

# Agenda

Surrey Heath  
Local Committee

## **Welcome to Surrey Heath Local Committee**

Your Councillors, Your Community  
and the Issues that Matter to You

## Discussion

### **REVISED AGENDA**

Highways Update

Pirbright Bends Speed Limit

Fire and Rescue Service Annual Borough  
Report



## Venue

**Location:** Camberley Theatre,  
Knoll Road, Camberley

**Date:** Thursday, 3 October  
2013

**Time:** 6.30 pm – Public  
Questions at 6pm

# You can get involved in the following ways

# Get involved

## ***Ask a question***

If there is something you wish know about how your council works or what it is doing in your area, you can ask the local committee a question about it. Most local committees provide an opportunity to raise questions, informally, up to 30 minutes before the meeting officially starts. If an answer cannot be given at the meeting, they will make arrangements for you to receive an answer either before or at the next formal meeting.

## ***Write a question***

You can also put your question to the local committee in writing. The committee officer must receive it a minimum of 4 working days in advance of the meeting.

When you arrive at the meeting let the committee officer (detailed below) know that you are there for the answer to your question. The committee chairman will decide exactly when your answer will be given and may invite you to ask a further question, if needed, at an appropriate time in the meeting.

## ***Sign a petition***

If you live, work or study in Surrey and have a local issue of concern, you can petition the local committee and ask it to consider taking action on your behalf. Petitions should have at least 30 signatures and should be submitted to the committee officer 2 weeks before the meeting. You will be asked if you wish to outline your key concerns to the committee and will be given 3 minutes to address the meeting. Your petition may either be discussed at the meeting or alternatively, at the following meeting.

## **Thank you for coming to the Local Committee meeting**

Your Partnership officer is here to help. If you would like to talk about something in today's meeting or have a local initiative or concern please contact them through the channels below.

Email: [nicola.enticknap@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:nicola.enticknap@surreycc.gov.uk)

Tel: 01276 800269



**SURREY**  
COUNTY COUNCIL

### **Surrey County Council Appointed Members**

Mr David Ivison, Heatherside and Parkside (Chairman)  
Mr Bill Chapman, Camberley East  
Mr Denis Fuller, Camberley West  
Mr Chris Pitt, Frimley Green and Mychett (Vice-Chairman)  
Mr Adrian Page, Bisley, Lightwater and West End  
Mr Mike Goodman, Chobham, Bagshot & Windlesham

### **Borough Council Appointed Members**

Mrs Vivienne Chapman, St. Paul's  
Mr Rodney Bates, Old Dean  
Mrs Valerie White, Bagshot  
Mrs Josepine Hawkins, Parkside  
Mr Paul Ilnicki, Heatherside  
Mr Surinder Gandhum, Lightwater

Chief Executive  
**David McNulty**

**If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print, Braille, or another language please either call Nikkie Enticknap on 01276 800269 or write to the Community Partnerships Team at Surrey County Council Surrey Heath Borough Council, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD or [nicola.enticknap@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:nicola.enticknap@surreycc.gov.uk)**

**This is a meeting in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact us using the above contact details.**

#### **GUIDANCE ON USE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT) AND SOCIAL MEDIA AND ON THE RECORDING OF MEETINGS**

Those wishing to report the proceedings at the meeting will be afforded reasonable facilities for doing so; however, there is no legal requirement to enable audio or video recordings or use of IT and social media during the meeting. The final decision on whether a member of the public or press may undertake these activities is a matter for the Chairman's discretion.

All mobile devices (mobile phones, BlackBerries, etc) should be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with any Public Address (PA) or Induction Loop systems. Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. This is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference with any PA or Induction Loop systems being caused. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

Any requests to record all or part of the meeting must be made in writing, setting out the parts of the meeting, purpose and proposed use of the recording, to the Chairman prior to the start of the meeting. In considering requests to record the meeting, the Chairman will take into consideration the impact on other members of the public in attendance. The Chairman may inform the committee and any public present at the start of the meeting about a proposed recording, the reasons and purpose for it and ask if there are any objections. The Chairman will consider any objections along with any other relevant factors before making a decision. The Chairman's decision will be final, but s/he may ask for recordings to be ceased in the event that they become a distraction to the conduct of the meeting and may request a copy and transcript of any recording made.

			
Cllr David Ivison (Chairman)  Heatherside and Parkside	<b><i>Cllr Chris Pitt</i></b> <b><i>(Vice Chairman)</i></b>  Frimley Green and Mytchett	Cllr Bill Chapman  Camberley East	Cllr Denis Fuller  Camberley West
		 <b>SURREY</b> <small>COUNTY COUNCIL</small>  <b>Local Committee</b> <b>(SURREY HEATH)</b>  <b>County Councillors 2013-17</b>	
Cllr Mike Goodman  Bagshot, Windlesham & Chobham	Cllr Adrian Page  Lightwater, West End & Bisley		

For councillor contact details, please contact Nikkie Enticknap, Community Partnership and Committee Officer ([nenticknap@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:nenticknap@surreycc.gov.uk)) Telephone: 01276 800269)

			
Cllr Vivienne Chapman St Pauls Ward	<b>Cllr Rodney Bates</b> Old Dean Ward	Cllr Paul Ilnicki Heatherside Ward	Cllr Josephine Hawkins Parkside Ward
		<p><b>Local Committee (SURREY HEATH)</b></p> <p><b>Borough Council Co-optees 2013-14</b></p>	
Cllr Valerie White Bagshot Ward	Cllr Surinder Gandhum Lightwater Ward		

For councillor contact details, please contact Nikkie Enticknap, Community Partnership and Committee Officer ([nenticknap@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:nenticknap@surreycc.gov.uk)) Telephone: 01276 800269)

## **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

To receive any apologies for absence.

Apologies have been received from Cllr Paul Ilnicki.

## **2 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

(Pages 1 - 12)

To approve the Minutes of the previous meeting, held on 4<sup>th</sup> July 2013, as a correct record.

## **3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests from Members in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting.

Notes:

- In line with the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012, declarations may relate to the interest of the member, or the member's spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom the member is living as husband or wife, or a person with whom the member is living as if they were civil partners and the member is aware they have the interest.
- Members need only disclose interests not currently listed on the Register of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.
- Members must notify the Monitoring Officer of any interests disclosed at the meeting so they may be added to the Register.
- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.

## **4 PETITIONS**

To receive any petitions in accordance with Standing Order 68. Notice should be given in writing at least 14 days before the meeting. Alternatively the petition can be submitted on line through Surrey County Council's e-petition website as long as the minimum number of signatures (30) has been reached 14 days before the meeting.

No petitions have been received.

## **5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

To answer any written questions from residents or businesses within the area in accordance with Standing Order 69. Notice should be given in writing or email to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer by 12 noon four working days before the meeting.

