

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 25th September 2006 St David's School, Church Road, Ashford

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*

Borough Council Members:

Councillor Gerry Ceaser*
Councillor Edward Culnane
Councillor Gerald Forsbrey*
Councillor Denise Grant*
Councillor Jack Pinkerton*
Councillor Robin Sider*
Councillor George Trussler*

*** = present**

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

- 23/06 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (ITEM 2)**
Apologies for absence were received from Mr. Agarwal and Mr Davies and Councillor Culnane.
- 24/06 MINUTES (ITEM 3)**
The Minutes of the meeting held on 19th June 2006 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.
- 25/06 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM 3)**
Councillor Sider declared a personal interest in respect of Annex A of item 15. Councillor Grant declared a personal interest in respect of item 11. Mrs Turner declared a personal interest in respect of paragraph 2.8 of item 16. Councillor Ceaser declared a personal interest in respect of paragraph 3.1 of item 16. Councillor Trussler declared a personal interest in respect of item 11.
- 26/06 PETITIONS (ITEM 4)**
Two new petitions were received which were the subject of separate reports on the agenda.

- 27/06 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME (ITEM 5)**
Three Members questions were received as set out in the annex attached together with the answers given.
- 28/06 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (ITEM 6)**
Seven public questions were received as set out in the annex attached together with the answers given.
- 29/06 FORWARD PROGRAMME (ITEM 7)**
It was reported that the December agenda would include reports on Members Funds and the Petition received previously from residents of Shepperton Road, Laleham. The report to the March meeting on the Christmas Park and Ride would be a review of that service.
Resolved:
The report be noted.
- 30/06 SELF RELIANCE IN STANWELL (ITEM 8)**
Resolved:
1. To note that Stanwell was a designated SCC Self Reliance area and that £150,000 had been allocated to spend during the years 2006/07, 2007/08 and 2008/09.
 2. To agree that the funds should primarily be used to bolster SCC services within Stanwell which would support children, young people families and improving educational attainment.
 3. Agreed that the Area Director should determine the specific allocation of self reliance funds within the priority areas set out in 2 above.
 4. To support the proposals set out in the report for the use of the self reliance funding which were (i) Stanwell Neighbourhood Youth Worker, (ii) Stanwell Mini Bridge Project (iii) Stanwell 7 Up Project and (iv) Early years intervention project and note that the Area Director would make the appropriate allocations within the available budget when the final costs were confirmed.
 5. Noted that if any self reliance money remained to be allocated after further discussions on the proposals in (4) above the Area Director would allocate this within the priority areas if agreed.
- 31/06 BELGRAVE ROAD, SUNBURY – PETITION REQUEST FOR ON STREET (ITEM 9)**
Resolved:
1. The petition be noted.
 2. No action be taken at this time.

32/06 VIOLA AVENUE, STANWELL – PETITION REQUEST FOR BOLLARDS (ITEM 10)

The Local Transportation Manager asked to be informed of any problems on particular days or times which Members became aware of. It was also suggested that the use of the Surrey Together team be investigated.

Resolved:

1. The petition be noted.
2. No action be taken at this time.

33/06 FELTHAM HILL ROAD, ASHFORD – PETITION REQUEST FOR ZEBRA CROSSING (ITEM 11)

The Local Transportation Manager reported that the consultation costs would be funded from the Safe Routes to Schools budget and not the Local Allocation as set out in paragraph 4.1.

Resolved:

1. The petition be noted
2. A scheme should be reconsidered and any future proposal would include consultation with local residents.

34/06 SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS PROGRAMMES (ITEM 12)

Mr Beardsmore asked for the A308 Staines Road West to be added to the list. Concern was expressed about the length of time being taken to complete the works on the A308 Windmill Road/Cadbury Road junction and the chaos being caused by the confusing road layout markings. The Local Transportation Manager reassured Members that she was actively in the process of seeking to resolve these issues including how to have the works completed speedily without having to temporarily alter the traffic signalling which could have a detrimental affect on the network. The Chairman undertook personally to keep this under close review.

Resolved:

1. The report be noted.
2. The updated programme of works for 2006/2007 and 2007/ 2008 be approved.

35/06 A308 KINGSTON ROAD AND STAINES BY PASS (FORDBRIDGE ROUNDABOUT SPEED LIMIT) (ITEM 13)

In response to Member questions the Local Transportation Manager advised that the Police did carry out enforcement along that stretch of the road. It was anticipated that the Order would be in place by January or February 2007.

