

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Runnymede LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 4.30 pm on 8 July 2013
at The Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone KT15 2AH.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr Chris Norman (Chairman)
- * Mrs Yvonna Lay (Vice-Chairman)
- Mrs Mary Angell
- * Mr Mel Few
- * Mr John Furey
- * Miss Marisa Heath

Borough / District Members:

- * Borough Councillor Derek Cotty
- * Borough Councillor Richard Edis
- Borough Councillor Alan Alderson
- * Borough Councillor Paul Tuley
- * Borough Councillor Patrick Roberts
- Cllr J M Edwards

* In attendance

1/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 1]

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 February 2013 were agreed as a true record and signed.

2/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 2]

No declarations of interest were received.

3/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 3]

Apologies were received from Mrs Mary Angell, Councillor Alan Alderson, and Councillor John Edwards.

4/13 PETITIONS [Item 4]

A petition had been received from the majority of residents in Lyne Road, Virginia Water, in respect of a new width restriction installed in February 2012 after agreement by the Local Committee. The petition was tabled at the meeting and stated that "the undersigned agree that the new barrier raises concerns regarding safety to lives and property, and this situation must not be allowed to continue". Mr Ted Warmington of Lyne Road introduced the petition, arguing that the restriction width should be increased by 2 metres and citing support from 85% of residents and the Watch Manager of Chertsey Fire Station. He said that since the restriction was moved to the Trumps

Green end of the road, he was unable to turn left out of his own driveway with a special purpose vehicle which he had used to tow horse-drawn carriages to local shows.

The chairman noted that the width restriction had been consulted on and agreed as part of a democratic process and that the Committee must be mindful of other residents' views and the costs of any changes, stating that a response to the petition would be provided at the next meeting in September.

5/13 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

The Committee received three written public questions to which written answers were provided and tabled at the meeting (appended document). Two of the questioners asked supplementary questions in absentia (which the chairman accepted because the meeting had been re-arranged at short notice) and the third (Mr Telford) attended and asked a supplementary. Answers to the supplementary questions were as follows:

Public Question 1 – Supplementary question

Thank you for the response. This is word for word the same response that was given to a similar question on 25th by the Cabinet Member for Transport and the Environment, and by the Surrey Heath Local Committee on 4th July. It clearly doesn't answer the 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 do so, so my supplementary question is:

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

Mr Furey (Cabinet Member for the Environment and a local committee member) gave the following answer:

"The removal of Green Belt status lies entirely within the hands of the borough council and we are sure that they are capable of responding to representations and observing a lawful process."

Public Question 2 – supplementary question

The applicants submitted the following supplementary question, which was tabled at the meeting:

PREAMBLE

1) Mis-direction:

The Applicants believe that the mis-direction by Andrew Milne at the LAC meeting in September 2012 is justification in itself for re-examining the issue before the LAC in open forum. This was raised in the Application dated 22nd March, 2013 and in the original question. One of the Applicants has been requesting the SCC in writing (including of the SCC Assistant CEO office) for clarification and justification of the "precedent" argument espoused at the LAC meeting in September 2012 by Andrew Milne of SCC Highways. There has been no answer to

this question. The Applicants note that the Chair in his answer to the Applicants initial written question has ignored this element 3) of the question. We think that the Chair now needs to explain what was the basis of the “precedent” notion as espoused by Highways and, if it is unable to explain this in detail and with legal basis, then this state of affairs should in itself be a reason for a re-examination by the LAC at this hearing on 8th July;

2) Police:

The conclusion which has been reached by the Chair (in the answer to the Applicants initial question) that the gate is not “necessary” is completely at odds with the dealings had by the Applicants with the Police. In fact, in a letter dated 22nd March 2013 from Surrey Police to County Cllr Heath (as submitted with the Application) Surrey Police state:

