

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Spelthorne LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 6.30 pm on 15 December 2014  
at Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames. TW18 1XB.

**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

---

**134/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Councillor Chris Frazer.

**135/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

Minutes from the Local Committee held on 29 September 2014 were agreed and approved as an accurate record and were signed by the Chairman.

**136/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest.

**137/13 SURREY FLOODS UPDATE - SPELTHORNE [Item 8]**

The Chairman decided to take all flood related items together, including written questions and public questions. Therefore, the agenda sequence was not as listed.

The Chairman welcomed members of the public. He also welcomed officers and staff from Surrey County Council (SCC), Public Health, Surrey Fire and

Rescue Service, Surrey Police, Spelthorne Borough Council, the Environment Agency, Thames Water and the Community Foundation for Surrey.

Ben Skipp, SCC Programme Manager, introduced the information item on 'Surrey Floods Update'. Local Committee members and members of the public asked questions and officers and staff from the above named organisations provided information and answers. Some questions were taken outside of the meeting, due to lack of information available on the night.

The Community Foundation For Surrey gave information about how funding has helped those effected by flooding. Some Local Committee members from SCC offered to give further funding from their members' allocations.

James Painter from SCC said that SCC was recruiting for a new post of Community Resilience Officer, who would be supporting local community flood groups.

The Flood item ran until 8.45pm, when the Chairman called for a break in the meeting, allowing people to leave who did not wish to stay for the remaining items.

The meeting re-convened at 8.50pm.

#### **138/13 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 5]**

The Chairman first asked for members' written questions on flooding only. Other member written questions were heard later in the meeting. The questions and answers are set out in Annex 1 to these minutes.

One member written question was received on flooding from Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos. Mrs Saliagopoulos asked a supplementary question: "Where is the money coming from [£52.2m partnership funding]?"

Ben Skipp, SCC Programme Manager replied that it was in addition to the £60m from central government for the Environment Agency (EA). Discussions are still taking place and the EA is updating predicted costs.

Mrs Saliagopoulos thanked officers and said she would follow up costings with Mr John Furey, SCC Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding.

Two other non-flooding written questions were received: one from Mrs Saliagopoulos and one from Mr Robert Evans. There were no supplementary questions.

There was one other member written question received from Cllr Spencer Taylor that was heard at the meeting but omitted from the papers:

"There are a number of voluntary organisations that generate recyclable waste which if residential, Spelthorne would gain credits for. Is Surrey CC in, or will be in, a position to extend collection of said material from persons or premises that are clearly noted as voluntary or community orientated groups,

to reduce the need for costly third parties that levy a charge for collect, then reap the benefits of reimbursement because of the material concerned?

I pose this question as I have been informed by our waste services that they can not collect commercial waste, understandable, without penalty, yet we have constituted organisations that are adversely affected by this rule that both Spelthorne and Surrey could benefit from.”

Richard Parkinson, SCC Waste Operations Group Manager, replied:  
“The types of materials that can be collected and disposed of by local authorities and for which charges for collection and disposal can be made are set out in statute.

Waste that arises from a voluntary organisation would be classed as commercial waste for which both a collection and disposal charge can be made. As there would be no avoided disposal cost if this waste were collected for recycling, the county council would not pay a recycling credit to a borough council or to any other organisation or company collecting this waste for recycling.

Where waste materials that originate from householders are collected by the borough council and retained by the borough council for recycling then the county council must pay the borough council a recycling credit to reflect the avoided cost of having to dispose of these materials. Where such household materials are collected and retained for recycling by third parties, then subject to verification that the material has been collected from householders and has been recycled, the county council may also pay a recycling credit to that third party.

There is no reason why a local authority cannot operate a commercial waste collection service, in fact , the Environmental Protection Act 1990 requires local authorities to arrange for the collection of commercial waste if requested to do so by the occupier of such premises. However for the reasons set out above, no recycling credit would be payable if the commercial waste were collected for recycling.”

Cllr Taylor will ask a supplementary question at the next Local Committee meeting on 23 March.

### **139/13 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 6]**

The Chairman first asked for public written questions on flooding only. Another public written question was heard later in the meeting. The questions and answers are set out in Annex 1 to these minutes.