Resolved:

1. The Borough of Spelthorne (Various Roads) (Restricted Roads and Speed Limits) Order 2001 be advertised for amendment, as shown on Annex A of the report.
2. The Borough of Spelthorne (Various Roads)

(Restricted Roads and Speed Limits) (Amendment No. 1) Order 2002 be revoked in its entirety.

3. If an objection was received before the end of the Objection period it be determined by the Local Transportation Manager in consultation with the Chairman, the Electoral Divisional Member and the Leader of the Borough Council.

36/06 ELMSLEIGH CENTRE/BUS STATION, STAINES – STOPPING UP THE HIGHWAY (ITEM 14)

Members hoped that GOSE would deal with this expeditiously.

Resolved:

If Spelthorne Borough Council made a formal application to the Government Office for the South East to have the land stopped up as public highway through Section 247 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the land be confirmed by the Head of Transportation as surplus to requirements.

37/06 LOCAL ALLOCATION 2006/07 (ITEM 15)

In regard to paragraph 2.3 – verge protection - Members were asked to inform the Local Transportation Manager of any other potential sites.

It was noted that the resurfacing near the junction of Manor Lane and The Avenue in Sunbury should be undertaken within the next two months.

Resolved:

That the forward programme as indicated at Annex B be approved.

38/06 MEMBERS FUNDS (ITEM 16)

Resolved:

1. The revised criteria and local guidance for the use of Members' Funds as set out in Appendices A and B be approved.
2. That subject to ratification by full Council on 17th October the delegated authority scheme in Spelthorne be implemented with immediate effect subject to the criteria laid down in the report, to the Area Director conducting appropriate consultations, to a maximum funding allocation of £1,000 and to applications agreed under delegated powers being reported to the next Local Committee meeting.
3. To note the current position relating to the £10,000 awarded in December 2005 for tree replacement and the contribution of £3,000 towards the scheme from Spelthorne Borough Council.
4. To note that the £250 funding given in October 2005 for tree removal from Mr Burrell's allocation had been

returned to his allocation as Surrey Transportation Service had funded this cost.

5. That £575 be granted towards a mosaic for the Arts Week Workshop at Knowle Park Infant School to be funded equally between Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Burrell, Ms Turner, Mr Davies and Mr Beardsmore.
6. That £4106 be granted towards new gym equipment at Kingscroft Primary School to be funded equally between Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Burrell, Ms Turner, Mr Davies and Mr Beardsmore.
7. That £1,000 be granted towards the regeneration and review of Staines Amateur Regatta to be funded equally between Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Burrell, Ms Turner, Mr Davies and Mr Beardsmore.
8. That £3,000 be granted towards the mobile youth provision in Stanwell Moor to be funded by Mr Agarwal.
9. That £10,000 be granted towards mobile youth provision in Sunbury Common and Ashford Common to be funded equally between Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Burrell, Ms Turner, Mr Davies and Mr Beardsmore.
10. That £2,000 be granted towards a junior choir for Spelthorne Young Voices to be funded equally between Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Burrell, Ms Turner, Mr Davies, Mr Beardsmore and Mrs Coleman.
11. £5,000 be granted from the capital allocation towards the installation of a new heating system at the Old School building in Littleton.

39/06

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting would be held on Monday 11th December at 7.00pm at Staines Community Centre, Thames Street, Staines.

The meeting which commenced at 7pm ended at 9.20pm

Chairman.....

**Annex to the Minutes of the SCC Local Committee in Spelthorne held on
25th September 2006**

AGENDA ITEM 5

MEMBER QUESTIONS

Mrs Coleman asked the following question:

“I have heard many complaints about the parking problems in Ashford, especially around schools. How do we now go about getting parking enforcement in the particular areas of complaint? Can we please have contact details for those responsible for parking enforcement?”

The Local Transportation Manager gave the following answer:

“Parking enforcement is carried out by Spelthorne Borough Council under an agency agreement with the County Council. Any concern about enforcement can be sent to David Scoggins, Parking Services Manager, who can be contacted at: d.scoggins@spelthorne.gov.uk”

Mrs Coleman asked the following question:

“Can we please be informed what the community gangs are, what they do, how their work is selected/prioritised, how often they are in an area, and for how long? Are these gangs active in the whole of Surrey, and does Spelthorne have a community gang? If so, how long has Spelthorne had one, and will members be able to have any say in what works are done where?”