“ I have been a Police Officer for 22 years at Egham. I first met Mr Shourie in the summer of 2011 when we walked the lane together and he outlined the issue and his proposal. I have previously been supportive of the proposal to install a gate and I continue to support this proposal. The lane has suffered and since 2002 there have been 222 crimes or crime related reports recorded by the Police including the theft of lead roof tiles from the properties of Mr Shourie, Mr Collins and the RAF Memorial to name but a few. I have been aware that the unmade road is an area for fly tipping which ranges from house hold waste to televisions and large lorry tyres which can number 10 to 20 in number. I am of the firm view that due to the isolated nature of the unmade section lane which has no lighting that this is facilitating crime in this neighbourhood (in addition to the fly tipping) as vehicles used for crime can be parked in this unmade section. I believe that a gate would prevent crime in the neighbourhood. I feel that installing this gate would stop a lot of crime as the university has had rooms broken into and the lane provides parking out of sight of the CCTV. The RAF Memorial site has had copper drain pipes stolen and offenders have again parked in the unmade area and these thefts have run into tens of thousands of pounds on several occasions. I would more than welcome the installation of the gate as proposed. I am willing to appear at a council meeting to express this view in person or answer any questions.”

Given this written evidence as part of the Application, we are of the opinion that no reasonable person could conclude that Surrey Police does not consider the gate “necessary”.

Further, with respect to the APU, as has been previously noted, the APU raised the issue of a gate with an occupant of one the Applicant properties unsolicited on a routine visit to Coopers Hill Lane. The APU has in a meeting with SCC Highways already confirmed (in addition to its’ letter of support dated 19th May, 2013) on 21st June that any additional measure of security in the lane would be beneficial.

The letter from the APU which has been submitted to the Chair on 20th May, 2013 states:

“The proposed installation of a gate in Coopers Hill Lane to prevent vehicle access would enhance the overall security in relation to aviation protection and would be in the interest of all agencies and residents of the area. We are aware of the incidents of fly tipping and unauthorised squatting along Coopers Hill Lane and immediate area and have liaised with Surrey Police and Royal Holloway Security in the past regarding these matters.”

Given these facts and statements from the Police, we do not think that any reasonable person could conclude that neither the Surrey Police nor the APU “consider the installation of a gate at this location” as being not necessary as stated in the Chair’s answer to the Applicants’ initial written question;

3) Answers to Emails:

In parallel with the initial written question (and now this Supplementary Question), the Applicants have raised a series of questions and issues in emails dated 14th June, 25th June, 27th June, 1st July and 4th July. The Applicants look forward to receiving full and detailed answers to these emails from the Chair following this meeting; and

4) New Evidence:

The unsolicited intervention of the APU (since the Application was made) is new evidence in itself. The Applicants DISAGREE that the Application contains NO new evidence since the last Application heard before the LAC in September 2012 given the 70 plus pages of evidence submitted. Further and in the alternative, the Applicants are of the view that the APU evidence (in a letter dated 19th May, 2013 as submitted and the view expressed in the meeting with SCC Highways on 21st June, 2013) is in itself new evidence and justification alone for a re-examination of this issue in open forum again.]

“Can the Chair please explain why, based on an incorrect assessment of the Police evidence (as set out above), the mis-direction by SCC Highways at the LAC meeting in September 2012 and the introduction of new evidence from the APU since the Application, it is refusing to allow discussion of the matter again at today’s LAC meeting or, failing which, at the next LAC meeting in September 2013.”

The chairman has given the following response on behalf of the Committee:

“According to Surrey County Council’s Constitution, questions to the Committee should be about general policy, **not** detail. However, I will summarise the history of this matter. When a request was made for a gate in Coopers Hill Lane at the Local Committee of June 2012,

members were advised that a longstanding Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) prohibiting vehicular traffic (except for access) had been in place for several decades, and on that basis a gate could be installed without further legal process. At the subsequent Committee meeting of September 2012 members were advised that no such traffic order existed, and that there was no compelling highways reason to advertise or defend a new TRO to permit a gate. The Committee agreed that it would not advertise a new TRO. The applicants submitted a further request in 2013 for a gate in the Lane, based on a gating order on grounds of anti-social behaviour from fly tipping. The chairman and vice-chairman, taking legal advice from officers and having considered **all** the evidence submitted, decided that the new information provided was not significant enough to provide a sufficient case for a gating order and that therefore the matter should not return to the Local Committee yet again.”

In addition Councillor Patrick Roberts (Englefield Green East) asked why the application could not be re-considered in the light of additional support gathered, since he understood that it had been rejected by the Committee in September 2012 because of the discovery of an administrative oversight. The chairman answered that the Committee were advised at the September meeting that there was no traffic order in place, and rejected the request because there was no good basis to advertise a new legal order to introduce a gate. He did not consider it appropriate to discuss further at the meeting, as Public Questions were intended to address general policy not detail.