One public written question was received on flooding from Mr Martin Cherrett. Mr Cherrett asked a supplementary question:  
“Why is there no answer to my petition that was heard by the Local Committee in March? It was not answered fully at the Committee meeting in June and it remains unanswered.”  
The petition was heard on 17 March 2014 and a petition response report came to the Local Committee meeting on 30 June.

Mr Cherrett said he was writing to Mr Furey as he believes the written answers to his questions are incorrect, including regarding S19, and he is going to make a legal challenge to SCC.

Cllr Watts reported that S19 is still on-going and will be published on the SCC website once it is completed.

One other non-flooding written question was received from Mr Andrew McLuskey. There were no supplementary questions.

#### **140/13 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

One petition was received, with 31 signatories.

Petitioner: Teresa Darby.

“We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to introduce traffic control measures e.g. speed humps, traffic lights, speed cameras, before any further fatalities and major injuries occur [on Walton Bridge Road].”

The petitioner was present at the meeting and spoke for three minutes. The Chairman thanked Teresa Darby and said a formal response to the petition will be presented by officers at the next Local Committee on 23 March 2015.

#### **141/13 PETITION RESPONSE [Item 4a]**

Two petitions were received at the 29 September Local Committee:

i) From Mr Paul West, Chairman, Ashford North Residents' Association, which contained 55 signatures and read:  
'For improved Traffic Control measures to eradicate the parking on and around the corner of Ashford Crescent and Station Crescent which is causing a hazard to pedestrians and road users.' Mr West was present.  
See the petition response report. Locations will be assessed and presented to the Local Committee in June 2015.

Cllr Joanne Sexton asked if other local roads could also be looked at, as people park in dangerous places, for example road corners. She said that a 'keep clear' sign is missing. Nick Healey will follow this up with the parking team.

Mr Daniel Jenkins asked if speed control could also be looked at, particularly near the new McDonalds. Nick Healey replied that if the committee wanted to do this quickly, it could commission a feasibility study.

Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos said that the next parking review commences in March 2015 and people should ensure they state what they want.

ii) From Mrs S E Pretorius-Warren which contained 750 signatures and read:

'To call on Surrey County Council to take urgent action to install a controlled pedestrian crossing on the junction of Staines Road West and Cadbury Road, Sunbury-on-Thames.' Mrs Pretorius-Warren was unable to attend. See the petition response report. The Local Committee will consider in the future whether to commission a feasibility study.

#### **142/13 COMMUNITY FOUNDATION FOR SURREY [Item 7]**

The Chairman welcomed Laura Thurlow, Deputy Director, Community Foundation for Surrey, who presented her report for information only. Laura also contributed to the earlier flood discussion.

The Community Foundation's work to inspire local philanthropy and build permanent resources is centred upon improving the lives of people across the county. Laura offered to update the Committee at a future meeting, if required.

#### **143/13 BLUE BADGE SCHEME [Item 9]**

The Chairman welcomed Alison Wright, SCC Blue Badge Team Manager, who presented the report for information.

Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos left the meeting after this item.

#### **144/13 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 10]**

Nick Healey, SCC Highways Area Team Manager (NE), presented his report. There was a vote for each recommendation:

(i) For: 11. Against: 1.

(ii) All agreed.

Cllr Jean Pinkerton left the meeting at this point.

(iii) For: 10. Abstained: 1.

(iv) All did not want to keep the date of 31 December. A new date of 15 January was proposed by Mr Robert Evans and seconded by Cllr Joanne Sexton. All then agreed.

(v) All agreed.

#### **The Local Committee (Spelthorne) AGREED to:**

- (i) Approve the use of the eastern footway of Town Lane, Stanwell, between Tesco and Clare Road, for use as a shared surface for pedestrians and cyclists (paragraph 2.4 refers);
- (ii) Approve the investment of £22,869 from the parking enforcement surplus (the entire amount available to the Local Committee) in maintenance of parking related signs and road

markings, and in extending the hours of operation of parking enforcement in Spelthorne (paragraph 2.7 refers);

- (iii) Agree the 2015-16 programme of Integrated Transport Schemes as set out in Table 4 below;
- (iv) Authorise the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman, to decide Divisional Programmes for next Financial Year, in the event that individual Divisional Members have not indicated their priorities **by 15 January 2015** (paragraphs 2.21 and 2.22 refer);
- (v) 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.

