

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 30th June 2008 at St David's Parish Centre, Everest Road, Stanwell

County Council Members:

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

Borough Council Members:

**Councillor Gerry Forsbrey*
Councillor Denise Grant*
Councillor John Packman
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)

- 32/08 CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN (Item 1)**
It was noted that Denise Turner-Stewart and Denise Saliagopoulos had been appointed by Council as Chairman and Vice Chairman respectively for this Municipal year.
- 33/08 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL APPOINTED MEMBERS (ITEM 2)**
Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Packman.

It was noted that Councillors J.D. Packman, R. A. Smith-Ainsley, G.E. Forsbrey, Mrs D. L. Grant, Jack D. Pinkerton, R. W. Sider and G.F. Trussler had been appointed to the Local Committee by Spelthorne Borough Council. Councillors .F. Ayers, M. L. Bouquet, C.A. Davis, H.R. Jaffer, Mrs V.J. Leighton, Mrs I. Napper and Mrs C. L. Spencer had been appointed as deputies.
- 34/08 MINUTES (ITEM 3)**
The Minutes of the meeting held on 17th March 2008 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.
- 35/08 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM 4)**

Borough Councillors Smith –Ainsley, Forsbrey, Mrs Grant, Pinkerton and Trussler declared a prejudicial interest in respect of item 14 and left the meeting during consideration of this item. Borough Councillor Sider declared a personal interest in respect of item 14. Mr Burrell declared a prejudicial interest in respect of item 13 recommendation 10 and left the meeting during consideration of this item.

36/08 PETITIONS (Item 5)

1 petition was presented in respect of Dunally Park and 5 petitions were presented in respect of Controlled Parking Zones in Staines.

37/08 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME (ITEM 6)

Five Member questions were received as set out in the annex attached together with the answers given.

38/08 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (ITEM 7)

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

39/08 LOCAL COMMITTEE PROTOCOL (ITEM 8)**Resolved:**

The Protocol set out in Appendix A be approved.

40/08 REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES AND APPOINTMENT OF TASKS GROUPS (ITEM 9)**Resolved:**

1. The Chairman be appointed to the Spelthorne Together (Local Strategic Partnership) and the Vice Chairman as Deputy.
2. The Chairman be appointed to the Safer, Stronger Spelthorne Partnership (Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership) and the Vice Chairman as Deputy.
3. Mrs Coleman be appointed to the Thriving Spelthorne Partnership.
4. Mr Burrell be appointed to the Health and Social Well Being Partnership
5. Mr Burrell be appointed to the Spelthorne Younger People Partnership
6. Mrs Saliagopoulos be appointed to the Community Learning Partnership.
7. No Member be appointed to the Transport/Getting About Spelthorne Group for the time being.
8. Mr Davies and Mr Burrell be appointed to the Walton Bridge Task Group.
9. The On street Parking Partnership be reconstituted with the terms of reference set out in paragraph 3 and Mrs Saliagopoulos and Mrs Coleman be appointed.

10. Mrs Turner-Stewart or Mr Berardsmore, depending upon their availability, be appointed to the Thames Flood Forum subject to confirmation that a place is available.

41/08 FORWARD PROGRAMME (ITEM 10)

It was noted that the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service would report to the 29th September meeting of the Local Committee.

Resolved:

1. The programme of reports to the Local Committee for 2008/09 be as set out below.
2. An informal meeting of the Local Committee be held on 3rd November 2008 at 7pm.

42/08 ANNUAL UPDATE ON COMMUNITY SAFETY (ITEM 11)

The Chairman welcomed Superintendent Jerry Westerman to the meeting who gave a presentation.

Resolved:

1. The budget of £24,000 devolved to the Local Committee for community safety be transferred to the Spelthorne Safer Stronger Partnership to be spent to further the work of the Group, £12,000 of this funding to be specifically ring-fenced for the provision of a domestic abuse outreach service locally.
2. To note the activities of the Spelthorne Safer and Stronger Communities Community Partnership in 2007/08 and plans for 2008/09.

43/08 STANWELL MOOR COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN (ITEM 12)

The Chairman welcomed Brian Harris, Assistant Chief Executive to the meeting.