Public Question 3 – supplementary

Mr Telford asked if the highways manager could indicate how long it would take for enforcement by Surrey County Council, and when would inaccurate signage in Coopers Hill Lane be put right.

Mr Milne answered on behalf of the Committee, advising that he could not say when the Legal Services department would take further action, and undertook to ask Mr Gosden to write to the questioner about the signage.

6/13 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]

No member questions had been received.

7/13 OPERATION HORIZON - ROADS MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME [FOR DECISION] [Item 7]

Ms Jane Young of Surrey County Council and Mr Lloyd Allen of May Gurney presented the report, later joined by Mr Mark Borland. They noted that Operation Horizon , which allocated £120 million county-wide over five years to repair the worst-ranked roads, would cover 11% of the road network in Runnymede and tackle 33km, much of it in the second year of the programme. The programme was not the county council’s only investment in local roads, but was in addition to a smaller budget for urgent winter repairs (potholes), and the locally determined capital maintenance budget for Local Structural Repair to provide for surface treatments.

Members asked about what would follow the five year plan, penalties available to deter utility companies from digging up the road following resurfacing, expected level of useage of the highways depot in Lyne Lane, and existing safety concerns about its junction with Hardwick Lane. It was confirmed that the new permit system for utilities works would be implemented at the end of 2013 and provide five years protection to roads except in case of emergencies such as a burst water main. Mr Borland said that the depot was not expected to generate significant additional traffic with just one delivery per week, and that it would not operate on Sundays or after 7pm. He agreed to meet two local members to review the junction. Members also asked about the stated plans to renew "all primary roads in Chertsey and Addlestone" and the expected congestion arising. Ms Young said that members and the public would be consulted on the business plan to deliver this, and that works on the A320 may be delayed due to recently notified plans by Affinity Water to dig trial holes along the length of this road.

The Committee agreed that

- i) they formally approved the £6m Operation Horizon programme for Runnymede and that the 33km of road across the defined scheme list detailed in Annex 1, be resurfaced over the investment period;
- ii) Surrey Highways produce an annual report in March 2014 confirming to the Local Committee the programme's progress and success to date.

8/13 WOBURN HILL & WEYBRIDGE ROAD SPEED ASSESSMENT [FOR DECISION] [Item 8]

Mr Andrew Milne explained that the highways team had reviewed the road in question following representations from St George's College, and in line with its general policy to introduce 40mph limits on roads of this character. Mr John Furey asked that a letter be sent from the chairman on behalf of the Committee to the Police Crime Commissioner, asking that Surrey Police devote greater resources to enforcing speed limits on local roads.

The Local Committee (Runnymede) agreed that:

- i) authorisation be given to advertise a notice in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effects of which would be to revoke any existing traffic orders necessary, and introduce a 40mph speed limit to the length of the A317 Woburn Hill and A317 Weybridge Road between the roundabout junction with A318 Chertsey Road to the existing 50mph/30mph speed limit change point west of D3093 Weystone Road (as shown in Annex 1);
- ii) authorisation be given to the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee and local member, to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals, and:
 - iii) subject to no objections being maintained, the order be made and the proposed speed limit change implemented.

9/13 HIGHWAYS UPDATE REPORT [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 9]

Mr Andrew Milne introduced this information report, noting progress made as detailed in Table 1 of the report and confirming that a report on the A317 feasibility study would be available shortly, and that Vehicle Activated Signs were due for installation in Lyne Crossing Road imminently.

Members asked about use of the revenue maintenance budget for clearance of blocked drains, the Community Enhancement budget, consideration of a CPZ in Englefield Green, and the location and timing of work on the “St Peter’s Way roundabout” (Table 6 of the report).

10/13 MAGNA CARTA 2015 PROPOSALS [FOR COMMENT] [Item 10]

Mrs Rhian Boast introduced the report, emphasising that plans were being developed in conjunction with the National Trust, Runnymede Borough Council, Royal Holloway and Brunel universities. She said that the aim of commemorating the June 2015 anniversary in this way was to recognise the heritage and international importance of the area, and to generate new visitors leading to economic benefits for Egham and surrounding areas. She tabled an annex to the report giving further details of the public consultation with 430 mainly local residents, and noted that the county council had appointed a leading consultants (Chris Blandford) who had worked on Stonehenge and Avebury. She indicated that some of the events already planned for 2015 were: a concert at the Royal Albert Hall on 15 May, an equestrian pageant, a fair at Royal Holloway, a national celebration of “Liberty” (led by the 800th Committee), and local Liberty events and bell ringing.

