

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE

Minutes of the Special meeting held on Thursday 4th February 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 Royer as substitute)*
Councillor Robin Sider
Councillor Richard Smith-Ainsley*
Councillor George Trussler***

*** = present**

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

11/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (ITEM 1)
Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Saliagopoulos, Cllr Packman, Cllr Pinkerton and Cllr Sider.

12/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM 2)
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 Spelthorne Local Committee 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, Isobel Napper, Vivienne Leighton and Malcolm Royer.

No further interests were declared.

13/10 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (ITEM 3)
There were no Chairman's announcements.

14/10 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME (ITEM 4)

There were no Members' questions

15/10 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (ITEM 5)

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

16/10 HEATHROW AIRTRACK: OBJECTIONS TO THE TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT ORDER 1992 (ITEM 6)

The Chairman welcomed Iain Reeve, Head of Transport for Surrey and Lyndon Mendes, Group Manager, Transport Policy and Projects to present their report.

The Committee considered each of the recommendations to Cabinet and agreed that a record of Members' comments would be annexed to the Cabinet report, as set out in Annex A attached.

Following concerns that the Committee needed a further opportunity to comment, once negotiations with BAA had further developed and nearer the start of the Inquiry, Mr Walsh proposed that an update be brought back to the committee in the Summer, which was seconded by Mr Beardsmore.

Members were also concerned that Local Committees and borough officers would not be involved in last minute decisions taken by the Head of Transport for Surrey under delegated authority during the Inquiry as set out in the report. Mr Beardsmore proposed an amendment to require consultation with local committee chairmen and borough officers wherever possible. This was seconded by Cllr Smith-Ainsley.

Resolved:

- (i) to give its views on the general approach and principles of the report, which will form the basis of the report to Cabinet in March.
- (ii) to give its views on the specific recommendations, regarding objections to the Heathrow Airtrack scheme, to be made to Cabinet as set out in the report.
- (iii) that the Head of Transport for Surrey should report back to the Local Committee this summer with further information in relation to the objections, and specifically objections (ii) Regulation 19/Rule 17, (x) Staines Station and (xv) Overhead Rail Line and receive the Committee's views.
- (iv) that the Head of Transport for Surrey will endeavour to consult the appropriate Local Committee Chairmen and relevant officers at the Borough/District Councils on the exercise of the delegated authority as set out in Cabinet recommendation xxi in the report

17/10

DATE OF NEXT MEETING (ITEM 7)

The next meeting to be held on Monday 15th March 2010 at The Council Chamber, Spelthorne Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines.

The meeting which commenced at 7.00pm ended at 9.05pm.

Chairman.....



**SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE – 4th February
2010**

AGENDA ITEM 4

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

There were no Member questions.

AGENDA ITEM 5

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Mrs Davies will ask the following question:

"We already have serious concerns about traffic congestion at the Kingston Road/London Road junction caused by the traffic light system at the Iron Bridge. This will only be made worse by the siting of the new Elmsleigh multi-storey car park entry/exit ramp. Its proximity to the Iron Bridge junction demands that it be included in the Bridge's traffic light system. This can only lengthen the cycle time for this set of traffic lights thereby exacerbating the existing congestion problems. Will the Council ask its experts to come up with a traffic management scheme that actually works? Furthermore, there are additional traffic management issues to be addressed during the construction phase. The Council must have a clear plan to cope with access to the Town Centre whilst South Street is closed during the construction period between points T1 and T2 as shown in the TWA plans as rerouting traffic through Two Rivers or the Bypass can only result in complete chaos at the Wraysbury road/Two Rivers junction. Additionally, the Council should consider providing additional car parking, for example by renting the former Majestic House site for the purpose and ensuring that the Bridge Street car park is retained."

The Head of Transport for Surrey will give the following answer:

It should firstly be noted that this scheme is not a Surrey County Council scheme but is being promoted by BAA. As such although, as a consultee, the County supports the scheme in principle, it has raised a number of objections to the Airtrack Transport and Works Act pending further information or mitigation from BAA. This includes requesting a Transport Management plan and analysis of traffic impacts including during the construction phase.

It is noted that there can be existing difficulties at the Kingston Road/London Road junction; much of the congestion however, is due to vehicles stopping and either parking or loading and unloading.

The main change to the highway network on South Street is the introduction of a new all-movements traffic signal junction between Mustard Mill Road (Iron Bridge) and the existing access to the Elmsleigh car parks to provide a direct access to the Elmsleigh Centre Multi-Storey car park. This new junction will be incorporated into the existing Urban Traffic Control traffic signal system but is nevertheless an additional junction for traffic to negotiate.

Initial traffic modelling indicates that this junction is unlikely to significantly affect traffic but it is possible that there will be some impact in the afternoon peak. Overall the traffic modelling work to date has indicated that the completed scheme would have no significant impact on the operation of the town centre as a whole but that there may be some localised impact of which some might occur at this junction at certain times of the day.

