from the Council to cover this money, which the police have been encouraged to use.
- 2) although money is always important, it is not the only determining factor in deciding where we should have a police presence. As I said in a letter to the paper following the article, Ashford is a busy, thriving town that deserves a police presence, and I commit to keeping one there."

Councillor Pinkerton asked the following question:

"Oaks Farm, Horton Road, Stanwell, Middlesex former Minerals site.
Planning Appeal SP95/01174 Charles Morris Fertilisers Ltd 24th July 1996

The result of the planning appeal to the Department for the Environment shows that a visibility splay should have been constructed 4.5 X 9 meters and a sign erected at the exit informing drivers to turn right onto the A3044 Stanwell Moor Road. The villagers had suffered unnecessarily. It raises the question of how much notice is taken of planning conditions? I am now told that they are preparing two new planning applications. The conditions also specify that the work allowed would be completed by 24th July 2006 and that Surrey County Council would receive details of the final restoration and landscaping by 24th July 2005. The bunds would be removed after 24th July 2006. 'Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning (general permitted planning) Order 1955 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order with or without modification) no plant or machinery whether fixed or moveable shall be erected on the site without prior written approval of the County Planning Authority.

I would like to ask the following questions;

- 1) Has Surrey County Council received any new planning applications for this site?
- 2) Has this site been allocated for use as part of SCC waste strategy?
- 3) Have Charles Morris given SCC details of the final restoration and landscaping due 24th July 2005?
- 4) Is Charles Morris required to restore the site to Green Belt Agricultural Land?
- 5) Is Charles Morris going to construct the visibility splay and right turn notice?
- 6) Have SCC agreed to any machinery being on site?
- 7) Will the bunds be removed by 24th July 2006?
- 8) Have SCC or anyone else any other designs on the site?"

The Area Director gave the following reply:

"I am consulting my colleagues and will send a written response to Councillor Pinkerton as soon as I can."

Agenda Item 7

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Mr John Carruthers asked the following question:

"On 31st May the national newspapers reported on the way Carillion staff performed whilst carrying out work on the East Surrey Area Highways Maintenance Contract '57minutes actual work done in an 8 hour day' was one reported comment, and apparently a substantial refund has been agreed.

Here in the West Area our work is carried out by another contractor, Ringway, and from the start of the contract the improvement in the quality of work produced was noticeable and there was a good working relationship.

However, bearing in mind what has happened in the east of the County, what steps are the Councillors taking to ensure that the high standard of work, production and cost effectiveness continues in our West area? How do you know what standard pertains here?"

The West Area Transportation Group Manager gave the following reply:

"The County Council carries out regular monitoring of the constructors' work in both East and West contracts through audits undertaken by our Contract Engineers.

We have also carried out more in-depth investigations into the productivity of both constructors. These were very much focused on those areas of work

where it is known in the industry that there is the most scope for inefficient working.

The report on Ringway is currently being considered by Senior Officers and will be taken to an Executive task group once negotiations with the constructors are more advanced. I am however pleased to be able to report that none of the issues which have received such high profile attention in the East contract are evidenced in the West.”

Mr John Carruthers asked the following question:

“It took some time to do, but I understand that the yellow lines in the Borough have now all been authenticated, and parking wardens are patrolling. The Police said at a recent Ashford Forum that 923 parking tickets had been issued in central Ashford and in and around the Dudley Road area, so clearly cash constraint is not now an issue.

1. The police at the last Local Forum said that wardens for Ashford had been curtailed to now only 3 hours a week. Has this reduction been approved by county councillors and does it also apply to Sunbury and Shepperton?
2. When the parking arrangements were set out, it was a clear instruction from the outset that this was not to be confined to Staines, but that ALL areas would receive the full share of enforcement. Will the Councillors ensure that Ashford is given its full entitlement?
3. Why is patrolling only done in the Dudley Road area of Ashford (as stated by the Police) with the rest of Ashford being ignored, good order is lost and law brought into disrepute? Parking on yellow lines, even double parking there, is common.
4. This also applies to the other townships outside of Staines. Why has this been allowed to happen?
5. We are all paying our council tax so why is favour being given to Staines to the detriment of the rest of the borough. The appearance is of collecting fines in Ashford to spend on Staines. Would the Councillors agree this is not good enough? Please can I have the support of the Ashford, Sunbury and Shepperton Councillors in this?
6. As a separate issue, many yellow lines have now been in place for 30 – 40 years. In that time the pattern of life and street activity has changed and the existing parking limitations and directions in some cases need urgent review. What steps are being taken to do this please?”

The Local Transportation Manager gave the following reply:

“Adjustments to the yellow lines and signs required for the enforcement of waiting and loading restrictions across the Borough are now complete. Under an Agency Agreement, the Borough’s Parking Attendants have patrolled the Borough since April 2005. Since parking on waiting and loading restrictions was decriminalised, Surrey Police have had little input to the enforcement of

the restrictions. The income from the penalty charge notices is currently used to cover the set up costs of the scheme.

