

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Runnymede LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
 held at 6.30 pm on 19 September 2016  
 at The Hythe Centre, Thorpe Road, Staines TW18 3HD.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Mr Chris Norman
- \* Mrs Yvonna Lay (Chairman)
- Mrs Mary Angell (Vice-Chairman)
- Mr Mel Few
- \* Mr John Furey
- \* Miss Marisa Heath

**Borough / District Members:**

- Cllr Nick Prescott
- Cllr John Ashmore
- \* Cllr Michael Kusneraitis
- \* Cllr Carol Manduca
- \* Councillor Barry Pitt
- \* Cllr Parshotam Sohi

\* In attendance

---

**96/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mary Angell, Mel Few, Cllr Nick Prescott (who attended informal question time but had to leave to a Runnymede BC meeting) and Cllr John Ashmore.

**97/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 June were agreed, and signed by the chairman.

**98/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

No declarations of interest were made.

**99/16 PETITIONS & LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION [Item 4]**

Mr Pipe, of Sandalwood Avenue, presented a petition signed by 31 residents of the Avenue objecting to the proposed parking restrictions (advertised over the summer following a Committee decision in February 2016), and thanked the Committee for the written response provided:

“The 2016 Runnymede parking review proposed new yellow lines on the bend  
 in

## ITEM 2

Sandalwood Avenue, where large vehicles have difficulty getting past multiple parked cars, and residents responded to the statutory consultation about this with the aforementioned petition. The Parking Team now recommends the following action:

to go ahead and install double yellow lines on the junction within Sandalwood Avenue (by house numbers 37 & 82), but only install a single yellow line along the straight part of Sandalwood Avenue (opposite numbers 2-8 and 12- 14). This single yellow line would operate 8:00am to 1:00pm Monday - Friday as requested by the petition, and in anticipation of this restriction being extended further as part of the 2017 Parking Review. In order to implement extended lines, we would need to advertise a revised proposal to get a consensus (as far as possible) on the new proposals in the 2017 Review.”

The lead petitioner accepted this proposal but expressed disappointment at the length of time required to action any change. Members discussed the issue of staff from the hospital parking for long periods in nearby roads, and the chairman agreed to write to Ashford St Peter’s Hospital Board noting the committee’s concern at the lack of staff parking provided on site.

### **100/16 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

No public questions had been submitted.

### **101/16 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

No member questions had been submitted.

### **102/16 DECISION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 7]**

The chairman was pleased to note that the bus stop outside Salesian School was being taken forward.

### **103/16 FLOOD RESILIENCE UPDATE REPORT [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 8]**

The chairman welcomed Tor Peebles (Surrey County Council), Sarah Bouet (Environment Agency) and Elizabeth Fowler (Surrey County Council) to present their contributions to the meeting.

Tor Peebles explained that Surrey County Council, as a flood risk management authority, had three strands within its Strategic Network Resilience team:

- Sustainable drainage (which comments on major new developments and whether the build could increase flood risk in the area)
- Capital team (which focuses on areas prone to flooding and lobbies government for flood mitigation work/funds)
- Strategy & Partnerships – which develops strategy and links with partner agencies and the community.

He noted that the Flood Risk Management Strategy (first published in December 2014) has been fully reviewed and a new version was about to be launched for consultation.

Sarah Bouet highlighted the information on flood prevention maintenance work available from the Environment Agency website, and the telephone helpline to report any concerns and locations. She noted that the River Thames Scheme costs and benefits had been updated, and modelling of how it would be designed and operate had been completed, along with initial surveys of boreholes in the gravel substrata. She also noted that there were two sites in Runnymede where temporary flood defences might be deployed if needed, subject to bidding for this national resource.

Liz Fowler, community resilience officer covering the whole of Surrey, encouraged residents to look at [www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyprepared](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyprepared) for information on how to be better prepared for any flooding in the area over the coming months, noting that training was available for local community groups or flood forums.

Members commented on an Environment Agency meeting on the River Thames Scheme held in Molesey earlier, and the significant amount yet to be raised to make it possible. The Cabinet member advised that he had lobbied the Chancellor (local MP Phillip Hammond) and was in dialogue with the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee to highlight the business case. The cost to the area of the 2013-2014 flood was raised, and it was confirmed that the events amounted to £850m.

