

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE**

**Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 18<sup>th</sup> January 2010 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)

**01/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)**  
Apologies for absence were received from Mr Agarwal and Mrs Nichols.

**02/10 MINUTES (ITEM 2)**

Mrs Coleman felt that the appendix to the minutes of the meeting on December 14<sup>th</sup> did not explain her concerns about the Minerals Waste plan fully enough. Emily Fraser agreed to pass her comments on to Tony Gould. These comments are attached as Appendix A.

Regarding paragraph 59/09 of the minutes of the last meeting on the Surrey Minerals Plan and the resolutions passed by this committee, Roger Hargreaves, Head of Environment at Surrey County Council, sent the a response to the committee which was been tabled and is attached as Appendix B.

The Minutes of the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2009 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

**03/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM 3)**

There were no declarations of interest.

**04/10 PETITIONS (ITEM 4)**

Two petitions were received. The first about bus route 557, on which lead petitioner Mr Andrew McCluskey spoke for three minutes. The second regarding waiting facilities at a bus stop.

**Resolved:**

To note receipt of the petitions.

**05/10 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME (ITEM 5)**

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

**06/10 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (ITEM 6)**

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

**07/10 DRIVE SMART INITIATIVE (ITEM 7)**

The Chairman welcomed Rebecca Kempster and Mick Pritchard from Surrey Police, who jointly gave a presentation and update on the Drive Smart Initiative. Information regarding activity in Spelthorne was tabled.

**08/10 THE SURREY BUS REVIEW (ITEM 8)**

The Chairman welcomed Ian Lake, Cabinet Member for Transport, Paul Millin, Passenger Transport Group Manager and Laurie James, Service Planning Team Manager to present their report.

The Committee considered the proposals and requested that their comments from this meeting, as set out in Appendix C attached, be submitted to the consultation as the Local Committee's response by the deadline of 31<sup>st</sup> January.

**Resolved:**

- (i) To give its views on the general approach and principles of the Bus Review
- (ii) To give its views on proposals for services in the Spelthorne area as part of the Bus Review Consultation process.

**09/10 MEMBERS FUNDS (Item 9)**

Concerns were expressed that some Members were not spending their allocations and that unspent funds could be lost as a result. Emily Fraser informed the committee that a Member's revenue allocation could not be spent by the other Members without their permission. However, given that it had been a committee decision on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2009 to split the capital allocation equally between all Members, Emily would seek clarity after the meeting as to whether this resolution could be

rescinded before the end of the financial year to enable any unspent capital monies to be allocated by other Members. The outcome of this enquiry would be communicated to Members as soon as possible.

**Resolved:**

- (i) To note that the Ashford Rotary Clubs Dictionary project 2009 underspent by £180. This will be rolled over to the 2010 project which was awarded funding of £2680 in November 2009. This will reduce Mr Walsh's contribution by £180.
- (ii) To agree change of funding for Thomas Knyvett school from Mrs Turner-Stewart's revenue allocation to Mrs Coleman's capital allocation.
- (iii) To approve an application for funding of £1000 from relate West Surrey towards start up costs for relationship counselling, to be funded from Mrs Coleman's allocation.
- (iv) To approve an application for funding of £2060.10 from Homestart Spelthorne for the recruitment and training of volunteers, to be funded £294 from Mrs Coleman's allocation and £588.70 from each of Mr Walsh, Mr Beardsmore and Mrs Saliagopoulos' allocations.
- (v) To approve an application for funding of £2145 from Spelthorne Borough Council for improvements to Shortwood South footpath, to be funded from Mrs Turner-Stewart's allocation.
- (vi) To approve an application for funding of £1000 for an equipment upgrade for Laleham Archery Club, to be funded from Mrs Turner-Stewart's allocation.
- (vii) To approve an application for funding of £500 for a fish tank for Meadowside Older People's Home, to be funded from Mrs Saliagopoulos' allocation.
- (viii) To approve an application for funding of £500 from Spelthorne Neighbourhood Watch, to be funded £250 from each of Mr Beardsmore and Mrs Coleman's allocations.
- (ix) To approve an application for funding of £895 from Desborough Sailing Club, to be funded from Mr Walsh's capital allocation.
- (x) To approve an application for funding of £599.25 from Clarendon Primary School for the replacement of a pond liner, to be funded from Mrs Coleman's capital allocation.
- (xi) To approve an application for funding of £3000 from the 1<sup>st</sup> Shepperton Scout Group, to be funded from Mr Walsh's capital allocation.
- (xii) To approve an application for funding of £3615 for the purchase and installation of a street light to be installed in the alleyway between French Street and Lime Crescent, Sunbury, to be funded from Mrs Nichols' capital allocation.