The County's main concerns over the impact of the scheme at this location relates to how the traffic is signposted through this part of the network to ensure that drivers are guided into the correct lanes and to the management of the traffic, particularly in relation to parking and loading/unloading to ensure the smooth flow of traffic.

In terms of construction, it is noted (in BAA's Transport Assessment) that a construction Transport Management plan will be submitted and will have to be agreed with the County. Therefore the County's current position is that it has raised an objection (objection ref xiii) relating to the traffic impacts pending further information from, and discussion with, BAA. The information requested includes a Transport Management plan and analysis of traffic impacts including during construction.

Mitigation of the construction impacts on parking is the responsibility of BAA in discussion with Spelthorne Borough Council who manage off street parking in the Borough. The County have raised an objection in relation to parking (objection ref xiv) pending information from BAA regarding the potential traffic impacts and phasing of the construction.

Mr Davies will ask the following question:

"Objection no. xvi - Air Quality

What are the Council's particular concerns regarding Air Quality during construction and in the longer term?"

The Head of Transport for Surrey will give the following answer:

The County's objections in respect of air quality (objection ref iii and xvi) are related to potential changes in traffic movements. The County's current position is that it has raised objections (objection refs iii and xvi) relating to air quality pending further information from, and discussion with, BAA. The

information requested includes a Transport Management plan and analysis of traffic impacts including during construction.

It should also be noted that Spelthorne Borough Council is the statutory authority in terms of air quality and have also lodged objections with respect to air quality.

SPELTHORNE LOCAL COMMITTEE

ANNEX A

4TH February 2010

The Committee made the following comments on the proposed recommendations to Cabinet (i) to (xxii)

(i) Timetable objection

- Stanwell is already affected by aircraft noise; therefore train hours should be no longer than aeroplane hours because of the additional disturbance to residents.
- There is a danger of focusing on filling up capacity on the rail network with Heathrow trains leaving capacity issues on other busy routes.
- The network is already congested and trains often late as a result, suggesting that there is little capacity available for new trains to Heathrow.
- Need to see the business case for the selected routes concerning the viability of the Airtrack scheme based on the projected passenger numbers, this is particularly relevant to routes using the new Staines chord, as this is an expensive aspect of the proposed scheme.

The committee agreed with the recommendation to maintain this objection until a satisfactory timetable has been produced.

(ii) Regulation 19/Rule 17 objection

- Some members felt strongly that the County Council should request that the Secretary of State direct BAA to supply additional information 'concerning any matter which is required to be, or may be dealt with, in the environmental statement' under Rule 17 because there are serious deficiencies in the EIA at this stage.
- Concern that additional information is required from BAA on several environmental aspects of the scheme including traffic, air quality and activities on the moor.
- Concerned that by not making a rule 17 request the County Council is stating that the environmental concerns raised are insignificant.
- That the approach to the Regulation 19/Rule 17 objection needs to be carefully considered within the broader picture of the County Councils whole approach to the Air Track Public Inquiry.
- Members would like the chance to reconsider taking this option if BAA fails to resolve the environmental issues satisfactorily ahead of the enquiry.

The committee agreed to support the recommendation to withdraw the objection at this stage, *but requested that an update be brought back in the summer in order to reassess the situation.*

(iii) Air quality objection

The committee agreed with the recommendation to maintain the objection until satisfactory information has been received about traffic movements.

(iv) Bridleway, Spelthorne objection

The committee agreed with the recommendation to withdraw the objection.

(v) Rights of Way, Spelthorne objection

- Members felt this was important to pursue as BAA had made a mess of the rights of way and failing to rectify their errors at this stage would result in problems later on.
- That BA should bare the cost of rectifying this issue.

The committee agreed with the recommendation to maintain the objection.

(vi) Cycle routes, Spelthorne objection

The committee agreed with the recommendation to withdraw the objection.

(vii) Ecology, Spelthorne objection

The committee agreed with the recommendation to maintain the objection pending the outcome of the dialogue between BAA and the objectors.

(viii) Landscaping, Spelthorne objection

The committee agreed with the recommendation to maintain the objection.

(ix) Waste management, Spelthorne objection

The committee agreed with the recommendation to maintain the objection

(x) Staines Station, Spelthorne objection

- This was the only benefit of the scheme for Spelthorne through increased accessibility and this has been removed. Even if only 200 people used the station, this would represent 200 fewer cars on the road.
- Need further information about how BAA made their estimations regarding usage of the new station.
- However, the disruption to Staines town centre during construction would be huge. If low estimates of usage are accurate then the scheme should be dropped.