## **6 MEMBER QUESTION TIME**

To receive any written questions from Members under Standing Order 47.

**7 HIGHWAYS UPDATE** (Pages 13 - 18)

Andrew Milne, NW Area Manager, Highways to introduce the Highways Update Report. The report records the progress made with the delivery of proposed highways schemes, developer funded schemes and revenue funded works this financial year.

**7a SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON PIRBRIGHT BENDS SPEED LIMIT** (Pages 19 - 24)

Andrew Milne, NW Area Manager, to introduce the report on Pirbright bends speed limit alteration.

**8 LOCAL SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FUND - CYCLE LINK, BISLEY TO KNAPHILL**

THIS AGENDA ITEM HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN.

**9 FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE ANNUAL BOROUGH REPORT** (Pages 25 - 36)

Paul Kenny, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service to introduce the Annual Report, which outlines the major strands of activity being undertaken within the Woking area by the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) teams based at Camberley and Chobham Fire Stations.

**10 MEMBERS ALLOCATIONS - 6 MONTH UPDATE ON EXPENDITURE**

Michelle Collins, Team Leader, Community Partnerships Team to verbally update members on some of the projects funded locally by Members Allocations.

**11 FORWARD PLAN** (Pages 37 - 40)

Nikkie Enticknap, Community Partnership and Committee Officer to introduce the Forward Plan report. The report is produced for each meeting of the Local Committee so that members can review the forward plan.

This page is intentionally left blank



**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Surrey HEATH LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
 held at 6.30 pm on 4 July 2013  
 at St Annes Church Centre ,45 Church Road, Bagshot, Surrey GU19 5EQ.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Mr David Ivison (Chairman)
- \* Mr Bill Chapman
- \* Mr Denis Fuller
- \* Mr Chris Pitt (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mr Adrian Page
- \* Mr Mike Goodman

**Borough / District Members:**

- \* Chapman
- \* Cllr Rodney Bates
- \* Cllr Valerie White
- \* Hawkins
- \* Cllr Paul Ilnicki

\* In attendance

---

**1/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Cllr Surinder Gandhum.

**2/13 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]**

To approve minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2013.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed the minutes from the previous meeting.

**3/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations made.

**4/13 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

No petitions were received.

**5/13 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

Three written public questions were received. A copy of the written questions and the written responses given are set out in Annex B, together with any supplementary questions raised.

## ITEM 2

### **6/13 WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

There were no Member questions raised.

### **7/13 TASK GROUP REPRESENTATION FOR 2013 / 2014 & LOCAL COMMITTEE COMMUNITY SAFETY BUDGET [Item 7]**

Following the recent County Council elections and the nominations of Borough Councillors, the Committee reviewed formal representation on task groups set by the Committee and the allocation of Community Safety funds to the Community Safety Partnership. Cllr Valerie White expressed an interest in joining the Youth Stakeholders group as an additional member and it was agreed that the Youth Council be consulted on this. Cllrs Innicki and Page were nominated for the Surrey Heath Strategic Parking group.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed:

- (i) The terms of reference for the Youth Task Group and the membership of the task group.
- (ii) The nominations to outside bodies.
- (iii) That the community safety budget of £3,226 that has been delegated to the Local Committee be transferred to the Surrey Heath Partnership.
- (iv) That the Community Partnerships Manager manages and authorises expenditure from the budget delegated to the Local Committee in accordance with (iii) above.

### **8/13 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 8]**

The recommendations are made to enable progression of proposed highways schemes, developer funded schemes and revenue funded works this financial year.

The Committee further discussed the Toshiba Roundabout Project covered in the update report and the additional tabled report. The initial design options were based on options that are generally found to be effective for this type of scheme. In this case, modelling results have shown that signalisation of the Toshiba roundabout would result in a considerable worsening of congestion, with significant increases in queue lengths and journey times. For this reason, the original scheme proposal cannot be continued with. However, the modelling exercise has also identified improvements that can be made which would provide benefits for both pedestrians and motorists.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed to:

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes
- (ii) Note the progress with budget expenditure
- (iii) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.

- (iv) Approve the contingency planning measures recommended in section 2.3.4 of this report.
- (v) Approve to continue with the delivery of the upgrade of the zebra crossing on the A325 Portsmouth Road arm of the Toshiba Roundabout to toucan crossings (as set out in point 1 of this update) this financial year, together with a study on providing a suitable crossing on the Frimley Road.
- (vi) Approve to continue with detailed design of the relocation and upgrade of the hospital crossing (as set out in point 2 of this update)
- (vii) Approve to continue with the detailed design of a third lane between Toshiba roundabout and the hospital roundabout (as set out in point 3 of this update).
- (viii) Approve that a report for further decision on this project be brought to the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) at its 3 October 2013 meeting.

### **9/13 OPERATION HORIZON [Item 9]**

Operation Horizon is a new targeted investment programme for road maintenance.

For Surrey Heath in particular, the new programme will result in £8m being invested in the local road network and will enable 45km of road (12% of local network) to be re-surfaced over 80 separate road schemes. It was confirmed that an international company was being used and that a ten year guarantee on works was included within the contract. Members were concerned that the long term planned programme should be flexible enough to include priority changes and that works should be joined up with planned gas/ water works and any structure changes (i.e. Bus lane – should this be amended, and traffic calming measures).

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed to:

Approve the £8m Operation Horizon programme for Surrey Heath and that the 45km of road, across the defined scheme list detailed in Annex One, is resurfaced over the investment period.

Receive a Surrey Highways annual report in March 2014, confirming programme progress and success to date.

### **10/13 AWARD OF THE YOUTH LOCAL PREVENTION FRAMEWORK CONTRACT FOR 2013 - 2015 [Item 10]**

The recommendation for the of award of funding is the culmination of several months' work by the Youth Task Group that will result in services being commissioned by the local committee in response to local need. The focus of the work will be to reduce the risk factors that are predictors of young people becoming Not in Education Employment or Training (NEET) in Surrey Heath.

## ITEM 2

The Local Committee is responsible for commissioning services to prevent young people becoming NEET Training within their local area. The Youth Task Group received presentations from a range of potential suppliers.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed to:

Approve the Youth Task Group recommendation to award a funding agreement for a twenty four month period from 01 September 2013 to Eikon Charity for 100% of the contract value (£79,000pa) to prevent young people from becoming NEET in Surrey Heath

### **11/13 PERFORMANCE UPDATE FOR THE CURRENT LOCAL PREVENTION FRAMEWORK CONTRACT [Item 11]**

The report updated the Local Committee on the progress made towards participation for all young people in Surrey Heath in post-16 education, training and employment during 2012-13. This is the overarching goal of Services for Young People (SYP) and our strategy to achieve it is set out in 'The young people's employability plan 2012-17'.