**10/10**

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

The next meeting would be a Special meeting to be held on Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> February 2010 at The Council Chamber, Spelthorne Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines.

The meeting, which commenced at 3.00pm, ended at 5.13pm.

Chairman.....



## SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE – 18<sup>th</sup> January 2010

### AGENDA ITEM 5

#### MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

“In my capacity as Chairman of Spelthorne Borough Council Licensing Committee I continually receive correspondence regarding the imposition of yellow lines in Gresham Road to control taxi ranks and the request for the investigation for a crossing for blind and disabled people to be investigated. Can the Local Highway Manager inform me why such requests which I understand have already been made known to the County Council in previous correspondence have yet to bear fruition?”

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

Extensions to the yellow lines along Gresham Road are included in the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment to waiting restrictions to which objections were resolved by this Committee on 09 September 2009. SCC’s Parking Team has programmed the markings to be laid by the end of the financial year, subject to reasonable weather conditions.

Schemes suggested for funding from the Local Transport Plan Budget were last assessed, prioritised and reported to this Committee in March 2008. The available funding has enabled four of the highest priority schemes to be progressed.

Schemes were not re-prioritised to take account of new requests in March 2009 as the allocation for 2009 / 10 will fund schemes that already had the approval of the Local Committee. In October 2009 this Committee indicatively approved funding for schemes for the next 5 years, based on the March 2008 assessment. Assuming the same funding levels as 2009/10, five of the highest priority schemes of that assessment will be implemented.

The request for a controlled pedestrian crossing is included on the list of requests for highway schemes and will be included in the next review.

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

“Spelthorne Borough Council is in the process of submitting a business case for the use of ground adjacent to the Shepperton Youth Centre site for the provision of a Skate Park. Funding is already in place to support this project. Knowing that the County Council is always anxious to support youth

development and reduce anti social behaviour in Surrey, would members of the Local Committee be able to support this venture?"

**The Area Director will give the following answer:**

The Head of Services for Young People recently met with Spelthorne Borough Council Officers to discuss the possibility of a Skate Park adjacent to the Shepperton Youth Centre site from a service deliver stance. At this meeting it was agreed that Borough Officers would draw up a more detailed business plan concerning this proposal.

The Head of Services for Young People has instructed relevant Officers at the County Council to work positively with Borough Colleagues in taking this forward.

Members of the SCC Local Committee in Spelthorne will have an opportunity to comment on youth related issues when the Services for Young People Plan comes to committee in this municipal year. Members may wish to consider reserving comments on this specific scheme until such time as they have had sight of the proposals coming forward.

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

"On the 19th of November 2009 I drew to the attention of the Local Highway Manager (Spelthorne) the fact that the first shared bus stop / taxi rank outside Debenhams department store in Staines had taken some 18 months to achieve through sheer red tape, unacceptable bureaucracy, and what I can only term as the unnecessary referral and interference of GOSE. We now have an identical situation whereby in March 2009 further approval for another shared bus stop / taxi rank in Staines was applied for and had again followed the correct procedure regarding the proposal being properly advertised in the media. Against my better judgement it was once again referred to GOSE. who in reply informed Surrey County Council Local Transportation Manager ( Spelthorne ) that whilst they did not see a problem with the authorisation, it would take some three months to process, which I found not only astonishing but unwarranted. Spelthorne Borough Council has a duty to provide taxi ranks in pursuance of its priority of making Spelthorne safe. GOSE are hindering this process and despite my communicating with them in December 2009 and again just this week I have received neither acknowledgement or formal reply. Will the Local Highway Manager agree with me that this is a totally unsatisfactory scenario, and thereafter continue to pursue GOSE for a reply which in essence only requires a 'rubber stamp' "

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

Signs and roadmarkings are introduced to the public highway in accordance with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions. Any deviation from these Regulations must be authorised by the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) of the Department for Transport in order for the signs and / or markings to be legally enforceable. Each authorisation is site specific. GOSE had informed us there would be a delay in dealing with this application

however I believe Councillor Sider is aware that the authorisation has now been signed.

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

“Surrey County Council reports that it has increased its winter gritting, performing better than the national average.

