

Minutes of the meeting of the
Spelthorne LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 6.30 pm on 16 December 2013
at Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames. TW18 1XA.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr Richard Walsh (Chairman)
- * Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Ian Beardsmore
- * Mrs Carol Coleman
- * Mr Robert Evans
- * Mr Tim Evans
- Mr Daniel Jenkins

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Chris Frazer
- * Cllr Ian Harvey
- * Cllr Jean Pinkerton
- * Cllr Joanne Sexton
- * Cllr Richard Smith-Ainsley
- * Cllr Spencer Taylor
- * Cllr Robert Watts

* In attendance

67/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

At the start of the meeting, Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos requested that the meeting end at 9.30pm, rather than 11pm as per the previous Local Committee meeting. The Chairman agreed to aim to achieve this.

No apologies were received. One member was absent (Daniel Jenkins).

68/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

Minutes from the Local Committee held on 30 September 2013 were agreed and approved as an accurate record and were signed by the Chairman.

Mrs Carol Coleman asked when there will be a Local Committee members' workshop to consider possible future cycling schemes. This will be discussed outside of this meeting.

There was a request for a 'matters arising' item with the minutes. This will be considered for future meetings.

69/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

70/13 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

There were two announcements:

1. As an action for the Chairman from the Local Committee on 30th September, Chairman Richard Walsh sent a letter to Surrey Fire & Rescue Service and Surrey County Council, to detail the Local Committee's opposition to proposals to close the Sunbury & Staines Fire Stations.
2. The Chairman would like to introduce an information item to the Local Committee from Spelthorne Borough Council, on a regular basis. On the agenda for this meeting there is an item on the Community Infrastructure Levy, which is being presented by an officer from the Borough Council.

71/13 PETITIONS & LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION [Item 5]

One petition was received, with 30 signatories:

Petitioner: Sabera Wahab

"We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to include a bus service route through from Sunbury Cross Roundabout, Staines Road East towards Hampton and Kingston."

The petition's details read: "There are no bus services from Sunbury Cross Roundabout towards Staines Road East and all the buses 235, 90, 216 from Sunbury Cross goes through Lower Sunbury, leaving residence who lives in Sunbury Road East, French St, Bowater Gardens and the surrounding streets leaving stranded. Residents have to walk about 15 minutes to go to Lower Sunbury and get on the bus which is around the same place as the train station. I have set up this petition because I have a small baby and when the weather is poorly, it is so difficult to ride a car and commuting by bus with a toddler is a safer option then taking the car out. Everyone rely on public transport and even going to the train station is so time consuming. The trains also come every 40 minutes which goes through Waterloo on top of the 15 minutes' walk. This causes problems in winter and rainy season when roads can get slippery and icy in the winter and especially when the days are much shorter. There is still a bus stop by Staines Road East which means there was a service which used to operate through this road but since I moved to this area two and a half years ago there was no service."

The petitioner was not present at the meeting. The Chairman thanked the people who signed the petition and said a formal response to the petition will be presented by officers at the next Local Committee on 17 March 2014.

72/13 PETITION RESPONSE: [Item 5a]

A formal response to the petition received from Councillor Spencer Taylor regarding the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service proposals for Spelthorne was received as Item 5a. Eddie Roberts, SFRS Area Manager, presented the petition response report.

Mr Roberts said that SFRS is trying to achieve a balance of responsibility and provision of service across all of Surrey. The proposed changes in the borough of Spelthorne are to create a new single fire engine fire station, to replace the two existing single fire engine fire stations at Sunbury and Staines. Members questioned whether Spelthorne's needs had been addressed. Mr Roberts stated that public consultation had taken place. Members reiterated their concerns, for example any future new build including the Eco Park. They also requested more financial information regarding the possible closures.

It was suggested that SCC Cabinet members should be lobbied before the January 2014 Cabinet meeting, when the matter will be discussed. Anyone can attend the Cabinet meeting as an observer and papers will be made available.

73/13 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Two member questions were received, from Cllr Robert Watts and Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos. The questions and answers are set out in Annexe 1 to these minutes.

Cllr Watts asked a supplementary question: "Please confirm why there is not an integrated project management scheme between Highways contractor Skanska and Highways engineers?" Highways Area Manager Nick Healey replied that this was being reviewed at directorate level and he will come back to Cllr Watts with a written explanation, as requested by Cllr Watts.

74/13 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

The Local Committee received written questions from four members of the public in advance of the meeting: one from Mr McLuskey, one from Mr Carruthers, one from Mr Rushbrook and one from Mr Seaman. The questions and answers are set out in Annexe 1 to these minutes.