Members asked about the size and source of the budget for the plans, the urgency of securing a Heritage Lottery Grant, and the nature of the National Trust’s perception of this sensitive site and what would be acceptable.

The chairman agreed to take two informal questions from residents as part of this item:

Mrs Brenda Millington (Runnymede Association of Arts) asked for an indication of how the Association’s local talents and contribution might be used towards the celebration events.

Mr Malcolm Loveday (Chertsey Society and captain of St Peter’s Church bell ringers) noted the National Council of Bell Ringers plan to organise national ringing on 14 June 2015, and the new Magna Carta Surprise Royal method rung at St John’s Egham recently. He asked if members of the Local Committee would support the lighting of the St Ann’s Hill beacon in June 2015 and consider finding funding for fireworks.

11/13 SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE IN RUNNYMEDE 2012-13 [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 11]

Mr Leigh Middleton introduced the report on performance in the first year of the Local Prevention Framework contract and transformation of services for young people. He highlighted the increase in the number of activities being provided for young people at youth centres.

Members praised the reduction to nil of the number of looked after children who came into contact with the criminal justice system, and asked which youth centres in the borough had achieved the accredited Level 3 standard. Mr Middleton advised that all but Englefield Green had done so, and he was confident that the latter would meet the standard by the autumn. Members noted the report.

12/13 YOUNG PEOPLE: LOCAL PREVENTION FRAMEWORK 2013-14 [FOR DECISION] [Item 12]

The chairman noted that the Youth Task Group of the Local Committee had been part of the process of interviewing which had led them to the recommendation.

Mr Leigh Middleton confirmed that, whilst only one bid had been received, the standard of the bid was favourable when benchmarked with Spelthorne's. He noted that the Task Group had met twice following additional questions being raised at the first presentation, and had agreed to recommend an award in full to Eikon, at their second meeting.

Two county members expressed misgivings about awarding the grant for a two year period and asked about quality assurance mechanisms in place. Mr Middleton confirmed that there were no break clauses in the current grant/contract but there was scope to take action if the monthly performance data indicated a need for improvement.

Mr Few proposed an amendment to the recommendation, seconded by Mrs Lay, which was carried unanimously. Mr Middleton noted that this would mean the decision on the award would be revisited by the Committee in twelve months.

The Local Committee agreed to:

Approve the Youth Task Group recommendation to award a funding agreement for a twenty four month period from 01 September 2013, **with a break clause after twelve months**, to the following provider:

i) Eikon Charity for 100% of the contract value (£83 000pa) to prevent young people from becoming NEET in Runnymede.

13/13 LOCAL COMMITTEE BUDGETS AND TASK GROUPS [FOR DECISION] [Item 13]

The Local Committee agreed:

i) the terms of reference for the Youth Task Group, Major Schemes (Egham) Task Group and the Parking Task Group, as set out in Annexes 1,2 and 3;

ii) the membership for these task groups for 2013-14:

Youth Task Group – Mr Chris Norman, Mr Mel Few (Cllr Gill Warner);

Parking Task Group – Mr Chris Norman, Mrs Yvonna Lay (Cllr John Edwards, Cllr Derek Cotty);

Major Schemes (Egham) Task Group – Mrs Yvonna Lay, Miss Marisa Heath (Cllr Patrick Roberts, Cllr Alan Alderson)

iii) to nominate Mrs Yvonna Lay, with Mr Chris Norman as deputy, to represent the Local Committee on the local Community Safety Partnership in 2013-14;

iv) that the community safety budget of £3 226 delegated to the Local Committee be transferred to the Runnymede Community Safety Partnership;

v) that the Community Partnerships Manager manages and authorises expenditure from the budget delegated to the Local Committee in accordance with (iv) above.

14/13 FORWARD PROGRAMME [FOR DECISION] [Item 14]

The Local Committee agreed to note the following forward plan items for the Local Committee on 30 September:

- * Community Safety Review 2012-13
- * On-street parking review recommendations
- * Highways Update
- * Major Schemes (Egham) update

Meeting ended at: 6.30 pm

Chairman