The Local Committee report focused on how the different commissions managed by the Commissioning and Development Team contributed to the goal, keeping in mind that these are only a part of the system that is working to increase participation.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed to:

Note the progress Services for Young People has made during 2012/13 to increase participation for young people in Surrey Heath, as set out in detail in the appendices to the report

### **12/13 FORWARD PLAN [Item 12]**

At each meeting of the Local Committee, members review the forward plan. The reports that are currently anticipated will be received by the committee are outlined in the plan. Members agreed to consider Section 106 monies at a private meeting, together with the A30 bus lane, and to bring these items to a public meeting should any decisions be required.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed to:

Note the forward plan.

Meeting ended at: 8.50 pm

---

**Chairman**

**Annex A**

**Surrey Heath Local Area Committee**  
**Open Public Question Time**

1. **Angela Mitchell, Deepcut Residents Association**  
The County Council needs to display joined up thinking over the traffic issues facing the area. We already have a traffic problem and have pending developments at Deepcut and DERA. The problems are not being mitigated in a meaningful way and the issues will affect the whole borough and also neighbouring boroughs. Will members of this Committee state their views to SHBC Planners?  
The size of the proposed supermarket on the Deepcut site is also of concern, as a supermarket of that size would need to pull in customers from surrounding areas and will have a negative impact on nearby businesses.
  
2. **Howard Hyde, Deepcut Residents Association**  
Councils can only implement S106 agreements in accordance with planning permissions. Can anything be imposed in the S106 agreement to ensure that the Highways works are completed before building development commences – we waited 10 years last time before these were done.

**Reply from Andrew Milne, Highways Area Manager (NW)**

Thank you for raising the questions. Communication and joined up thinking does take place. SHBC does ask for Highway views and the Local Transport Planning team are aware of all the future proposed developments. We are not invited into detailed S106 negotiations but I can ask colleagues in transport management and come back to you.

**Reply from the Chair**

This Committee does not have the remit to assist on individual planning applications, which are dealt with by Surrey Heath Borough Council – however, we can question and insure joined up thinking especially with regard to Highways matters. There are lots of planned developments both in Surrey Heath and surrounding areas, the prime one being the DERA site. The Committee do not have the remit to get involved in individual planning applications – but there are 11 Borough Councillors present at this meeting who are all hearing the views expressed.

**Reply from Cllr Mike Goodman**

We need to show more joined up thinking and this committee should help with this.

**Reply from Denis Fuller**

We should say what we think and what we feel should be done. We need money spent on the Red Road, with roundabouts at the junctions and a wider road in places - this will cost approx £2 to £3 million. 65% of the new CIL money will be going towards the countryside under

SANGS (Suitable alternative natural green space) and we need to redirect this. I am willing to help lobby for this.

**Reply from Vivienne Chapman**

Unfortunately, none of the Borough Councillors can speak on this subject as we will be making a decision on the planning application. However, we can observe and listen to views.

**Reply from Rodney Bates**

I can't comment on the planning aspect, but I do know that we were promised a roundabout in 1987, so I will try and investigate this.

**Reply from Cllr Bill Chapman**

Cllr Chapman clarified that the information about the size of the supermarket came from the supermarket location scout, and that residents from Frimley Green, Frimley, Mitchett etc would be attracted to the store. Residents stated that they wanted a supermarket on the site – but not one as large as that proposed.

**3. Katia Malcaus Cooper, Lightwater**

It is frustrating that on issues such as the Red Road and traffic locally, the parish, county and borough council are all powerless. We were promised a roundabout at Briars estate but this was never delivered. We have now been told that having roundabouts on the Red Road will encourage people to use the roads more as rat runs.

**Reply from the Chair**

We are not completely powerless. We do question and lobby and raise the issues at County level. I myself raised the issue of vehicle activated signs and the Committee got the speed reduced to 50mph (admittedly, the Committee wanted this brought down to 40mph, but this was not supported by Police evidence). We do need enforcement though, with cameras or police presence. We need two roundabouts at Macdonald Road and Lightwater Road and the members of the Local Committee support this.

**4. Glyn Carpenter, Bagshot**

Can Church Road in Bagshot be made into a one way street up from the High Street. Lorries and delivery vans cause problems and one way would mitigate this. The residents support this and would be happy to get up a petition if it is needed.

**Reply from Andrew Milne, Highways Area Manager (NW)**

We would need to look at this further and come back to you.

**5. Colin Manley, local resident**

Are the Highways department now getting smarter about contracts for road maintenance, grass cutting and vegetation clearance? You need to insist that faulty workmanship is corrected at their cost – not taxpayers.

**DRAFT MINUTES - 4 July 13 - to be formally agreed at the next meeting****Reply from Andrew Milne, Highways Area Manager (NW)**

Our Highways contractors do have to repair potholes if they fail. This is embarrassing and is disruptive for multiple occasion repairs – however we are working on the reasons for failures, which can be due to weather conditions, or temporary quick repairs in high traffic areas.

**6. Eric Williams, Parish Councillor, Bagshot**

I refer to the review of local bus services. I understand that pending Government cuts will result in further loss of services. What commitment can the Committee give to keeping the current service?

**Reply from the Chair**

Unfortunately, we cannot give assurances as we don't know what the impact of Government cuts will be and how we will manage this – but we will need to look at the whole range of transport issues affected. We are keen to retain, if not improve services and will try to work with commercial companies on this.

**Reply from Mike Goodman, SCC**

There are lots of voluntary agencies who offer transport services and we may need to be more joined up with regard to what is already available, to avoid duplication and help to promote existing services.

**7. Jenny Garner, Woodlark Glade, Camberley**

There is a speeding problem at Kings Ride. Developer contributions of £30,000 were allocated to resolving this and the community proposed 2 single road build outs. However, Highways rejected this and proposed a new scheme, which has been discounted by residents. Anti social speeding is an issue – do we have to wait for an accident before something is done? Kings road is lengthy with a lot of vehicle use. The Department of Transport recommends that build outs will reduce speed. What will happen to the £30,000 if this cannot be agreed? How can we work with highways on this? We have a residents proposal.

**Reply from Andrew Milne, Highways Area Manager (NW)**

I am sorry to hear that the SCC attitude to this might have come across as negative or non supportive. I will go back and talk to the Officers involved and will take back your proposal to them to be followed up. With regard to money, S106 terms of agreement can be very specific which means the money could only be used in this area or, if not specific and this cannot be agreed, could be used elsewhere. I would need to look at the detail of the agreement.

