

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Spelthorne JOINT COMMITTEE**  
held at 6.30 pm on 16 December 2019  
at Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames. TW18 1XB.

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

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Mr Richard Walsh (Chairman)
- \* Mr Robert Evans
- \* Mr Tim Evans
- \* Mr Naz Islam
- Miss Alison Griffiths
- \* Mrs Sinead Mooney
- Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

**Borough / District Members:**

- \* Cllr Ian Harvey (Vice-Chairman)
- Cllr Maureen Attewell
- \* Cllr Chris Bateson
- Cllr Sue Doran
- \* Cllr Tom Fidler
- \* Cllr Joanne Sexton
- \* Cllr Richard Smith-Ainsley

\* In attendance

---

**OPEN FORUM**

Members of the public were invited to put informal questions to the Committee ahead of the official Committee business. Questions and their responses have been published as an annex to the minutes.

**31/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

From Spelthorne Borough Council

Cllr Sue Doran  
Cllr Maureen Attewell

From Surrey County Council

Ms Denise Turner-Stewart  
Miss Alison Griffiths

**32/19 MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes from the meeting of 30 September were agreed as being an accurate record.

### **33/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

No declarations of interest were received.

### **34/19 DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 4]**

The Committee members reviewed the decision tracker.

It was agreed that representatives from the Esso pipeline project should be invited to the next meeting.

### **35/19 MEMBERS' COMMUNITY ALLOCATIONS UPDATE [Item 5]**

The County Council members were reminded that there was a deadline of 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2020 for submission to their members' allocation.

### **36/19 PETITIONS & PETITION RESPONSES [Item 6]**

Petition 1: Road Safety Improvements outside Chennestone School in Sunbury.

This petition was presented by 9 year old Rosie Gurney and was brought about as a result of her experiences of walking to school. She wanted to be able to gain some independence by walking by herself but her parents felt that the main road was too dangerous and so Rosie instigated the petition to request a parking attendant or a crossing to be installed.

She and her parents had also sent in a short video of Rosie and her brother walking to school to demonstrate the problems that they encountered and this was shown to those present.

The Area Highways Manager acknowledged the problem and outlined some of the things that have been done in the area to promote road safety, such as instigating 20 mph zones and road humps in some of the roads where cars had been speeding. However, it is not possible to do everything at once and sometimes they need to review areas again to see if further measures are required.

Officers recommended to the Committee that a Road Safety assessment be carried out and findings reported to a later meeting of the Joint Committee.

The Committee agreed noting not only the safety benefits for pupils but the benefits to the environment of increasing motivation for people to walk rather than use their car.

The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) agreed:

- (i) that the Road Safety Outside Schools assessment will be undertaken and the results reported to a future meeting of the Joint Committee.

Reason:

1. The Joint Committee felt that the petitioner had made a good case for improvements to be made and want to investigate options for road safety measures.

Petition 2: Pavement Widening outside Church Street and Vicarage Road, Staines

This petition was presented by Mr Bower on behalf of the Staines Village Residents & Traders Association. They have requested that the pavement is widened outside of The Bell Public House. It is proposed that this will serve the community in two ways. Firstly, the widened pavement will improve safety of pedestrians, especially those using wheelchairs and mobility aids and secondly, the narrow road that will result from this adjustment would deter vehicles (a number of which are large commercial vehicles) from speeding through this junction.

The Divisional Member supported this petition saying that she had spoken to several concerned residents about this matter and could attest to the public support for this proposal. She also remarked that as well as the safety aspect to this proposal, preserving the character of this historical area was also important to the community.

The Area Highways Manager acknowledged the concerns and outlined the issues. In order to widen the pavement as suggested, it would mean that the remaining carriageway would not be wide enough for two lanes and so this road needs either to install a priority pass, or become part of a one-way system. It was suggested that Highways officers in collaboration with the Divisional Member could assess the area and discuss the various options for consideration. The Committee agreed on this course of action.

The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) agreed:

- (i) to add this site to Committee's prioritisation list for possible future Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS schemes).

Reasons:

1. The Joint Committee felt that this should be investigated in order to improve safety and access for all users.

### **37/19 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 7]**

No members' questions were submitted.

### **38/19 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 8]**

Question 1: Requesting answers re: Stanwell Place.

Mr McLuskey posed a question which highlighted his frustrations at not being able to clarify the latest plans for the site at Stanwell Place which is owned by the construction company CEMEX.

The officer's response acknowledged his concerns and explained that whilst these were shared by officers and members of the Committee, both the borough and county council had limited influence over what was a national concern.

It was suggested that a formal approach was made by the Joint Committee to CEMEX to request a site visit and this could be followed up by a letter to the local MP if CEMEX were not forthcoming.

This approach was agreed and the decision tracker was updated to reflect this.

Question 2: Consultation with residents on 20 MPH zone in French Street, Sunbury.