Resolved:

To note and endorse the Plan but agreed that no resources could be committed at the present time.

44/08 MEMBERS FUNDS (ITEM 13 AND ADDENDUM REPORT)**Resolved:**

1. The criteria for the use of Members' Funds for 2008/09 remain as for 2008/09 and approved accordingly.
2. The amendment to the guidance note for the use of Members' Funds in relation to the funding of individuals (Paragraph 5 of Appendix B) be approved.
3. The Area Director in consultation with the Chairman be authorised to approve projects up to £1,000 in consultation with the Chairman
4. The funding approved under delegated authority in 2007/08 be noted.
5. The funding approved under delegated authority for 2008/09 be noted.
6. The funding returned by Spelthorne Borough Council be noted.

7. £1000 be granted to Ashford Choral Society towards the costs of staging a summer concert to be funded by Mrs Coleman.
8. £500 be granted to the Sunbury and Shepperton Arts Festival to be funded equally by Mr Burrell and Mr Davies.
9. £1831.16 be approved for funding advertisements for the remaining four Local Committees in this municipal year to be shared equally between Denise Turner-Stewart, Denise Saliagopoulos, Victor Agarwal, Carol Coleman, Laurie Burrell and Ian Beardsmore.
10. £118.23 be granted to Shepperton Horticultural Society for the costs of printing schedules to be funded by Mr Burrell.
11. £5,000 be granted from the capital allocation for Thamesmead School towards a new outdoor performance area.

45/08**ALLEGED PUBLIC FOOTPATH BETWEEN BISHOP DUPPAS PARK AND WALTON LANE, SHEPPERTON (ITEM 14)****Resolved:**

1. Public footpath rights be recognised over route A-B on drawing 3/1/86/H10 and that this application for a MMO under sections 53 and 57 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to modify the Definitive Map and Statement by the addition of a footpath is approved. The route to be known as Public Footpath no.80 (Sunbury).
2. A legal order be made and advertised to implement these changes. If objections are maintained to such an order it would be submitted to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for confirmation

46/08**ALLEGED PUBLIC FOOTPATH ALONG SCHOOL LANE TO ST NICHOLAS C.E. PRIMARY SCHOOL AND FOOTPATH 44 SUNBURY, SHEPPERTON (ITEM 15 AND ADDENDUM REPORT)****Resolved:**

Public footpath rights be recognised over the route A-B-C on drawing 3/1/86/H8 and that this application for a MMO under sections 53 and 57 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to modify the Definitive Map and Statement by the addition of a footpath be approved. The route will be known as Public Footpath no.78 (Sunbury).

47/08**FELTHAM ROAD, ASHFORD – PROPOSED WEIGHT RESTRICTION (ITEM 16)****Resolved:**

1. The proposed 7.5 tonnes weight restriction B377 Feltham Road, Ashford between B3003 Clockhouse Lane and the county boundary be advertised by public notice.

2. The proposed 7.5 tonnes weight restriction on C233 Chertsey Road, Ashford be advertised by public notice.
3. Subject to no objection being received these restrictions be implemented.
4. If an objection to either proposal was received before the end of the objection period, it be determined by the Local Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman and the Local Electoral Division Member.
5. The implementation of the proposal be funded from the 2008/09 and 2009/01 Local Allocation budgets.

48/08 CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE FOR STAINES – OUTCOME OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION (ITEM 17)

Resolved:

1. The parking situation in Staines be reviewed during summer/autumn 2009.
2. The waiting restrictions shown at Annex C be advertised by public notice.

49/08 C230 GREEN STREET/NURSERY ROAD, SUNBURY – PROPOSED CONTROLLED PEDESTRIAN PHASES AND RIGHT TURN (ITEM 18)

Resolved:

1. The proposed controlled pedestrian phases and right turn lane at the junction of C230 Green Street and Nursery Road, Sunbury as shown on Drg. No 6546-03 at Annex A be approved.
2. Construction of the proposal is funded from the 2008/09 Transport Plan budget.