Further Public Questions and Comments were raised during the meeting under specific items on the agenda:-

**Highways Report – Toshiba roundabout**

**8. Colin Manley, local resident**

The hospital will need to participate in the scheme too – they need to remove their barrier to speed up traffic entering the parking area and introduce pay and display parking.

**Reply from Josephine Hawkins**

*A separate lane to the Hospital would make sense and the hospital need to work with us on this issue.*

**Reply from Denis Fuller**

I am concerned about the changes proposed as we need to get this right. I like the idea of a separate lane to the Hospital, but the Hospital also need sensible parking arrangements and we need to consult with them.

**Reply from Bill Chapman**

Creating a separate lane without changes to the Hospital parking arrangements will be folly as it will merely create parking on the Highway as the traffic backs up. The situation is currently one out and one in and this needs addressing. I support the toucan crossing but a further crossing on Frimley Road is also required.

**Reply from Rodney Bates**

It is refreshing that all concerned have recognised that the previous scheme was wrong and are to correct this.

**Reply from the Chair**

The Hospital are trying to address the parking issues. They have brought land at Lion Way for more cars and are looking at additional parking with a 2 storey facility next to their existing structure. I hope that they will consider a traffic circuit around their site and I will discuss this with their Chief Executive.

**Reply from Andrew Milne, Highways Area Manager (NW)**

We are talking with the Hospital over the proposed changes as we do recognise the importance of everyone being on board with the new proposal. A cycle lane can also be incorporated with the 3<sup>rd</sup> lane – but on the Hospital side this will be a joint cycle / pedestrian route.



## Annex B



**Surrey Heath Local Area Committee**  
**Annex B – Written Public Questions, Responses and Supplementary questions**

**Q. Written question from Mr. Andrew Telford representing CPRE Runnymede.**

Whereas:

1. SCC unanimously resolved on 19/3/13 "To use its power to protect Surrey's Green Belt".
2. CPRE Runnymede wholly endorses this resolution.
3. Runnymede Borough Council's draft Local Plan is inconsistent with the resolved position of SCC as it does not protect Surrey's Green Belt, removing, as it does, several hundred acres from the Green Belt at the DERA site to facilitate development.
4. Removing DERA from the Green Belt will have a direct and detrimental effect, not only on Runnymede Borough, but also on Chobham Common, and therefore the heritage assets within Surrey Heath Borough.
5. There is strong popular support for SCC's landmark resolution as demonstrated by CPRE Surrey's e-petition regarding this matter, administered by MySociety through the RBC website, which has comfortably passed the threshold number of signatures required to ensure a debate in Full Council at RBC regarding removing any of the DERA site from the Green Belt.

The question:

***What action does the SHLC propose taking in prosecuting SCC's resolved policy of using its power to protect this part of Surrey's Green Belt, and will this include making a timely representation, as a neighbouring Borough, to Runnymede Borough Council raising a 'strong objection' to removing the land at the DERA site from the Green Belt?***

**A. Response from Chairman on behalf of the Committee:**

At its meeting on 19 March 2013, the County Council unanimously resolved to use its power to protect Surrey's Green Belt, support the National Planning Policy Framework (section 9 – paragraphs 79 to 92) and the Government's policy of protecting the Green Belt, to make Surrey's MPs and the County's Districts and Boroughs aware of this resolution and for any Green Belt development in the County to be in line with the needs and wishes of Surrey residents.

Under the National Planning Policy Framework, it is for the Districts and Boroughs to set Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans with local consultation and independent examination of any proposed changes.

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath)

Runnymede Borough Council is currently preparing its new Local Plan and recently consulted on a draft Pre-Submission version of its Core Strategy. Balancing the need for housing and employment growth and the need to protect the Green Belt is a matter to be decided at the local level through the Runnymede Local Plan.

**Q. Supplementary question from Mr. Andrew Telford representing CPRE Runnymede.**

Thank you for the response Chairman. This is word for word the same response that I had last week from the Cabinet Member for the Environment and Transport and, of course, doesn't answer my question - it merely repeats the resolution of SCC of 19th March.

The fact that planning matters are not within the remit of SCC does not prevent SCC making representations to RBC on planning matters. Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 clearly makes this possible.

If SCC will not use its power in this instance of a clear and present threat to the green belt, exactly when will it use it, so my question is:

What action will this Committee take with respect to SCC's resolved position of using its power to protect the green belt with regard to the DERA site?

**A. Response from Chairman on behalf of the Committee:**

The Chair provided a response outside of the meeting.

**Q. Written question from Mr. Richard Wilson, Windlesham**

Surrey's Green Belt is under imminent threat. Neighbouring Runnymede Borough Council's draft Local Plan involves removing the entire DERA site at Chobham Common from Green Belt status. The development that this would then allow would be devastating for rare wildlife and heathland within Surrey Heath borough. On 19 March 2013 Surrey County Council resolved unanimously to use its power to protect the Green Belt.

Cllr Pitt and the former councillor representing Windlesham were absent from that meeting and two other Surrey Heath county councillors were elected for the first time at the 2 May election.

The question:

***Do each of the current members of this committee, including Borough councillors, agree with the then members of Surrey County Council that no land should be removed from Surrey's Green Belt?***

**A. Response from Chairman on behalf of the Committee:**

I refer to the answer given above. However the question also asks each member of the local committee - county and borough - whether they agree that no land should be removed from Surrey's Green Belt.

**Annex B**

My colleagues may wish to comment, but I am certain SCC members would reiterate support for SCC's full resolution i.e.

Council resolves:

1. To use its power to protect Surrey's Green Belt.
2. To support the National Planning Policy Framework (section 9 –paragraphs 79 to 92) and the Government's policy of protecting the Green Belt.
3. To make Surrey's MPs and the County's Districts and Boroughs aware of this resolution.
4. That any Green Belt development in the County is in line with the needs and wishes of Surrey residents.

Surrey Heath Borough Council objected to Runnymede's Pre-Submission Core Strategy, with concerns that RBC have not undertaken a borough wide review of the Green Belt as evidence that DERA is the most appropriate site to be removed from the Green Belt to help address housing needs, and over the transport impacts on Surrey Heath of development at DERA.

**Q. Supplementary question from Mr. Richard Wilson, Windlesham**

Is the Committee unanimous on this? Would the Chair of the Committee write to Cllr Norman, Chair of Runnymede?

**A. Response from Chairman on behalf of the Committee:**

The Committee is not a debating society. You are most welcome to contact individual Councillors for a response. I will speak to Cllr Norman and make him aware of the views expressed, but it is not the prerogative of this Committee to influence Runnymede. I would reiterate that Surrey Heath have objected to the development.

