

Minutes of the meeting of the
Runnymede JOINT COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 17 June 2019
at The Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone KT15 2AH.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

Surrey County Council Members:

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

Borough / District Members:

- * Borough Councillor Mark Maddox (Chairman)
- * Borough Councillor Alan Alderson
- * Borough Councillor David Anderson-Bassey
- * Borough Councillor Nigel King
- Borough Councillor Nick Prescott
- * Borough Councillor Donald Whyte

* In attendance

OPEN FORUM

The Chairman invited questions from members of the public ahead of the start of the formal meeting. The question and subsequent response are attached to the minutes and will be noted on the Decision Tracker for the next meeting.

1/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies received:

Mr Mark Nuti,
Cllr Nick Prescott

2/19 MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes from the meeting of the 18 March were agreed by the Committee

3/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No interests were declared.

4/19 DECISION TRACKER [Item 4]

The Committee perused the decision tracker and were happy to close the items indicated.

The Partnership Committee Officer provided a verbal update to the item that arose at the meeting of 18 March relating to the availability of Section 106 funding and its potential for use in the renovation of Runnymede Pleasure Grounds. This was to report that the County's Infrastructure Agreements Manager and an officer for Transport Development Planning had arranged had been in contact with the divisional Member and the Borough's Head of Community Development to look at any opportunities for funding to improve the access to the site. At this time, no funding has been identified.

There was a request to clarify the outcome arising from item 7 from the 19 November meeting where both councils would be considering parking provision in relation to the Egham Gateway development and it was agreed that this would be relayed to the appropriate Members and updated in the tracker.

5/19 PETITIONS AND PETITION RESPONSES [Item 5]

No petitions had been received from members of the public

6/19 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]

No Member questions had been received.

7/19 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 7]

No written questions had been received.

8/19 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 10]

The Chairman elected to take this item first, in a change to the published agenda.

The Area Highways Manager (North-West Surrey) addressed the Committee to present his report which outlined the work carried out during 2018/19 and the proposed schedule for 2019/20 against the allocated budget. This year's budget does see an increase in capital funds but no revenue funding which will have an impact on the amount of maintenance that can be carried out this year.

The Area Highways Manager explained the Members' Highways Fund in which each County Member receives an allocation of £7,500 which they can use to respond to particular issues in their respective areas.

He proposed that Members contribute some of this towards the establishment of a "vegetation gang" which would target overgrown vegetation that impacts the use of the highways and footpaths. This approach would mean that Members could nominate priority areas which, when aggregated as part of a borough wide programme, would be more cost effective.

Members also enquired as to other uses for the funding such as whether it can be applied to parking issues. The Area Highways Manager replied that there are some restrictions to its usage; such as there being a maximum spend per item of £2,500 and that the project should not be one that would

incur future maintenance costs for the Council. However, the funding can be applied to a variety of improvements.

Clarification was requested as to why the sum of all the schemes in the proposed capital works programme came to £320,000 when the available funding is £190,000. The response was that a number of contingency items are included as “fall back schemes” should other projects be unable to proceed for operational reasons. This removes the need to bring the schedule back to Committee for further approval. This prevents delays in works being implemented, and ensures that budget is fully allocated.

Finally, the Area Highways Manager outlined the process for how schemes are included in the schedule and agreed on by the Committee and how Members can nominate schemes for future consideration. As part of this discussion, Members wanted to know how improvements can be made to the camber of pavements where the surface has become hazardous and how access can be improved for those with mobility issues. The Area Highways Manager advised that there was no specific protocol for pavement surface improvements and that this was done on an adhoc basis. However in the case of new developments or refurbishments, access was often a consideration in the planning process and that the County Council could advise on these issues as a statutory consultee.

The Joint Committee (Runnymede) noted:

- (i) the progress of schemes and revenue funded works for the 2019/20 financial year.
- (ii) the budgetary position.
- (iii) that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.

Reason:

Highways matters are part of the Committee’s executive function and operational and budget status is reviewed at every committee meeting throughout the year.