#### **145/13 MEMBERS' ALLOCATION FUNDING UPDATE [Item 11]**

The Chairman requested that all SCC members spend their member's allocation by the beginning of February 2015. If not, the Chairman will agree with the Area Highways Manager to spend any unallocated money on highways in Spelthorne, rather than it going back to a central 'pot'.

#### **The Local Committee (Spelthorne) AGREED to note:**

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

#### **146/13 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME 2014-2015 [Item 12]**

#### **The Local Committee (Spelthorne) AGREED to:**

- (i) Agree the Forward Programme 2014/15 as outlined in Annex 1, indicating any further preferences for inclusion, **with the exception of the Update on the Eco Park, which will not be coming to the March 2015 Local Committee due to the Judicial Review. This item is to be postponed to a later date.**
- (ii) Consider any further themes for Member briefings during 2014/15 and the next municipal year.

**147/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 13]**

To be held on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2015 at 7pm in the Council Chamber,  
Spelthorne Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames TW18 1XB.

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

The meeting which commenced at 7pm ended at 10.35pm.

Meeting ended at: 10.35 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank



**SURREY**

**SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE – 15 December 2014**

**Annex 1 Minutes**

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

**MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTION TIME**

**1. Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos will ask the following question:**

“Regarding the recent very serious fire in Staines town:

I am sure the Members of this Committee would like to thank Surrey Fire & Rescue for the outstanding efforts they made to bring the fire under control in dangerous conditions. In conjunction with Surrey Police and our own Surrey Highways officers they worked tirelessly to clear up and open the main road into Staines Town. I would like to know please how many fire appliances were on the scene from Surrey? How many appliances were brought in from elsewhere where the Service has reciprocal arrangements? In the Chief Fire Officer's opinion did this work well? Residents have told me they have concerns regarding the future capabilities of Spelthorne's fire cover in light of this recent very serious incident. Would the Chief Fire Officer reassure those residents please?”

**Eddie Roberts, Area Commander East, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service, will give the following answer:**

“At the height of the fire there were 16 fire appliances in attendance (15 of which were from Surrey), 2 aerial ladder platforms and 2 water carriers. Given the scale and duration of this incident Surrey Fire and Rescue Service sought additional resources through the existing mutual assistance arrangements drawing from London Fire Brigade, Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service and West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service. Over the course of the incident fire appliances from 17 Surrey station's ranging from Spelthorne to Godstone, Reigate, Haslemere and Camberley attended. London Fire Brigade supported the incident with 4 appliances, Royal Berkshire and West Sussex with their aerial ladder platforms. Our mobilising system identified that the first two nearest appliances to Renshaws Industrial Estate were Staines and Egham.

As you know our emergency response cover is not based on borough or county boundaries and in this case our own internal mobilising arrangements and resources were implemented effectively to support the incident commanders needs at scene but also that the mutual assistance was identified early on which allowed a timely response from our neighbouring services too. All of these pre-existing operational arrangements worked well

and allowed Surrey Fire and Rescue Service to contain and extinguish the fire thereby limiting the impact of the event on the local community.

Following the proposed changes in Spelthorne, attendance times to emergency incidents are predicted to remain within the countywide Surrey emergency response standard. We will continue to engage with communities to reduce the numbers of incidents and their impact.

Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority's Statement of Assurance 2013-2014 detailing comprehensively how it meets the requirements of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 and other legislative obligations across locally, regionally and nationally, can be found at this link:

[SFRA Statement of assurance 2013-14](#)

If the link does not work, here is the filepath;

[http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0006/798414/Surrey\\_FA\\_Statement\\_of\\_Assurance\\_v2.4.pdf](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/798414/Surrey_FA_Statement_of_Assurance_v2.4.pdf) .”