**Q. Written question from Nigel Eastment representing The Chobham Society.**

Whereas:

1. SCC unanimously resolved on 19/3/13 "To use its power to protect Surrey's Green Belt", and their stated position in limb 4 of the resolution is that any Green Belt development in the County should be "in line with the needs and wishes of Surrey residents".
2. Fairoaks Operations Ltd's proposal for a hangar at Fairoaks Airport, on any view, is major 'development in the Green Belt' that encroaches on the Green Belt, and therefore does not protect it.
3. Fairoaks Operations Ltd's has not demonstrated a need or wish of Surrey residents for a new hangar at Fairoaks.
4. Fairoaks Operations Ltd's has not demonstrated that a hangar is 'required' (See GPDO 1995 Schedule 2 Part 18 J), in particular no intention has been proposed to remove the existing hangar that is claimed to be obsolete.

The question:

***What action does the SHLC propose taking in prosecuting SCC's resolved policy of using its power to protect this part of Surrey's Green Belt, and ensuring that any Green Belt development in the County is in line with the needs and wishes of Surrey residents, and will this include making a timely representation to SHBC raising an objection to this proposal?***

**A. Response from Chairman on behalf of the Committee:**

At its meeting on 19 March 2013, the County Council unanimously resolved to use its power to protect Surrey's Green Belt, support the National Planning Policy Framework (section 9 – paragraphs 79 to 92) and the Government's policy of protecting the Green Belt, to make Surrey's MPs and the County's Districts and Boroughs aware of this resolution and for any Green Belt development in the County to be in line with the needs and wishes of Surrey residents.

The current proposals on Fairoaks Airport, a major developed site in the Green Belt, fall to be considered under Part 18 A.2 of the General Permitted Development Order. This allows a relevant airport operator to carry out development in connection with the provision of services and facilities on operational land, subject to the operator consulting the local planning authority before carrying out any development. The airport operator, Fairoaks Operation Ltd, has consulted Surrey Heath Borough Council in order to confirm that the proposal is permitted development. There is no requirement for the Borough Council to consult third parties, although a meeting with Chobham Parish Council has been arranged.

**Q. Supplementary statement from Nigel Eastment representing The Chobham Society.**

Since asking the question and receiving the answer, things have moved on a bit. Chobham society it to be a loophole that allows permitted development so that no mitigation measures can be enforced. We would urge Surrey Heath planners to impose mitigation measures. We would also raise concerns over the consequences of the development of aerodromes and will lobby Michael Gove MP on this. We look forward to Councillors support on this.

## SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

## LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)

DATE: 3 OCTOBER 2013

LEAD OFFICER: ANDREW MILNE – AREA HIGHWAYS MANAGER (NW)

SUBJECT: HIGHWAYS UPDATE

DIVISION: ALL

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

This report records the progress made with the delivery of proposed highways schemes, developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works this financial year.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:****The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to:**

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes
- (ii) Note the progress with budget expenditure
- (iii) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The above recommendations are made to enable progression of all highway related schemes and works.

## **1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

- 1.1 Surrey County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) states the aim of improving the highway network for all users through measures such as reducing congestion, improving accessibility, reducing personal injury accidents, improving the environment and maintaining the highway network so that it is safe for all users.

## **2. ANALYSIS:**

### **2.1 2013-14 Integrated Transport and Developer Funded Schemes**

- 2.1.1 Following the Surrey Heath Local Committee held on 18<sup>th</sup> October 2012, it was agreed to promote the Toshiba Roundabout Improvement Scheme. This is a major project, and the highest priority on the Surrey Heath list of potential works.
- 2.1.2 Both the 2013/14 ITS and capital maintenance allocations have been committed to this project to enable delivery (£306,702 in total). This has been combined with use of appropriate developer deposits of £435,132 to provide an overall scheme budget of £741,834.
- 2.1.3 Design work is progressing. Video surveys, traffic counts and modelling work were undertaken to evaluate the effectiveness of introducing signals. This exercise led to the conclusion that signals would not have a beneficial effect at this location. The outcome recommendation was that an additional lane between Toshiba roundabout and Frimley Park hospital roundabout would provide a significant improvement to journey times and a decrease in congestion.
- 2.1.4 Additional scheme details were presented to Committee Members during the private meeting held on 20 June 2013. During this meeting Committee gave approval to progressing with the design of the additional lane for potential delivery in 2014/15, delivery of two upgraded pedestrian crossing points on the A325 Portsmouth Road arm of the Toshiba roundabout this financial year, and to review the potential for pedestrian crossing improvements on the B3411 Frimley Road.
- 2.1.5 Design of the additional lane is in progress. To ensure best value, early contact has also been made with Skanska so that the proposed lighting replacement works under the Streetlighting PFI contract are carried out in a way that accommodates the additional lane.
- 2.1.6 Delivery of the pedestrian crossing improvements on the A325 Portsmouth Road will commence in October 2013 with the installation of ducting. Further works will take place after this with the completion of these improvements by March 2014.
- 2.1.7 An initial review of the non-controlled pedestrian crossing on Frimley Road showed a zero level of usage over an eight hour period. Further review work will be carried out but as there is presently no funding provision for this item, the focus will remain on delivery of the crossing improvements and preparation for the anticipated installation of the additional lane in 2014/15.

- 2.1.8 Proposals for the ITS programme in 2014/15 will initially be discussed at the Private Members Meeting to be held on 7 November 2013, where a further update on progress with the Toshiba project will be provided. A further update report will be presented at the December Committee.

## 2.2 Revenue maintenance allocations and expenditure 2013/14

- 2.2.1 The 2013/14 revenue maintenance allocation for Surrey Heath is £226,525. Table 1 shows how these funds have been allocated and the spend progress to date.

Item	Allocation (£)	Comment (as at 20 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2013)
Drainage / ditching	40,000	£32,838 committed.
Carriageway and footway patching	80,025	£49,864 committed.
Vegetation works	60,000	£60,000 committed.
Signs and markings	30,000	£8,266 committed.
Parking	6,500	£6,500 committed. £3.5k of the original £10k allocated has been reallocated to the patching budget as these funds are no longer required by Parking to complete their works in Surrey Heath.
Low cost measures	20,000	£8,347 committed.
<b>Total</b>	<b>226,525</b>	<b>£165,215 committed</b>

**Table 1 – 2013/14 Revenue Maintenance Expenditure**

## 2.3 COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT FUND

- 2.3.1 The total 2013/14 Community Enhancement allocation for Surrey Heath is £30,000. Committee have previously determined to divide this fund equally between County Council Committee Members.
- 2.3.2 The Maintenance Engineer for Surrey Heath will provide guidance and assistance, organise cost estimates and raise orders to ensure delivery of works.
- 2.3.3 To ensure that this fund is effectively spent and to enable highways contractors to deliver works before the end of the financial year, it is recommended that all works should be agreed by 31<sup>st</sup> October 2013.
- 2.3.4 In the event of no firm spending decisions being made, the Maintenance Engineer will determine suitable works and organise their delivery.
- 2.3.5 A summary of spend progress is shown in Table 2.

