

DRAFT

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE**

**Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 10<sup>th</sup> October 2011 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 Penny Forbes-Forsyth**  
**Councillor Vivienne Leighton\***  
**Councillor Isobel Napper\***  
**Councillor Joanne Sexton\***  
**Councillor Richard Smith-Ainsley\***  
**Councillor Robert Watts\***  
**Councillor Suzy Webb\***

**\* = present**

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

- 52/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)**  
Mrs Nichols and Councillor Forbes-Forsyth gave their apologies for this meeting.
- 53/11 MINUTES (Item 2)**  
The Minutes of the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2011 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
- 54/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**  
No declarations of interest were given.
- 55/11 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Item 4)**  
There were no Chairman's announcements.
- 56/11 PETITIONS (Item 5)**  
One petition signed by 450 residents was received and presented by Mrs Jacque Hogan which read:  
  
"Our quality of life is being affected by the constant stream of H.G.V's using Squires Bridge Road, Laleham Road, New Road and Charlton Road.

The H.G.V's are causing excessive vibration to houses and buildings. They are speeding and causing unbearable noise from the early hours, throughout the day and until the late hours of the night. This is not helped by the fact that they travel in numbers. The sheer number of lorries makes using, crossing, working and living along Squires Bridge Road, Laleham Road, New Road and Charlton Road, intimidating, frightening, dangerous and unhealthy.

The residents and visitors would like a total ban on H.G.V's using these roads. Or failing that, any other reasonable measure that can be agreed by the councillors and residents to improve our quality of life. Although this has been an ongoing problem for many years it has now reached an unacceptable level."

**Resolved:**

That the petition be received and a report be submitted to the 16<sup>th</sup> January 2012 meeting of the Local Committee.

57/11

**MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (Item 6)**

Two Member questions were received and the answers are as set out in Annex 1 to these minutes.

58/11

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item 7)**

Three public questions were received and the answers are as set out in Annex 1 to these minutes.

59/11

**ANNUAL REVIEW OF MONITORING OF APPLICATIONS FOR GOODS VEHICLES OPERATORS LICENCES (Item 8)**

**Resolved:**

To note

- (i) There was now an established system in place for notifying and consulting Members of applications in their Divisions and in some cases neighbouring divisions
- (ii) Training for Members was carried out in September and November 2009 and was made available for all County Councillors. More training will be available for later this year.
- (iii) The contents of the Annual Information report.

60/11

**SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE ANNUAL REPORT (Item 9)**

**Resolved:**

To note the report.

61/11

**D6283 CHURCH ROAD, SHEPPERTON PETITION RESPONSE – REQUEST FOR A VEHICLE ACTIVATED SIGN (Item 10)**

**Resolved:**

To note the report and that the Vice Chairman intended to fund a temporary VAS through his allocation of the Community Pride funding.

62/11

**HIGHWAYS SCHEMES PROGRESS REPORT (Item 11)**

**Resolved:**

Agreed to

- (i) Note the report
- (ii) The reallocation of £12,000 towards a freight study for the Borough (including data gathering).
- (iii) The Chairman asking the London Borough of Hounslow to provide information on how the £30,000 contributed by SCC towards a feasibility study has been used and that the London Borough of Hounslow be invited to meet with Members.
- (iv) Mark Boland being invited to attend the 16th January meeting of the Local Committee to enable Members to express concerns about the performance of the May Gurney contract in relation to some Spelthorne issues.

63/11

**B376 WALTON LANE, SHEPPERTON – PROPOSED 7.5 TONNES WEIGHT RESTRICTION (Item 12)**

**Resolved:**

Agreed

- (i) The proposed 7.5 tonnes weight restriction (except for access purposes) on B376 Walton Lane, Shepperton be advertised by public notice
- (ii) The proposed 7.5 tonnes weight restriction (except for access purposes) on Windmill Green, Shepperton be advertised by public notice, subject to the consent of the land owner and consultation with the residents of Windmill Green and Sherbourne Gardens
- (iii) Subject to no significant objection being received the restrictions be implemented.
- (iv) If an objection to the proposed restriction on B376 Walton lane is received before the end of the objection period, it is determined by the Area Team Manager (NE) in consultation with the Chairman and the Local Electoral Division Member and leader of the Borough Council.
- (v) If an objection to the proposed restriction on Windmill Green is received before the end of the objection period, it be determined by the Area Team Manager (NE) in consultation with the Chairman and the local Electoral Division Member and leader of the Borough Council.