50/08 C248 KINGSTON ROAD/C240 WOODTHORPE ROAD, ASHFORD – PROPOSED CONTROLLED PEDESTRIAN PHASES (ITEM 19)

Resolved:

1. The proposed controlled pedestrian phases at the junction of C248 Kingston Road and C240 Woodthorpe Road, Ashford as shown on Drg. No 3871-03 at Annex A be approved.
2. Construction of the proposal be funded from the 2008/09 Transport Plan budget.

51/08 LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN PROGRAMME FOR 2008/2009 (Item 20)

Resolved:

The LTP Programme for 2008/09 as shown at Annex C be approved.

52/08 LOCAL ALLOCATION 2008/2009 UPDATE (ITEM 21)

Resolved:

The Local Allocation for the year 2008/09 at Annex C be approved.

53/08

DATE OF NEXT MEETING (ITEM 22)

The next meeting would be held on Monday 29th September at 7pm at Ashford Youth Centre, Kenilworth Road, Ashford.

The meeting which commenced at 7.00pm ended at 9.45 pm

Chairman.....

**Annex to the Minutes of the SCC Local Committee in Spelthorne held on
30th June 2008****AGENDA ITEM 6****MEMBERS QUESTIONS****Councillor Pinkerton asked the following question:**

“As the roadside trees in Kenilworth Road, Petersfield Road and Warwick Avenue, Staines are obstructing the television signal and the roots roadside drainage problems and flooding and SCC have already been notified on many occasions could you please let me know when they will be pollarded and the roots cut back from the drainage system?”

The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:

“We currently have no programme to cut back the roots or pollard the trees in these roads. If there is localised flooding please forward me details of the locations and we will investigate them. There is no obligation on the Highway Authority to reduce tree size considered safe by professional inspection in order to improve signal reception, nor is there a legal requirement. It is detrimental to the vitality and structure of trees to carry out works unnecessarily and should only be carried out on a specialist’s recommendation.”

Mr Burrell asked the following question:

“The road surface on the temporary Walton Bridge northbound carriageway on the Spelthorne side has been slowing breaking up over a number of months, and is now in serious need of urgent maintenance. The Walton Bridge Implementation Team have given a number of assurances to me as the Divisional Member that this issue will be addressed, and a promise was made to undertake the work in April this year. However to date this commitment has not been achieved.

1. Has a date been set to implement the resurfacing work yet?
2. Could an explanation be given by the officers as to why the delay to complete this work has arisen?
3. Can a detailed examination of the road surface on both the carriageways of the temporary bridge, and the viaduct be undertaken so that all defects to the road surface can be address for a one off maintenance repair.

It is clearly evident that the whole road surface is starting to deteriorate, and planned closures of the carriageways will have to be undertaken at night to reduce the inevitable traffic congestion that will arise as result of this work.”

The Head of Surrey Highways asked the following answer:

“The A244 around Walton Bridge is split into three distinct sections, and for clarity I will comment on each of them separately.

Commencing with Walton Bridge Road, at the northern end of the bridge, the surfacing was inspected a few months ago and three areas of surface defects were noted. An Order to Ringway was issued and the work was programmed to be completed by 10 July. A County Council inspector visited the site on 12 June and confirmed that while the extent of the surface defects had increased, the depth remained constant. I have been advised that the repairs to Walton Bridge Road will be carried out on 6 July 2008.

A detailed inspection of the new temporary Walton Bridge was carried out in February, and the defects that required immediate action were attended to. Since then the bridge has been regularly monitored, and any dangerous defects have received immediate attention. The surfacing of the bridge is not perfect, but at this moment there are no defects that require immediate attention. Nonetheless, as you know, it is planned to resurface the bridge. This has taken longer to arrange than anticipated whilst a solution that will resolve the continuing surfacing problems with the bridge is identified. It is essential that the work should last the for the expected life of the bridge, but at the same time the cost must be proportionate to the bridge's life. These works will hopefully be undertaken during August, when traffic is at its lightest. We will give you some firm dates as soon as possible.

The surfacing of the Cowey Sale viaduct was inspected on 13 June and three areas of surface course failure were found near the junction with Walton Lane. None of areas meet our intervention levels. They have been classified as category 2C defects and have been entered onto the street history as such. Within the budgets available we can only repair those defects up to category 2B. This road is inspected quarterly, and the Highways Inspector will pick up any deterioration at the next scheduled inspection during July”.