Member	Allocation	Comment (as at 20 <sup>th</sup> September 2013)
Bill Chapman	£5,000	£1,424 committed.
Denis Fuller	£5,000	£1,414 committed
David Ivison	£5,000	£4,990 committed.
Chris Pitt	£5,000	£0 committed.
Mike Goodman	£5,000	£833 committed.
Adrian Page	£5,000	£0 committed.
<b>Total</b>	<b>£30,000</b>	<b>£8,661 committed</b>

**Table 2 – Community Enhancement Fund spend progress**

## ITEM 7

### **2.4 2013-14 Capital Maintenance Budget**

- 2.4.1 This budget has been allocated to the Toshiba Roundabout Improvement scheme as detailed in section 2.1 of this report.

### **3. OPTIONS:**

- 3.1 No options have been presented in this report.

### **4. CONSULTATIONS:**

- 4.1 Consultation is routinely carried out for highway-related schemes with relevant key parties including residents, Local Members, Surrey Police and Safety Engineering. Specific details regarding consultation and any arising legal issues are included in individual scheme reports as appropriate.

### **5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:**

- 5.1 Proposed ITS schemes are prioritised to ensure that the maximum public benefit is gained from any funding made available. So far as is practicable, Officer proposals follow the Countywide scheme assessment process (CASEM) and the prioritisation order determined by this.
- 5.2 The Committee Capital and Revenue Maintenance budgets are used to target the most urgent sites where a specific need arises, to keep up with general maintenance activities that reduce the need for expensive repairs in the future and to support local priorities. The nature of these works is such that spend may vary slightly from that indicated in Table 1.

### **6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:**

- 6.1 It is an objective of Surrey Highways to treat all users of the public highway equally and with understanding. An Equalities Impact Assessment is undertaken for each Integrated Transport Scheme as part of the design process.

### **7. LOCALISM:**

- 7.1 Through the views and needs expressed by local communities and accommodating where possible the involvement of local communities in looking after the public highway, localism is routinely considered as part of the consultation and bidding processes for highway-related works. Specific details regarding localism are included in individual reports as appropriate.

### **8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

- 8.1 Other implications, such as the contribution that a well-managed highway network can give to reducing crime and disorder, are considered in relation to individual schemes and specific details are included in individual reports as appropriate.



Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report.

## **9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 9.1 The Committee is asked to note the contents of this report.
- 9.2 It is recommended that a further Highways Update is presented at the next meeting of this Committee.

## **10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

- 10.1 Officers will continue to progress delivery of all schemes and ensure effective use of all budgets.

---

### **Contact Officer:**

Andrew Milne, Area Highways Manager (NW) – 03456 009 009

### **Consulted:**

-

### **Annexes:**

-

### **Sources/background papers:**

-

---

This page is intentionally left blank

## SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

## LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)

DATE: OCTOBER 2013  
 LEAD OFFICER: ANDREW MILNE, AREA TEAM MANAGER



SUBJECT: PIRBRIGHT BENDS – SPEED LIMIT CHANGES (AMENDMENT)

DIVISION: FRIMLEY GREEN AND MYTCHETT

<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUE:</b>
Following the 'Pirbright Bends – Speed limit Changes' report presented to Surrey Heath Local Committee on the 14 <sup>th</sup> March 2013, there has been a requirement to seek the Local Committee's approval to amend the legal order for this scheme.
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>
<p><b>The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Note the contents of this report</li> <li>(ii) Agree to authorise the change to the legal order allowing the speed limit terminal signs to remain in their existing location.</li> </ul>
<b>REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>
Recommendations have been made based upon making the speed limits enforceable at no additional cost.

<b>1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:</b>
--

1.1 Since the local committee gave approval to this scheme in March 2013, officers have been working to introduce the approved speed limit. In the course of these activities it has been found that there is a slight discrepancy in the location of the existing speed limit terminal signs and the legal division between a National Speed limit (a section of road without a system of street lighting, without a legal order) and 30mph limit (a section of road with a system of street lighting without a legal order), i.e the first/last lamp column, on Guildford Road, Frimley Green. Currently the terminal signs are located approximately 23m south east of the first lamp column which signifies the legal commencement of the 30mph limit.

1.2 To resolve this issue, the terminal signs could be moved to be in-line with the first lamp column. This is not suitable as there is a telegraph pole at this location which would obscure visibility to the signs. Moving the telegraph pole would incurring significant expense and delays the scheme.

1.3 The current location of the speed limit terminal signs is the most suitable location for them, but this will require a legal order to authorise it.

**2. ANALYSIS:**

2.1 N/A

**3. OPTIONS:**

3.1 There are two options available for the local committee. These are:

- a. Agree to the recommendation, and authorise the amendment to the legal order.
- b. Oppose the recommendation, and leave the anomaly between the speed limits. Funds will need to be found to deal with this anomaly at a later date.

**4. CONSULTATIONS:**

4.1 N/A

**5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:**

5.1 If the local committee agree with the recommendations then there are no additional costs, as a legal order is already required for this scheme.

**6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:**

6.1 The Highway Service is mindful of its needs within this area and attempts to treat all users of the public highway with equality and understanding.

**7. LOCALISM:**

7.1 If the local committee agree with the recommendations then the local communities will see no additional changes other than those already agreed to in the March 2013 report.

**8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report

**9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 9.1 This report details the issues surrounding the speed limit terminal signs location on Guildford Road, Frimley Green. It is recommended to authorise the legal order amendment, which would have the effect of retaining the existing location for speed limit change, at no additional cost, whilst making the speed limits enforceable.
- 9.2 It is important to note that this speed limit reduction scheme has been promoted by Safety Engineering through the Guildford Local Committee. If this amendment is not approved, this will result in there being a significant anomaly, with the majority of Pirbright Bends being treated with a 40mph speed limit, and then there being a 25m stretch of 60mph within the boundary of Surrey Heath before the speed limit changes to 30mph. The purpose of the proposed amendments is to remove the 25m stretch of 60mph so that the 40mph speed limit continues to the start of the 30mph limit.

**10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

- 10.1 If agreed, the Traffic Regulation Order is amended and advertised for public consultation.

---

**Contact Officer:**

Peter Orchard, Assistant Engineer - 03456 009 009.