1. I am unclear about the origin of the details contained in your question, but some of the information is inaccurate. Surrey Police have little interest in the issue of Penalty Charge Notices since decriminalised parking enforcement (DPE) was introduced to Spelthorne. The time spent at each town or area in the Borough is specified in the Operational Parking Policy document, which is confidential. However, there has been no alteration to the time spent in each area. The document was agreed by the DPE Task Group and subsequently by the relevant committees.
2. All areas are allocated an amount of time in the Operational Parking Policy. To date, 12% of the parking attendants' available patrol time has been spent in Ashford and 11% of the penalty charge notices were issued in Ashford. Any adjustment to the policy will be agreed between the County's and Borough's nominated officers.
3. Enforcement in Ashford is not confined to the Dudley Road area, but spread across the whole Ashford area.
4. Enforcement is carried out in accordance with the Operational Parking Policy.
5. See 4. above.
6. Many of the waiting and loading restrictions have been in place for many years. Requests for alterations to the restrictions are reviewed annually but there is no proposal, and no staff resource, to review all of the restrictions in the Borough, at this time."

Mr John Carruthers asked the following question:

"Reducing unnecessary legislative burdens – A Review Body has been set up by the Cabinet Office led by Neil Davidson QC, to look at the whole process by which EU legislation is implemented in the UK and which welcomes examples of gold plating, double banking, and regulatory creep.

Local Government is in the forefront of implementation of this legislation, and both Borough and County Councils must be particularly hit by the unfounded extra cost and staffing of putting all this into practice.

Of course council taxpayers are materially affected by this legislation. Can you therefore please inform me what action both Borough and County Councillors and officers are taking? What response has been given to this Review? (info contact [www.cabinetoffice:GOV:UK/REGULATION/DAVIDSON REVIEW/](http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/regulation/davidson-review/) (Davidson Review Enquiries; tel 0207 276 1751)"

The Area Director gave the following response: (answer in progress)

"I have consulted my corporate services colleagues who have advised from a finance point of view no work has been undertaken on this and I have no information on costs of compliance with EU regulations."

Mr John Carruthers asked the following question:

"The Education Director's Report to School Governors dated April 2006, under Intervention for Pupils with Special Needs (SEN) refers under Background on page 11 to the limiting effect of so much money being spent on expensive out of County placements. The final recourse for the most challenging pupils. Surrey does not have In County establishments at this level and to place elsewhere costs about £180,000 per year per pupil. This is having a serious effect on the money left over to adequately fund the main body of SEN pupils.

Parents of seriously affected SEN pupils regularly appeal against decisions to keep their children within county at lower level facilities rather than being transferred to the, they think better, expensive out-county placement. Even taking their case to Court at even more expense to County. This was in fact always a very serious matter, but now even more so with the budget reductions.

Any proposal or action therefore to overcome SEN problems at an earlier stage in order to reduce the number of pupils reaching this final placement ought to be given as much encouragement as possible. Education Officers generally have always tried to overcome these problems within the existing departmental structure, but have not been able to stem the continual costly demand for out county placements.

The Social Services face a similar problem concerning their own "customers", but some time ago were able to substantially improve their situation by use of AMIIS (Adjudication, Mediation, Independent Investigation Service.) This service although funded by SCC Social Services is actually independent and impartial, and is there to support the affected person through all the procedures to a sensible result. This way cases are managed much more effectively, and money is saved, the completely unnecessary insistence of parents to go to extreme positions can be curtailed, and cash for legal, management as well as high grade facility is saved.

To save just one pupil from going to out County Placement would easily pay for the whole years cost of AMIIS and would still show a saving. Currently AMIIS have social service based expertise in place, but they are able and willing to set up and carry out the same duties on behalf of Education. I understand that preliminary discussion took place, last year, but the Education Department have not so far shown any serious indication of taking the matter forward.

Please will the Local Committee endorse this proposal, urgently take it forward and monitor progress?"

The Area Director gave the following answer:

"I have consulted with my colleagues in Services for Families and have and the following response:

The way the question is put to the Council I think is slightly misleading. The social care part of Children's Service has a statutory responsibility to have a complaint system which has to be independent. As a result we commission AMIIS to act as advocates for parents and help resolve complaints. There is a statutory complaints system for social care involving various stages of complaint and we have no option but to provide this service.

For pupils with SEN there is funded by Surrey County Council an independent advocates service called Partnership with Parents managed by Kate Evans. They will represent parents with children with SEN.

The Educational Psychologists have a mediation role together with the managers of the SEN teams to try to resolve issues before they reach tribunal. There is therefore a well established route and I cannot see that an arrangement with AMIIS would add much to this and particularly would not solve issues which reach tribunal. However, I understand that the education department have looked at the possibility of commissioning a service from AMIIS. This is not a statutory requirement for Surrey County Council and it maybe that with the review of council services there is not the budget for this."

Mr Andrew McCluskey asked the following question:

"How, in the light of current predictions of severe drought, does Surrey County Council propose to maintain the existing quantity and quality of water supply from local reservoirs currently earmarked for gravel extraction?"

The Head of Environment and Regulation gave the following answer:

"Gravel extraction from current reservoirs is normally carried out by dredging while the reservoirs continue to function for the storage of water. Water quality is carefully monitored by the water companies at all times, and normally is not affected by the extraction of gravel, provided it is carried out in accordance with the planning permission for extraction. Planning permissions for gravel extraction are monitored and enforced by the County Council. The long term impact of gravel extraction is normally to deepen reservoirs and increase their storage capacity."

Mr Andrew McCluskey asked the following question:

"How in the light of Spelthorne Borough Council's policy of knocking down the Stanwell Centre does Surrey County Council intend to maintain its existing standard of care here for senior citizens?"

The Operations Manager SCC Spelthorne and Weybridge Social Care Team gave the following answer:

“Spelthorne and Weybridge Social Care Team, Adults and Community Care, Surrey County Council, provides individual care packages for Adults and Older People, whose social care needs fall within the county eligibility criteria, and live in the borough of Spelthorne. Working with Spelthorne Borough, alternative arrangements are being made for those older people currently attending Stanwell Day Centre who have been assessed as requiring day care services. Already Surrey County Council funds care provision at Benwell Day Centre for frail, older people with high needs who live across the borough, including Stanwell. We are working closely with Spelthorne Borough and will be re-providing the Benwell facility whilst extra care housing and the new day care within is being built.

Adults and Community Care supports the expansion of other services for frail older people including SPAN and the Meals on Wheels service and will be making an increased financial contribution towards this. We are also engaged in ongoing dialogue with Spelthorne Borough to explore other possibilities for joint provision for older people in the Stanwell Area”.

Mr Andrew McCluskey asked the following question

“How in the light of the decision to knock down the Stanwell Centre does the County Council plan to keep its existing standard of library service to Stanwell?”

The Area Director gave the following reply:

“I can confirm that Surrey County Council intends to maintain a library in Stanwell and is involved in the discussions with our various partners involved in the redevelopment proposals.”

Robin and Maire Marsden asked the following questions:

“Can the Committee please confirm (in respect of all parts of the following question):

- Whether the budget allocated for design and reinstatement of the Avenue/Manor Lane junction island, was spent on design only?
- Whether this money was provided by London Irish sponsorship and if they are aware how the money was actually spent?
- Who the Council’s contractors are and what steps are being taken to recoup these monies from them?
- Who is responsible for issuing such contracts?
- How will such a recurrence be prevented in respect of the Manor Lane Traffic Calming measures and will the same contractors be used (or is it put out to tender)?

Following the December Committee meeting and January residents/ Engineer meeting we understood that Manor Lane is a priority. When will funding be made available to commence these long awaited works?"

The Local Transportation Manager gave the following reply:

"A condition of the planning permission for the development at London Irish included a contribution of £30,000 for suitable traffic calming and two pedestrian refuges on The Avenue and £18,000 towards cycling, both in the vicinity of the development. The funding was not specifically for measures at The Avenue junction with Manor Lane. However, as there was insufficient funding to introduce a scheme along the length of The Avenue it was considered that this junction would be appropriate.

Our constructor produced several design options for traffic calming in the vicinity of The Avenue / Manor Lane the junction at a total cost of £23,244 leaving little for implementation. London Irish have not been contacted on this matter, which is usual practice.

The County Council has a partnering agreement whereby the constructor, Ringway, covers the west side of the county. It was a decision of SCC's Executive to appoint two constructors to the County.

The instruction to design a scheme for the junction was at a very early stage of the contract and was the only scheme I am aware of that produced several options for one location. Ringway is still the constructor for the west of the County and our instructions for design are now more specific.

With regard to traffic calming proposals along Manor Lane, while it may seem to be a long awaited scheme by residents, it is not unusual for a proposal to take several years to get to this stage, particularly where there is no recent history of casualties from road traffic collisions. This proposal is one of reassurance and supports the Community Speedwatch scheme that is carried out there. The funding for the proposals is set out in Item 14 of this report."

Mr John Hirsh asked the following question:

"The Lower Sunbury Residents' Association has made repeated requests for a full public consultation on the future of the TP 26 Linear Park and its landscaping. The stretch between French Street and The Avenue, in particular, is little more than a wasteland. There appears to have been no technical input on landscape design to help shape this valuable public open space; or even to determine its purpose.

The circulation of plans to Residents' committees and; what amounts to a 'street survey' of a limited number of residents in the immediate vicinity, do not constitute 'full public consultation'.

Will the Council reassure residents that no further steps will be taken on the future of TP 26 until such consultation (e.g. public exhibition, artist's impressions and full debate) has taken place?"

The Local Transportation Manager gave the following answer:

"The response to the public consultation regarding the route that a proposed shared pedestrian / cycle route should take across this land is set out at Item 15 of this Local Committee Agenda.

Unfortunately, the County Council does not have the staff resource to carry out a public exhibition on this proposal. However, the County and Borough are working in partnership on this proposal and the landscaping is an issue that Spelthorne will address.

Hence, here are no plans by the County to provide artists' impressions and subsequent debate on the uses of the land but I understand that the Borough Council may wish to consult further on their proposals."