

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 9th September 2009 at Spelthorne Borough Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines.

County Council Members:

Mrs Denise Turner-Stewart (Chairman)*
Mr Victor Agarwal*
Mr Ian Beardsmore*
Mrs Carol Coleman*
Mrs Caroline Nichols*
Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos*
Mr Richard Walsh*

Borough Council Members:

Councillor Gerry Forsbrey*
Councillor Denise Grant
Councillor John Packman (Councillor Jaffer as Substitute)*
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)

20/09 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)
Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Packman. Councillor Jaffer substituted for Councillor Packman. Mr Agarwal and Mrs Nichols had to leave the meeting early.

21/09 MINUTES (ITEM 2)
The Minutes of the meeting held on 20th July 2009 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

22/09 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM 3)
Surrey County Council's Standards Committee agreed to grant a dispensation to the below listed councillors to speak and vote (in line with their normal rights as set out in Surrey County Council's Constitution) at any meeting of the Surrey County Council Local Committee in Spelthorne in relation to Airtrack and the Heathrow Airtrack Order from 4 September 2009 up to and including 31 August 2010.

Ian Beardsmore, Caroline Nichols, Richard Smith-Ainsley, Gerald Forsbrey, Denise Grant, Jack Pinkerton, Robin Sider, George Trussler, Frank Ayers, Huseini Jaffer and Isobel Napper.

Victor Agarwal declared a personal interest under item 9 regarding Heathrow Airtrack as an employee of British Airways.

23/09**CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (ITEM 4)**

BAA were invited to this meeting to discuss Heathrow Airtrack, but they declined to attend.

24/09**MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME (ITEM 5)**

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

25/09**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (ITEM 6)**

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

26/09**4TH AMENDMENT TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS
CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS (ITEM 7)**

The Parking Projects Manager tabled a revised proposal for the Benwell Meadows Estate, which Members felt needed to be examined by the On Street Parking Group before being referred back to the Local Committee.

Resolved:

- (i) to consider the results of the formal consultation and door to door surveys
- (ii) that where there has been no objection, the restrictions be introduced
- (iii) that where an objection has been made, the resolution recommended in this report be agreed excluding paragraph 3.3, relating to Benwell Meadows Estate Petition
- (iv) that, subject to the agreement of items (ii) and (iii) above, the amended Traffic Regulation Order be made and the proposed on-street parking restrictions are implemented
- (v) that Benwell Meadows Estate is referred to the On Street Parking Group for consultation and then referred back to the Local Committee for decision.

27/09**MEMBERS' FUNDS (ITEM 8)****Resolved:**

After a vote with six in favour and four against,

- (i) that the criteria retain the wording that "The funds will not be used to cover revenue costs – expenditure must be of a one-off nature or serve as pump-priming" and the Repeat Funding paragraph number 2 in the Guidance Note to the criteria also be retained.

28/09**TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992 – THE HEATHROW
AIRTRACK ORDER (ITEM 9)**

During the discussion regarding this item, the meeting was adjourned between 5.51pm and 5.57pm.

Resolved:

That the following recommendations be made to the Cabinet of the County Council

- (i) that the scheme has the potential to cause severe harm to Spelthorne and therefore the committee objected strongly to the current proposals contained within the TWA and pressed for suitable mitigation measures to be paid for by the scheme proposers, HAL
- (ii) that the County Council and the Borough Council should continue to work closely together to ensure a high level of consistency between their respective objections to the Transport and Works act application
- (iii) that the following responses be made to the Objections listed in the Officer Recommendations:
 - agreed with objection i but asked HAL to explain why the high street station does not have a sound business case.
 - regarding objections ii and iv, recommended that HAL should first be required to address issues deemed to be unacceptable on the existing routes for Bridleway 50 and Cycle Route T5 before alternative routes be identified (which do not have an adverse impact on the moor) and that further discussion should take place between county and borough officers to reach agreement on this issue. The Committee also recommended that issues of safety be taken into account. Cycle Route T5 must be retained.
 - agreed with objection iii.
 - agreed with objection v, as protection of Staines Moor SSSI is of critical importance. The committee also wished to register serious concerns regarding the likelihood of successfully translocating biologically important plants to new habitats and the uncertainty in relation to the implementation of the scheme if all the proposed compensation land identified is not all acquired by HAL
 - agreed with objection vi but observed that no landscaping proposals have yet been made.
 - agreed with objection vii.
 - regarding objection viii, requested that HAL explain why the high street station does not have a sound business case.
 - agreed with objection ix
 - agreed with objection x
 - agreed with objection xi but asked that the County Council also considers its concerns in relation to longer term impacts arising from increased delays

from the additional junction in South Street for the multi-storey car park and the impact of queuing at the Thorpe Road level crossing on the A308/A320 roundabout and Staines Bridge.