Supplementary:

Mr McLuskey would like an answer to his question, but the Chairman stated that this committee was not the appropriate place to provide it and suggested that he approach his MP. The Chairman instructed officers not to take this question again at any future Local Committee.

Mr Carruthers felt his question wasn't fully answered. The Chairman suggested that Mr Carruthers write directly to the SCC education officer, with detailed examples and cc the Chairman. However, Mr Carruthers felt he had taken it as far as he could and he would not be pursuing the matter.

Mr Rushbrook felt his question had not been answered. Some of the committee members live in that area and empathized with Mr Rushbrook. It was suggested that Spelthorne Borough Council has some pumps that could be loaned to SCC to aid clearing water from the pedestrian tunnels. Highways Area Manager Nick Healey said that that is no SCC plan for Sunbury Cross at present. If the Local Committee wants to prioritize the area and carry out a feasibility study, the committee would need to find the budget for this.

Mr Seaman felt that the last paragraph of his question had not been answered. The Chairman requested that officers follow this up and provide an answer for Mr Seaman before the next Local Committee.

75/13 INTRODUCTION OF THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY IN SPELTHORNE [Item 8]

The Chairman welcomed John Brooks, Deputy Head of Planning and Housing Strategy, Spelthorne Borough Council, who presented the report. Mr Brooks confirmed that there is a transparent process and charging system for CIL. It is not a planning policy, but simply a method of collecting the money. Collection starts when building starts, so probably not during the first year. The Infrastructure delivery plan is on the SBC website. Spelthorne is approximately in the middle of Surrey's districts and boroughs regarding the CIL implementation timetable. SBC has a working group for CIL and the timetable was considered and planned.

The Chairman thanked Mr Brooks for the report and for his time in attending this Surrey County Council committee.

THE LOCAL COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE) AGREED:

- (i) To note the report for information.

76/13 PARKING IN BURGESS WAY, STAINES [Item 9]

THE LOCAL COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE) AGREED:

- (i) To note the report for information.

77/13 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 10]

The Chairman welcomed Nick Healey, Highways Area Manager (North East), who presented the report. After a full discussion, the officer's recommendations on the report were amended – see below.

An amendment to recommendation (ii) was proposed by Cllr Robert Watts and seconded by Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos. The vote: 10 for, 1 against, 2 abstentions. Therefore it was carried.

A new recommendation was proposed by Chairman Richard Walsh and seconded by Cllr Joanne Sexton. See recommendation (iii). The vote: 9 for, 4 against. Therefore it was carried.

An amendment to the date in [new] recommendation (iv) was proposed by Cllr Richard Smith-Ainsley and seconded by Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos. The vote: 13 for. Therefore it was carried.

THE LOCAL COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE) AGREED:

- (i) To authorise the Area Team Manager to allocate newly released monies for the Stanwell and Stanwell Moor and Staines South and Ashford West Divisions to Highways

schemes on behalf of the respective Divisional Members, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman, in the event that the Divisional Members are unable to decide how to spend these monies by 31st December 2013 (paragraphs 2.5 to 2.7 refer).

- (ii) **Not to allocate the entire 2014-15 Pooled Capital Allocation of £100,000 to the A308 junction with School Road Scheme. The updated costs makes this scheme unfeasible at the present time.**
- (iii) **That the 2014-15 pooled capital budget figure of £100,000, agreed by the Local Committee on 30 September 2013, is allocated to the Divisional Allocations.**
- (iv) To authorise the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, to decide Divisional Programmes for next Financial Year, in the event that individual Divisional Members have not indicated their priorities by **31 January 2014** (paragraphs 2.20 to 2.22 refer).
- (v) To authorise the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

78/13 FELTHAM ROAD WEIGHT RESTRICTION - PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESULTS [Item 11]

Nick Healey, Highways Area Manager (North East), presented the report. After discussion, it was proposed by Mrs Carol Coleman and seconded by Cllr Chris Frazer that the officer's recommendation be replaced by a new recommendation – see below. The vote: 12 for, 1 abstention. Therefore it was carried.

THE LOCAL COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE) AGREED:

- (i) **That officers should consider a one-way weight restriction in consultation with Surrey Police and bring back to a future Local Committee for consideration.**

79/13 HALLIFORD VILLAGE WEIGHT RESTRICTION - PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESULTS [Item 12]

Nick Healey, Highways Area Manager (North East), presented the report. It was felt by councillors that almost all the residents want this recommendation.

