SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> March 2012 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

Councillor Patel substituted for Councillor Webb at this meeting.

## \* = present (All references to items refer to the Agenda for the meeting)

## 16/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)

Mrs Saliagopoulos, Councillor Sexton and Councillor Webb gave their apologies for this meeting. Councillor Patel substituted for Councillor Webb at the meeting.

## 17/12 MINUTES (Item 2)

The minutes of the meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2012 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### NOTE: Under Item 02/12, ie:

'It was noted that the London Borough of Hounslow should be requested again to provide information on how the £30,000 contributed by SCC towards a feasibility study, referred to under minute 62/11, had been used.'

It was agreed that Highways manager Matthew Scriven would now take further action to follow this up.

- **18/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)** No declarations of interest were given.
- **19/12 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Item 4)** The Chairman made no announcements.

## 20/12 PETITIONS (Item 5)

One petition was received.

Councillor Frazer from Spelthorne Borough Council presented a petition with 228 signatures for enforcing weight restrictions in Feltham Road. The petition read:

"We PETITION Surrey County Council and all appropriate agencies to enforce forthwith the weight restrictions on lorries agreed by the Local Committee on the 30<sup>th</sup> June 2008, as an urgent first step to curbing the noise, danger, damage and disruption caused by HGV traffic in Feltham Road."

#### **Resolved:**

- (i) That the petition be received.
- (ii) That the officer response would be presented at the 9<sup>th</sup> July 2012 formal meeting of the Committee.

## 21/12 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (Item 6)

Two Member questions were received from Mr Agarwal and Mrs Saliagopoulos. The answers are as set out in Annex 1 to these minutes.

## 22/12 PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item 7)

Two written questions were received from members of the public and the answers are as set out in Annex 1 to these minutes.

## 23/12 C231 GASTON BRIDGE RD/UPPER HALLIFORD RD PETITION RESPONSE (Item 8)

The Highways Manager, North East Area Team, replied to the petition brought to the Local Committee meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2012.

#### **Resolved:**

(i) The Committee noted the contents of the report.

(ii) The Committee agreed that the location should be monitored by the Highways team and if the situation changes it will be identified via the Spelthorne Road Safety Working Group, which consists of Road Safety officers, Surrey Highways, Surrey Police, Surrey Fire & Rescue. The location will continue to receive enforcement by the Police and temporary VAS deployed.

## 24/12 LOCAL PREVENTION FRAMEWORK – SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE (Item 9)

## **Resolved:**

- (i) The Committee approved SCC Officers' recommendations to award a contract for a twelve month period to the following provider: Surrey Youth Consortium, for 50% of the contract value (£64,000) to prevent young people from becoming NEET for first time entrants into the criminal justice system in Spelthorne.
- (ii) The Committee agreed that a special meeting of the Local Committee should be convened to consider and approve options for services to be commissioned with the outstanding £64,000.

## 25/12 YOUTH SMALL GRANTS (Item 10)

## **Resolved:**

The process for approving Youth Small Grants as set out within paragraphs 2.3 to 2.6, **subject to the following amendment:** 

(i) **In paragraph 2.4:** If there is funding unallocated after this meeting, then it is recommended that bids are considered for approval at future meetings of the Local Committee.

## 26/12 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE REPORT April – September 2011 (Item 11)

This report was for information only.

## **Resolved:**

- (i) The Committee noted the performance of SFRS within Spelthorne.
- (ii) The Committee supports the achievement of personnel at Staines and Sunbury Fire Stations

- (iii) The Committee supports the commitment by SFRS to embrace new technology and improved initiatives, to reduce risk further and make Spelthorne safer.
- (iv) The Committee endorses SFRS to continue working with partners to influence behaviour in the community.
- (v) The Committee will consider further promotion of the SFRS Firewise Scheme with partner agencies and local contacts.
- (vi) The Committee recognises that following evaluation of initiatives, funding may be requested in order for them to be implemented, maintained or continued.

### 27/12 PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS FOR BURGES WAY, STAINES AND CLARENDON ROAD, ASHFORD (Item 12)

#### **Resolved:**

- (i) The Committee agreed to the proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Spelthorne as described in the report and shown in detail on drawings presented at the committee meeting as annex A and B.
- (ii) The Committee agreed that the intention of the County Council to make an Order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on street parking restrictions in Spelthorne as shown on the drawings in annex A and B be advertised and that if no objections be maintained, the Orders be made.

## 28/12 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES PROGRESS REPORT (Item 13)

#### **Resolved:**

(i) The Committee noted the contents of the report for information.

(ii) The Committee agreed to hold a Members workshop to determine the 2012/13 Highways Programme.

#### 29/12 MEMBERS' ALLOCATIONS REPORT (Item 14)

Note: There was an Addendum to this report, tabled at the meeting.

#### **Resolved:**

The Committee:

(i) NOTED the Criteria and Guidance Note for the use of

Members' Allocations as set out in Appendix A to the report.

- (ii) NOTED the allocations approved under delegated authority by the Community Partnership Manager and Community Partnership Team Leader (East) in consultation with the Chairman (section 2).
- (iii) APPROVED the items submitted for funding (capital and revenue) from the 2011/12 local committee budget detailed in section 3.
- (iv) APPROVED the items submitteed for funding (capital and revenue) from the 2011/12 local committee budget, detailed in the Addendum.
- (v) NOTED that that a proposal for Miss England Semi Finals was withdrawn by Councillor Saliagopoulos.
- (vi) NOTED that the proposal for two parenting courses for parents with children with ADHD/Aspergers Syndrome from Councillor Agarwal's allocation is subject to Relate West Surrey providing additional information including updated costs and confirmation regarding duration and timings.
- (vii) NOTED that funding for the Signage for Shepperton project from Councillor Walsh's allocation has been increased to £1528.48 to fund the cost of two signs.
- (viii) NOTED the remaining member allocation balances detailed at Annexe 1.

## 30/12 DATE OF NEXT MEETING (Item 15)

To be held on **Monday 9<sup>th</sup> July 2012** at 7pm in the Council Chamber, Spelthorne Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines TW18 1XB. (6.30pm – 7pm: Informal Public Question Time.)

A Special Local Committee will be convened at an earlier date, to consider the Local Prevention Framework proposals (see Item 9 above).

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00pm, ended at 8.45pm.

Chairman.....

## Annex 1

## SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE – 19<sup>th</sup> March 2012

## AGENDA ITEM 6

#### MEMBER QUESTION TIME

#### Mr Agarwal will ask the following question:

"What plans does Surrey County Council have to ensure that a full consultation takes place before any more Surrey Schools move to Academy Status?"

# Peter-John Wilkinson, Assistant Director – SCC Schools & Learning, will give the following answer:

Unfortunately it is not in Surrey's gift to require specific consultation regarding individual schools becoming academies. It is the governing body which decides, by simple resolution, if it wants the school to become an academy. Before a maintained school is converted to an academy, the school's governing body must consult with 'such persons as they think appropriate'. This'consultation' can be done before or after an Academy Order has been made. Therefore the requirements in law appear to be quite minimal. Some schools are undertaking a good deal of consultation with their local communities, others less so. As the LA, we have asked to meet with governing bodies before they make their decisions so we can make a case to remain with the LA. We have mostly been able to do this.

We have - in different settings, with governors, heads etc, tried to put the general case in favour of remaining with the LA. If the question relates to further work of this kind, then we can discuss what else might be possible.

#### Mrs Saliagopoulos will ask the following question:

"Can our officers please give me some assurance as to the timescale of the installation of 3 hour parking measures in the area of Knowle Green Health Centre and can the patients of the Surgery have some assurance as to Surrey County Council resolving the issue of commuter parking in and around the area of the Health Centre?"

# Jack Roberts Engineer, SCC Parking Strategy and Implementation, will give the following answer:

Should the committee decide to approve the parking proposals for Burges Way - Staines, the advertisement of the restrictions would begin in April and run for a 4 week period extending into May.

Subject to there being no insurmountable objections in response to the advertisement, work on the ground should be completed by the end of August at the latest.

The proposed 3 hour limited waiting bays would completely prevent commuter parking and any other all day parking from taking place. Although it is possible that non health centre visitors could still use the bays, the situation would be a significant improvement on the current, and it is almost certain that there will be more opportunities to park near to the health centre during opening hours.