64/11

**A3044 STANWELL MOOR ROAD/PARK ROAD BANNED U TURN (Item 13)**

**Resolved:**

Agreed to

- (i) Advertise the Traffic Regulation Order in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and subject to no objections being received, the Order be made
- (ii) The Area Team Manager (NE) in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee and Local Divisional Member and leader of the Borough Council resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals.
- (iii) The implementation of the scheme once the Traffic Regulation order had been made.

65/11

**MEMBERS' FUNDS (Item 14)**

It was noted that the Berryscroft Court Lounge application had been resubmitted at a lower amount of £8,028.21

**Resolved:**

- (i) To note funding agreed under delegated authority since the Local Committee in July 2011.
- (ii) Approved funding of £1455.52 to Littleton CE Infant School for the provision of a picnic area from Mr Walsh's allocation.
- (iii) Approved funding of £1580 to Shepperton Slalom Canoe Club for the purchase of boats and paddles from Mr Walsh's allocation.
- (iv) Approved funding of £2460 to Spelthorne Borough Council for the purchase of winter hanging baskets for Staines South and Ashford West from Ms Turner-Stewart's allocation.
- (v) Approved funding of £2000 to Spelthorne Borough Council to move the existing London Stone from The Lammas to Memorial Gardens from Mrs Saliagopoulos's allocation.
- (vi) Approved funding of £5,000 to Berryscroft Court for the refurbishment of the residents' communal lounge from Ms Turner-Stewart's allocation.

66/11

**LOCAL PREVENTION FRAMEWORK (Item 15)**

**Resolved:**

To approve the recommendations in Section 7 for future commissioning of preventative services for young people through the Local Prevention Framework.

67/11

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING (Item 16)**

To be held on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> January 2012 at 7pm in the Council Chamber, Spelthorne Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines at 7pm.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00pm, ended at 9.40pm.

Chairman.....

**SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE**

**10<sup>th</sup> October 2011**

**AGENDA ITEM 6**

**MEMBER QUESTION TIME**

**Councillor Napper asked the following question:**

At the 11th July meeting of the Local Committee it was agreed to consult on proposals to impose waiting and on street parking restrictions at various locations in Spelthorne and depending upon the outcome of the consultations to make an order under the relevant Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. One of the proposals was to have double yellow lines at the junction of Park Avenue with Laleham Road. Please could I be informed whether the consultation process has started and what the estimated timescale is for these waiting restrictions to be implemented? I feel this should be given priority as this is a very busy road. It is terrible the amount of cars parked every where.

**Peter Wells Assistant Engineer, Parking Strategy & Implementation Team gave the following answer:**

The consultation has not started yet. The legal notice is scheduled to be published on 10 November 2011. It will be posted on site in the form of street notices, published in local 'paid for' newspapers, be available to view on deposit with plans at libraries in Spelthorne and the borough council offices, Knowle Green and viewable on-line on the Surrey County Council website.

The consultation period will run until 8 December 2011, subject to any objections being successfully determined implementation will take place in Spring 2012. Unfortunately it is not possible to progress one individual location ahead of all other sites. To work efficiently and cost effectively as possible all locations are progressed together.

**Mrs Coleman asked the following question:**

For many years I have been asking questions at this Committee on behalf of residents, regarding Clockhouse Lane. Residents, quite rightly, want to know now, if SCC intends to actually do anything about the HGV issues in this road. They are asking me, that if not, Surrey are just honest about it and say so now.

**The North East Area Team Manager gave the following answer:**

## **DRAFT**

Surrey County Council is committed to the introduction of an HGV restriction southbound on Clockhouse Lane to support the existing northbound restriction. Committee will be asked to consider allocating funding to undertake a Borough wide HGV study at the 10th October Committee to better investigate the impacts of an HGV restriction here and in other locations in Spelthorne. If Surrey County Council was to simply advertise the proposed restriction and received a significant objection, for example from a neighbouring highway authority, it would require a public enquiry to progress further, hence the need for a robust evidence base.