9/19 MEMBERSHIP OF TASK GROUPS AND EXTERNAL GROUPS [FOR DECISION] [Item 8]

The Partnership Committee Officer introduced the report which outlined the task groups that had been established by the Joint Committee in previous years and asked the Committee to agree on the membership of these task groups and other external groups for the year 2019/20.

The officer continued that whilst it was customary to agree on these task groups and external group memberships at the first meeting of the municipal year, feedback from councillors along with the changing landscape of partnership working within both councils (as mentioned in points 2.16-2.18 of the report) meant that there had been questions raised prior to the Committee

about whether the task group format was still an appropriate one for the Committee to adopt when focussing on certain important issues.

The Chairman proposed that this report was deferred as he felt that members would benefit from evaluating task groups more fully and exploring other possible options.

Committee members were keen to have input on issues such as parking but agreed that the method by which this should happen should be reviewed. It was suggested that the Chairman should raise this issue with other Local and Joint Committee Chairmen to explore how other committees address these issues prior to the report being brought back to Committee.

The Joint Committee (Runnymede) agreed:

- (i) To defer this report until the September meeting following further feedback and development of what external groups and the Joint Committee might achieve.**

Reasons:

- (i) The Committee felt that the function of Task Groups need to be evaluated to ensure they were fully effective.
- (ii) Both councils are currently focussing on improving their partnership working and it was felt that this might have an impact on whether Task Groups were needed.

10/19 JOINT COMMITTEE COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING [FOR DECISION] [Item 9]

The Partnership Committee Officer introduced this report by explaining how the proposed process would work and its benefits in ensuring transparency and accountability in how the funding is spent. She then updated the Committee on the two projects that had been supported as a result of the funding awarded in 2018/19; a campaign to educate residents on alcohol abuse and the purchase of mobile CCTV cameras to detect incidences of fly-tipping.

The County Council's Community Safety Manager, elaborated further on the two projects. Impressed by the success of the mobile cameras since being deployed in the borough, councillors asked whether it would be possible for further cameras to be purchased from this year's funds. The Community Safety Manager said that the Borough's Community Safety Partnership could certainly consider this and put in another bid for additional cameras if they felt there was need for them.

The Joint Committee (Runnymede) agreed that

- (i) The Committee's delegated community safety budget of £3,000 for 2019/20 be retained by the Community Partnership Team, on behalf of the Committee, and that the Community Safety Partnership and/or other local organisations be invited to submit proposals for funding that meet the criteria and principles set out at section 3 of this report.
- (ii) Authority be delegated to the Community Safety Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the joint committee and divisional members as appropriate, to authorise the expenditure of the community safety budget in accordance with the criteria and principles stated in section 3 of this report.
- (iii) The committee will receive updates on the project(s) that are funded, the outcomes and the impact it has achieved.

The Joint Committee (Runnymede) noted

- (iv) The update on the projects funding by the committee's funding in 2018/19 set out in section 2.

Reasons

- (i) The report sets out a process for allocating the committee's delegated community safety budget of £3,000 to local organisations.
- (ii) As part of the process, updates are given to the Committee on projects that have been supported.

11/19 FORWARD PROGRAMME 2019/20 [Item 11]

The Committee considered and agreed the Forward Plan as presented in the agenda.

12/19 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Monday 23 September, 2019.

Meeting ended at: 20:15

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**RUNNYMEDE JOINT COMMITTEE
17 JUNE 2019**



**OPEN FORUM IN ADVANCE OF FORMAL MEETING
VERBAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Question from Mrs Mary Abrahams of Thorpe.

Mrs Abrahams voiced concern about the state of Thorpe Cemetery. In the new part of the cemetery, some of the graves appear to be sinking. Paths can also get very muddy.

Mrs Abrahams stated that she had been visiting the cemetery for over ten years and it has always been kept in good condition up until her recent observations.

Response :

Cllr Nigel King responded and agreed that Runnymede Borough Council's Green Spaces Team do a really good job of keeping their cemeteries in good order but is aware that sometimes sinking graves can be caused by issues with the individual grave itself and where this is the case, the families of those interred are contacted. Cllr King passed Mrs Abrahams his contact details and resolved to follow this up with her directly.

This page is intentionally left blank