## AGENDA ITEM 7

## PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

# Mr John Hirsh, Hon. Chairman, Lower Sunbury Residents' Association (LOSRA) will ask the following question:

"The following developments have now been approved or are in prospect for the Lower Sunbury/Shepperton area:

- The new Walton Bridge;
- Gravel Extraction at Watersplash Farm, Fordbridge Road;
- The Eco Park at Charlton Lane;
- Approx. 50 new homes at the Environment Agency Site in Fordbridge Road, Lower Sunbury;
- Approx. 50 new homes in Green Street/Thames Street, Lower Sunbury;
- Approx. 200 new homes in The Avenue, Lower Sunbury;
- The construction of rugby pitches on the Hazelwood Golf Course, Green Street, Lower Sunbury.

The cumulative effects of some or all of these developments will be considerable with predictable increases in traffic congestion and environmental pollutants. What active steps will be taken to ensure that the policy objectives outlined in 'The Surrey Transport Plan; Congestion Strategy 2011 -2026, Page 8' and 'The Surrey Transport Plan, Air Quality Strategy 2011 -2026' are met and that full account of the cumulative effects (traffic congestion and environmental) of these proposed developments are fully addressed, given that the whole of the Borough is an Air Quality Management Area with particular hotspots close to the sites in question?"

# Jan Haunton, Strategy Group Manager – Environment & Infrastructure Directorate, will give the following answer:

The policy objectives of the Surrey Transport Plan are, of necessity, high level aims. In an area like Surrey, where development frequently tends to be focussed on already developed areas, in part to protect the Green Belt, further development may lead to intensification in the use of sites. Whilst this may be capable of management in the near vicinity, given current methods of travel and communication it can increase pressures in the wider environment over a period of time. Surrey's role is to minimise these impacts where they can be defined at the local level, and to seek to mitigate them on a case by case basis.

Local Planning Authorities such as Spelthorne Borough Council, may seek to address these impacts by seeking contributions from developers towards mitigating the impacts of development in the locality. Spelthorne Borough Council is currently able to do this utilising the S.106 mechanism (under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Moving forward the borough is able to consider adopting the Community Infrastructure Levy (introduced through recent planning legislation) as a means of enabling wider consideration and resolution of these issues.

Surrey County Council and Spelthorne Borough Council work closely on air quality matters, sharing data and information in this area. These will also be taken into account as we develop an updated transport strategy for the borough to address wider travel demands, both now and in future, and the attendant problems.

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

"In the light of the points below, can the Chair explain the apparently neglectful and unhelpful approach of Surrey Police to Stanwell and Stanwell Moor?

a) The failure of the local Police to apprehend anyone with regard to the rash of 'Asian Gold' burglaries in Stanwell.

b) The serious law and order issue which has developed OVER MONTHS in Hithermoor and adjacent areas.

c) The failure of the two PCs present at the North Stanwell Police Panel to check threatening behaviour and verbal defamation.

d) The 'brushing off' by the local Police Inspector of a complaint regarding c) as none of his business."

# Inspector Derrick Laing, Neighbourhood Inspector for Spelthorne, will give the following answer:

A: Mr McLuskey was present during a recent community meeting in Stanwell where I outlined the current work being undertaken by Surrey Police in response to the series. There has been an arrest but unfortunately there was insufficient evidence to charge. There has also been a group of individuals charged with conspiracy to burgle linked to offences in the Spelthorne area. No one has been charged specifically with the asian jewellery series in Stanwell.

We continue to work towards improving our intelligence picture to establish any potential suspects. All the offences have been reviewed to ensure all opportunities have been considered. We will continue to work with the local community to keep them informed and address their concerns. **B:** Mr McLuskey refers to serious law and order issue in Hithermore. I am not aware of any serious breaches of law and order and would require further information to provide a proper update.

Mr McLuskey and he has been informed that the incident at the panel meeting does not constitute a criminal offence and did not warrant my officers taking any further action with the persons involved. The matter has been referred to the council who have responded to him.

**D**: The action of the other party at the meeting does not constitute an offence and therefore I do not expect my staff to get involved. This is not a police matter therefore there is no complaint to manage.

I spoke to Mr McLuskey at the end of the community meeting. I am disappointed that he did not raise his concerns about the apparent neglect and unhelpful approach by me and my team. We continue to work with the residents of Stanwell to reduce the offences and to provide useful crime prevention advice. The asian burglary series remains my main priority.