## **AGENDA ITEM 7**

### **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

#### **Mr Malcolm Robertson asked the following question:**

Over the past few months, this Borough has seen, amongst other things threatened or imposed; an increase in gravel extraction, a reduction in Fire and Rescue Cover, loss of permanent staff to our Libraries, car parking charges, and an unsafe, unreliable and totally inefficient incinerator masquerading as an 'eco park'.

The County Council which administers Surrey's eleven Boroughs is now actively seeking, through its "Aggregates Recycling Joint Development Plan" to target Spelthorne yet again by proposing 25% of the preferred sites to be situated within our single Borough. Would the County Council please explain why it has put forward such an unbalanced and disproportionate plan, which will merely exacerbate the problems we already suffer in the area from heavy lorries and plant, noise, dust, fumes and particulate matter in what is already a borough wide Air Quality Management Area?

Furthermore, and in particular, why does the County Council seem prepared to allow, and in some cases, even prefer, mineral extraction and aggregate recycling to surround Shepperton and its environs, by besieging us with sites at Littleton Lane, Home Farm, Laleham Road Nurseries, Queen Mary Reservoir, Charlton Lane and Watersplash Farm?

#### **Les Andrews Planning Policy Manager Planning & Development Group Services for Communities gave the following answer:**

It is not the case that Spelthorne has been targeted by the Aggregates Recycling Development Plan Document (ARDPD). The sites identified in the ARDPD are there because they are already in other adopted Development Plan Documents (DPDs) or they have emerged through a thorough planning assessment process regarding their suitability for development as an aggregate recycling facility.

There are two key aspects of the ARDPD which underlay the inclusion of sites considered to have potential for such recycling. The first is in terms of the process which led to the sites' identification. The second is the level of confidence which can reasonably be had in anticipating that proposals will come forward for the development of recycling facilities.

## DRAFT

Turning to the first point, sites were drawn from three main sources. These were from potential recycling sites in the adopted Surrey Waste Plan, potential mineral workings in the now adopted Surrey Minerals Plan and a countywide assessment of potentially suitable locations.

It is important to remember that the products from aggregate recycling contribute to the maintenance of the fabric of the urban areas. It is appropriate therefore that the recycling facilities are located in or in close proximity to these urban areas. The focus of the search that was carried out by officers can be summarised as primarily looking for previously developed land in or adjacent to the urban areas with a priority for areas in North West Surrey, Guildford, Woking and Reigate / Redhill. This is the approach set out in the adopted Surrey Minerals Plan. The countywide search was undertaken for over 90 sites which were considered might have potential for locating an aggregate recycling facility. Of these a number were shortlisted for more detailed consideration and from which the sites identified in the ARDPD are drawn. The sites have been subject to a detailed examination and represent only those locations which are considered to have potential. Thorough as this search was, it is recognised that there may be windfall sites other than those assessed and the ARDPD makes policy provision for this eventuality.

The second point has two strands. The purpose of the ARDPD is to deliver the aim of the adopted Surrey Minerals Plan to increase aggregate recycling in the county from the current level of about 370,000 tonnes per year (tpa) to 800,000 tpa by 2016 and 900,000 tpa by 2026. Whilst there is scope for increasing production from the existing aggregate recycling facilities, further new recycling facilities will be needed. The precise number of facilities that will be needed cannot be predicted but assuming a number of modest facilities came forward producing 70,000 tpa each, this would indicate up to 7 or 8 facilities could come forward. Larger facilities would of course mean less facilities. The exact locations of where proposals may come forward also cannot be predicted. These uncertainties are dealt with in the ARDPD by considering three potential outcomes for production which do not differentiate as to which sites will come forward. The ARDPD considers what the overall level of production would be where 25%, 50% and 75% of the overall capacity were to materialise.

The final point made in the correspondence is with regard to mineral extraction and aggregate recycling in Spelthorne. With the exception of Watersplash Farm, all of the sites have been the subject of the most rigorous examination at the planning application stage when no significant adverse impacts were identified. Watersplash Farm was examined at the Surrey Minerals Plan Public Examination and is included in the now adopted Surrey Minerals Plan. This site would in due course be the subject of rigorous examination at the planning application stage.

## **DRAFT**

### **Andrew McLuskey asked the following question:**

Given the news that the Stanwell health Centre has recently been sold is the Committee confident that it will be able to carry on with library and other county linked responsibilities on that site for the foreseeable future?

### **Rose Wilson, Library Operations Manager, Cultural Services gave the following answer:**

The library service has been involved with Spelthorne Borough and the developers in the design and planning for the new GP's surgery and library and Surrey County Council's Estates Planning and Management service have been involved in the leasing arrangements for the library. The library which is in temporary shop premises is expecting to move into the new space before Christmas. The space adjacent to the library- the cafe area, has been designed flexibly to allow joint use of library and cafe space, so that the library service can run a local programme of children's events, family learning sessions, and lifelong learning opportunities which it has not been able to do before. The service hopes to work holistically with the GP's surgery to encourage health and well being and positive parenting. Plans for the fitting out of the new library are well under way and a launch programme will be set up to ensure all the residents of Stanwell are aware of the new library.

### **Mr J Herring asked the following question:**

At the July Committee meeting a question was asked regarding the signs advertising a local estate agent attached to a traffic sign in Church Road Ashford. A councillor responded stating it was not sanctioned by the council and would be removed. It has not been removed and another business is now advertising in similar fashion in Woodthorpe Road. What is the stance of the Council on this development?

### **The North East Area Team Manager gave the following answer:**

The signs were erected by Spelthorne Borough Council further to an initiative to allow sponsorship of signage by local businesses in the area. Officers from the two authorities are liaising on the future of the signs.

### **Mr Freddie Capes asked the following question:**

#### **Re Feltham Road**

On what basis was the agreement to make a traffic regulation order for the HGV ban on Feltham Road (at a committee meeting on 30.06.08) withdrawn due to lack of assumed support from Hounslow Council? Was Hounslow Council's lack of support confirmed in writing and if so by whom and with what authority? Was Spelthorne's action to drop a previously stated and accepted proposal halted as a result of inconsideration of Feltham Road residents needs, was it dropped for financial reasons or was economical restraint from Hounslow to Spelthorne a major consideration.



**The North East Area Team Manager gave the following answer:**

It is understood that the proposals for a HGV restriction on Feltham Road were put on hold in order to concentrate on the introduction of an HGV restriction on Clockhouse Lane Southbound. As part of the Highway Update report item approval is being sought to better understand the impacts of introducing HGV restrictions across the Borough, including Feltham Road, in order to advise Members on a potential package of measures which could be progressed in the 2012/13 financial year onwards.

**Nikhil Dally asked the following question:**

As I have explained in detail in my correspondence to members of the Local Committee, the report concerning item 10 of the Agenda – the Request for a Vehicle Activated Sign in Church Road, Shepperton – contains multiple factual inaccuracies, and omits some of the most salient and reliable evidence relating to this issue. In view of these inaccuracies and omissions, would not the only honest course of action be to reject this report, or at least to defer it until such time as its multiple failings can be properly and objectively investigated? In the meantime, could funding for the Vehicle Activated Sign not be found from the current Local Committee Revenue Allocation?

**The North East Area Team Manager gave the following answer:**

In response to the points made by Nikhil Dally in correspondence which I have set out below, I would make the following responses:

**point 1.1:** The petition was signed by 171 signatories from Old Shepperton village. Given that there are, according to the Post Office, c. 156 addresses in Old Shepperton, this suggests overwhelming support from the residents and business proprietors of the village.

**RESPONSE:** The number of signatories should have been recorded in the minutes. In this instance this did not occur. The number of signatories does not impact on the recommendations of the report. Officers must base their reasoning on data such as speeds and collisions not public feeling.

**point 1.2:** Your report's description of Church Road as "quiet" is tendentious. The road can indeed sometimes be quiet. However, it is often dangerous.

**RESPONSE:** There is no data to support the road being dangerous.

**point 1.6:** Your report falsifies what happened at the meeting between myself, Mike Pritchard (Surrey Police) and Adrian Selby (Surrey County Council) on 25th January. At no point did I ever request "traffic calming and Vehicle Activated Signs to be installed along the length of Church Road". On 25th January I merely asked the question: "What would be feasible and what would be effective in slowing cars down on Church Road?" Adrian Selby failed to answer this question. It was Mike Pritchard himself who suggested that we ask for a VAS, and kindly offered to install a Police VAS temporarily.

**RESPONSE:** Having consulted the Officer the recollection of the meeting

## DRAFT

differs from that of the petitioner, however this has no bearing on the recommendations of the report.

**point 2.2:** At the meeting on 25th January, I pointed out a series of discrepancies in the statistics collected by the Police SDR in November 2010. Mike Pritchard admitted that the readings taken by this machine were unreliable: in his exact words, the SDR was “not working properly”. I can go through these discrepancies in detail with you myself, if you wish. However, for your report to quote statistics based on readings from a machine which the Police admit “is not working properly” is quite reprehensible.

**RESPONSE:** The Council requested the data from the Police. The data supplied by the Police must be considered reliable or it would not have been provided.

**point 2.3:** There have been at least three car crashes on the Church Road S-bend in the last three years, not two in five years as your report claims. One was in the winter of 2008-9 (outside Moy Lodge), one was in June 2010 (into the front wall of Winches Cottage), and one was at the entrance to Manor House Court in spring 2011. Your report presents no evidence that none of these accidents were speed related: your report simply assumes this, and states this opinion as fact.

**RESPONSE:** Officers use the personal injury collision data recorded by the Police. When a personal injury collision occurs likely contributory factors are recorded. Speed was not recorded to be a contributory factor in any of the collisions.

**points 2.7 & 3.1 & 4.2:** Your report continues to repeat the claims, still without producing any reliable supporting evidence, that there have been “no speed related collisions” and that there are “low average speeds” on Church Road.

**RESPONSE :** See above

**point 3.3:** No evidence is presented to support your claim that a VAS “may have little or no effect on speeds”. In fact, exactly the opposite conclusion is drawn by the residents of Old Shepperton who live and drive along Church Road: that is why they overwhelmingly support this petition. Your suggestion that the trigger speed of 35 mph was “rarely being activated” is utterly contrary to the evidence collected by the Police. I quote Mike Pritchard: “I confirm we have had 5000 activations in 3 weeks which averages out at 260 per day”. This evidence is borne out by my experience on CSW duty, where, even when the VAS was working, I was recording c. 10 cars over 35 mph in an hour. 260 cars driving over 5 mph over the speed limit each day is, I suggest, a significant number for such a “quiet” road.

**RESPONSE:** The views are that of professional road safety officers involved in the deployment of VAS across the County. They do not consider that a permanent VAS is justified at this location.

## DRAFT

**point 4.1:** At the meeting on 25th January, Mike Pritchard suggested that the cost of supplying and installing a permanent VAS would be “c. £2500-3000”. Adrian Selby was at that meeting, and made no objection to this figure. I therefore find your report’s claim that the cost would be “£6000-8000” puzzling.

**RESPONSE:** The cost estimate includes purchase and installation (including connection of permanent power supply) of a VAS.

**point 4.2:** Incredibly, the fact that “residents want to reduce the trigger speed from 35 to 30 mph” is presented as evidence to suggest that a VAS is not needed. This is clearly a fatuous conclusion: residents were very pleased with the effect of the temporary VAS on speeds on Church Road. We think that lowering the trigger speed further may make the VAS even more effective; however, if there is evidence to the contrary, we are happy to hear it.

**RESPONSE:** The trigger speed for VAS should be set at enforcement intervention levels i.e. 35mph.

**point: 4.3:** It is implied, again, that the only reason to install a VAS is for “public reassurance”. This is false. The residents of Old Shepperton live on a daily basis with speeding cars. They have seen the positive effect the VAS has had on traffic speeds; and they have seen how the situation has deteriorated since the VAS was removed. This has nothing to do with reassurance and everything to do with reducing speeding and increasing safety.

**RESPONSE:** There is no evidence that the VAS would serve any purpose other than to provide public reassurance.