- agreed with objection xii but argued strongly that the impact on Staines Town Centre from the increased down times on the Thorpe Road Level Crossing is of critical importance. The committee noted that Highway improvements have so far only been identified to deal with Vicarage Road and that HAL must also be required to fund improvements to the Thorpe Road crossing.
 - No comment was made regarding objection xiii.
- (iv) that serious concern was expressed in relation to the Staines Chord proposals concerning the feasibility of linking the two car parks and the lack of evidence from HAL on this issue. Wished to highlight problems for traffic seeking to exit from the combined car parks onto the Thames Street Junction and also the failure by HAL to consider phasing works to complete the ramp for the multi-storey car park prior to the rest of the Elmsleigh Surface Car Park being taken to build the scheme.
- (v) that HAL should fully demonstrate that the shortest possible and practical length of overhead electric lines on Stanwell Moor be agreed subject to HAL providing full technical information of the change over process
- (vi) objections be made regarding the potential impacts of the TWA on air quality especially in relation Spelthorne as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)
- (vii) that it should be recommended that paragraph 9.5.4 in the body of the report on cycle routes be reworded, para 9.6.3 on archaeology be expanded upon and that para 16.1 in the conclusion to the report be redrafted
- (viii) that it should be recommended that the Borough Council and County Council should work closely together to ensure that Spelthorne residents' interests are fully represented during the construction and operation of this new scheme, should it go ahead; that the statutory roles and responsibilities of all of the member organisations of TfS are to be respected; and that the Borough Council and County Council should come back to the local committee for discussion during any construction phase
- (ix) that it should be recommended that the comments of the Spelthorne Local Committee be incorporated in full as an Annex to the Cabinet report
- (x) that it should be recommended that, should it progress further, the Local Committee should be regularly kept up to date on any further developments.

29/09

DATE OF NEXT MEETING (ITEM 10)

The next meeting would be held on Monday 12th October at The Council Chamber, Spelthorne Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines.

The meeting which commenced at 4.00pm ended at 7:16pm

Chairman.....



**SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE – 9th
SEPTEMBER 2009**

AGENDA ITEM 5**MEMBERS QUESTIONS****Councillor Sider asked the following question:**

In view of Spelthorne Borough Council's policy in promoting a safer Spelthorne, the Council have applied to the County Council for a shared bus stop / taxi rank at the top of the High Street in Staines. Notice to this effect was given in accordance with the provisions of Section 63 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 after consultation with Surrey County Council as the highway authority and also with the Chief Officer of Police. Such notice was signed by the Chief Executive of Spelthorne Borough Council, dated and published in the Surrey Herald on the 25 February 2009. This rank would be used when buses had ceased to run and would provide a further get you home service to those visiting clubs and restaurants in the area. In view of the complications involved with the referral of the Borough's last application for a shared bus / taxi rank adjacent to Debenhams department store in Staines taking well over a year to resolve, due to this being submitted by the County Council to GOSE for comment, can the Local Transportation Manager inform me as Chairman of Spelthorne Borough Council's Licensing committee why an application such as this has again been forwarded to GOSE, and will the County Council note that the scheduled date for the imposition of this shared bus stop / taxi rank was in fact after the 25th March 2009. In view of the foregoing culminating in even further delays, can the Local Transportation Manager give me a full progress report of our current application

The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:

The signing required for a shared bus stop clearway / taxi rank needs the approval of the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) as the sign is not standard. Signs not included in the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions need approval both for the type of sign and the location at which it will be positioned. Informal discussion with GOSE has identified no problem in pursuing a second shared bus stop clearway / taxi rank in Staines and the application is being progressed through SCC's Traffic Projects Team. There was some confusion with the bus stop clearways which is now resolved and I will advise you of the approval as soon as it is received.