THE LOCAL COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE) AGREED:

- (i) To make the traffic regulation order and install the necessary signs.

80/13 WINTER MAINTENANCE ARRANGEMENTS UPDATE [Item 13]

Nick Healey, Highways Area Manager (North East), presented the report, to update the Committee on the Winter Plan for 2013/14, which sets out provisions for keeping roads and footways accessible during winter weather. A request was made that Local Committee borough councillors should receive winter gritting route maps when SCC councillors receive them.

THE LOCAL COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE) AGREED:

- (i) To note the report for information.

81/13 LOCAL COMMITTEE AND MEMBERS' ALLOCATION FUNDING UPDATE [Item 14]

This Item was for information only. Members noted the amounts spent from Members' Allocation and Local Committee capital budgets. The Chairman made a request to SCC councillors that all monies are spent by the SCC deadline of end of February 2014. A request was made to officers that more publicity is undertaken so that more projects come forward with proposals.

THE LOCAL COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE) AGREED:

- (i) To note the amounts that have been spent from the Members' Allocation and Local Committee capital budgets, as set out in Annexe 1 of this report.

The Chairman suspended the Local Committee meeting from 9.20pm to 9.25pm to ask Mr John Hirsh to speak about a proposal regarding a pedestrian bridge at Sunbury. The SCC member for this area was asked to consider how the proposal could proceed.

82/13 FORWARD PROGRAMME 2013-14 [Item 15]

The Chairman requested that the Local Committee receives a report on Adult Social Care – Mental Health.

An amendment was noted on Item 15 Annexe 1: delete BAA as it is now known as Heathrow.

THE LOCAL COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE) AGREED:

- (i) The Forward Programme 2013/14 as outlined in Annexe 1, indicating any further preferences for inclusion.
- (ii) To consider any further themes for Member briefings during 2013/14 and the next municipal year.

83/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 16]

To be held on Monday 17 March 2014 at 7pm in the Council Chamber,
Spelthorne Borough Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-Upon-Thames
TW18 1XB

(6.30pm – 7pm: Informal Public Question Time)

The meeting which commenced at 7pm, ended at 9.30pm.

ANNEXE 1: WRITTEN QUESTIONS [ITEMS 6 & 7]

Meeting ended at: 9.30 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank



SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE – 16th December 2013

AGENDA ITEM 6

MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTION TIME

1. Cllr Robert Watts will ask the following question:

“Would the area highway manager please confirm why a contractor working for Surrey County Council in replacing lamp columns in Spelthorne has not taken into account the anticipated new cycle lane. The funding of this cycle lane scheme through the DTP and a top up payment by SCC has been agreed for some months and the initial design completed. Lamp columns along Gaston Bridge Road have recently been replaced in their original positions that will need to be moved again to facilitate the construction of the new cycle lane. Please confirm why there is no interrelationship between departments in SCC Highways and why money is being wasted in these times of severe austerity?”

James Young, Walton Bridge Supervisor, will give the following answer:

“A meeting was held between officers and representatives from Surrey County Council's street lighting contractor at the end of June, following completion of the outline consultation drawings by the external consultant employed by the county to undertake the design of this scheme.

At this meeting it was ascertained that the street lighting design work for the section of the A244 that forms the part of the cycle scheme in the borough of Spelthorne was at a very advanced stage with completion within a small number of weeks. In addition the installation programme showed that these works were to begin very imminently. The PFI contractor had already sourced all required equipment and other resources for this upgrade works and so due to the advanced state of the project it was felt that it would not be beneficial to stop the project. The costs of aborting the PFI upgrade works at such a late stage were weighed up against the costs of altering the position of the lamp columns as part of the Cycle Safe scheme construction period. Having ascertained that Skanska would proceed with their work as planned, when subsequent delays to this work took effect, there was no direct link within Skanska between the replacement teams and the Cycle scheme and so the opportunity to review coordination didn't arise.

Throughout the length of the proposed scheme within Spelthorne there will only be a need to move the new lamp columns back to be in line with the new

back edge of the footway. Although within the limits of the Toucan crossing, proposed near the junction with Gaston Way, it may be necessary to alter the column layout due to the changed road layout. At the time of the meeting insufficient detail was available about this crossing to then have been able to change the PFI contract design which was another reason for continuing these works as planned.

On many occasions since the inception of the PFI lighting contract there have been instances where PFI upgrade works and Surrey County Council network improvement schemes have been coordinated thereby saving the county valuable money. This approach will continue in the future but sometimes factors outside the control of the teams mean that this is either not possible to postpone the works due to their advanced stage or that it would not cost effective to delay one set of works in order to combine works.”

2. Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos will ask the following question:

“Here is the response I have received from our officers when I asked why a well established local Club was being asked to pay substantially more by way of rent. Would members agree with me that the proposed rent rise is totally unreasonable?”

‘Further to your request I have been in contact with colleagues in Property Services and have gathered the following information to answer your query.

Staines Pistol and Rifle Club had a licence at the Leacroft Centre and the fee charged was £1,700 per annum. The licence permitted the Club to use the range area for 2 hours per week, from 19.00 to 21.00 on Tuesday evenings only. The licence expired in January 2013 and was not renewed to enable the Leacroft Centre to be refurbished. At this time the Rifle Club were consulted by Dipal Patel and Ann Davies (both of whom have now left SCC) and were told that improvements were being made (mainly based on structural necessity) and that a lease would be the best way forward to ensure safeguarding at the centre. I have been informed that the Gun club noted and supported this although it appears that charges were not discussed at this time.

The terms proposed for the new lease are:

- A term of 3 years to commence on completion of the lease.
- Either party to have the option to terminate the lease on an annual basis, providing 6 months written notice has been given.
- Rent £2,750 per annum.
- A contribution of £2,050 per annum (increased annually in line with RPI) towards electricity, water, repairs and maintenance of the exterior of the building, communal access and pedestrian gate, CCTV system and monitoring, gas, safety certificates, inspections and reports in relation to the building, and buildings insurance.
- The Club to be responsible for any business rates attributable to the range.

As mentioned above, The Leacroft Centre has been refurbished since the licence was granted. The rationale for the changes to the proposed costs are as follows:

- The hours of use will change from 2 hours per week to 24/7 access and use of a dedicated area.
- An independent entrance door to the proposed rifle range.
- Installation of dedicated toilet.
- Installation of CCTV.
- Improved condition of the space following the refurbishment.'

Clare Neave, SCC Estates Delivery Manager, will give the following answer:

"The Leacroft Centre is owned by Surrey County Council and is occupied by the Youth Development Service.

Historically, the Rifle Club has occupied accommodation at Leacroft under a Licence that allowed two hours access per week. The amount charged reflected this arrangement.

The Leacroft Centre has recently under gone an extensive refurbishment at the Council's cost, which has directly benefitted the Club and been completed in consultation with them. The Rifle Club's accommodation has had a new access created so that Club Members do not have to pass through the Youth Club. This will enable the Club to have greater flexibility as to when it uses the premises. Furthermore, it will now have its own toilet facilities and the Club will have far more use of the Rifle Range, enabling them to promote their facilities and perhaps grow as a Club.

From the outset, I understand that it was discussed and agreed with the Club that following completion of the works, the Club would be required to complete a lease on the accommodation and pay a rent and contribution to out goings that was reflective of their use going forward. We have always been open and honest on this point. Council officers are under an obligation to achieve best value and we are unable to indirectly subsidise third party organisations by offering subsidised or reduced rents. The rent and service charge is very reasonable and in my view the Club would struggle to find better value elsewhere.

I understand from my colleagues who are directly involved in the transaction and negotiations that a meeting is to be set up for sometime in January between Property Services, Denise Saliagopoulos and the Club in order to clear up any misunderstandings."

AGENDA ITEM 7

PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTION TIME

1. Mr Andrew McLuskey will ask the following question:

“Given that the local committee web site lists ‘Social care and health’ and also ‘learning’ as being among its concerns it seems appropriate to bring to this body for answer at the Dec 16 meeting the following question:

Why despite numerous enquiries and reports concerning the activities of Jimmy Savile at Duncroft School are we STILL (a year on from the revelations) in the dark about basic issues relating to this matter (e.g. why he was given unsupervised access to pupils, and why the police didn’t question the Head)?”

Inspector Ian St John, Spelthorne Neighbourhood Inspector Surrey Police, will give the following answer:

“Mr McLuskey has repeatedly asked this or similar questions, both of myself and Chief Inspector Laing.

The advice that has been given to Mr McLuskey still stands, i.e. that the information he is requesting is directly linked to the investigation and consequently is not a question I can answer. Mr McLuskey has been advised as to how he could request the information from Chief Inspector Laing.”

2. Mr John Carruthers will ask the following question:

“At a previous Local Committee Meeting my question on pupil exclusion and PRU’s was given a full and lengthy answer. In effect saying that I was wrong and that no pupil is permanently excluded before he/her is sent to a PRU so that they cannot be returned to the original school.