**Consulted:****Annexes:**

Annexe 1 – Map showing location of the proposed amendment

**Sources/background papers:**

None

---

This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank



## SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

## LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)

DATE: 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2013

LEAD OFFICER: ALAN CLARK, AREA COMMANDER, SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE

SUBJECT: SFRS ANNUAL REPORT 2012-13

DIVISION: SURREY HEATH BOROUGH DIVISION

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

The report appended as **Annex 1** outlines the major strands of activity being undertaken within the Woking area by the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) teams based at Camberley and Chobham Fire Stations.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:****The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to:**

- (i) Recognise the achievements of the borough teams within the Surrey Heath Borough and support their commitment to improve initiatives to reduce risk and make the Surrey Heath Borough safer through the delivery of the borough/station plan.
- (ii) Note the targets and initiatives set within the Surrey Heath borough plan for 2012/13 and support the Fire and Rescue Service in the delivery of this plan.
- (iii) Support the achievements of the whole time/ retained duty personnel at Camberley and Chobham and acknowledge the availability offered by employers who release staff, and those who are self-employed.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

To update the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) on the work of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service teams within the borough.

**Please refer to the annual report appended as Annex 1.**

**Contact Officer:** Karen Pointer/Paul Kenny 01737 242444

**Consulted:** SFRS officers

**Annexes:** Annex 1 – Annual Report

**Sources/background papers:**

- Surrey Heath Borough Plan 2012/13
- SFRS Public Safety Plan

[www.surrey-fire.gov.uk](http://www.surrey-fire.gov.uk)





MISSION

**To provide a professional and well supported Fire and Rescue Service which reduces community risk in order to save lives, relieve suffering, protect property and the environment**

*Surrey Fire and Rescue  
Local Committee Report  
April 2012 – March 2013*

*Completed by  
Assistant Group Manager*

*Karen Pointer  
Community Impact West Area  
Surrey Heath Borough*

ITEM 9  
**Contents**

1	.....	1
2	KEY ISSUE .....	3
3	SUMMARY .....	3
4	OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS.....	3
5	SURREY HEATH STATISTICS .....	4
6	REPORTING AGAINST IDENTIFIED TARGETS.....	5
7	FIRE SAFETY PROTECTION ACTIVITIES .....	5
8	COMMUNITY FIRE PREVENTION .....	6
9	SAFEGUARDING REFERRALS .....	6
10	VOLUNTEERS SERVICE.....	7
11	COMMUNITY RISK REDUCTION.....	8
12	COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT.....	8
13	WHAT HAPPENS NEXT .....	9

## KEY ISSUE

- 1.1 This report outlines the major strands of activity being undertaken within Surrey Heath area by the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) teams based at Camberley and Chobham Fire Stations.

## SUMMARY

- 1.2 The report contains information on the various activities undertaken by the Borough team to reduce the risk from fire, water and road traffic incidents to the residents of Surrey Heath Borough, including direct contact, public education programmes and campaigns.

## OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

### **The Local Committee is asked to:**

- 1.3 Recognise the achievements of the borough teams within Surrey Heath Borough and support their commitment to improve initiatives to reduce risk and make Surrey Heath Borough safer through the delivery of the borough/station plan.
- 1.4 Note the targets and initiatives set within the Surrey Heath Borough plan for 2012/13 and support the Fire and Rescue Service in the delivery of this plan.
- 1.5 Support the achievements of the wholetime/retained duty personnel at Camberley and Chobham and acknowledge the availability offered by employers who release staff, and those who are self-employed.

## ITEM 9

**SURREY HEATH STATISTICS**

Within Service/Borough Target		
Close to Service/Borough Target		
Above Service/Borough Target - Action Required		
<b>Key Performance Indicators for 2012/13</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2011/12</b>
Percentage of Fires attended in dwellings with no smoke detection fitted	Service Target: < 38%	Service Target: <33 %
	23%	26%
No of fatalities due to primary fires	Service Target: 7	Service Target: 7
	0	0
No of injuries arising from accidental dwelling fires	Borough Target: 6	Borough Target: 6
	6	2
No of false alarms caused by AFA's (automatic fire alarms)	Borough Target: 146	Borough Target: 146
	130	130
No of calls to malicious false alarms attended	Borough Target: 12	Borough Target: 12
	10	9
No of deliberate Primary & Secondary Fires (excluding vehicles)	Borough Target: 127	Borough Target: 127
	44	127
No of deliberate & Secondary vehicle fires	Borough Target: 15	Borough Target: 15
	6	9
No of calls to fires attended - primary	Borough Target: 126	Borough Target: 126
	105	95
No of calls to fires attended - Accidental fires in dwellings	Borough Target: 35	Borough Target: 35
	40	28
Percentage of accidental dwelling fires confined to room of origin	Borough Target: >91%	Borough Target: >88%
	90%	93%
No of fires in non domestic premises	Borough Target: 20	Borough Target: 20
	23	7
No of HFSVs (Home Fire Safety Visits) Visits to Risk Households	Service Target % at Risk >60%	Service Target % at Risk >50%
	148 (70%)	151 (54%)
Total Visits	210	281

## REPORTING AGAINST TARGETS NOT ACHIEVED

### 1.6 Accidental Dwelling Fires

2012/2013	2011/2012
Borough Target 35	Borough Target 35
40	28

- 1.7 There is a 14% increase on the borough target which is due to 3 fires that occurred at the same premise over a period of 5 months. These were small fires in a kitchen and bathroom that involved an elderly gentleman. This gentleman is listed for other calls such as false alarms and work is ongoing to support him within his home setting. No fires have been identified at this address since September 2012.

### 1.8 Number of Fires to Non Domestic Premises

2012/2013	2011/2012
Borough Target 20	Borough Target 20
23	7

- 1.9 Although this appears to be a large increase on the previous year it is not a true reflection as the average number of 20 fires are recorded for earlier years pre 2011-12. No trends have been identified for fires in non domestic premises but this does include Frimley park hospital with small fires recorded. Ie. Burnt toast that has caused damage to the toaster.

## COMMUNITY FIRE PROTECTION

## ITEM 9

### 1.10

	2012	2011
Prosecutions	3	-
Prohibition Notice - Formal	0	-
Enforcement Notice - Formal	4	-
Deficiencies Notice - Informal	23	-
Licensing Consultations	18	-
Building Regulation Consultations	70	-

**(Currently I have no data for 2011)**

- 1.1 Himchuli, A30 Camberley, all 3 prosecutions relate to individuals who failed to comply with an article 27 notice. Each was fined £500 plus £415 costs.

## COMMUNITY FIRE PREVENTION

- 1.2 We will undertake intelligence-based Home Fire Safety Visits (HFSV), in the areas most in need of this service, using the provided data and local knowledge to target this work. Currently a target of 60% is expected for our crews to reach vulnerable people and the most at risk from fire in our communities. SFRS will work closely with Adult and Social Care teams to ensure the following are targeted.