This has not been the experience in Lower Sunbury and Halliford. As the snow began to fall on Wednesday afternoon, 6th January, Priority Level One roads had not been gritted. I had to make a car journey which included Thames Street and Green Street which are both Priority One Roads so I experienced the treacherous conditions first hand. Not only could my small car not handle the conditions but I watched a lorry skid in Thames Street and a TFL 216 bus skid in Green Street at the Nursery Road junction. Later that day one of the brand new pedestrian lights at the Nursery Road junction was knocked over by another vehicle. On Thursday all schools were closed in the area and TFL cancelled its buses. On Friday some buses were on diversion; and some schools remained closed, probably rightly given the poor state of the roads and pavements. The pavements around Sunbury Health Centre were still dangerous on Monday 11<sup>th</sup> January.

Green Street in particular is classified by Surrey County Council as a ‘traffic sensitive street’ and statistics show it carries high traffic volumes. More than 200 bus movements pass down that road and these were seriously disrupted from Wednesday to Friday. So why was the road not gritted?

Who made the decision as to which roads were gritted and when was the decision taken? Why did Lower Sunbury’s Priority One roads receive no precautionary gritting? Was the decision reviewed as the weather worsened? Please could I have a schedule showing which roads (and any pavements) were gritted in Lower Sunbury and Halliford including the date and time they were done.”

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

The decision on which roads are gritted and when is detailed in the Winter Service Plan 2009/10 and was approved by the Transportation Select Committee.

The responsibility to instruct precautionary salting operations, based on current information, rests with both Constructors. Detailed arrangements for undertaking this function are included in their annual Winter Service Operational Plan. When widespread ice or snow can be forecast up to three days before the event, the decision is taken in consultation with the Principal Asset Project Manager. During periods of continuing adverse weather operations the decision is taken in liaison with the Principal Asset Project Manager and Area Operations Managers. Decisions on whether or not to salt the roads together with the timing and the quantity of salt are reviewed on receipt of updated weather forecasts from the Met Office.

The Priority 1 routes had been gritted everyday from 31 December to 05 January inclusive so there was a substantial layer of residual salt on the carriageway when the snow fell.

On 05 January the decision to grit 'A' roads only was taken in liaison with the Highway Group Managers (West and East) with the Principal Asset Planning Manager in order to manage salt stocks.

The dates and times when 'A' roads and Priority 1 routes were gritted are given on the daily updates that I forwarded to County Members last week and included Priority 1 runs at 20.00 on 07 January and at 03.00 on 08 January using a sand/salt mix.

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

“Please could you supply a schedule to show for each of the last five years the original budget and actual expenditure on painting white lines in Spelthorne, broken down by County Division. For the financial year 2009/10 could the figures be further broken down into spend to date and forecast for the remaining months to the financial year end.”

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

The information you have requested is not readily available in the format you have requested and to compile this information would take a considerable length of officer time. The information I do have is that prior to April 2008 the allocation for Spelthorne Aids to Movement, which includes both signs and roadmarkings was as follows:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Expenditure</b>
2005 / 6	57,000	49,365
2006 / 7	37,000	35,843
2007 / 8	38,300	37,387

From April 2008 the budgets for the districts were combined to provide allocations of £185,000 for roadmarkings only for the West Area of the County.

In addition, Members made available an additional £34,000 and £23,000 in 2007 / 8 and 2008 / 9 respectively to renew roadmarkings in Spelthorne.



**AGENDA ITEM 6****PUBLIC QUESTIONS****Mr Pat Brady will ask the following question:**

“Regarding the modifications to lane marking on Sunbury Cross Roundabout, which were due to be carried out early in the 2009/2010 financial year, please will the Local Highways Manager provide an update?”

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

The revised layout of the markings around the roundabout have been designed and this will be discussed with Surrey Police and the Highways Agency during February 2010. The proposed layout will then be submitted for safety audit and at that stage details of the proposed layout could be made available to enquirers.

The most recent safety audit on the roadmarkings at Sunbury Cross was Stage 3 (post construction) carried out in June 2006 associated with Kempton Park Racecourse. At that time the recommendations were to:

Ensure the carriageway markings and signage correspond.

Ensure lamp columns were fully operational.

Amend the circulatory carriageway markings to reduce the merging conflict for Kingston-bound drivers from the M3 offslip.

Remove the ‘Local’ carriageway marking from the circulatory carriageway.

Remove the tapered carriageway marking between the nearside circulatory lane and central circulatory lane opposite the A308 westbound roundabout exit.

This scheme is currently considered to require revenue funding and as an allocation has yet to be identified there is no programmed date to implement the changes.

**Ian Robinson will ask the following question:**

"What progress has been achieved in answering my request for an investigation regarding the issue of car tyres inside wall damage and resulting accidents alleged to be caused by speed cushions".