## **2. Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos will ask the following question:**

“Can our officers please confirm that Surrey County Council has no power to hold Thames Water to account? Would they also agree that this is due to outdated Government Regulations and that this needs to be pointed out to the appropriate Central Government Department? Would the Council consider undertaking this on behalf of local residents please?

Secondly, over the Summer break a Task Group met regularly, around the County. This Group was chaired by Cllr David Harmer, Chairman of the Environment Select Committee. This Task group was specifically initiated by the Leader of the Council to investigate urgently the flooding in Surrey. Can our officers please provide a written breakdown of those meetings, specifically in relation to the River Ash and the Sluice Gate? What were the recommendations made? What is the up-to-date position as regards funding successfully obtained from Central Government by Surrey County Council? I thank officers in advance for the time they give to answer the above questions.”

## **Ben Skipp, SCC Programme Manager, Environment and Infrastructure, will give the following answer:**

“Water and Sewerage Companies (WASCs) are private organisations and they fall under the regulatory framework of OFWAT (The Water Services Regulation Authority). Whilst WASCs are classified as risk management authorities under Flood and Water Management Act 2010, they only need to have regards to our Local Flood Risk Management Strategy. The County Council must act according to its statutory powers and duties and terms of regulation and enforcement these are outside its remit and lie with the regulatory bodies.

Surrey County Council's Flooding Task Group held 19 witness sessions between April 2014 and October 2014. A detailed breakdown of these meetings can be found in annexe 2 of the Task Group's final report, which is available to view online in full at [www.surreycc.gov.uk](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk). Representatives of 16 divisions in Surrey were interviewed, and two meetings were dedicated to discussing the impact of flooding in Spelthorne, which included specific reference to Staines-upon-Thames.

The recommendations of the Task Group, along with a breakdown of its meetings, are also available to view in full online. In summary, recommendations to undertake selective dredging in the Thames, improve communications during flood events, establish flood fora and press water companies to make improvements in their networks were put forward, and these were approved by the County Council's Cabinet on 25 November 2014.

In keeping with Council policy on Task Groups, all meetings were held in private and therefore the notes of these meetings are confidential and not available in the public domain. However, County Councillors are entitled to see these notes on request from Democratic Services at SCC. As this was a County Council sponsored task group the issues were investigated on a strategic level and not primarily focused on resolving specific issues in individual localities.

Following the Autumn Financial Statement, the Lower Thames Scheme received commitment for an additional £60m funding post 2021, which has now reduced partnership funding requirement to £52.2m out of the total scheme cost. Surrey County Council did not receive any funding from central government to support its six-year flood alleviation scheme programme, so alternative funding will need to be sought to initiate the different feasibility studies that had been identified as part of the six-year programme. Subject to funding being secured, the feasibility studies will help inform and support future bids for funding."

**3. Mr Robert Evans will ask the following question:**

"What degree of co-ordination is there between SCC and Spelthorne BC when it comes to road repairs, especially re-surfacing?"

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

"Surrey County Council is responsible for maintaining the Public Highway network within Spelthorne, with the exception of trunk roads (the A30) and motorways (the M3 and M25). This includes inter alia maintenance of the surfaces, drainage, streetlighting, and Highway vegetation (including trees and verges). Spelthorne Borough Council maintains Highway verges on behalf of Surrey County Council under an environmental maintenance agreement. Otherwise Spelthorne Borough Council has no responsibility for maintaining the Public Highway asset per se. A number of Spelthorne

Borough Council's responsibilities do benefit the Public Highway or indeed utilise the Public Highway. For example:

- Spelthorne Borough Council's Street Cleansing responsibility provides a direct benefit to the Public Highway network.
- Spelthorne Borough Council provides some street furniture - for example benches, litter bins and street name plates.
- Spelthorne Borough Council's refuse collection service utilises the Public Highway network.

Surrey County Council's Highway Safety Defect repair business is very ad hoc, with repair deadlines for each individual defect according to its severity. There is no opportunity for coordination of any Borough Council activity in this context.

