



**SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE – 30 June 2014**

**AGENDA ITEM 6**

**MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTION TIME**

**1. Mr Richard Walsh will ask the following question:**

“Following the recent high winds, rain and floods, what plans do Highways have to include an appropriate response to such severe weather conditions in their winter service arrangements and when will these be implemented?”

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

“Surrey County Council's response to cold weather is proactive, well developed and after a number of cold winters is well rehearsed. Our response to the recent floods was coordinated through our Emergency Planning Team on a reactive basis. That said parts of the Winter Service Plan are common to all extreme events and indeed the Merrow control hub was utilised by our contractor to coordinate resources over the storm periods of the most recent winter.

We are developing a project to develop a proactive, coordinated response to other weather events. The project is at a very early stage but is likely to cover a number of key themes:

- (1) What we do in response to an extreme weather event
- (2) What the community can do
- (3) Coordination with partner agencies
- (4) Communication.

The Winter Service took some time to develop to the level of service we now enjoy. It may well take a similar length of time to develop a similar level of response to other weather events.”

**2. Cllr Robert Watts will ask the following question:**

“Why is work running late on the new proposed cycle track at Gaston Bridge Road and Walton Bridge? This is now holding up the Project Horizon road repair programme. Please can you tell me what the start and completion dates are for this project?”

**Lesley Harding, SCC Sustainability Group Manager, will give the following answer:**

“The work to construct the Cycle Scheme has not begun as early as hoped, partly because of the need to prioritise resources to tackle the local flooding and associated remedial works. In addition, there is pressure on the budget for a number of reasons, including enhancements to the scheme as a result of the consultation, the estimated scheme costs are now greater than the estimate provided when submitting the bid to the Department for Transport.

Officers have been working intensively to undertake value engineering and will be undertaking negotiations with DfT and Sustrans within the next couple of weeks to ensure the scheme can proceed within agreed limits.

Surrey County Council does apologise for any frustration this delay may cause; however, it is clearly important to ensure the overall design fully meets the needs of the community and demonstrates best value. We will seek to confirm the revised delivery dates as soon as possible and will keep Local Committee chairmen, vice chairmen and divisional members updated.”

**AGENDA ITEM 7**

**PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTION TIME**

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

"Given Heathrow's declared intention - in its recent submissions to the Airports Commission - of extending its boundaries into Spelthorne and thereby prohibiting Stanwell's use of its 'green lung', what action does the Committee feel it can take to defend local people's interests?"

**Katharine Harrison, SCC Principal Spatial Planning Officer, will give the following answer:**

"The submission as proposed by Heathrow Airport indicates that part of Stanwell Moor will be lost as a result of the scheme to accommodate a third runway and related additional development at the airport. Replacement green space is proposed to compensate for this loss, but this appears to be sited outside the Surrey boundary. The submission documents can be downloaded from this website: <http://your.heathrow.com/britainsheathrow/downloads/>

It should be noted that the schemes submitted by the two promoters (Gatwick Airport Limited and Heathrow Airport Limited) have not been officially published, although Heathrow Airport Limited have made their submission public. They will be officially published for public consultation, scheduled to start in October and likely to run to December. The Airport Commission will be scrutinising the schemes between now and October and they will be carrying out further assessment work and may recommend further changes.

Therefore, at present, there is no formal consultation processes in which the committee can currently be engaged and the proposals for consultation have yet to be finalised. However the Local Committee should be aware that a Members' seminar for County Councillors is scheduled for the morning of 15 September 2014 at County Hall, to be chaired by Peter Martin, to which both Heathrow Airport Limited and Gatwick Airport Limited have been invited to give presentations on their submissions. The Leader and relevant portfolio holders from each borough and district will also be invited to this event where there will be the opportunity to seek more detailed information about the schemes, raise specific issues of local concern and to engage in discussion about these concerns."