Councillor Sider asked the following question:

Shepperton Town Ward is experiencing a wave of vandalism to such an extent that the Borough Council have spent over £5k in recent weeks in repairs to the play park at Shepperton recreation ground. I am of the opinion that if Shepperton Youth Centre were staffed and open on a regular basis, a great deal of this unwarranted vandalism would have been avoided. Can Surrey County Council Youth Development Officer inform me:

- a) The current situation with regard to advertising for staff and when and in what newspaper the last advertisement was placed?
- b) A list of the activities available in the Youth Centre on each evening, Monday to Friday inclusive?
- c) In the event of the County Council being unable to recruit staff to supervise Shepperton Youth Centre, have they considered calling for volunteers to staff this establishment, and if not, why not?

The Youth Development Officer gave the following answer:

The Youth Development Service has used a rolling advert for new part-time staff. Our positions have been advertised on Surrey County Council's website and through this, the advert is picked up by other recruitment sites such as Surrey Jobs and Job Centre Plus. Surrey County Council do not advertise in the published press immediately, as this has not shown value for money in the past. We have appointed 4 new staff in the last quarter and these individuals are currently going through the recruitment checks process. We are unable to develop our work further at current due to a lack of 'Leaders in Charge', these are more senior part-time workers who take responsibility for sessions. We are currently developing an in-house training programme as part of a 'grow your own' approach to filling these vacancies.

Shepperton Youth Centre is currently open every Wednesday night for open access. Thursday nights provide for a targeted project, and occasional Friday nights are open in partnership with Shepperton Churches. We are looking at options to open on Tuesdays (evenings or after school). This would take Shepperton to its full delivery capacity.

We do not have a shortage of part-time workers at present, however our Leader in Charge vacancies is a barrier to further delivery. We are working on this at present.

AGENDA ITEM 6**PUBLIC QUESTIONS****Mr Earl Gray asked the following question:**

We should ask that the members of the Local Committee provide answers to the following questions relating to the Airtrack proposals.

- i. Where is the precise location of the 45000 tons of harmful waste sited at this time?
- ii. Are SCC and SBC Borough Council ensuring that a full and complete qualitative and quantitative analysis of all inorganic and organic compounds contained within and forming the Harmful waste mass are to be provided to the public domain. The analysis to include, heavy metals, toxic substances, asbestos, acid radicals, carcinogenic particulates. Also concentrations and volumes of (???) formed during the period of decomposition of the harmful waste together with any gases which cause air pollution, hydrology.
- iii. What protocol will be followed during excavation removal and disposal to ensure absolute safeguards to hums and animals/birds?
- iv. What are SCC and SBC doing with regard to mitigating disturbance, noise, inconvenience to residents of Moor Lane and Spelthorne and grid locking traffic due to level crossing closure times being increased at A3376 Thorpe Road and Egham Station and construction of the whole airtrack project.

The Airtrack Project Manager gave the following answer:

1. The applicants, Heathrow Airtrack Limited, appear to have estimated that there are 49,000 cubic metres tonnes of waste that will need removing from the existing landfill sites at Hithermoor Farm and the Bedfont Court/Horton Road landfill sites. As landfill waste cannot be spread or reused without special treatment, it is wholly appropriate for the applicants to adopt the precautionary principle of assuming that the landfill waste may be contaminated and that it will need to be removed accordingly.

2. Neither Council is in a position to ensure this. The applicant is required to assess the degree of contamination and act according to statutory regulations and safeguards. All details about the disposal of waste should be set out in a waste management plan. Heathrow Airtrack Limited state the intention to produce a waste management plan in their Environmental Statement. The application is being made to the Department for Transport and not the County or Borough Councils. It will be for the DfT to decide, in the first instance, whether the submitted information regarding waste disposal is sufficiently detailed to support the application.

3. The applicant will be obliged to follow the strict regulations in place to ensure that waste is handled safely. The waste has to be dealt with by licensed carriers required to follow specific regulations and codes of practice designed to safeguard human health and the environment. Disposal of waste for landfill has to be made at licensed sites. The transfer and deposit of waste is ultimately controlled by the Environment Agency.