Mr Burrell asked the following question:

“A number of local residents have commented on the poor quality of the current grass cutting programme being carried out by Spelthorne Borough Council.

1. Could an assurance be given to Spelthorne residents that an improvement to the grass cutting will be achieved in the future?
2. Do Surrey County Council Highways Officers monitor the quality of the work carried out under the Agency Agreement?
3. Can a programme of the proposed cuts by areas be published for the information of members and residents of Spelthorne?”

The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:

“1. The budget that SCC would have spent on cutting the grass during 2008 / 2009 is being transferred to Spelthorne Borough Council and I understand

that the Borough Council has made additional funding available to enhance environmental maintenance on the public highway. This will enable up to 10 grass cuts to take place, if conditions require them, during the current financial year.

Due to the favourable grass growing weather conditions Spelthorne has found the length of the grass to be longer than ideal for cutting which has meant that the period between cuts has been extended due to the time taken to get around all areas. However now that they have started the 3rd cut across the Borough residents will see an overall improvement which is already evident along Convent Road, Halliford by pass, Staines Road West and the A308. Spelthorne accepts that residents were left with clumps of residue grass after cutting but that should be less evident with the next cut.

2. There is no specific monitoring of the grass cutting, however I do observe the grass situation when making site visits across the Borough, as do my colleagues. The quality of the grass cutting will be reviewed by both parties later this year. The grass cutting is currently carried out by agreement by both SCC and SBC and there is no Agency Agreement in place.

3. Because of the issues mentioned in 1. above Spelthorne did not want to publish a schedule that was uncertain but they are compiling one which will be available to members and members of the public alike. However due to the fact that the cutting is done in-house the schedule may be subject to change dependant on growing conditions. If grass is not growing very fast they may decide to utilise staff more efficiently by carrying out other verge type maintenance.”

Mr Burrell asked the following question:

' Was the Local Transport Manager Annette Williamson for Spelthorne consulted in relation to the recent installation of two telephone structures on the pavements in High Street, Shepperton, outside the Post Office and Shepperton Village Hall?

If not, can steps be taken to address the following issues regarding the siting of these unsightly telephone kiosks?

1. In relation to the structure on the north footway, 20 yards west of the vehicle access to Shepperton Village Hall, this seriously restricts the sight lines of any cars exiting the village hall car park, and presents a major danger to vehicular traffic travelling east along the High Street. It also presents a danger to the visually handicapped people using the pavement at this point, and obstructs the free passage of the pavement for pedestrians.

2. The structure outside the Post Office causes obstruction to pedestrians using the pavement, and is dangerous for the visually impaired.

3. Both structures seriously inhibit the view of the High Street by the recently installed CCTV cameras, which this Local Committee helped to finance. Was

consideration given to this point before permission was granted by the Planning Department at Spelthorne Borough Council?

4. How many of these Telephone Kiosks are proposed for Spelthorne, and is the Local Transport Manager aware of any other problems affecting highway issues, for which she has a responsibility.

It is fair to say that the majority of residents in Shepperton regard these structures as unsightly, and that they do nothing to enhance the environment of the High Street'

Transportation Development Control gave the following answer:

"The Local Highways Manager was not consulted concerning the replacement telephone kiosks on Shepperton High Street outside the Village Hall and the Post Office. Transportation Development Control (TDC) was consulted by Spelthorne Borough Council under a prior approval 56 day planning application. TDC raised no objection to the telephone boxes and would not generally consult with the Local Highways Managers on the planning applications. It is TDC's role to raise any objection at the planning stage. If no objection is raised then the installation occurs under permitted development as they are a statutory undertaker and have rights to install equipment in the highway.

Both TDC and the Local Highways Manager have investigated the matter and discussed the applications further with Spelthorne Borough Council.