**2. Mr Fred Wallin will ask the following question:**

"Could I have an update on the proposal for a footbridge over the railway at Clockhouse Lane? I was told some time ago that £30,000 was passed to Hounslow BC as a Surrey contribution for a feasibility study. As yet I have heard no outcome."

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

“A full reply has been provided within the Highways Update report at Item 11. The Local Committee provided £30,000 to the London Borough of Hounslow from its 2010-11 budgets as its contribution to a feasibility study to investigate improved pedestrian and cycle facilities over the railway line intersecting Clockhouse Lane, Ashford.

The London Borough of Hounslow is trying to gain access to the private land in order to complete site investigation works, which would in turn enable them to complete the feasibility study. The private landowners have made some demands in terms of indemnities and this request is currently with their legal department.

The Area Team Manager has received from the London Borough of Hounslow copies of invoices from the consultant undertaking the study totalling £69,487.20. A further approx £5,000 has been spent on other costs such as the temporary traffic orders, road closures and staff time. The original understanding of Spelthorne Local Committee was that the scheme should be funded 50:50 by Surrey County Council and the London Borough of Hounslow. To date the London Borough of Hounslow has contributed approximately £45,000 to this scheme. The London Borough of Hounslow is still keen to see this scheme delivered in due course, although funding remains a challenge.”

**3. Cllr Marian Rough will ask the following question:**

“Following on expressions of concern from ward members over touring coaches being utilised on narrow residential wards with on road parking in my ward, please may I ask that these routes be re-examined and redirected to the two main arteries for Stanwell - Clare Road and Town Lane?

I have previously enquired from the roads department and a verbal answer was that the teenagers boarding these vehicles for schools outside of the ward cannot walk the 10 minutes to either road. However it would seem that other Stanwell teenagers are walking to Knyvetts and other local schools over a longer distance. I was also assured that the vehicles used were 29 seaters and this is definitely incorrect.”

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

“As Highway Authority Surrey County Council has no powers to instruct the operator of a bus or coach to use a particular route. The only way to prevent the use of a particular route by buses or coaches would be to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order to prevent routes being used. Officers are not aware of any technical justification to introduce such a restriction in this case. As Highway Authority our primary function is to maintain the Highway safe for public use, for passing and re-passing. Therefore if on street parking is

making it difficult for coaches to pass and re-pass, we may need to consider the removal of the on street parking.”

**4. Mr John Seaman will ask the following question:**

"Statements made by County Councillor John Furey about waste disposal and the proposed Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Shepperton which were published in the Surrey Herald on 15 May 2014 included *'The Eco Park will take out all the landfill waste in the three surrounding boroughs of Elmbridge, Runnymede and Spelthorne'*.

How much waste from these three boroughs is currently sent to landfill either directly or indirectly as rejected material, bottom ash and air pollution control residue?

If the Eco Park is built and operated successfully how much waste from these three boroughs will sent to landfill either directly or indirectly as rejected material, bottom ash and air pollution control residue?"

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

"In 2013/14 we estimate that approximately 16% (10, 762T) of the **residual** municipal waste produced by Spelthorne, Runnymede and Elmbridge was landfilled. When we add land filled bottom ash from the energy recovery process (3,466T), this percentage rises to 22%. We do not have a figure for the amount of air pollution control residue (APCR) produced but this is typically 3-4% of the total waste sent for incineration so would be around 1900 tonnes per year.

The proposed gasifier at the Eco Park will deal with approximately 55,500 tonnes of waste from Spelthorne, Elmbridge and Runnymede each year.

Of this 55,000 tonnes, approximately 11,000 tonnes per year of materials including metals and other non-combustible or oversized materials will be removed at the pre-processing stage.

The remaining 45,500 tonnes of material will be gasified and this will produce 6300 tonnes of bottom ash and an estimated 1600 tonnes per year of APCR.

It would be SITA's intention to source recycling or recovery markets for as much as possible of the pre-processing residue, bottom ash and APCR, with the aim of avoiding any landfill.”

This page is intentionally left blank