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

The Transport Research Laboratory often undertake research of this type however I am unaware of a study in this issue. Surrey County Council do not currently invest funds in to reasearch although we do have representatives who sit on national committees where the question can be explored with colleagues elsewhere in the country.

To my knowledge SCC has received no reports of the damage you describe and there is no evidence from other sources that traffic calming is causing this problem.

**Julia Gilson will ask the following question:**

“Proposed reduction/complete cut of Bus route 557

My question as a resident of Lower Sunbury with 2 daughters attending Salesian school in Chertsey is this:

How will they get to and from school if the 557 bus route is cut?

This bus route is a lifeline between Sunbury and Chertsey there is no public transport alternative that does not involve multiple buses or a combination of bus and train which will add extra time and cost to the journey. The service is already at a minimum with only one bus and hour. I would like to see an increase in the number of buses on this route not a reduction.”

**The Passenger Transport Group Manager will give the following answer:**

The County Council is encouraging Surrey bus users, local residents, stakeholders and all other interested parties to let it know their views on the proposed review of bus services in Surrey. No decisions have been taken as the public consultation on the review runs until the end of January 2010. All comments received will be analysed and presented to the County Council's Cabinet to enable Members to make an informed decision on the future of bus services.

Through the review County Council wants to:

- focus on the areas with stronger demand
- increase some services where an affordable opportunity arises
- maintain service to areas of greatest social need
- adjust some routes to improve reliability
- reduce services which are less well-user
- create a more integrated and affordable network across the entire county
- make the network simpler and easier to understand
- reduce the need for subsidy in the long term

The review is about balancing affordability with demand over the next three years, with Spelthorne being part of the first phase. It is accepted that there are no easy answers. It is also accepted that any reductions in bus service will impact upon existing users. If agreed, any proposed changes will take place from September 2010 for the Spelthorne area.

**Terry Lyden will ask the following question:**

“Why are there are no facilities for the blind or disabled or even the rest of the community to cross the road outside the station exit /entrance in Gresham

Road..Like it or not people do cross the road from between parked taxis with the obvious danger to themselves and moving traffic. There is a shortage of dropped kerbs with tactile paving in general. to assist road crossing and entrances to Car Parks etc. Why give preference to able bodied taxi drivers and DISADVANTAGE the Blind, Disabled and the public at large?"

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

I recall you asked a similar public question on this matter at the meeting of this Committee on 24 November 2008 and I note that your question overlaps Councillor Sider's second question on this Agenda at Item 5.

Schemes suggested for funding from the Local Transport Plan Budget were last assessed, prioritised and reported to this Committee in March 2008. Your request for a pedestrian crossing is included on the list of requests for highway schemes and will be included in the next review of schemes.

However, in October 2009 this Committee indicatively approved funding for schemes for the next 5 years, based on the March 2008 assessment. Assuming the same funding levels as 2009/10, five of the highest priority schemes of that assessment will be implemented. It is therefore unlikely that a pedestrian crossing will be introduced in the near future.

**Surrey Minerals Plan Consultation****Additional Comments regarding Manor Farm from Carol Coleman**

- The cumulative effect of restoration to deep water, along with the numerous reservoirs and water bodies already in this area of the County make restoration to deep water inappropriate.
- Instead restoration to agriculture, forestry/woodland, or recreation, such as sports uses, community orchard and allotments (of which there is a shortage), or a mix with some shallow water for activities such as rowing, angling and swimming, bearing in mind the County's commitment to supporting access to green space, would be a more appropriate type of restoration for this site.
- If minerals can be removed, then they should try as hard as possible to infill afterwards.
- There is a need in the area for access to green space.
- Concerned that removal of gravel from the area will lead to flooding in this area.
- Manor farm is in close proximity to housing.
- There is an increased risk of flooding.
- A precedent has been set for removing sites from the plan in the removal of Eashing Farm.
  
- Can excavated waste from the Airtrack Scheme be included in Surrey's apportionment, or used for infill in Spelthorne?

**Minerals Plan Consultation. Response to Spelthorne Local Committee from Roger Hargreaves, Head of Environment at Surrey County Council.**

“I have looked carefully at these issues and discussed the matter with Lynne Hack, the Environment Portfolio Holder.

Consultation Period

An extension of the consultation period is not something that could be done at short notice. It could only have been carried out if it were undertaken for the county as a whole in order to ensure equity. With the close of the consultation on 18th December this would have effectively meant an extension for at least a month. It would have been a major and expensive exercise to extend the time.

Also, 9,000 different organisations and individuals were written to including those people who have shown concern about minerals issues in the past. I do think this is good coverage and it is unlikely that a further consultation period would have raised new issues. There will be further opportunities to consider views on the Aggregates Recycling DPD.