1. Between Barclay's Bank and the Village Hall, eastern side of Shepperton High St. From a distance of 2m (rather than 2.4m. based on the fact that this is a small car park and nudging out onto the High St is acceptable) measured into the exit from the Village Hall, the sightlines seem reasonable. A car will remain in sight all the time and it is likely that a motor bike or cycle will at least partially remain in view. In my view, whilst it is not in the best location, it is not so detrimental that SCC could have sustained a refusal at appeal. I would also point out that Highway Design Standards (TD9/93) also state that objects of 550mm wide located within sightlines can be ignored. Whilst the advert is much wider than this width, if the end of the object was aligned to the edge of the kiosk nearest the carriageway, this would have a similar effect of blocking sightlines to the tangent in the road.

2. Outside Post Office, western side of Shepperton High St. The footway is still approx 3m in width and adequate for pedestrians to pass by.

3. The view from CCTV cameras was not considered as part of this application on the basis that it was understood that the applications were for replacement phone kiosks.

4. There is a total of 13 approved applications for replacement telephone kiosks within Spelthorne. There is a problem location at Staines Road West / Alexandra Road, Sunbury. This relocated kiosk should have been

positioned behind sightlines of 2.4m (measured into Alexandra Road) by 160m (measured along Staines Road West).

With regard to the other concerns regarding visual impairment, this is not a reason for refusal. The visually impaired still have to negotiate other obstructions within the highway (post boxes normal telephone boxes, lamp columns etc) and there is sufficient footway width for all people to get past. The free flow of pedestrians is not an issue because adequate footway widths have been maintained.”

Mr Burrell asked the following question:

“A local resident in Church Road, Shepperton is becoming increasingly concerned regarding the unauthorised parking on the 'Double Yellow' and 'Single Yellow Lines' in Church Road and Chertsey Road, Shepperton. Could details be supplied by the Parking Manager, Spelthorne Borough Council on how many Fixed Penalty Notices for these two roads have been issued by the Spelthorne Parking & Enforcement officers since January 2007 to date? He feels that with the introduction of 'Car Parking Charges' in Manor Park Shepperton, this will only increase the unauthorised and illegal parking on the highway in this area if we fail to enforce the parking restrictions.

In Church Square, Shepperton, one of the public houses is placing tables and chairs on the highway along the side wall of St Nicholas Church which reduces the flow of vehicles along this section of the highway. What action has been undertaken by our officers to redress this matter, and can the licensee apply for a licence to authorise their use of the highway for this purpose?”

The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:

“SBC’s Parking Services Manager advises that 15 penalty charge notices have been issued along the restricted length of Church Road and seven along Chertsey Road. During the day there is minimal on-street parking but during the evening problems occur due to those visiting the local public houses and restaurants. SCC funds a limited enforcement service during the evening periods, by agreement between myself and the Parking Services Manager.

Our Community Highways Officer visited Church Square and at the time of the visit tables and chairs were not located on the highway. An application for a licence to place tables and chairs on the public highway may be made by the landlord of the Kings Head. Our Community Highways Officer discussed the matter with the landlord and established that the area under consideration is the pedestrian area in front of the church, not on the carriageway. It was discussed whether he could put tables and chairs on the paved area in front of the church if there was no objection from the vicar. An application form has been sent to the landlord, however I am concerned that the land is not adjacent to the premises and may be inappropriate.”

AGENDA ITEM 7**PUBLIC QUESTIONS****Mr John Carruthers asked the following question:**

“Referring to Page 13 of Surrey Governor Summer 2008 Issue.
Heading: Informal Meetings of Governing Bodies reproduced below:.

A number of governing bodies have sought advice recently from us with regards to ‘informal meetings’ of the Governing Body and the production of minutes of such meetings.

All meetings of the governing body are meetings which need to be recorded and must have an agenda and minutes. There is, therefore no such thing as an ‘informal meeting’ of the governing body. The governing body is a legal entity and, as such, must conduct its business openly, honestly and with transparency. Any governing body issues that warrant discussion and possible action must, therefore, be considered by governors who have had those matters delegated to them by the governing body. There will obviously be occasions when the governing body take part in CPD opportunities and this does not constitute a formal meeting of the governing body.