The Local Transportation Manager asked the following answer:

“Each district in Surrey has a Community Gang that carries out minor works to cut back vegetation, overhanging branches, install bollards / posts and plug potholes on a temporary basis. They are not equipped to carry out permanent highway patch repairs. The Spelthorne Community Gang’s work is prioritised by highway maintenance staff and is determined by the complaints and enquiries received. If an issue is considered to be sufficiently urgent to warrant action on the same day, the Community Gang can respond.

Spelthorne has had a Community Gang for over 3 years and Members’ work is often included on the schedules. This ensures expert advice and knowledge from officers and that the work that is carried out is included within the maintenance contract and on the public highway. “

Mrs Coleman asked the following question:

"I have had many complaints about the weed growth on pavements and roads in Ashford. Could we please be informed what problems there are with treating weed growth, and when the weeds in Ashford were last treated? Could we also please be informed when they are to be treated/removed?"

The Local Transportation Manager asked the following answer:

"Weed growth this year has been particularly strong and the second weed spray started on 18th September. It takes about 3 weeks to cover the whole of the Spelthorne area and we have 2 weed sprays each year. The weeds in Ashford were last treated in May / June 2006 within the 1st weed spray for the current financial year."

AGENDA ITEM 6

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Mr. John Seaman asked the following question:

"The Spelthorne Bulletin (No. 76 September 2006 page 4 states "Citizens Advice Bureaux (CAB) Plans have been agreed for the CAB to be located in Sunbury Library"

1.1 Has the proposed move of the Sunbury CAB to Sunbury Library been discussed by Surrey County Council, its Committees or Officers?

1.2 If so please give details.

2.1 Has there been any consultation with users of Sunbury Library about this proposed move?

2.2 If so please give details.

3.1 If the proposed move takes place where will the Sunbury CAB be located in Sunbury Library?

3.2 What effect will this have on the service currently provided at Sunbury Library, including access and book stock?

4.1 Has the proposed move been formally agreed by Surrey County Council?

4.2 If so please give details."

The Area Manager Libraries North West asked the following answer:

"1.1 Surrey County Council's Libraries and Culture Division and Spelthorne Borough have many examples of working in partnership including the provision of Stanwell library, where service will be maintained in Stanwell despite closure of the Day Centre and the Staines Library/ Spelthorne Museum project which will be completed soon. When the decision to close the

Benwell Day Centre and Stanwell Day Centre was made, officers held a meeting to discuss the issues arising.

A proposal was agreed locally to investigate the possibility of putting the CAB into Sunbury library, which has very low levels of use of space available for a library of its size- issues of 264 per square metre against an average of similar libraries of 378 issues per square metres and where there has been concern for some time about declining use. The proposal was taken to Estates Property Management within SCC where it was felt to be in line with a strategy of co-location and making better use of space and more detailed discussions were then carried out. Only minor adaptations are needed to relatively unused space on the upper floor to accommodate the CAB and a licence to occupy the space will be drawn up. It was not felt that this needed to go through a committee process, as adaptations are minor and the impact on service minimal.

2.1 Consultation with users of Sunbury library about this move has not been held directly as the impact on the service will be minimal.

There is great synergy between the work of the CAB and the library, there will be mutual benefit in use of reference materials, information technology etc for its users and it will bring a stream of visitors to the library which will encourage use and make the library more sustainable for the future.

3.1 The CAB will be located at the rear of the upper floor and space previously used for storage will be incorporated minimising the impact on floor space. Building work will start in November and the CAB will open in the library in January. This is seen as a positive opportunity by CAB and Libraries and Culture.

3.2 There will be no impact on access except for some temporary unavailability of the upper floor during adaptations. Apart from routine stock weeding, stock is being relocated not reduced in the move.

4.1 There is no requirement for such a proposal to have a formal agreement, as long as the sharing of accommodation is agreed and a proper lease drawn up by Estates Management."

Mr. John Carruthers asked the following question:

"At the Borough Planning Committee of the 13th September 2006 an interesting situation occurred. The Planning report to the Committee on an item stated that under Highways consultation SCC had No Objections to the Application so long as certain minor conditions were included with any Approval. This seemed clear enough, yet one of the Committee members was then able to quote chapter and verse from SCC Policy, and facts issued by SCC, that seemed to flatly contradict the given advice of no objection. Also Members present openly also voiced their own grave doubt as to the adequacy of the proposed highways measures, wishing to add this as a

further reason for a refusal. However, because the SCC professional Highways Officer had nevertheless specifically stated that County had no objection to the scheme under consideration, the Committee with great misgivings decided regretfully that it had to accept this advice, in spite of the highways problems that clearly still needed to be solved. The meeting was in public and the frustration was felt by all present. In fact older members of the Local Committee will remember two to three years ago attempting to improve liaison and co-operation between Officers and Members of both Councils on this same subject but with limited success.

Bearing in mind that the Local Committee now includes Borough Members, would you not agree that this is an ideal forum in which to raise such matters to achieve greater understanding and working in unity, and to agree a protocol should such a situation occur again? Is it not true that in this particular case any future road safety measures needed to overcome the perceived safety hazards will be now only at the cost of the County and the Public rather than the developer? Also in future would it be less passive, and in fact more accurate, for Borough Planning reports to actually state there ARE objections that can be overcome by....., rather than the current passive No Objections provided that? The existing wording reduces that importance of the conditions attached."

The Local Transportation Manager asked the following answer:

"The provision of highway observations on planning applications is delegated to County Council Officers that are passed to Spelthorne Borough Council for inclusion in their reports. It is for the Borough Council to decide on the content of their reports and whether the highway requirements are recommended for approval.

I understand from colleagues that the planning application you refer to may be Little Manor and Taranaki on Green Street, Sunbury. I also understand that the application was refused and it was resolved that the Borough Council would contact the County Council to establish the reason for not objecting to the scheme when it appears to be below their normal standards for visibility / junction separation.

With regard to highway safety, observations are provided to address potential hazards that a proposal could introduce and to take into consideration any known casualty problem.

The wording contained in the Borough's committee reports refers to the format that the observations are provided to them by the County Council. Planning permissions are granted subject to various conditions. The same positive approach to development is used by County Council colleagues in Transportation Development Control.

There is a protocol that deals with the way planning applications are dealt with whereby relevant County Councillors are notified of significant applications. There is also a provision whereby a request may be made by the Chairman

for an information item to be provided to the Local Committee Members on major developments e.g. Two Rivers in Staines. The planning applications on Green Street would not be large enough to warrant such a report.”

Mrs Sandra Bryant asked the following question:

“I would like the Local committee to answer the following questions at the meeting on 25th September please, I will fax or post the relevant photos.

When driving from west or east along Russell rd towards the mini roundabout with Walton Lane, lots of residents cannot understand why very few drivers obey the Highway Code rules, I feel that this is because the signs are in the wrong order and in the wrong places.

With an average of 110-1200 vehicles an hour (a quarter of the M42 per hour, the busiest M way in UK) , if driving behind a lorry van or HGV the signs are not visible to car and van drivers, also the roundabout signs are after the roundabout, and being one of the most famous and popular cycle paths in the UK, the absence of any signs is dangerous for all.

Also the surface of the roundabout ring marking is very tilted and the recently laid tarmac and old tarmac so uneven it is dangerous to drive around, the rattling of axles is deafening,

The tarmac recently laid in Walton lane is dangerous as it was not levelled in the middle and the tarmac for the roundabout was just dumped down

Could the roundabout please be levelled and the signs corrected please?”

The Local Transportation Manager asked the following answer:

“I have checked the signing at the roundabout and agree that it should be improved. The review of traffic calming along Russell Road will be carried out shortly and reported to the next meeting of this Committee so I shall ensure this signing is included in the review.

The road surface at the roundabout does tilt but I do not consider it to be hazardous. The surfacing along Walton Lane is uneven at the middle of the road, along the longitudinal joint, caused by the overlap of binder. This is attributed to by the alignment of the road. They are generally under the centre line roadmakings so they should not be driven over frequently”

Mr Fred Wallin asked the following question:

“Could I have an up-date of progress made to the proposed footbridge across the railway at Clockhouse Lane? If nothing has been achieved can I ask once

again, if the embankment at the approach to the bridge could be infilled from the smallholdings to the bridge parapet. This would allow pedestrians and possibly cyclists some protection for 80% of the journey.”

The Local Transportation Manager asked the following answer:

“Discussion with officers from the London Borough of Hounslow is on-going. The next stage is to establish the requirements of Network Rail. An officer level meeting with these colleagues had been arranged to take place on 12 September but was cancelled by Network Rail due to staff sickness. The meeting is being rearranged.

This bridge is clearly hazardous to cross on foot. I consider that the provision of a safer environment for about 80% of the route could encourage more pedestrians to use the bridge, which could lead to an increase in the number of collisions and injuries that occur there.”

Caroline Hunter asked the following question:

“I would like to know where Guildford Street is on the priority list of tree maintenance works which was quoted by the Local Transportation Director in response to a question from Mrs Saliagopoulous on 20 February. On 20 March the Annual Highway Maintenance Management Plan for 2006/7 also mentioned the development of a 5 year maintenance schedule.