4. The Transport and Works Act application needs to demonstrate to both authorities that the construction of and the running of the Airtrack Service as

proposed within the application is satisfactory and if it does not, an objection could be made to the Secretary of State . It is clear that the scheme as proposed will cause unacceptable traffic problems at a number of level crossings. This will lead to traffic congestion, delays, poor bus reliability and access problems for the emergency services, especially the Thorpe Road, Vicarage Road and Station Road areas. A mitigation package of measures currently being identified could overcome these concerns subject to funding of the identified measures by the scheme promoters and subject to Cabinet approval. In addition the scheme promoters will also need to apply for a Code of Construction in relation to the construction of the new railway line and associated works, if the Transport and Works Act application is approved by the Secretary of State.

Mr Andrew McLuskey asked the following question:

In his recent election manifesto Cllr Agarwal told us that he had got Stanwell Youth Centre to open three nights a week. Can he tell us which nights these are?

The Youth Development Officer gave the following answer:

Stanwell Youth Centre has recently been upgraded and modernised to provide a high quality facility for young people. Working with our partners, Stanwell Centre for Young People is open five nights a week. These are as follows:

Mondays – Youth Theatre (run by Spelthorne Borough Council, term time)

Tuesdays – Open Youth Club

Wednesdays – Targeted Young Women’s Project

Thursdays – Targeted Project Night

Fridays – Juice Club (a junior youth club for 8-12 year olds run by local volunteers, supported in kind by the Youth Development Service)

The Centre has also been used to support the work of Signal and A2 Housing’s regeneration projects.

Mr Geoffrey Rippingdale asked the following question:

Given that there have been several serious accidents on the Fordbridge Roundabout in the last few months, the latest being on the evening of Saturday, 29th August, are they Police and County Council aware that this is a major traffic accident “black spot”.

One accident two months ago (on the south side of the roundabout) involved a fatality and severe damage to the brick wall/parapet, whilst the other on 29th August (on the north side) has badly damaged the other brick wall/parapet and probably resulted in serious injuries judging by the state of the car.

Two weeks ago a car was overturned on the roundabout when struck by a speeding car.

Other recent accidents have required extensive repairs to the railings on the south-east side of the roundabout.

How many more fatalities does it require before some form of traffic calming is introduced on this part of the A308?

The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:

Our records show that during the last three years 22 collisions resulted in personal injury around the Fordbridge Roundabout junction and clusters of collisions have occurred at the Fordbridge Road and Kingston Road entry points onto the roundabout. The collisions were discussed at the bi-annual officer level Casualty Reduction Working Group meeting that was held yesterday and Officers agreed that a site investigation would take place to decide whether accident remedial measures should be carried out.

Requests for improvements to the highway network are assessed, prioritised and reported to the Local Committee for approval. The criteria used to assess these requests is in accordance with the Local Transport Plan objectives to reduce congestion and to improve accessibility, road safety and the environment and, where possible to align the implementation of improvement and maintenance schemes. Many of these requests seek to reduce vehicle speeds, however funding for improvement schemes is very limited.

A scheme is proposed at the junction to introduce a toucan crossing over Staines By Pass on the north-west arm of the roundabout. At current levels of funding and subject to funds being made available this improvement is likely to be constructed during 2012 / 2014.

Mr Keith Johnson asked the following question:

The new bus shelter that has appeared adjacent to the Southbound carriageway just south of the Nursery Road Junction has a large two-sided advertising hoarding impeding over half of the footpath freeway. It is in a residential road opposite a row of suburban houses. It would appear to contravene PPG19 on both grounds of amenity and public safety. The pedestrian access between the bus stop and the advertisement section is very restricted on a footpath utilised by a high number of schoolchildren.

I should like to know:

Who is responsible for approving the shelter design and location?

Who is responsible for the advertisement control?

What public consultation has taken place?

The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:

Colleagues at Spelthorne Borough Council advise me that the designs are based on their contract with Clear Channel, the shelter provider. SCC agree the location of shelters in liaison with the Borough Council.

Advertisement control is the responsibility of the Borough Council.

The Borough Council advise me that they do not need to undertake consultation on non advertising shelters, but they do so anyway, and advertising shelters require planning permission

My SCC colleague has visited the bus shelter on Green Street, just south of Nursery Road and taken several photos. He also took the following measurements:

the width of the shelter is 1.4m

the footway width is 3.4m

the gap between the shelter and kerb is 1.7m

the gap between the shelter and the bus stop flag is 1.6m

These measurements would not normally affect mobility, however I am aware that this part of Green Street is particularly busy at the end of the school day.