Members queried how the sustainable drainage team addressed additional risks from new development. Tor Peebles said that they fulfilled the response as Surrey County Council statutory consultee on all applications of more than 10 units, and lobbied government for additional funding to incorporate new drainage, as in a test case in Guildford.

Gill Warner asked, from the floor, if overflow of rainwater from drains was being addressed. John Furey advised that gullies were cleared regularly with frequency based on whether they were on an A, B or C class road, but that the age and capacity of the drainage system meant that large quantities in a short space of time could overwhelm some of the 136,000 gullies for which Surrey County Council is responsible. Residents could find further information on the website:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-maintenance-and-cleaning/drainage-and-flooding>

Malcolm Loveday of the Chertsey Society welcomed progress on the River Thames Scheme and asked if a high volume pump might be used in the event of the River Bourne flooding. He was advised that the Flood Risk Management Strategy did not go into such a level of detail, but set general conditions.

## **104/16 HIGHWAYS UPDATE REPORT [FOR DECISION] [Item 9]**

Andrew Milne summarised the key points in the report, noting that the detailed design for Egham High Street pedestrian enforcement was complete and installation was expected in January, also that county councillors should submit their requests to allocate Community Enhancement funds to the highways team by 31 October.

Members asked about the abuse of a No Entry sign at one end of Egham High Street, the breakdown of funding for the Runnymede Roundabout major

## ITEM 2

scheme, and the possibility of drainage work to prevent the entrance to a school car park in Bagshot Road Englefield Green from flooding.

Andrew Milne confirmed that the pedestrian enforcement mechanism would be installed at both ends of Egham High Street, and the Cabinet member for Highways advised that the Roundabout scheme had been largely funded by the local enterprise partnership (LEP) with contributions from Surrey CC and Runnymede BC, he undertook to circulate a breakdown of costs.

The Local Committee agreed to:

- i) Note the progress with schemes and revenue funded works for the 2016-17 financial year
- ii) Note the budgetary position
- iii) Note that a further Highways Update report would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee
- iv) That the operating times of the school Keep Clear marking outside Chertsey Nursery School (Pycroft Road) be extended to prohibit parking between 8.15am and 4pm from Monday to Friday.

### **105/16 COMMUNITY SAFETY IN RUNNYMEDE 2015-16 [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 10]**

The chairman introduced Shazia Sarwar, community safety officer at Runnymede BC, and Sergeant Sarah White representing Surrey Police (as the neighbourhood inspector was unable to attend for personal reasons), and noted that she was pleased to note that the Police Crime Commissioner was talking to the borough about the cost of Safer Runnymede CCTV and a potential contribution from Surrey Police.

Sergeant Sarah White summarised recent data on reported crime using Powerpoint slides, noting that Runnymede was ranked sixth in the county for total notifiable offences. Shazia Sarwar summarised the range of partnership activities undertaken and noted that Runnymede had the lowest level of anti-social behaviour within the northern boroughs of the county.

Members commented on drug use, and recent incidents of ram raiding at a local shop and a violent incident in a car park which had made the local news, asking about incidents of wildlife and online crime. They also asked what specific local priorities the neighbourhood inspector had identified.

### **106/16 LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING OF COMMUNITY SAFETY PROJECTS [FOR DECISION] [Item 11]**

Sylvia Carter, community partnership officer and Surrey County Council representative at the Community Safety Partnership, outlined a proposed new method of authorising expenditure from the county council/local committee contribution to community safety in Runnymede, to take effect immediately.

The Local Committee agreed that:

- i) The delegated community safety budget of £3,000 per Local Committee for 2016-17 is to be retained by the Community Partnership Team, on behalf of the Local Committee, and that the

Community Safety Partnership is invited to submit proposals that meet the criteria and principles for funding as defined at paragraph 2.6 of this report;

- ii) Authority is delegated to the Community Partnership Manager, in consultation with the chairman and vice chairman of the Local Committee, to authorise the expenditure of the Community Safety budget in accordance with the criteria and principles stated at paragraph 2.6 of the report;
- iii) The Committee receives a report detailing the projects that were successful in being awarded the local community safety funding and the outcomes and impacts they have achieved.

**107/16 MEMBER ALLOCATIONS FUNDING [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 12]**

Members noted the report.

**108/16 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 13]**

Members noted the items for the next meeting.

Meeting ended at: 8.45 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank