



Minutes of meeting

LOCAL COMMITTEE (Surrey Heath)

Date: Thursday 30 June 2011

Time: 6.30 PM

Place: Our Lady Queen of Heaven Church Hall, Frimley

Members present:

Surrey County Council [5]

Cllr Bill Chapman (Camberley East)

Cllr Denis Fuller (Camberley West)

Cllr Chris Pitt (Frimley Green & Mytchett)

Surrey Heath Borough Council [4]

Cllr Vivienne Chapman (St Paul's)

Cllr Colin Dougan (St Michael's)

Cllr Edward Hawkins (Parkside)

Cllr Paul Ilnicki (Heatherside)

Cllr Valerie White (Bagshot)

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)

DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting

21/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from County Councillors Lavinia Sealy, David Ivison and Stuart MacLeod, and Borough Councillor Richard Brooks. No Borough substitute Members attended the meeting.

22/11 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 17 February 2011 [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting of the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) held on 17 February 2011 were agreed and signed.

23/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None were received.

24/11 PETITIONS [Item 4]

No petitions were received.

25/11 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

One written public question was received. A copy of the question and response is set out at Annex B. In a supplementary, Mr Laphorn, representative of Campaign Against the Merger (CAM), asked the Local Committee what support will local councillors give to help Kings International become an Academy, to enable our children to access high quality education locally. Will local councillors and Surrey County Council work together to agree a strategy, before the end of this term, to recruit students to Kings?

The Chairman responded that, because the issue is not within the remit of the Local Committee, a full response was not possible at the meeting and that he would forward the question to the Schools Commissioning Officer for a response. However, the Chairman commented that local councillors do take the matter very seriously and have met with officers. He thanked CAM for asking the question and encouraged the group to talk to other borough councillors, adding that the issue is very important for the local area.

26/11 WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 6]

None were received.

Executive Items for Decision

27/11 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PROTOCOL, SURREY HEATH TASK GROUP REPRESENTATION, AND SURREY HEATH MEMBER REPRESENTATION ON EXTERNAL BODIES [Item 7]

Lesley Trusler introduced the report, indicating the protocols for public engagement by the Local Committee, and delegates to task groups in the borough.

Resolved: That

- (i) the arrangements set out in the report for handling questions from the public, petitions, and rights of ways matters and, specifically:
 - a. that the Local Committee will offer an opportunity for public engagement and informal questions for half an hour before each formal Local Committee meeting commences (subject to annual review);

DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting

Written Public Questions

- b. that the number of public questions which may be asked at any one meeting will usually be limited six, but the Chairman may use his discretion to take more;

Petitions

- c. that in exceptional circumstances the Chairman may use his/her discretion to accept petitions with fewer signatures in cases where it would not be appropriate to get 100 signatures, for example where a proposed scheme affects fewer than 100 properties, and that the Local Local Committee will follow the county council standard for the number of signatures required on e-petitions;

Rights of Way

- d. to note the County Council's Standing Orders concerning public participation on Rights of Way applications, attached at Annex 1;

(ii) Surrey Heath Parking Task Group:

The Terms of Reference for the Surrey Heath Parking Task Group, to appoint Bill Chapman and Denis Fuller as the county council members to the group, and requested that the borough council nominate two representatives;

(iii) Surrey Heath Youth Transformation Task Group:

The Terms of Reference for the Surrey Heath Youth Transformation Task Group, appointed Denis Fuller and Lavinia Sealy as the county council members of the group, and requested that the borough council nominate two representatives;

(iv) To note the following Member representatives:

- a. Surrey Heath Partnership – Bill Chapman
- b. Single Issues Group for Young People – Denis Fuller.

28/11 MEMBER ALLOCATIONS 2011/12 [Item 8]

Lesley Trusler introduced the report which detailed the arrangements for pooling Member Allocation funding for 2011/12 together with information on allocations made since the previous meeting and new bids to consider.

There was a Tabled addition to the report which detailed paragraph 12.2, a bid of £1650.00 from Camberley Rugby Club for the purpose of purchasing a cooker.

Resolved:

- (i) To pool £1,410 from each Member's revenue allocation of £8,410 into a central revenue fund for 2011/12 and to pool the £35,000 capital allocation
- (ii) A maximum level of funding per project for revenue allocations of £3,000, and that capital projects over £3,000 may be considered by the Local Local Committee
- (iii) That when considering bids the presumption is that the Local Local Committee will not fund 100% of schemes, and that it is not in favour of funding organisations which are already receiving Surrey County Council funding

DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting

- (iv) To delegate the power to approve bids of up to £1,000 to the Community Partnerships Manager, with the following criteria being met:
 - a. The decision being required before the next formal meeting
 - b. The bid has the sponsorship of the local Member and the agreement of the majority of the county local Local Committee Members
 - c. Funding comes from the individual Member's pot, or each Member can have no more than two bids in between each meeting from the pooled pot
- (v) The allocations detailed in paragraphs 11 and the allocation detailed paragraph 12.1 at a reduced level of £2000, and 12.2
- (vi) To note the allocations agreed under delegated powers as set out in paragraph 13 of this report
- (vii) To note the total allocations made during 2010/11 as detailed in Annex A.

29/11 COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING 2011/12 [Item 9]

Lesley Trusler introduced the report, which set out arrangements for delegating Community Safety funding for 2011/12.

Resolved:

- (i) that the community safety funding [£2500] delegated to the Local Committee be transferred to the Safer Surrey Heath Community Safety Partnership;
- (ii) that the Community Partnership Manager manages and authorises expenditure from the budget delegated to the Local Committee in accordance with the Local Committee's decision;
- (iii) to note that the funding of £12,000, which is ring fenced for the use of the crime and disorder partnerships subject to Domestic Abuse Outreach being provided, will be paid to the Surrey Community Safety Unit who are now managing and administering the funding to the Domestic Abuse Outreach providers in the borough of Surrey Heath.

Executive Items for Information Only

30/11 SURREY FIRE & RESUE SERVICES ANNUAL REPORT [Item 10]

Alan Clark introduced the report and advised the Local Committee on specific hotspots in the borough and that Surrey Fire and Rescue Services focuses on prevention of fires as the best way to reduce incidents. The major fire risk in Surrey Heath is outdoor fires, Mr Clark reminded the Local Committee of four very large incidents in the borough in recent months and the high levels of resources needed to combat such fires.

Denis Fuller asked Mr Clark if the service intended using volunteers as an "early warning" resource and Mr Clark confirmed that the service was looking into arrangements where those using common land could raise the alarm to SFRS, to try and keep small incidents small. He further confirmed that the service was keen to continue working in partnership on community safety issues. The Chairman thanked Mr Clark and congratulated the service on their work throughout 2010/11.

Resolved: To recognise the achievements of the Borough Teams at Camberley and Chobham.

DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting

31/11 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)

32/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 12]

As in 21/11 – no further apologies were received.

33/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 13]

Cllr Vivienne Chapman and Cllr Bill Chapman declared interests in Item 18, Cllr Vivienne Chapman declared an interest in Item 21, and Cllr Colin Dougan declared an interest in Item 17.

34/11 PETITIONS [Item 14]

No petitions were received.

35/11 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 15]

None were received.

36/11 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 16]

None were received.

Executive Items For Decision

37/11 ON-STREET PARKING IN SURREY HEATH [Item 17]

David Curl introduced the report, advising the Local Committee that the original proposals presented in January 2011 had been reviewed and amended with the relevant divisional Members, resulting in the proposals contained within the report. Mr Curl also referred to an additional Annex, number 3, which was tabled.

Bill Chapman detailed the reasons for the proposals and how the consultation period would be undertaken, adding that any comments received during the consultation period would be reviewed by a working party of the Local Area Committee, and that recommendations for any changes to the scheme would be brought to the Local Committee. Members asked for the consultation to be as widespread as possible, particularly in areas where it was likely that there would be an impact from displaced parking. Mr Curl advised that the proposals would be advertised in the local press, via the county web site and a list of relevant e-mail contacts/groups. There would also be notices posted at the proposed sites.

There was a discussion about the proposed charging structure, and about concerns around parking that may be displaced due to the implementation of the proposals. Mr Curl advised that it was envisaged that the controlled parking zone and the residents parking scheme may both be reviewed in order to assist residents affected by displaced parking.

Resolved:

- (a) To approve the statutory advertisement of the parking charges and waiting restrictions shown on the attached plan in Annex 2 (also available in hard copy at the meeting)
- (b) That objections and comments to the proposals will be reviewed by the Local Committee in Autumn 2011.

DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting

38/11 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 18]

Andrew Milne introduced the report which detailed a progress update on 2010/11 highway schemes, the out-turn of the 2010/11 revenue maintenance programme, and proposals for 2011/12 Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS) and revenue maintenance programme.

Colin Dougan asked what the allocation for controlled parking zone works, within Table 4, was allocated for. Mr Milne advised that the specific works for that allocation were not yet known, and Mr Dougan commented that the allocation would not be sufficient to cover the cost of extending the controlled parking zone to mitigate for displaced parking arising out of the proposals for on-street parking at Item 17.

Bill Chapman proposed swapping scheme 22 (Crawley Hill/Church Hill Pedestrian Crossing) for scheme 2 (A321 Mytchett Road Pedestrian Crossing), from the ITS scheme list, and asked Valerie White to give feedback from site visits carried out at the scheme locations in recent weeks. Mrs White confirmed that whilst Church Hill had been busy during the site visit, there had appeared to be more of a need at Mytchett Road on the day.

There was further discussion around the prioritised list of ITS schemes and it was agreed that officers would look to maximise developer funding for future schemes, and that the Local Committee would continue to try to influence changes around the county council prioritisation of cycle schemes, since they are not regarded as a priority for funding by the Surrey Heath Local Committee.

Mr Milne confirmed that the proposed crossings would also benefit pedestrians, and reminded the Local Committee that, in some cases, developer funding was tied to specific schemes being built and that if the schemes were not built, the funding would be lost. Mr Milne further commented that the scheme “ranking” system was in use across Surrey, and was used by officers in a dispassionate and non-biased way.

Mr Dougan asked officers to discuss the proposals for the crossing on the A30 with the Principal at Collingwood College, where there was in place a standing instruction for students to use the footbridge over the A30.

Mr Chapman concluded that there was not enough support for his proposal to change the ITS schemes and it was therefore agreed that the proposals made by the officers would be agreed.

Resolved:

- (i) To approve the list of ITS schemes scheduled for progression, and approve the developer funded schemes which are part-funded by the Local Committee;
- (ii) To note the revised highways schemes list;
- (iii) To note that a further Highways update report is to be brought back to the next meeting of this Local Committee.

DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting

39/11 COMMUNITY PRIDE FUND [Item 19]

Andrew Milne introduced the report which detailed how the new Community Pride Fund would work.

Resolved:

- (i) To devolve funding to each County Councillor based on an equitable allocation of £5,000 per division;
- (ii) To note that individual Members allocate their funding based on the principles detailed in Annex A;
- (iii) To note that Members should contact the Area Maintenance Engineer to discuss any specific requirements and arrange for the work activities to be managed on their behalf.

40/11 RED ROAD – OPTIONS FOR SPEED LIMIT [Item 20]

Andrew Milne introduced the report which detailed options for reviewing the speed limits along Red Road, Lightwater. Mr Milne advised the Local Committee that there were in excess of 6.5 million vehicle movements a year along Red Road and that the average speed recorded on the road was 54 miles per hour (mph) which was only just in excess of the proposed 50 mph along the full length of the road.

Mr Milne referred the Members to his report, in particular his analysis of incidents during the previous three years.

The Chairman reminded the Local Committee of its previous recommendation, which was 40mph from the junction of The Maultway to junction with Lightwater Road, and 50mph from junction of Lightwater Road to junction with Guildford Road (Lightwater Bypass). Councillor Vivienne Chapman proposed, and Councillor Paul Ilnicki seconded, a proposal to change the officers recommendation at (i) to – The speed limit for Red Road be changed TO - 40mph from the junction of The Maultway to junction with Lightwater Road, AND 50mph from junction of Lightwater Road to junction with Guildford Road (Lightwater Bypass). The proposal was passed with five members in support and two against.

The Community Partnership & Committee Officer advised the Local Committee that, as Members had decided to agree a speed limit that was in contrary to the advice of the Highways Officer and Surrey Police, the matter would be referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport, and that a report setting out the decision of the Cabinet Member, would be brought back to the Committee at the relevant time. Consequently, the Local Committee did not consider recommendations (ii) to (v).

Resolved:

- i) to reject the officer's recommendation at (i);
- ii) We recommend that, with immediate effect, the speed limit be changed to 40 mph from the junction of The Maultway to junction with Lightwater Road, and 50 mph from junction with Lightwater Road to the junction with Guildford Road (Lightwater Bypass).

DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting

41/11 MAP MODIFICATION ORDER FORD ROAD, CHOBHAM [ITEM21]

Susan Briant introduced the report and outlined the process by which the Local Committee should consider the request to add a public footpath to the definitive map and statement for Surrey. There was a short discussion and Mrs Briant circulated some photographs of the site to Members. There were no requests to speak from either the Applicant or the Objector to the proposals.

Resolved:

- (i) A Map Modification Order (MMO) be made to add a public footpath from the highway verge on Ford Road to Footpath No. 45 (Chobham) to the definitive map and statement for Surrey.
- (ii) In the event that one or more objection is received and maintained, that the order and supporting documentation be forwarded to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to decide the matter.

Executive Items for Information Only

42/11 ANNUAL REVIEW OF MONITORING OF APPLICATIONS FOR GOODS VEHICLE OPERATOR'S LICENCES [ITEM 22]

The report was for information only.

43/11 RESPONSE TO PETITION ASKING FOR TRAFFIC ISLAND ON RED ROAD [ITEM 23]

The report was for information only and Members noted that a full response would be presented at the next meeting in October.

44/11 RESPONSE TO PETITION ASKING FOR A REDUCTION ON THE RED ROAD SPEED LIMIT [ITEM 24]

The report was for information only as a full response had been considered in the report at Item 20.

45/11 FORWARD PLAN [ITEM 25]

The report was for information only.

The meeting finished at 9.38pm.

Chairman

Open Public Question Time - Notes
Surrey County Council's Local Local Committee (Surrey Heath)
30 June 2011, Our Lady Queen of Heaven Church Hall, Frimley

1. **Paul Deach, Borough Councillor for Deepcut & Mytchett**
Regarding the removal of school transport to Grove School. The decision to remove the bus affects military families who now have to travel between 2 – 8 miles to take their children to school. The families did not have a choice of schools since Grove is the only school available to them. I have heard that the bus costs £76,000 to run – I would like to know when the contract was last reviewed and who signed-off the bus route?

Reply from Bill Chapman, Chairman

The question is not within the remit of the Local Local Committee but I will ask officers in the relevant service to respond to you direct.

2. **Tim Dodds, Borough Councillor for Lightwater**
Why have the demolished road signs on Red Road still not been replaced?

Reply from Andrew Milne, SCC Area Team Manager

I am aware that the signs have not yet been replaced. An order was raised in February, you may be aware that the County Council has recently appointed a new highways contractor and the order was placed in the transition period. The sign will be replaced by the end of July at the latest.

3. **Nick Dorrington, Friends of Bagshot Library**
Can an independent qualified review of the Libraries Public Value Review take place?

Reply from Bill Chapman, Chairman

We are now looking at solutions for the proposed 11 community libraries – I will pass your question on to the relevant officer to respond direct.

4. **Denis Jefferies, Resident of Bagshot**
Why is the county council replacing the single yellow line in Church Road, Bagshot, with a double yellow line?

Reply from David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager

Where changes to traffic regulations are proposed, site notices are placed showing details of how to respond. If objections are received they are considered by the Group Manger and, where necessary, the relevant Divisional Member of the Local Local Committee. I am unsure why the changes have been proposed but I will ask the officer concerned to reply to you direct.

5. **David Allen, Borough Councillor for Frimley Green**
Can I have a progress report on the provision of double yellow lines in Frimley and Frimley Green please?

Reply from Bill Chapman, Chairman

I will ask the relevant officer to respond direct.

DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting

6. Alan Barnard, Deepcut Liaison Group

At the previous meeting of this Local Committee, David Rushmer asked a question about the county council undertaking a survey of traffic flows in Deepcut. He has not received a response.

Reply from Andrew Milne, SCC Area Team Manager

I passed the question on to Andrew Stokes, the officer dealing with the project. I will speak with Andrew and ensure that a response is forthcoming.

7. Joanne Potter, Borough Councillor for Mytchett and Deepcut

Lamp posts in the Surrey heath area are being replaced – what is the cost to the taxpayer, is there any income from their scrap value, and is it necessary to replace them all?

Reply from Andrew Milne, SCC Area Team Manager

Columns up to 10 years old will only have the “heads” replaced with energy saving equipment, so that they can be dimmed as appropriate. I would expect that scrap values of columns will be recouped but I will verify with the officers involved and report back to you.

8. Liane Gibson, Borough Councillor for Windlesham

Works are currently being carried out to drains and sewers in Windlesham – there are not many diversion signs and the signs that are in place are not clear – can you investigate and resolve?

Reply from Andrew Milne, SCC Area Team Manager

I will address with the maintenance team.

9. Glyn Carpenter, Borough Councillor for Bagshot

Could the county council look into laying hatching on the highway at the junction of A30 London Road and Bridge Road Bagshot. This would help prevent traffic build up lined to the development along the A30.

Reply from Andrew Milne, SCC Area Team Manager

I will look at this request with the highways team.

10. David Stewart, Deepcut

Regarding the removal of the school bus between Deepcut and Grove School, I would like to know who deemed the walking route to the school to be safe for children, and I would also like responses to questions I have already put to the officers dealing with the removal of the bus.

Reply from Bill Chapman, Chairman

I will ask the relevant officer to respond direct.

11. Craig Fennell, Borough Councillor for Mytchett and Deepcut

Surrey Heath is currently seeing the largest development in the south-east, at Deepcut. Traffic flows and surveys undertaken during the May half-term bank holiday week will not reflect the real picture. Can you assure me on behalf of residents that proper surveys at appropriate times will be undertaken?

Reply from Andrew Milne, SCC Area Team Manager

Andrew Stokes is the county council officer involved in this development. I have not been involved in the surveys, or when they were carried out, but I

DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting

agree that it wouldn't seem sensible to have undertaken them at a time that was not representative of traffic flows, if indeed that was the case. There is no benefit to Officers in purposely skewing survey data, nor is it in the interests of the Authority. As the Area Highways Manager, it would create a long-term problem for me if the proper flows were not recorded, and needed infrastructure mitigations in relation to the impact of the development were not constructed. Also, once agreed developer monies had been spent, I would not necessarily have any available budget to remedy any outstanding issues that resulted from the development. As requested, I will raise this matter with Andrew Stokes about when and how the surveys were carried out.

Item 5 – Written Public Questions

Q. Written Question from Steve Laphorn, Vice-Chair Campaign Against Merger

"Does the Local Local Committee support the mission and aims of CAM (see below) and what measures are being taken by the Local Committee to achieve the aims and to ensure that Kings International provides a successful choice of school in Surrey Heath".

Ref: CAM Mission and Aims

<http://tomlinscote-kings.blogspot.com/p/cam.html>

Our Mission is to: Stop the merger and retain the separate identity of both schools.

Aims: (deliverables)

1. The retraction of the merger proposal for Tomlinscote and Kings.
2. The retraction of the closure proposal for Kings International.
3. The retraction of the proposal to operate a split site school in Frimley/Camberley.
4. To understand the findings of the Due Diligence exercise and ensure the Governors make an informed decision on behalf of the education of our children.
5. To actively participate in the consultation process with Governors and County.
6. To ensure the provision of high quality education for students during this period of uncertainty.

Whilst not within the remit of the Local Local Committee, the Chairman has asked officers to investigate:

A. Response from Nicholas Smith, School Commissioning Officer

Surrey County Council recently consulted on a proposal to (1) close Kings International College for Business and the Arts and (2) expand Tomlinscote School to take in the pupils and site of Kings International. The expanded school would have been spread across the two sites.

In the light of the responses received to the consultation, and the decision of the Governing Body of Tomlinscote School not to proceed with the Council proposal, Surrey County Council has decided to withdraw the school organisation proposal concerning Kings International College and Tomlinscote School.

The County Council remains committed to securing education provision on the Kings International School Site and will support the existing soft federation between Kings International School and Tomlinscote School.

The Council will continue to work with local education providers to ensure a viable and successful long-term offer of education across the area. We intend to discuss the best way forward with many stakeholders, including, but not limited to, the school's IEB, staff and parents, Tomlinscote School, Collingwood College and other interested local parties.

DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting

Supplementary Question

Thank you for the response to our question.

What support will our local councillors give to help Kings International become an Academy to enable our children to access high quality education locally. Will local councillors and Surrey County Council work together to agree a strategy, before the end of this term, to recruit students to Kings?

Response from Bill Chapman, Chairman

As stated, this issue is not within the remit of the local Local Committee. However, local councillors do take the matter very seriously and have met with officers. Thank you for asking the question, I do encourage you to talk to other borough councillors – this is a very important issue for the local area. We all want to work together on bringing Kings' standards to a level we all would like to see.

DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting