



**Minutes of meeting**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (Surrey Heath)**

**Date:** Thursday 17 February 2011

**Time:** 6.30 PM

**Place:** Collingwood College, Camberley

**Members present:**

**Surrey County Council [5]**

Cllr Bill Chapman (Camberley East)

Cllr Denis Fuller (Camberley West)

Cllr Stuart MacLeod (Windlesham, Bagshot & Lightwater)

Cllr David Ivison (Heatherside & Parkside)

Cllr Chris Pitt (Frimley Green & Mytchett)

**Surrey Heath Borough Council [4]**

Cllr Vivienne Chapman (St Pauls)

Cllr Colin Dougan (St Michaels)

Cllr Wynne Price (Bisley)

Cllr David Whitcroft (Mytchett and Deepcut)

All references to items refer to the Agenda for the meeting.

The meeting was preceded by an Open Public Question Time. The notes are in **Annex A**.

**Part 1. In Public - Part A (voting by county members on decision items)**

**01/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mrs Lavinia Sealy, Cllr Richard Brooks and Cllr Paul Ilnicki. No borough substitute Members attended the meeting.

**02/11 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 14 October 2010 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the last meeting of the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) held on 14 October 2010 were agreed and signed.

**03/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

None were received.

**04/11 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

One petition was received.

The Petition was presented by Borough Councillor Moira Gibson and stated:

“We object to the proposal from the County Council to cease providing the Windlesham Mobile Library service and call upon Surrey County Council to reject these plans and retain the mobile service for the benefit of all ages in the village”.

Councillor Gibson explained that the service is very important to local people and, that whilst she understood the difficult financial situation and also that the decision had been called-in, she would urge colleagues to think again and look at innovative ways to provide the service. The petition was not within the remit of the Local Committee. It was agreed to receive the petition and pass it on to the relevant formal committee.

**05/11 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

One written public question was received. A copy of the question is set out in **Annex B**. In a supplementary WM Gray asked the service is currently considering telemetry to all BA teams [breathing apparatus] at a cost of £300,000. While this equipment is important to have, it is not safe if there is no back-up and another vehicle cannot be sent in. Why haven't other methods of savings been considered other than from front-line staff?

Steve Owen-Hughes responded, stressing that the consultation process was to ensure that all questions from interested parties were welcomed. He advised that the final Public Safety Plan (PSP) would look far different to the draft plan. Proposal 10 of the draft PSP is to review governance models – sharing senior officers, sharing services etc – as soon as possible, but that the PSP was a 10-year plan so not all measures would be immediate. Further savings from Fire Services are expected to be achieved from 2013/14 onwards.

**06/11 WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

None were received.

**Executive Items for Decision**

**07/11 MEMBER ALLOCATIONS 10/11 [Item 7]**

Councillor David Whitcroft declare a personal interest in 14.11, although voting rights applied to county councillors only. Carolyn Rowe introduced the report.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed:

- (i) the allocations detailed in paragraphs 11, 12 and 13;
- (ii) to note the allocations agreed under delegated powers as detailed in paragraph 14;
- (iii) to note the summary of allocations in Annex A.

### **08/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2011/12 [Item 8]**

David Waine and Gavin Kitchen, Youth Development Service, introduced the report, drawing Members attention to service highlights of 2010, and to the key targets for the service for 2011/12.

The Local Committee congratulated the Service on its achievements.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed:

- (i) the targets and priorities for youth service delivery in Surrey Heath in 2011-12 as outlined in section 4 of the report.

### Executive Items for Information Only

### **09/11 SURREY FIRE & RESCUE SERVICES – PUBLIC SAFETY PLAN [Item 9]**

Steve Owen-Hughes and Gavin Watts, Surrey Fire & Rescue Services, introduced the report which detailed 13 proposals for the *draft* Public Safety Plan 2011–2020.

Members asked questions about the implications of the proposals for Surrey Heath. Mr Owen-Hughes advised that the Service has a Response Plan for fire incidents of a significant nature, and that the Service was investigating the potential for a Dynamic Risk Mobilising Programme that would enhance the management of resources during such incidents.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed:

To comment on the Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority draft Public Safety Plan by the deadline of 4<sup>th</sup> March 2011.

### **10/11 LIBRARY SERVICES – PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW [Item 10]**

Peter Milton introduced the report, advising Members that the objectives for the Review were to ensure that the library service was fit for the future, recognising that the way people use libraries has changed, and to reflect budget pressures. There were likely to be two areas for change – the cessation of the mobile library service, and the adoption of community library arrangements at some libraries in the county. In Surrey Heath, Bagshot library had been identified by the Review as suitable for use as a community library.

Members expressed concerns about the processes involved in the Review, and the criteria by which the 11 community libraries had been identified. They were also concerned about the impact that the loss of libraries and the mobile library service would have in their localities.

Peter Milton advised that many local authorities were reviewing their library services and that the county council would continue to provide all the services in the community libraries, with the exception of the frontline staff.

