

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE**

**Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 17<sup>th</sup> March 2008 at The Bishop Wand School Conference Centre, Laytons Lane, Sunbury on Thames**

**County Council Members:**

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

**Borough Council Members:**

**Councillor Colin Davis\***  
**Councillor Gerry Forsbrey\***  
**Councillor Denise Grant**  
**Councillor Jack Pinkerton**  
**Councillor Robin Sider\***  
**Councillor Richard Smith-Ainsley**  
**Councillor George Trussler\***

**\* = present**

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

- 18/08            APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (ITEM 1)**  
Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Packman (and his substitute was Councillor Davis), Councillors Grant and Pinkerton.
- 19/08            MINUTES (ITEM 2)**  
The Minutes of the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2008 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.
- 20/08            DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM 3)**  
Councillors Colin Davis, Sider, Trussler and Forsbrey declared a personal interest in respect of the Airtrack report agenda item 8.
- 21/08            CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Item 4)**  
The Chairman brought to Members' attention the variety of community projects which the Local Committee had supported through the distribution of Members' funds and acknowledged the work undertaken by Keely Duddy and Elaine Bennett in the administration of the funds. The Chairman was also pleased to announce that the County Council would shortly be entering into a contract with Spelthorne Borough Council to undertake grass

cutting and certain highway maintenance works. The Borough Council would be supplementing the County Council's budget of approximately £210,000 for this with a contribution of an additional £100,000. It was also noted that the Chairman and Vice Chairman had written to the London Borough of Hounslow and Transport for London seeking support and funding for the Clockhouse Lane bridge works which the SCC Executive Member for Highways also supported.

**22/08 PETITIONS (ITEM 5)**

One petition signed by 268 residents, with photographs setting out examples of residents' concerns, was presented by Councillor Pat Weston requesting weight restrictions for HGVs using Feltham Road, Ashford. The Chairman thanked Councillor Weston for bringing this matter to the Committee's attention and asked that this be looked into quickly and seriously.

**Resolved:**

The Local Highways Manager investigate this matter and report on this to the Local Committee.

**23/08 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME (ITEM 6)**

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

**24/08 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (ITEM 7)**

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

**25/08 AIRTRACK CONSULTATION (ITEM 8)**

The Chairman welcomed Richard Morris from CJ Associates and Mike Noakes from BAA to the meeting and Mr Morris gave a presentation to Members on the options being proposed in the consultation.

There was a wide ranging discussion about the options and Members sought clarification and more information about a number of issues. Mr Morris undertook to respond to Members in relation to some of the points he would need to obtain further information about.

There were no decisions about a preferred option at this stage but Members asked a number of questions, raised several concerns and made various comments as set down below. Generally there was a feeling that because of the uncertainties about so many issues it was difficult to regard this as a consultation.

- Whether new railway stock would be purchased and if so whether this had been costed

- How the various public views on the different options would be weighed and if the overwhelming view was against if the scheme would not proceed
- Whether the ownership of the new station would be BAA or Network Rail
- Whether there could be a station at Stanwell Moor
- There was no support for the overhead electrification proposals
- The BAA's preferred electrification up to Staines Station would have a significant detrimental visual impact causing a disfigurement of the landscape around Staines and on Staines Moor.
- Whether consideration could be given to the change over from the overhead gantries could take place just outside Terminal 5 and before Staines Moor to avoid the gantries having to come right into Staines (BAA's preferred option). Clarification was being sought on the distance between and tunnel exit and Stanwell Moor and whether the changeover could occur there
- There was considerable concern about the negative environmental impact the proposals would have on Staines Moor and its special status as an SSSI
- Three Members supported Option 4 as being the option having the least negative environmental impact on Staines Moor
- Staines had the potential to become another Clapham Junction with 304 additional trains per day
- That the residents of Stanwell Moor and Staines would reap all the considerable disbenefits for the sake of the benefits to non Spelthorne resident users of the Heathrow Express service
- Whether environmental studies had been undertaken to assess the detrimental impacts on the environment in Spelthorne and what their conclusions were so far?
- Whether consideration had been given to providing additional car parking in Staines
- What security would be available at the new station and by whom, Surrey Police, British Transport Police or BAA?
- What measures would be put in place to prevent people from getting onto the rails?

**Resolved:**

- (i) That the various views expressed by Members as set out above be submitted to CJ Associates as the Local Committee's response at this stage.

**26/08****MEMBERS FUNDS (ITEM 9)**

Members noted that the following requests had been approved under delegated authority (i) Kingscroft Junior School £1,000 for four picnic tables and 2 outside notice/chalk boards from Mrs

Saliagopoulos's allocation (ii) Echelford School £700 towards outdoor play equipment from Mr Davies' allocation and (iii) Priory Green Trees £1,000 from Mrs Turner-Stewart's allocation.