Manor Farm

The publication of the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy and Primary Aggregates DPDs was specifically to invite views on their soundness and legal compliance, in accordance with the statutory process, and was not a general consultation. The County Council has already made the decision to include the Manor Farm site and issues around Manor Farm had been raised with the portfolio holder and the Cabinet by Carol Coleman and taken into account before the decision was made. A large amount of information has also been examined on the merits for its inclusion including the potential for an alternative restoration. At this very late stage in the process the County Council is expected to make only minor changes to the plan. I should point out, however, that the plan, and all the representations on the plan, will be independently tested through the Examination in Public process.”

## SPELTHORNE LOCAL COMMITTEE

18<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2010**Comments made in response to the report on the Surrey Bus Review as requested under Officer Recommendations (i) and (ii).**

- There are many elderly residents of Shepperton who live near the War Memorial who find it difficult to walk up to the Railway Station to catch buses (438,439,218,555). Would it be possible to divert the buses down the High Street, round the War Memorial and back in order to make the buses more accessible to these residents and would serve to increase patronage?
- Shepperton Studios Estate is due to get two buses which should be of benefit to local residents.
- **Route 557** – routes 438 and 439 follow very similar routes to Staines. Would it be possible to have only one bus on the Staines route and then retain the 557?
- Time spent on buses is of huge concern. Bus Journeys can take two hours. It will take much longer to get to St Peter's from Shepperton with a change a Staines.
- When the review is over, it is essential to encourage people to use bus services to prevent further cuts in the future.
- **Route 557** – there is great need for this bus route and it must remain. Having to change buses to get to hospital would cause extra stress and strain for patients. There is also a time pressure for appointments which can be very early in the morning. Travelling 2hrs by bus each way is a considerable amount of the day used.
- There is great concern over journey times and more information is needed to reassure passengers.
- **Route 557** – patients and visitors use the bus to get to St Peters. A long bus journey could be very stressful for visitors too. The 557 provides a very important local service.
- The Bus Service Operators Grant should be given to local authorities to be distributed to subsidise necessary services and to encourage more fuel efficient buses.
- **Route 400** – the bus linking Charlton Village to Ashford Hospital should not be removed. Once it has been taken away, it will be very difficult to get back. Charlton residents will be very isolated with a half mile walk to the nearest bus stop.
- The review is taking the non-car method of travel away from some areas; need to bear this in mind in terms of planning implications if bus services are removed.
- **Route 400** – in view of the Ashford Hospital service this service provides to residents, this should be taken into consideration when considering the level of subsidy applied to this service.
- **Route 557** – Could the 557 route be changed so that it qualifies for the Rural Bus Subsidy.

- **Route 557** – route should be kept as serves the community and hospital.
- **Route 218** – should be considered for retention as it serves an isolated community and is low cost. Bus users should be surveyed on increased fares to make it sustainable.
- The map in the consultation document has omitted Ashford
- TFL should introduce additional services in peak times e.g 08.30 in the morning
- Addlestone and Ottershaw have 2 direct routes to St Peters but Ashford has none.
- Would like an increased service on TfL route 117 to be examined.
- Has the impact of removing the School Specials on the environment been considered?
- Clarification sought and gained that the review will include an environmental assessment.
- **Route 400** – an elderly gentleman in Charlton will be without a bus service with the removal of route 400. The 218 may go there if they can find a stand, but will only take him to Walton and Shepperton, not Staines or Ashford.
- **Route 557** – This service is vital to a wide range of people. It has low usage because of the rural location of St Peters. By the nature of hospital attendance, usage of the service will be sporadic. The principle of maintaining a hospital service for residents in both the North and South of the Borough should be retained in order to enable residents to access both the Ashford & St Peters sites. Could the route go through a commercial or population centre to attract more passengers? The route could be split to have one go to St Peters from the north and one from the south.
- **Route 218** – there are a surprising number of passenger journeys on this route, which argues against it being cut.
- The £11m net subsidy currently being spent on buses is a huge figure and is worrying with further government cuts imminent.
- Laleham Road appears to have an improved service.
- **Route 555** – will this route be extended from central to provide access to T5?
- **Route 555** – was originally subsidised by BAA but they have cut funding leaving the burden with SCC
- **Staines Bus Station** – is currently an inadequate interchange, particularly if it is to receive more passengers as a hub.
- There are concerns about affordability and access for those with the greatest social need for the bus network.
- **Route 557** – The review must consider access to those with a social need e.g. access to St Peters is required for residents utilising maternity services.