Surrey County Council's road resurfacing programmes are planned programmes of discrete resurfacing schemes, which frequently require road closures. The opportunity for coordination for these programmes is limited to ensuring alternative arrangements for refuse collection are put in place. The reason for this is that a resurfacing scheme is a labour intensive activity, and there is very little (if any) opportunity for the Borough Council to attend the same site for some aspect of their business.

The greatest regular opportunity for coordination is in the routine maintenance of high speed roads and other dual carriageways, where lane closures are needed for gully emptying, vegetation management and / or street cleansing. We endeavour to coordinate these lane closures with the Boroughs' and Districts' environmental maintenance and street cleansing teams, to make the most of the (expensive) lane closure while it is in place.

When a Borough or District arranges a "deep clean" for a particular street we endeavour to coordinate these with activities such as gully cleaning. These are generally ad hoc opportunities.

County and Borough officers do liaise regularly to identify and take any other ad hoc opportunities for coordination of activities or resources."

## **AGENDA ITEM 6**

### **PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTION TIME**

#### **1. Mr Andrew McLuskey will ask the following question:**

“Can the Committee explain how the dangerous Quagga Mussel seems to have leapfrogged straight from the Continent of Europe into the Wraysbury River?”

#### **The Environment Agency will give the following answer:**

"The Quagga mussel is an invasive non-native mollusc that has spread from the Ponto-Caspian Region of Eastern Europe, it is native to the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea. It is believed to have invaded Western Europe via the Danube and has spread across much of this area over the last 10 years. The mussel has become abundant in many parts of Western Europe, and so its arrival in UK waters was expected at some point. A draft risk assessment for this species indicates the likely pathways of introduction into UK waters are through ballast water discharge, movement of recreational craft, angling and as a contaminant of imported plants. The exact route by which the mussel was able to arrive in the Wraysbury reservoir and river is currently not known. However, we are conducting surveys in other nearby reservoirs and watercourses to identify its current distribution, which may provide more of a clue to how this species arrived here.

To help avoid the further spread of the Quagga mussel the Environment Agency is recommending that everyone follow the [check-clean-dry](#) campaign, especially when near watercourses or before entering sensitive habitats.”

#### **2. Mr Martin Cherrett will ask the following questions:**

“1. Does Surrey County Council accept that it has any responsibility for assessing the flood risk of the Thames Water Aqueduct in Staines upon Thames under its duties under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010?”

2. Does Surrey County Council have any plans to further investigate the sequence of events leading to the flooding of the River Ash in February 2014, under its powers under s.19 of the Act?

3. Does Surrey County Council assess that new structures, as outlined by Thames Water for the Spelthorne Committee Meeting of 15th December, on the Thames Water Aqueduct are an adequate and appropriate method of containing the risk of flooding? Is it satisfied that the associated Protocol is adequate and appropriate to the task of notifying the relevant parties, including the public, at times of heightened flood risk?

4. Does Surrey County Council have a responsibility in ensuring that appropriate maintenance and testing programmes are carried out on flood protection and prevention assets with in their county? And if not, who is responsible for ensuring that they are both maintained and operable?

5. If Surrey County Council does not have a view on the matters, which public body does it think should be responsible for these matters?"

**Ben Skipp, SCC Programme Manager, Environment and Infrastructure, will give the following answers:**

"1. Surrey County Council does not have such responsibility. Thames Water is the asset owner and as explained in John Furey's letter of 5 December to Mr Cherrett, the flooding is from a Main River and is currently being re-modelled by the Environment Agency. We will consider and support any options proposed.

2. A S19 investigation identifies the risk management authorities, their duties under the FWMA and their actions or proposed actions in relation to those duties. In this case, the risk management authorities are known - Environment Agency and Thames Water. They are reviewing the modelling of the flooding and the protocol between them.

3. We have not seen the Thames Water document or any revised protocol so are unable to comment. In any event the protocol is between Thames Water and the Environment Agency and does not require endorsement by the County Council.

4. There is no legal requirement / duty imposed to ensure that appropriate maintenance of these assets is undertaken. That responsibility rests with the asset owner.

5. The County Council must act according to its statutory powers and duties. In terms of regulation and enforcement these are outside its remit and lie with the regulatory bodies."