



Item 2 Minutes: Annexe 1

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE – 30th September 2013

AGENDA ITEM 6

MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTION TIME

- 1. No Member questions were received for this meeting.**

AGENDA ITEM 7

PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTION TIME

- 1. Mr P Hughes will ask the following question:**

“The current temporary access to the Marina from Walton Bridge is ideal for an experiment to relieve the congestion caused by traffic turning right for Cowey Sale and on to The Minnow, by permitting those drivers coming from the Shepperton side an alternative, namely to turn left instead.

This will only be possible when demolition of the old bridge is complete, and a carriageway formed beneath it. Thereafter the trial period - of say 3 months? - could be scheduled to fit in with the outstanding ancillary works on the bridge.

Could the Committee give this proposal from the Elmbridge Seniors due consideration?”

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

“At this stage it would not be feasible to change the design for the new Walton Bridge, its approaches or associated works. However it is recognised that the construction of the bridge has prompted a number of concerns and suggestions for further improvements. Therefore it is being recommended to Surrey County Council's Local Committee's in both Elmbridge and Spelthorne that a 'Walton to Halliford Transport Study' be undertaken. If approved, this study would include consultation with the local communities on both sides of the river, investigation of any concerns and suggestions, traffic surveys and casualty analysis. The study will make recommendations to both Local

Committees on possible further improvements. The proposed study could investigate infrastructure improvements for vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians, heavy goods vehicles and buses. The suggestion from Mr Hughes could also be considered if the study were to be approved.

2. Mr John Seaman will ask the following question:

*'Surrey County Council is now looking to deliver further improvements by engaging with the 55 waste authorities in the SE7 area A strategic blueprint is being developed to steer the SE7 authorities towards becoming a waste business that supplies commodities and fuel to the market and delivers substantial financial benefits to the SE7 taxpayer'.**

"When these further improvements have been realised why will Surrey need an advanced thermal treatment facility at Charlton Lane, Shepperton or elsewhere to combust 45000 tonnes of waste each year and which will have an operating life of at least 20 years?"

* Surrey County Council Cabinet 25 June 2013 Agenda page 49 paragraph 14

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

"The Eco Park is an essential element of Surrey's waste infrastructure. The SE7 strategic blueprint builds on the existing and planned capacity for waste and recyclables in the region and looks to achieve greater value from the use of materials and operation of existing and planned infrastructure. Therefore the development and operation of the Eco Park is consistent with the SE7 strategic blueprint"

3. Mr John Hirsh will ask the following question:

"Whilst aware of the current consultation on the Surrey Cycling Strategy to which this Association will be submitting its response; and putting to one side considerations of costs or precise location options, would the Committee approve the principle of erecting a foot/cycle bridge '*over the river Thames*' * to the benefit of Spelthorne residents' amenity; and formally recommend this initiative to the SCC Cabinet member for Transport, Highways & Environment; and the Cabinet Member for Communities?"

* words inserted

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

"Strictly speaking Surrey County Council's Local Committee for Spelthorne is unable to approve the construction of a new bridge formally. The formal

'approval' of a new bridge would be subject to inter alia planning approval, land acquisition, and funding.

Notwithstanding the formalities, in principal Surrey County Council would welcome new transport infrastructure that was beneficial in meeting our transport objectives. Encouraging cycling and walking as alternative modes of transport to the private car is recognised as key to cutting congestion, improving accessibility, improving air quality, and improving individual health. Experience suggests that wholesale take up of walking and cycling is critically dependent on the provision of high quality infrastructure, that is seen to be safe and advantageous when compared to the alternative car journey.

Therefore in principal a new cycle / pedestrian bridge over the Thames is an interesting suggestion. Before Surrey County Council could lend its support to such a suggestion, we would need to be satisfied that the anticipated benefit would justify the likely cost, would outweigh any negative impact, and that the priority of such a suggestion would compare favourably to other schemes elsewhere in Surrey. It would take a reasonable amount of effort in the context of a feasibility study to assess these.

The Local Committee is invited to indicate its support (or not) for the suggested new bridge. If considered a priority the Local Committee could commission an initial feasibility study to begin to examine the business case for a new structure, possible locations, technical considerations and likely costs.

It is the intention that in the future a local cycling action plan will be developed with the Local Committee to identify potential new cycling infrastructure that could be implemented should any money become available in the future (for example in case the Cycle Safety Fund from the Department for Transport that was announced last year is repeated in future years). The aim would be to have a number of possible schemes and a priority agreed so that a bid could be prepared and submitted in the future. If the Local Committee is favourable to the suggested cycle/ pedestrian bridge over the Thames, this could form part of the local cycling action plan, and could then be considered in the future alongside other schemes in the Borough and across Surrey."

4. Mr Andrew McLuskey will ask the following question:

'Given the very considerable local concern about the recent Heathrow proposal for a new runway to the South West of the existing Airport will the Local Committee agree to support in any way it can (including financially) the setting up of a 'Save Our Villages' pressure group?'

Answer:

This question does not fall within the remit of the Local Committee. The change on rules on Local Committee Funding now bans Local Committee Allocation funding from being used to support planning related activities.

Funding a pressure group to campaign against a new runway falls foul of this new rule.

You may be interested to know that the Council resolved at Cabinet on Tuesday 16 July 2013 that:

“This Council recognises the crucial role of the airports at Heathrow and Gatwick in supporting employment for Surrey residents, generating investment in the Surrey economy and in attracting and retaining major businesses to locate in the county.

Given the vital importance of these airports for the continued success of the Surrey economy, this Council opposes any proposals that would serve to reduce their capacity or the role of Heathrow as a hub airport.

This Council remains of the view that expansion at either airport would require the environmental and surface issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed.

This Council calls on Government and the aviation industry to prioritise investment in road and rail connections to the airports to reduce congestion and overcrowding”