**Resolved:**

1. To approve a change in use of funding for Age Concern for funding awarded in March 2007 (paragraph 2.1)
2. To note funding approved under delegated authority since the last meeting (paragraphs 2.2 - 2.8 and items reported orally).
3. To approve an application for funding of £3500 from Spelthorne Borough Council for the installation of a CCTV camera in Spout Lane, Stanwell from Mr Agarwal's allocation.
4. To approve an application for funding of £1558.60 from Shepperton Library towards the installation of a storage shed from Mr Davies' allocation.
5. To note an application for funding of £1000 from Spelthorne Borough Council for the purchase and planting of ten trees at Priory Green approved under delegated authority.
6. To approve funding of £2697 to WR Sports for the installation of benches, water heaters, signs, shed and waste bins to be funded £2580 from Mrs Turner-Stewart's allocation and £117 from Mr Beardsmore's allocation.
7. To approve an application from Thomas Knyvett College for funding of £6175 for gym refurbishment, to be funded from the capital allocation.
8. To note the use of capital monies and Members' Funds to promote the economic, environmental and social well being of Spelthorne.
9. To record their thanks to Keely Duddy and Elaine Bennett for their support to Members in administering the Members' funds allocation scheme.

**27/08**

**FORWARD PROGRAMME 2008/09 (ITEM 10)**

**Resolved:**

- (i) Agreed to include in the forward programme of items (i) the number of Spelthorne children missing from school rolls and (ii) update on Surrey Connexions service in Spelthorne (iii) further consideration be given to the forward programme at the termly meeting to be arranged for after the Annual meeting of the Council in May.
- (ii) To note the next informal meeting of the Local Committee would be on 28<sup>th</sup> April which would include a report on school attainment in Spelthorne.

**28/08**

**LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN PROGRAMME FOR 2008/09 (ITEM 11)**

There was a discussion on the merits or otherwise of having the assessment list given resources would only enable so few of the schemes to proceed. The Local Highways Manager explained

that the list was a combination of suggestions from Members, residents and the local highways service which needed to be assessed objectively against certain criteria.

**Resolved:**

- (1) That the following schemes be included in the LTP
  - (i) Priority 2 – Green Street j/w Nursery Road Pedestrian facilities £15,000 - design
  - (ii) Priority 4 - Clockhouse Lane Ped/Cycle bridge £20,000 – design (part)
  - (iii) Shepperton Road bend realignment £60,000 - implementation
  - (iv) Priority 19 - Staines Road West j/w School Road Pedestrian facilities and turning movements £20,000 - design
- (2) To note that Priority 20 - Kingston Road j/w Woodthorpe Road Pedestrian facilities £15,000 – design would be funded from Section 106 monies

**29/08****LOCAL ALLOCATION 2008/09 (ITEM 12).****Resolved:**

- (1) To include in the proposed programme for 2008/09
  - (ii) Waiting restrictions 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment Borough wide £25,000
  - (iii) Mobility ramps Borough wide £5,000
  - (iv) 20mph zones associated traffic calming Staines and Lower Sunbury £15,000
  - (v) The Local Highways Manager would report back to the Local Committee when the full budget details for the Local Allocation were known
- (2) To note that Charlton Lane – gating in Lower Sunbury £2,000 had been approved previously by the Local Committee.

**30/08****REVIEW OF REQUESTS FOR AMENDMENTS TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS (ITEM 13)**

Councillor asked that in future the assessment list be given a glossary.

**Resolved:**

- (i) the 34 highest priority locations on the list of requests for amendments to waiting restrictions as shown at Annex A be advertised by public notice;
- (ii) subject to no objection being received these restrictions be implemented;
- (iii) if an objection was received before the end of the objection period, it be determined by the Local Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman, the Local Electoral Division Member and the Leader of the Borough

Council; and

- (iv) the implementation of the amendments be funded from the Local Allocation 2008 / 2009 at an estimated cost of £25,000.

**31/08**

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING (ITEM 14)**

The next meeting would be held on Monday 30<sup>TH</sup> June 2008 at St David's Parish Centre, Everest Road, Stanwell.

The meeting which commenced at 7.00pm ended at 9.18pm..

Chairman.....

**Annex to the Minutes of the SCC Local Committee in Spelthorne held on  
17<sup>th</sup> March 2008**

**AGENDA ITEM 6**

**MEMBERS QUESTIONS**

**Mrs Saliagopoulos asked the following question:**

“Can I please have an update regarding s106 monies yet to be spent?”

**The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:**

“The available S.106 funds in Spelthorne is set out at Annex A, on the attached sheet.”

**Mrs Turner-Stewart asked the following question:**

“Could the Highways Manager please provide a comprehensive schedule of all outstanding works programmed for Staines South, Ashford West, that have been generated by complaints from members of the public or from the Divisional Member?