Mrs Nichols posed this question about a proposal to extend the 20 MPH zone in Sunbury. Her question illustrates concerns she had that residents are not being adequately consulted on these measures. She felt that the proposed scheme had some benefits but that these could have been improved upon. She felt that consulting residents on certain aspects such as signage should have been done at a much earlier stage and that residents did not have adequate time to engage.

The Area Highways Manager replied that residents' views are usually sought once a defined solution has been designed for a specific location, rather than on a generic question of whether or not residents desire measures in the general vicinity. The proposal in question is part of a wider scheme of measures across this area of Sunbury. However, budget and operational constraints have meant that these measures have been installed a piece at a time. This means that residents may not appreciate the collective impact on traffic of all the measures working together once installed and so residents' feedback may not be impactful on the ultimate decision. In the instance highlighting by Mrs Nichols however, residents' feedback did result in an adjustment made to the final plan for the scheme so this was valuable in this case.

Question 3: Inclusion of Adult Education Centre in Local Plan.

This question was put by Mrs Nichols' and illustrated her concerns that the centre's inclusion means that it is earmarked for closure and is requesting more information about this. The officer's response from Surrey County Council is that there are no plans to close this at this time. The property was included to encourage a joined up approach in the future usage of borough and county assets. This response was accepted by the Chairman.

### **39/19 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (FOR DECISION) [Item 9]**

The Area Highways Manager presented his report which gave an update on the progress of the Highways programme for 2019/20 as well as looking ahead to the Committee's priorities in 2020/21.

Committee members were able to clarify details of the proposed projects with the Highways manager to inform their decision.

It was also requested that members received more information to understand how officers came to their recommendations from the many prospective projects available.

The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) agreed to:

- (i) Authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member to advertise the necessary legal order to adjust the one-way system in Walton Lane, Shepperton, to resolve any objections, and if there are no insurmountable objections to make the change on site.
- (ii) Approve the recommended capital ITS programme for next Financial Year 2020-21.
- (iii) Approve the proposed LSR programme for next Financial Year 2020-21
- (iv) Authorise the Area Highway Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Members, to amend the 2020-21 capital LSR programme as appropriate when the 2020-21 budgets have been confirmed
- (v) To authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

Reasons:

1. The Committee agreed to give approval to actions that will bring the 19/20 programme to completion
2. The Committee agrees to the proposed Highways programmes and funding in order that work can commence promptly in the next financial year, once budgets have been approved.

#### **40/19 OVERVIEW OF STREET WORKS OPERATIONS (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 10]**

The Traffic and Street Works Manager presented to the Committee. The presentation began with an overview of the team and their work. It then went on to outline how the street works of external companies (such as utilities) are coordinated and monitored and what powers Surrey County Council has to ensure that works are completed to time and to a suitable standard.

Committee members wanted to know how the public could usefully provide feedback to the team to help monitor street works and under what circumstances fines could be levied to external organisations for substandard work. The officer reported that there are online portals for the public to report

dangerous road works or tarmac reinstatements and that in a recent case, a report from a resident resulted in a very dangerous situation being quickly remedied and a successful prosecution was brought against the offending company.

**41/19 IMPROVEMENTS TO SHOPPING CENTRES IN SPELTHORNE (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 11]**

Spelthorne Borough Council's Economic Development Manager presented the report which detailed recent successful shopping parades refurbishments in the borough as well as feedback from the businesses and any lessons learned about carrying out such projects again in the future.

**42/19 HOMELESSNESS INITIATIVES IN SPELTHORNE (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 12]**

A report from Spelthorne's Housing Strategy and Policy Manager was presented on homelessness and how this was being tackled in the borough. The officer reported that Spelthorne Borough Council's homelessness strategy was open to consultation and encouraged committee members to input into this and to encourage other to do so.

A video from the charity Crisis was shown to highlight some of the issues faced by homeless people.

**43/19 FORWARD PROGRAMME 2019/20 [Item 13]**

The Forward Programme was agreed for the next meeting.

**44/19 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 14]**

The next meeting is to be held on Monday 23 March 2020.

Meeting ended at: 21:25

---

**Chairman**

## **SPELTHORNE JOINT COMMITTEE**

16 December, 2019



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

#### **Question 1 – Mr Paul Jacobs**

Mr Jacobs asked about the Stanwell Place (Stanwell Woods) site. His concerns were that CEMEX who currently own the site may not be using it for its intended purpose and may have sold this on. As part of the original deal, a nature site was proposed for the south of the site but there seems to be no progress on this which leaves residents concerned that CEMEX may be deviating from their agreement. Please can the borough council and county council (via the Joint Committee) comment?

#### **Response:**

The Chairman acknowledged that this was a sensitive issue for local people and noted that a written question on the same subject was being discussed as part of the written public questions which were item 8 on this agenda. Therefore the chairman stated that the issue would be discussed then.

This page is intentionally left blank