- BAA has claimed that when the High Street Station was initially proposed, many people objected to it. They have been unable to provide any evidence of this.
- It is interesting that BAA have provided a business case for the High Street Station, which they decided not to take forward, but have never provided a business case for the chord.
- Dismissing the station on the basis of cost does not hold when considered against the cost of a new runway or terminal 6.
- The cost and disruption of building a new station could be reduced by building a very small, basic station.

The committee agreed with the recommendation to maintain the objection pending more detailed information from BAA, *but requested that an update be brought back in the summer in order to reassess the situation.*

(xi) Cycle parking, Spelthorne objection

The committee agreed with the recommendation to maintain the objection pending confirmation of the facilities to be provided has been received from BAA.

(xii) Parking, Spelthorne objection

- Residents have repeatedly objected to CPZs in the past because of the cost.
- It was proposed that BAA should provide funding for residents' parking permits in any CPZ that is implemented as a direct result of Heathrow Airtrack.

The committee agreed with the recommendation to maintain the objection, pending further discussions with BAA about mitigation measures.

(xiii) Traffic impacts, Spelthorne objection

- This is considered an essential objection by some members to maintain as the combined impact of construction, the multi-storey car parks and the levels crossings will have a significant effect on traffic in the town centre.
- BAA response only refers to construction traffic and the wider impact of traffic through Staines need also to be acknowledged.
- It is important to remember that Thorpe Road level crossing directly affects Staines traffic as well as Egham.

The committee agreed with the recommendation to maintain the objection pending further information from BAA about traffic impacts.

(xiv) Car Park impacts, Spelthorne objection

- BAA response refers to alterations to the ramp, but this is not the only impact which needs to be addressed as there is also the issue of all traffic using one car park entrance where they would have used two and the problematic traffic flows inside Tothill car park whilst it also acts as an entrance to the Elmsleigh car park. These issues must be taken into account.

The committee agreed with the recommendation to maintain the objection pending the traffic information and discussions with BAA's consultants.

(xv) Overhead rail line, Spelthorne objection

- Requested that written assurance is received from BAA that they will not extend the overhead lines beyond the minimum necessary for transition.
- Surrey County Council should continue to monitor this situation. It could be that future changes in technology allow transition to take place inside the tunnel. The opportunity to change if this becomes the case must not be lost.
- BAA's reasons for needing to use overhead lines at all are confusing and need to be clarified.

The committee agreed with the recommendation to withdraw the objection, *but requests that BAA provides a written guarantee that overhead lines will be used for the shortest possible distance only and that an update be brought back in the summer in order to reassess the situation.*

(xvi) Air quality, Spelthorne

The committee agreed with the recommendation to maintain the objection until satisfactory information has been received about traffic movements.

(xvii) Runnymede level crossings objection

- BAA must take responsibility for funding the mitigation package of measures and not pass the buck back to the County Council.
- Need to link issue back to Staines and its impact on traffic flows.
- Need more accurate information regarding downtimes at the level crossing as these keep changing.
- Electronically controlled crossings would keep traffic moving better but neither Network Rail nor BAA is prepared to pay for this upgrade.

The committee agreed with the recommendation to maintain the objection until agreement has been reached about the proposed mitigation package.

(xviii) & (xix) Station stopping service objections

- Important to pay attention to wider transport issues and strategic transport in the region.
- Concerns expressed over whether the views of residents of Virginia Water had been sought.

The committee agreed with the recommendation to withdraw the objection. *Mr Beardsmore and Mrs Coleman abstained.*

(xx) Hithermoor Landfill site new objection

- Need to ensure the Council is in a strong position in negotiations with BAA and not back down too soon.
- Need to identify what mitigation will be provided for residents of Stanwell Moor who will be affected by noise, dust etc.
- More information is required about where the contaminated material that is removed will go. It is not wanted in Spelthorne.
- A statement of Human Health Impact should be incorporated.
- If the service proves not to be commercially viable, is there a restoration plan? This has been an issue with minerals sites not being restored.
- Air pollution from digging up this site should be raised as a concern.
- Staines Moor does flood, has sufficient work on flood risk analysis been completed?

The committee agreed with the recommendation to raise an additional objection regarding the risk of ground water contamination from disturbance of the Hithermoor landfill site and the subsequent impact on Staines Moor SSSI.

(xxi) The committee agreed with the recommendation to agree that a delegation be made to the Head of Transport for Surrey in discussion with the Cabinet Member for Transport, Deputy Leader and Leader of the Council to negotiate and agree the resolution of objections in the event that these are not resolved by the Full Council meeting on 23 march 2010. *In addition, it was requested that, where possible, the Head of Transport for Surrey will also consult the appropriate local committee Chairmen and relevant officers at the district/borough councils on the exercise of the delegated authority.*

(xxii) The committee agreed with the recommendation that Cabinet be asked to agree that the County Council prepare and present at the Public Inquiry should the objections not be resolved, taking into account the resource implications involved.