Everything said there would also apply to Local Committees, so that the official position of County is that there is no such thing as an `informal meeting` of Councillors, and all Meetings MUST be conducted openly. Please will you therefore publicise ALL Local Committee Meetings whether informal or formal so that the public can attend any of them?”

The Area Director gave the following answer:

“The law relating to meetings of governing bodies is different from that which pertains to our Local Committees. The "informal " meetings of the Local Committee are outside of any legal requirements and are not decision making but are simply a meeting of some Members with officers to consider a particular issue/service. Member and officer meetings take place across the County.

Informal meetings are exactly that and are not subject to Access to Information legislation. It is accepted that confusion could be caused by calling them informal meetings of the Local Committee which look as if the Committee is meeting but in private but I should like to give the assurance that this is not the case “

Andrew McLuskey asked the following question:

"Can Councillors comment on the apparent laxity/poor enforcement of rules which allow extraction companies to carry on digging and dealing in minerals

after the time limits of their licence is up - under cover of making further applications?"

The Environment & Regulation Planning Development Control Team Manager gave the following answer:

"The question is general but it might be intended to apply to a number of sites in Spelthorne where planning permissions have expired and the County is/has been in discussion with the operator about extending the life of the working.

The treatment of each case will depend on the circumstances. Planning enforcement action is a discretionary remedy available to the local planning authority and is not a requirement in every case. The planning authority must decide whether it is expedient to take action based on the relevant provisions of the Development Plan and any other material considerations. The Government advises that the usual alternative to taking formal enforcement action is to invite a retrospective planning application. Government further advises that the fact that the development has already taken place should make no difference to the consideration of the merits of the application. Failure to meet the deadline for completion set out in a planning permission for mineral working will normally give rise to further proposals to extend the timescale for working and restoration. Such proposals are normally dealt with favourably unless the extended deadline might otherwise prejudice the quality of the restoration or there is some other amenity or environmental objection. Mineral working activity may be disrupted by various factors and local planning authority must act in a reasonable way when seeking to regularise unauthorised or unexpected development proposals."

Borough Councillor Caroline Nichols asked the following question:

"Tree maintenance in the Lower Sunbury and Halliford Division has become urgent in a number of roads here. I recall a question to Spelthorne Committee some while back eliciting an answer that the budget for tree maintenance runs out well before the financial year end leaving only those trees deemed to be dangerous to be pruned. Is this still the case?"

Some residents have indicated to me that they would be willing to finance pruning of highway trees that are adjacent to their properties. Would SCC consider introducing a policy equivalent to the borough council Tree Preservation Order Scheme? I would envisage an SCC inspection visit and agreed work through SCC's approved contractors.

A number of pavements have become so distorted by tree roots that they are now a serious trip hazard. What are SCC's protocols for dealing with these? Does flattening and retarmacing around tree roots kill trees? I ask this because just recently a very short stretch of pavement was being resurfaced by Ringway in Claremont Avenue, Sunbury but a much worse tree-rooted patch yards away – which has been identified by white markings for over a year - remained untouched. It apparently 'wasn't on the list'.

Where trees have been cut down for safety reasons does the Council have a policy for replanting?"

The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:

"£150,000 is available for tree maintenance across the six districts in the west of the County Council, which will not cover the cost of all tree works that we would like to carry out.

Tree Preservation Orders are a Borough Authority Town Planning function. The Borough Council will promote Tree Preservation Orders wherever appropriate to safeguard healthy trees of amenity value, giving priority to the protection of those known to be under threat. Permission will not normally be granted to fell preserved trees, but where such trees are felled replacement planting will be required. The County Council does not have general tree preservation order making powers and there is no plan to introduce a similar scheme for highway trees.

Highway trees should only be pruned in line with the Surrey Arboricultural Specification. Residents may pay for this work to be carried out, however it does not give them entitlement to carry out work that conflicts with best practice such as crown reduction or pollarding without special written approval by the County Council arborist. The circulated documents are a guide to arboricultural priorities in terms of work that the County Council will and will not authorise.

Levelling footways and footpaths often causes damage to tree roots and is one of the reasons that most street trees have a shorter life expectancy than equivalent trees grown in a non-hostile environment, such as those in parks or gardens.

There has been no highway tree planting programme since 2004."