

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE**

**Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> November 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 Jack Pinkerton\***  
**Councillor Robin Sider**  
**Councillor Richard Smith-Ainsley\***  
**Councillor George Trussler\***

**\* = present**

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

- 46/09 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)**  
Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sider. Cllr Pinkerton arrived at 10.30 am and Mrs Saliagopolous arrived at 11.05 am.
- 47/09 MINUTES (ITEM 2)**  
The Minutes of the meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> October 2009 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.  
  
The Minutes of the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2009 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.
- 48/09 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM 3)**  
There were no declarations of interest.
- 49/09 PETITIONS (ITEM 4)**  
There were no petitions received.
- 50/09 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME (ITEM 5)**

One Member question was received as set out in the annex attached, together with the answer given.

**51/09 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (ITEM 6)**

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

**52/09 CONSULTATION ON SURREY MINERALS PLAN (ITEM 7)**

The Chairman welcomed Tony Gould, Planning Policy Manager and Les Andrews, Planning Policy Manager to the meeting.

A vote was requested regarding recommendation (i) where the committee was asked to agree with the County Council. Mrs Turner- Stewart, Mr Walsh, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Cllr Packman, Cllr Smith-Ainsley and Cllr Forsbrey voted in favour of the resolution. Mrs Nichols, Mr Beardsmore, Mr Agarwal and Mrs Coleman voted against the resolution. Therefore the resolution was carried.

The committee felt that local residents had not had sufficient opportunity to comment on the draft aggregates recycling and draft minerals site restoration document and therefore did not feel placed to make comments on the documents at this time. As a result Cllr Packman proposed resolution (iii) which was seconded by Cllr Smith-Ainsley.

**Resolved:**

- (i) Confirmed that it agreed with the County Council that the proposals in the core strategy and primary aggregates documents were sound
- (ii) Agreed that the local committee wished to submit comments on the draft aggregates recycling and final draft minerals site restoration documents.
- (iii) Agreed that the committee would reconvene to consider its comments on the draft aggregates recycling and final draft minerals site restoration documents following further public consultation.

**53/09 MEMBERS' FUNDS (ITEM 8)**

Members were given an oral update on the East to West project and the Catholic Society project as requested at the last meeting.

Because Spelthorne Borough Council were unable to undertake maintenance of the brackets as set out in para 2.11, resolution 7 had to be amended to reflect this. The amendment was proposed by Mr Walsh and seconded by Mr Beardsmore.

**Resolved:**

1. The funding given by Mr Agarwal, Mr Beardsmore, Mr Walsh, Mrs Saliagopoulos and Mrs Turner-Stewart of

- £259 each towards advertisements for Local Committee be noted.
2. Funding given to Spelthorne Museum by Mr Walsh be noted.
  3. The updated position relating to funding bids from the Catholic Children’s Society and East to West, which were put before the Local Committee on 12 October be noted.
  4. The funding approved under delegated authority since the last Local Committee Meeting be noted.
  5. £1120 be approved from Mrs Saliagopoulos’ allocation for Burway Rowing club.
  6. £409 be approved from Mr Agarwal’s allocation and £2451 be approved from Mr Walsh’s allocation for the Rotary Club of Ashford for the provision and distribution of dictionaries to all Year 5 children within Spelthorne.
  7. £1250 be approved from Mrs Turner-Stewart’s allocation for Spelthorne Borough Council fro the purchase and installation of 10 brackets, flags and flagpoles at Stainash parade and Victoria Parade subject to the following being received:
    - i. Written agreement from the property owners for the erection of brackets, flagpoles and flags on their property
    - ii. A copy of the owners’ public liability insurance
    - iii. A copy of the structural adequacy design certificate (as required by the Local Highway Manager)
    - iv. Confirmation that maintenance of the brackets will be undertaken biannually.
  8. £2150 be approved from Mrs Saliagopoulos’ capital allocation for St Peter’s Church Hall toward new hall curtains.

**54/09**

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING (ITEM 10)**

The next meeting would be held on Monday 18<sup>TH</sup> January 2010 at The Council Chamber, Spelthorne Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines.

A Special Meeting of the Committee will be held on Monday 14<sup>th</sup> December 2008 at The Council Chamber, Spelthorne Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines.

The meeting which commenced at 10.00am ended at 12.16pm

Chairman.....



**SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE – 19<sup>th</sup> November 2009**

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

**Member Questions**

**Councillor Pinkerton will ask the following question:**

“Could you please let me know when the following problems will be attended to?”

**STANWELL NORTH**

1. Drains in Stanwell due to their construction have passed their working life without major work.
2. At least a third of the paths are in a bad or potentially dangerous condition.
3. Roads in the area are in a poor condition, pot holes go for 6 months plus awaiting repair, in many places longer. Horton road joining Stanwell Moor road, is an accident waiting to happen, Surrey police and county officers seem blinded to the potential serious consequences of taking no action.
4. Street lights go for months waiting repair. “

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

Defects on the public highway are rectified in accordance with the West Area Maintenance Delivery Plan as reported to the October 2009 meeting of this Committee. The highway is inspected on a routine basis by the Highway Inspector and ad-hoc repairs are investigated by our Community Highways Officers.