- Adults over the age of 65 (Worse at 75)
- Individuals who live alone
- Individuals with Mental Health illnesses, including Dementia & Memory Loss
- Individuals with disability and mobility difficulties
- Individuals who are either Alcohol or Drug dependant
- Individuals who smoke (The above will be compounded if coupled with smoking)

- 1.3

2012/13	2011/12
Service Target % at Risk >60%	Service Target % at Risk >50%
148 (70%)	151 (54%)
203	281

## SAFEGUARDING REFERRALS

- 1.4 The Service works in collaboration with Social Services to ensure vulnerable adults/children are identified and care action plan is



formulated.

2012/13	2011/12
Totals	Totals
9	8

## **VOLUNTEERS SERVICE**

- 1.5 Our Volunteers assist firefighters in prevention and education activities. The volunteers work alongside the firefighters delivering crucial safety information to the general public at a wide variety of events, from Open Days to Public Events, and also delivering Home Fire Safety Visits to the general public. Our volunteering scheme has proved to be highly successful and we have a high number of volunteers out in the community assisting our firefighters in delivering safety information. As a result we have managed to reach more households and importantly, more vulnerable people.
- 1.6 If you know of anyone who would be interested in becoming a volunteer for the service please can you provide this link for them which gives you all the information you need to know about being a [Surrey Fire Volunteer](http://www.surreyfirevolunteer.org).([www.surreyfirevolunteer.org](http://www.surreyfirevolunteer.org))

## **COMMUNITY RISK REDUCTION**

### **1.7 Community Fire Protection**

As part of our protection information crews and dedicated teams of fire safety officers visit premises to gather information on specific risks. This information is recorded and placed on our mobile data terminals for reference if we are to attend an incident at the premise. 12 high risk premises were visited during 2012/13 giving us valuable information on their specific risks.

### **1.8 Community Fire Prevention**

Due to the particularly wet weather throughout 2012 very little action has been required from Surrey Heath crews to attend wildfire incidents. During April wildfire patrols took place in areas that required a fire service presence. Although outwardly crews have not been highly visible in relation to wildfires, a lot of internal work has been carried out to update fire plans of commons and identify tracks suitable for certain Fire Service vehicles. Additional work is being carried out for the entire service with a dedicated wildfire officer to improve wildfire procedures, policies and training, which is reflected through other Fire Services and national guidance.

Surrey Heath crews have attended various mini targeted campaigns identifying streets where people are at a higher risk of fires.

### **Volunteers Service**

Within the Surrey Heath Borough volunteers have supported the fire station open day which raised a large amount of money for the firefighter's charity. They have played a supportive role with the targeted HFSVs ensuring that the most vulnerable individuals are approached to ensure they are safe in their homes from fire related issues.

## COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

### 1.19 Education

The Services education team currently attends Special Educational Needs schools to deliver fire safety advice.

Number of Schools	Number of Pupils
2	65

### 1.20 Junior Citizens

No Junior Citizens was run in the Surrey Heath borough for this current year. The Junior Citizens scheme is aimed at children aged between 10-11 years (Year 6)

Number of Days	Number of Pupils
-	-

### 1.21 Firewise Scheme

The Service has a successful referral scheme aimed at young people, who have shown an interest in fire setting.

Surrey Heath Borough	
Number of Referrals	11

### 1.22 Youth Engagement Scheme

The Youth Engagement Scheme is an innovative scheme run by the Service with support from partners such as the Youth Support Service, Brooklands College. (Public Service tutors) The aim of the scheme is to divert young people from anti-social behavior and youth crime.

Surrey Heath Borough	
Total Number of Referrals	6
Total Number Offered Taster Session	3
Total Number Started	3
Total Number Graduated	2

### 1.23 Safe Drive Stay Alive

The main aim of the Service has always been to reduce the injuries and deaths of young people aged 16-25. This is achieved through various activities, mainly Safe Drive Stay Alive.

Surrey Heath Borough	
Number of Pupils	405

## WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

ITEM 9

1.9 Members asked to support the Station(s) plan for 2012/13  
Members asked to recognise good performance by Surrey Heath personnel  
in 2012/13

**LEAD OFFICER:** Alan Clark, Area Commander

**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 01737 242444

**E-MAIL:** alan.clark@surreycc.gov.uk

**CONTACT OFFICER:** Karen Pointer Assistant Group Manager –  
Community Impact – West

**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 01737 242444

**E-MAIL:** Karen.pointer@surreycc.gov.uk

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** Surrey Heath Plan 2012/13  
SFRS Public Safety Plan.  
Web: [www.surrey-fire.gov.uk](http://www.surrey-fire.gov.uk)

<b>File Ref:</b> Surrey Heath Borough Report April 2012-March 2013	<b>Owner:</b> AGC Karen Pointer Community Impact West Area
<b>Date of Issue:</b> 9 <sup>th</sup> September 2013	<b>Version Number:</b> 1
<b>Consulted:</b> Yes	

## SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

## LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)

DATE: 3 Oct 2013

LEAD OFFICER: Nikkie Enticknap

SUBJECT: Forward Plan

DIVISION: All

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

This report is produced for each meeting of the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) so that members can review the forward plan. The reports that are currently anticipated will be received by the committee are outlined in paragraph 3.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to note and comment on the forward plan contained in this report.**

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The report contains an updated version of the Local Committee's forward plan.

**1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

1.1 The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) may receive a forward plan at each meeting setting out the anticipated reports for future meetings. The forward plan will be used in preparation for the next committee meeting. However, this is a flexible forward plan and all items are subject to change.

**2. ANALYSIS:**

2.1 No analysis was required for this report.

**3. OPTIONS:**

3.1 In addition to the following, requests from Members for other reports will be welcomed.

**Thursday 12 December 2013**

1. Highways Update
2. Highways 2014/2015 programme
3. TRO Bridleway 19
4. Community Safety issues report

**Thursday 13 March 2014**

5. Members Allocations – end of year report on projects funded
6. Highways Update
7. Operation Horizon – Year 1 review and Year 2 list approval
8. Youth Local Prevention Framework

**4. CONSULTATIONS:**

4.1 Members and Surrey County Council officers have been consulted.

**5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:**

5.1 There are no financial implications of the forward plan.

**6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:**

6.1 There are no equality and diversity implications arising out of the forward plan.

**7. LOCALISM:**

7.1 Future reports and discussion topics for the Local Committee are included in the forward plan, giving all residents and businesses in the Surrey Heath area notice of topics on future agendas.

**8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report

**9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

9.1 The committee is asked to note the forward plan contained in this report.

**10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

10.1 No further action is required.

---

**Contact Officer:** Nikkie Enticknap, Community Partnerships and Committee Officer (Surrey Heath)  
01276 800269

**Consulted:** Members and Surrey County Council officers have been consulted.

**Annexes:** None

**Sources/background papers:** None

---

This page is intentionally left blank