I live in Guildford Street, Staines and there is a large lime tree approximately 7m tall on the pavement, less than 1m from the boundary wall of my property and 2m from the front wall of my property.

I have lived here for some 8 years and during this time there has been no tree maintenance carried out. I have been writing to the Local Transportation Director regularly over the last few years requesting that pruning of the tree is undertaken as it now dwarfs my house, large branches are overhanging my roof and the front of my property, tree roots have recently caused a crack to appear in my front wall and are destroying my path and damage to my foundations.

I believe that many other residents have also contacted the Council requesting maintenance be carried out.

I am anxious to prevent further damage to my property and, since it appears the Council is unwilling to carry out its maintenance responsibilities, I have started to obtain quotes to remove the overhanging branches from my property in order to avoid potential roof damage over the winter period. I have been advised to consider taking legal action to recover the cost from the Council.”

The Local Transportation Manager asked the following answer:

“To deal with the many requests we receive for tree maintenance, a priority list has been compiled. This priority list assesses the tree as to whether it is dead or causes potential danger, root problems, road safety problems, potential damage to property / insurance claim, public safety / law & order problems or a nuisance to residents.

Guildford Street is about 50th on the priority list of works to be ordered. The estimated cost to bring all trees along Guildford Street up to specification is £6,000. Unfortunately, we have already spent the tree maintenance budget of £75,000 for this financial year.”

Mr A Wells asked the following question:

“Pot holes in Upper Halliford Service Road Leading into Birch Grove.

For the past 18 months I have written and spoke to Surrey County Council Highways Dept Contact name Mr George Wells, which I find is a waste of my time and money and four weeks to get a reply from the Council. What the residents want to know is WHY HAS THE REPAIR NOT BEEN DONE, which has now become more dangerous. The council have been informed that if an accident happens they shall be held responsible.”

The Local Transportation Manager asked the following answer:

“We currently have 667 outstanding maintenance enquiries across Spelthorne. Priority is given to heavily used routes and shopping areas. However, I have arranged for the potholes in Upper Halliford Service Road that leads to Birch Grove to be filled within the next two weeks.”

Mrs M Kane asked the following question:

"Urgent action is necessary within this borough to deal with shrubs and bushes in front gardens overhanging the pavements at eye level and low growing plants spreading onto the pavement, reducing the walking area and creating a hazard, particularly to residents with deteriorating sight.

I am concerned mostly about the area in Sunbury in which I live, namely:

Cumberland Gardens where a large tree planted in the green verge currently has branches spreading across the pavement and there is no alternative but to walk through it or walk on the road; further along spiky shrubs between paving stones on the pavement hide broken and uneven pavements.

In Kinross Drive a series of bushes at eye level, including a shrub bearing large thorns overhanging the pavement and ivy growing over the low wall has

spread half way across the pavement. This matter has already been reported to Spelthorne Borough who referred me to Surrey Highways. I was told an Inspector would attend but in 14 months the situation has increased with stinging nettles now growing out of the Ivy.

In Oakhall Drive a thick overgrown privet bush hangs across the pavement forcing one to step into the road in order to pass. All the way around there are crops of weeds growing in the gutters.

At the entrance of the Groveley Road Park in Groveley Road there are bramble type thorns growing out at eyelevel and each day I tuck one back on itself and the next day there is another that has grown.

Does the rule still apply that residents should keep their plants and shrubs trimmed to within their boundary and not overhanging nor allowed to encroach on the pavement? What is SCC proposing to do about this please?"

The Local Transportation Manager asked the following answer:

"Cumbernauld Gardens. I am not aware of a tree in the verge with branches sprouting across the footway but have arranged for our Highway Steward to visit the location and order remedial works as necessary. With regard to the footway condition, the last inspection by our constructor Ringway was on 1 May when no defects were noted, although the footway condition was officially noted as "Below Average". The second weed spray of the year is currently underway.

Kinross Drive, Oakhall Drive and the entrance to Groveley Road park appear to be enforcement issues. I have been unable to locate a previous report on Kinross Drive regarding overgrown vegetation.

Residents and other landowners should keep plants and shrubs within their boundaries and there should be no overhanging or encroachment onto the public highway. Indeed, under the Highways Act 1980, private owners have a duty to maintain vegetation such that it does not, by overgrowing the highway, impede the passage of vehicles or pedestrians. Unfortunately, this is a time consuming process and we have insufficient resources to deal with the number of encroachment issues that have occurred across the Borough"