The Local Committee agreed to provide comments for inclusion in the Review feedback.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed:

- (i) to assist the Library Service in consulting with and engaging with local community groups and organisations on the viability of establishing a community partnership at Bagshot library
- (ii) to note that the Library Service will maintain published opening hours and avoid closures by recruiting up to the level of the budget allocated.

**11/11 UPDATE ON LOCAL ISSUES [Item 11]**

The report was for information only.

**Part B – In Public (voting by county and borough members on decision items)**

**12/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 12]**

As in 01/11 – no further apologies were received.

**13/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 13]**

None were received.

**14/11 PETITIONS [Item 14]**

Three petitions were received.

14 (i) Petition on Speed Limit on Red Road, presented by Parish Councillor Adrian Page  
Although this petition is within the remit of the Local Committee, the petition wording is directed at the Cabinet Member. A copy would be sent to County Councillor Ian Lake for his information.

A response to the petition will be brought to the next meeting of the Local Committee.

14 (ii) Petition on Proposed Changes to Bus Service 500, Windlesham, presented by Borough Councillor Moira Gibson

The petition was not within the remit of the Local Committee, and the consultation period had expired. However, on this occasion it was agreed to receive the petition and add the comments to the responses already received.

14 (iii) E-Petition to Create a Safe Crossing Point on Red Road, Lightwater, presented by Borough Councillor Tim Dodds. Councillor Dodds confirmed that he would close the petition that day, 17<sup>th</sup> February 2011.

A response to the petition will be brought to the next meeting of the Local Committee.

**15/11 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 15]**

None were received.

**16/11 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 16]**

None were received.

**Executive Items For Decision**

**17/11 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 17]**

Andrew Milne introduced the report.

Mr Milne referred the committee to the **Tabled Annex**, which was a list of prioritised Local Transport Schemes (LTP) for Surrey Heath. There was a discussion about the Annexed document and Mr Milne confirmed that the list could be used as a comprehensive list of schemes which could be delivered via various funding streams, including Section 106 developer funding. Mr Milne advised the Members that a budget allocation of £153,351 for revenue maintenance schemes during 2011/12 had been made.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed:

- (i) to note progress with delivery of highways schemes;
- (ii) to note the positions of its highways schemes and revenue maintenance budgets;
- (iii) to authorise the Area Team Manager to reallocate any residual 2010/11 revenue maintenance funds as necessary within the approved categories to prevent any potential under-spend;
- (iv) to authorise delegation of authority to the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and Vice Chairman to determine which schemes from Annex A, which was **Tabled**, which was the list previously approved by the Local Committee in 2009, to progress ahead of the meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2011;
- (v) to authorise the Area Team Manager to use any allocated revenue maintenance budget for 2011/12 as detailed in section 3.5 of the report. If the funding decision varied by more than £20,000, to authorise the Area Team Manager to allocate the ratio of funds in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman;
- (vi) to note commencement of the new highways contract on 28 April 2011, and the potential for variation of indicative scheme costs resulting from this;
- (vii) to note that a further Highways update report is to be brought back to the next meeting of this Committee.

Executive Items for Information Only

**18/11 SMALL DISAVANTAGED AREAS FUND – FUND PANEL DECISIONS [Item 18]**

Carolyn Rowe introduced the report.

The report was for information only.

**19/11 TASKS COMMISSIONED BY THE LOCAL COMMITTEE – MONITORING REPORT [Item 19]**

Andrew Milne introduced the report which was for information only.

**20/11 FORWARD PLAN [Item 20]**

The report was for information only.

Councillor Dougan requested that an item on residents parking be included on the Forward Plan.

The meeting finished at 21.34

Mr Pitt left the meeting at 20.05

---

Chairman

Open Public Question Time - Notes  
Surrey County Council's Local Committee (Surrey Heath)  
17 February 2011, Collingwood College, Camberley

**1. Valerie White, Windlesham Parish Council**

I would like to thank the Local Committee for the 20 miles per hour scheme in Bagshot. Is it possible to have the speed limit written on the road?

**Reply from Andrew Milne, SCC Area Team Manager**

I will follow up and respond after the meeting.

**2. Margaret Williams, Windlesham Parish Council**

Has the value of the Bagshot Library to the community been considered?

**Reply from Rose Wilson, SCC Library Operations Manager**

The library service is aware of the role that libraries play within local communities, and the facilities that they offer to residents and users. We would be very surprised if the proposals did not meet with resistance and want to work with local communities in setting up community libraries. The Public Value Review has ignored the value that communities give to their libraries – community cohesion, learning. Families still use libraries but the way they use them has changed – items like e-books have impacted on footfall in libraries and we need to look at alternative ways of providing the service.

**3. Tim Dodds, Borough Councillor, Lightwater**

Some of the road safety signs on Red Road have been demolished in accidents, what steps are being taken to replace them and what road safety maintenance is scheduled for this stretch of road? Will it include the removal of grass covering the road edge rumble strip, repainting of the white lines, and installation of cat's eyes in place of the reflectors?

**Reply from Andrew Milne, SCC Area Team Manager**

I am aware of the missing road signs and an order has been raised for their replacement, which will be by the end of March.

An inspection of the edge markings has been carried out. The white edge marking and the 'cats eyes' are visible throughout the length of the road to the west of Macdonald Road, and are in an acceptable condition. There was no apparent vegetation obstructing the lines or cats eyes, but, inevitably, there will be some dirt and debris that is blown or washed along the carriageway edge as there is no kerb up-stand and the verge is immediately adjacent. Currently the lining and cat's eyes will only be replaced within routine maintenance regimes, and in the summer any vegetation growth will also be dealt with within this programme.

**4. Moira Gibson, Borough Councillor, Windlesham**

New traffic lights have been installed at Sunninghill Road but have had hoods on since Christmas – can you update on when they will work at peak hours?

**Reply from Andrew Milne, SCC Area Team Manager**

I am unable to answer that question but will respond after the meeting.

**5. David Rushmer, Deepcut Liaison Group**

I want to ask the county and borough councillors if they understand the sensitive position with regard to road transport data supporting the development at Princess Royal Barracks. The data from county is based upon national trips data, the borough council has carried out a survey of current usage for comparison. There is concern about the impact that 1200 new homes would have on Deepcut and the whole of Surrey Heath. There is significantly greater car usage than predicted.

**Reply from Andrew Milne, SCC Area Team Manager**

I am unable to answer this question since this project is being managed by Mr Stokes at the county council. I will refer the question to him for an answer.

**Reply from Bill Chapman, County Councillor**

The committee intends to have a meeting with officers to look at this issue. Does the county council have the data you refer to?

**Reply from David Whitcroft, Borough Councillor**

Evidence was given to the Inspector of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy on 16<sup>th</sup> February and he voiced his concerns about some of the data. It is for local Members to maximise the planning gain particularly for transport movements.

**Reply from Wynne Price, Borough Councillor**

This issue affects all of Surrey Heath.

**6. Ruth Hutchinson, Windlesham Parish Council**

When will Guildford Road in Bagshot be resurfaced?

**Reply from Andrew Milne, SCC Area Team Manager**

I will consult the maintenance team and respond.

**7. Meurig Williams, Borough Councillor**

There is a petition on bus services and the library and both affect Bagshot. Will Surrey County Council use joined-up thinking regarding the accumulated effects of such threats to district centres?

**Reply from Stuart MacLeod, County Councillor**

The county council has not looked at these issues accumulatively and their quite alarming impact. I would like to reassure you that the bus review generated many letters to county hall. However, I am working with officers to focus on alternatives but there are some tough decisions to make. The library decision was called-in and there will be a further meeting next week.

**8. Rodney Bates, Borough Councillor, Old Dean**

Are the committee aware of the concerns of the public and the Chobham Councillor over the length of time it will take for a 2<sup>nd</sup> vehicle to reach fires? Will the committee listen to those concerns, including the concerns of the firefighters themselves?

**Reply from Steve Owen-Hughes, Surrey Fire & Rescue Services**

Surrey Fire & Rescue is very aware of the public concerns surrounding the proposals contained within the *Draft* Public Safety Plan. We are attending today to ensure that the consultation process is brought to the attention of local councillors and members of the public, and so that questions can be raised and answered.

**Item 5 (Tabled) – Written Public Questions**

**Q 1. Written Question from Watch Manager Andrew Gray - on behalf of the fire-fighters in Surrey Heath.**

Why have the PSP team decided to drastically cut front line services (especially at night) for £700,000 saving, ignoring laid out guidelines by the Government which include sharing Chief Officers/senior staff and amalgamations between Fire and Rescue Authorities?

**A 1. Whilst not within the remit of the Local Committee, the chairman has asked officers to investigate:**

**Response from Gavin Watts, Area Manager, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service**

**The Fire and Rescue Authority are consulting on a range of proposals designed to improve the service provided to the county of Surrey in terms of reducing the risk from fire and other incidents. The government guidelines referred to are contained within Fire and Rescue Bulletin red 1/2010, which is referred to on page 8 of the draft Public Safety Plan (PSP) and were in specific response to the spending review. These guidelines identified seven areas where potential savings could be made:**

“2.4 It is for individual Fire and Rescue Authorities – not central government – to make local decisions on how to make these reductions. However, we have identified seven areas where we consider potential savings could be achieved:

- Flexible staffing arrangements
- Improved sickness management
- Pay restraint and recruitment freezes
- Shared services/back office functions
- Improved procurement
- Sharing Chief Officers and other senior staff
- Voluntary amalgamations between Fire and Rescue Authorities.”

Surrey Fire and Rescue Service have already made savings related to flexible staffing, shared services/back office, improved procurement and robust sickness management. The Public Safety Plan clearly identifies the intention to explore all of the issues relating to governance, including the potential to amalgamate or share senior officers. Details of this are contained within proposal number 10.

Frontline service from Fire and Rescue is about all of the services that the public receive, including the wide range of prevention and safety education and the statutory enforcement activity that we undertake. The draft Public Safety Plan is setting out how these elements are improved within an integrated approach, whilst retaining an appropriate level of emergency response.