Could timescales be provided where appropriate?

Could satisfactory reasoning be given for any requests that are unable to be acted upon?”

**Mrs Coleman asked the following question:**

“Could the Highways Manager please provide a comprehensive schedule of all outstanding works programmed for Ashford that have been generated by complaints from members of the public or from the Divisional Member?

Could timescales be provided where appropriate?

Could satisfactory reasoning be given for any requests that are unable to be acted upon?

What is the average time taken for the person reporting the highways complaint to receive a reply from Surrey County Council Highways?

What is the percentage of complaints that do not get a reply?

How many repairs need to be redone?”

**The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:**

“The County Council distinguishes between complaints and enquiries. Since the beginning of January the County has received 1578 enquiries and four complaints relating to the Spelthorne Area. The County’s system for logging enquiries does not cater for reporting split by electoral ward.

It is not possible to automatically calculate which enquiries result in a job and bearing in mind the number of enquiries, manually completing this task would be quite onerous.

Since January, 875 jobs for work on the highway have been raised in Spelthorne. These were the result of public enquiries, highway safety inspections and issues picked up by Council Officers.

Safety critical jobs are committed automatically, with other jobs committed as resources become available. Since January 533 jobs have been committed of which 324 jobs are in progress or have been completed. The remaining 209 jobs are awaiting commencement by our Constructor.

Jobs are prioritised according to a number of factors including the Council's defect matrix, available resources, the impact of the defect and other works planned in the area.

Resources are not unlimited and some defects may be postponed for some time as they do not meet the criteria for the repair. However, for 2008 / 2009 some funds are being diverted from the Local Transport Plan Schemes Budget to resurfacing schemes to help address on-going maintenance needs.

At the end of December the Key Performance Indicator for works completed "right first time" for West Area Highways was 92% for the current financial year.

The enquiries that were responded to within time for weeks ending 28 December 2007 and 07 March 2008 were 28% and 49% respectively. For the same dates the average countywide response rates were 42% and 54%. The improvement in response rates reflects the very considerable effort that has been put into enquiries by all staff, aided by an additional member of staff within Spelthorne. All enquiries that request a reply should get one."

## **AGENDA ITEM 7**

### **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

#### **Mr John Carruthers asked the following question:**

"There has been discussion in the media about saving money by turning off street lights overnight. There will be arguments for and against and clearly some lights will be more needed than others. With about 10,000 street lights in Spelthorne alone, including a couple of thousand keep left etc lights, the ability to make substantial energy savings is possible. Something that must be close to County's heart the way that it is being treated financially by Government. Also old Sunbury UDC area lights are with time clocks will be easier to adjust than the light activated Staines UDC ones. As the responsible authority, please may I be informed what policy and action on the above is intended?"



**The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:**

“There are about 8,500 lighting units in Spelthorne (of which about 110 are currently controlled by time clocks), about 1,220 illuminated signs and about 580 bollards.

As a part of the proposed street lighting Private Finance Initiative (at their meeting on 11 March the Executive approved the project progressing to the next stage - "Best and Final Offer") it is currently proposed to provide all new street lighting units with the ability to change the lighting levels and be turned off for part of the night.

The ability to adjust the lighting levels will mostly affect the main traffic routes. The current standard practice is to design lighting levels on traffic routes to the peak traffic flows on that route such that at other times of the night lighting levels are consequently higher than the traffic flows at that time would justify if designed to those traffic levels. The proposal is to set the lighting such that the lighting levels reduce and increase at appropriate times to be compatible with the traffic flows (i.e. higher in the "rush hours" and lower in-between).

In addition there will be the facility to turn off or similarly lower lighting levels in residential roads at appropriate times during the night. This facility would not be implemented until after appropriate discussions with the relevant communities, and in reality is not expected to be implemented in the majority of situations.

All reductions in lighting levels and part night-time lighting have the potential to reduce energy costs but this must be after ensuring that traffic safety and crime/fear of crime are not compromised.”

**Mr David Penny asked the following question:**

“Residents in Leacroft and Priory Green are concerned that the Mustard Mill Road junction with South street has been problematical since it was constructed. It is understood that software has been purchased to do some Mathematical modelling of the various options. This of course should have been done before the construction. Has such modelling now been carried out? What are the results of this? It is obvious that this junction causes many of the traffic problems in Staines town centre.”

**The Local Highways Manager will give the following answer:**

“The paramics model of Staines Town Centre is well developed and available for testing options when the needs arise. Following the compilation of the model some adjustment was made to the traffic signal timings at High Street / Mustard Mill Road / South Street which have resolved some of the congestion difficulties.