Today, Fordway PRU has pupils that actually have been already excluded before being sent to the PRU. Clearly this is against your stated policy and wrong. What please will you do about this?

I am well aware that, instead, the pupil can eventually be sent to a different school, but that is just hiding that your policy is not being followed.”

Kerry Randle, SCC Area Education Officer – NE, will give the following answer:

“The original response submitted to the Local Committee and included within Annexe 1, Item 7 of 30 September 2013 meeting did not state pupils are *never* sent to a primary PRU without first attending a prevention programme there.

Statutory and County Council exclusions guidance states that wherever possible schools should employ strategies and interventions within school to improve behaviour, after which if unsuccessful and the pupil requires further support, should consider a prevention place at a PRU.

However, there are some circumstances outlined in both statutory and County Council guidance where the behaviour of a pupil may be of such a nature or incident that a headteacher may need to impose a permanent exclusion without having employed prevention strategies.

North East Surrey currently has two pupils attending The Fordway Centre who fall into this category.

The County Council seeks to avoid exclusion if at all possible, however the decision to exclude rests with headteachers and governors. The County Council can advise maintained schools but does not have the right to advise academies unless requested to do so.”

3. Mr George Rushbrook will ask the following question:

“What steps are being undertaken to address the increasing traffic congestion at the junction and surrounding area. Have Surrey CC and their consultants undertaken traffic surveys and are improvements being taken into account for all the new planned developments?”

- There are important health and safety issues that should be addresses as well as traffic capacity. What steps are being taken to improve the air quality at the junction which has one of the highest air pollution levels in the Borough. Has air quality modelling been undertaken to look at the impact of increased traffic?

- What steps are being undertaken to avoid the flooding of the pedestrian tunnels in future?”

Nick Healey, SCC Highways Area Team Manager (NE), will give the following answer:

“The Sunbury Cross junction is shared between Surrey County Council who maintain the carriageway, road markings, and signs, and the Highways Agency who maintain the traffic signals and the slip roads to and from the motorway. Surrey County Council has no specific plans to review the operation of the Sunbury Cross junction. Neither has Surrey County Council undertaken any recent traffic surveys. Neither is Surrey County Council aware of any plans or surveys on the part of the Highways Agency. Any modifications to the junction would need to be taken forward by both Surrey County Council and the Highways Agency in partnership. The developer of any new significant development must submit a Transport Assessment, which details the anticipated impact of the proposed development on the transport and highway network. The County Council would scrutinise the Transport Assessment with the Highways Agency. As the Highways Agency control and maintain the traffic signals they would assess whether a new development would affect congestion at the Sunbury Cross roundabout junction itself. Surrey County Council would assess whether any new development would affect congestion on the network beyond the junction. In the context of a

planning application mitigating measures may be identified for the developer to provide or contribute to. Such mitigating measures, if agreed by Spelthorne Borough Council as Local Planning Authority, would then be formalised in planning conditions or obligations.

Spelthorne Borough Council is responsible for monitoring air quality in the borough of Spelthorne.

There are permanent pumps at this junction to ensure the subways do not flood. The pump control equipment was damaged in a recent road traffic collision, which rendered the pumps inoperative until the equipment could be repaired. There are no specific plans to improve the flood protection of the subways, as for all normal circumstances the existing pumps are considered adequate."

4. Mr John Seaman will ask the following question:

"This question relates to the Cabinet meeting held on 30 October 2013.

- If the plant at the proposed Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Shepperton is transferred to Surrey after year 9 of operation which costs, including those for maintenance and insurance will Surrey County Council be responsible? (Cabinet agenda paragraph 31)

- When the proposed Eco Park ceases to be operated which costs including dismantling, demolition, site clearance, site remediation and waste disposal will be the responsibility of Surrey County Council? (Cabinet agenda paragraph 31)

- When Surrey County Council's external financial adviser carried out value for money (to the UK taxpayer) and affordability (to the Council) assessments were these and similar costs and potential liabilities fully considered? (Cabinet agenda paragraphs 47 -51) "

Richard Parkinson, SCC Waste Group Manager, will give the following answer:

"Following hand back of the plant from SITA in 2024, the responsibility for operating the plant including the cost of maintenance and insurance will transfer to Surrey County Council. These costs were included within the financial assessment presented to Cabinet.

Decommissioning costs would be the responsibility of Surrey County Council in the event that the plant ceases to operate at some point after hand back.

Decommissioning costs have not been included within the financial assessment since it is not possible to say at this stage what, if any, costs would be incurred. That would depend on future use of the site."