Unfortunately the matters you have raised are very general and so difficult to answer. Where you have specific concerns, the quickest means of reporting a problem is by registering it on line, or emailing your concern to [wah@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:wah@surreycc.gov.uk). Alternatively you may choose to telephone the Contact Centre on 03456 009 009.

I am unclear of the problem at the junction of Stanwell Moor Road / Horton Road however I have been in communication with Surrey Police by email just recently and we do not consider the junction to be hazardous. If you have additional information, I will be able to investigate the matter further.

**AGENDA ITEM 6****PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

**Mr John Hirsh, Hon. Chariman of the Lower Sunbury Residents' Association LOSRA, will ask the following question:**

“This Association is on record as having expressed dissatisfaction at the passive role played by the Highways Authority when considering applications put before the Planning Authority. Indeed, it was at this very Committee that no fewer than four members of the SBC Planning Committee spoke in support of my complaint of Highways Authority inertia.

On 4<sup>th</sup> December it is expected that outline applications by Urban Initiatives on behalf London Irish Holdings will be put before the Planning Authority. These applications will be of considerable scale and will propose the development of two separate sites in Lower Sunbury. Urban Initiatives have advised that a transport assessment will be submitted with the outline plan - a requirement quite properly demanded by the LPA.

May this Association be assured that a diligent and detailed response will be prepared by the Highways Authority; and that in the course of its preparation, and before completion, full consultation takes place with the community?

It goes without saying that LOSRA would be very willing to facilitate such a process.”

**The Senior Transportation Development Control Officer for Spelthorne replied:**

**The LPA's are statutory obliged, in accordance with the Town and Country Planning General Development Procedure Order (GDPO), as amended, to consult SCC as highway authority, and they are also obliged to take into account any advice that the Highway Authority may offer in response to the consultation. It is only advice, however, and the LPA is entitled to take that advice and consider it in conjunction with other non-highway related factors, which may or may not conflict with it. The LPA is then entitled to come to a balanced decision, having taken these various factors into account.**

In responding to LPA consultations, the County Council as Highway Authority provides advice and only recommends refusal of an application where it can demonstrate real harm. In effect, from the Highway Authority's point of view, a totally neutral stance is taken regarding the development itself, and refusal is only recommended where shortfalls in highway standards would lead to a tangible deterioration in highway safety or where there is a clear conflict with transportation policy. However, it is not the Highway Authority's role to resolutely recommend refusal of applications unless every highway standard in the vicinity is met to the full, and this approach is also supported by the planning inspectorate.

It is also a requirement of SCC as highway authority that a full transport assessment be provided as part of the planning application, which will be fully assessed once SCC have received a copy of the application.

It is not appropriate to put out to consultation SCC's response which in itself is only a consultation response to Spelthorne BC. Having said that we are more than happy to receive consultations

**Mr Andrew McLuskey will ask the following question:**

Does the committee think it fair and reasonable that four of the sites envisaged for development in the Surrey Minerals Plan are in one county division (i.e. Stanwell)? This bearing in mind the huge amount of environmental stress the area is already under.

**The Planning Policy Manager (Minerals and Waste) will give the following answer:**

Two proposals for mineral working in the primary aggregates DPD fall in Stanwell division. King George VI Reservoir will be worked by dredger and, judging by experience of working of the Queen Mary Reservoir, is unlikely to generate significant disturbance.

Appropriate mitigation of potential noise, visual and other impacts of the proposed working of Homers Farm will protect the amenity of adjoining properties, so that there would be no significant adverse impacts. In both cases, access will be direct to roads designed to cope with the vehicle movements generated.

The county council proposals within the minerals plan have been prepared following thorough assessment of potential sites for development and with input from extensive public consultation. It may not seem fair and reasonable that two sites are identified within one electoral division but the reality of the situation is that minerals can only be worked where they occur. The county council is mindful on the one hand of the need to plan to deliver its contribution to the regional requirement for aggregates, and on the other to do so in a way which is environmentally and socially responsible.

The other two proposals concern the draft Aggregates Recycling DPD. Oak Leaf Farm was identified in the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 as a suitable site for waste treatment facilities. A thorough assessment of the environmental impact of the proposal was undertaken as part of the recent determination of a planning application for this site.

The second proposal is for the location of an aggregates recycling facility at Stanwell Quarry for a temporary period commensurate with the remaining life of the site. Here again, it is assumed that traffic to and from the site will not affect residential areas within Stanwell.

The Surrey Waste Plan identifies criteria for the selection of sites suitable for aggregates recycling and this includes use of mineral workings where such recycling would not lengthen the life of the site. Recycling is a more sustainable way of dealing with waste and in this case can contribute to the overall demand for construction aggregates. This is particularly relevant to Surrey in offering an alternative to land-won sand and gravel. The location of these two proposals falls within the catchment area where it can be anticipated that significant volumes of construction and demolition waste will arise and where the recycled material will be needed.