Members may recall the receipt of a similar question last December “

**Councillor Marian Rough has asked the following question:**

“As residents perceive Borough responsible for pavements and not County, views expressed and heard whilst canvassing etc. Would the Committee accept that a control measure should be put in place particularly in the matter of infill development when pavements around the site are damaged? Being based upon joint interest and communication -this could be at planning stage locally and information passed to County if action is required. It does not seem feel or reasonable for residents to face the inconvenience and risk or in effect eventually to pay for restitution via their taxes whilst the developer is absolved from his responsibilities and enjoys fuller profits.”

**The Local Highways Manager will give the following answer:**

“It is the responsibility of the resident or developer who is organising the works to be carried out to ensure there is no resultant damage to the public highway.

When officers observe or are made aware of damage to the highway, they seek to get the highway repaired at the expense of the resident / developer. Where that is not possible or agreement cannot be gained, SCC would repair the damage and recharge the resident / developer. If they decline to take responsibility for the damage, we could take legal action against them to recover our costs.

It is a matter for the resident / developer to decide whether or not they should pursue the matter with the business responsible for the construction work.

If specific sites cause concern they should be referred to the Local Highways Manager.”

**Councillor Caroline Nicholls asked the following question:**

“ I understand the Charlton Lane Community Recycling Centre site is closing for refurbishment but I can find nothing on either the Surrey or Spelthorne Council website. What improvements will be made? When will the site be closed and for how long? What should residents do with their waste/recyclables during the closure period?

I understand there is the possibility of introducing food and green waste recycling at Charlton. Is this Surrey’s preferred option and will a food/green waste plant stop the use of the site for an incinerator? Is Surrey CC in negotiations with a plant provider? What type of waste process is proposed and what are the likely timescales for its introduction? What is the envisaged catchment area for food/green waste collection and how many extra traffic movements will this generate each year? Will the site also continue to accept household recyclables? “

**The County Waste Minimisation Officer gave the following answer**

“Refurbishment of the Charlton Lane Community Recycling Centre is scheduled to commence on 19th May 2008 and is expected to be completed by September 2008. The refurbishment work will involve the extension of the

existing site to provide additional recycling and waste containers which will be sunk into the ground so that they can be accessed without having to climb steps.

The development is taking place as an extension to the existing site, and therefore the site will remain open during the refurbishment works.

The Charlton Lane site has been identified within the Submission Draft Surrey Waste Plan as a site which is potentially suitable for waste treatment, including treatment by thermal means.

The County Council, as Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) is currently evaluating the potential for use of the Charlton Lane site in light of the planning inspectors' report and no firm decision has yet been made to the types of facility that may be developed on the site in the future. However the Waste Disposal Authority is recommending to the County Council's Executive on 25th March that the second Energy from Waste Plant, outlined in the WDA Action Plan, should be developed at Land adjacent to Trumps Farm, Kitsmead Lane, Longcross.

We expect that the potential uses that the WDA may have for the site will be clearer towards Spring/Summer 2008.

The WDA has identified the need for facilities to process kitchen and garden waste either by anaerobic digestion or 'In Vessel composting' and this capacity is planned to be available from 2010. The WDA is in discussion with its waste management contractor, Surrey Waste Management Ltd, with regard to provision of these facilities.

If the WDA were to consider developing a digester or in vessel composter at the Charlton Lane site then issues such as the catchment area and traffic movements would be identified as part of the necessary planning application.

There are no plans to stop collecting household recyclable materials at the site and we would expect this function to continue in the event that other waste management facilities were developed on the site."

Spelthorne S.106 Agreements

Below is a list of S.106 Agreements in Spelthorne.

Public Transport

Planning application location	Available funds in £s	Details
Old Police Station, London Road, Staines	122,600	Provide public transport / cycle / pedestrian improvements
Tillys Lane (ABC Cinema), Staines	122,500	Transport initiatives in Staines Town Centre (SVD) or non car user initiatives
Centurian House, London Road, Staines	49,600	Alternative transport initiatives in area of development

Scheme specific

Former ABC Cinema, Clarence Street, Staines	98,600	Close central gap and extend guardrail. Upgrade pedestrian route across Staines Bridge
Tilly's Lane, Staines	13,200	Church Street improvements
London Irish, The Avenue, Sunbury	29,300	Traffic calming / pedestrian refuges in The Avenue
Former Council Depot, Commercial Road, Staines	49,600	Improvement to Laleham Road / Commercial Road
Staines Town FC, Wheatsheaf Lane, Staines	10,000	Traffic calming within vicinity of club.
BP Sunbury, Chertsey Road, Ashford	51,700	Controlled parking zone only
HMP Ashford, Woodthorpe Road, Ashford	36,500	Pedestrian phasing at Woodthorpe Road / Kingston Road

Committed Sums

BP Sunbury, Chertsey Road, Ashford	43,200	Maintenance of block pavements
--	--------	-----------------------------------

17 March 2008