

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Spelthorne JOINT COMMITTEE**  
 held at 6.30 pm on 20 March 2017  
 at Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames TW18 1XB.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos (Chairman)
- \* Mr Ian Beardsmore
- Mrs Carol Coleman
- \* Mr Robert Evans
- \* Mr Tim Evans
- \* Ms Denise Turner-Stewart
- \* Mr Richard Walsh

**Borough / District Members:**

- \* Cllr Ian Harvey
- \* Cllr Sandra Dunn
- \* Cllr Mark Francis
- Cllr Alison Griffiths
- \* Cllr Naz Islam
- \* Cllr Richard Smith-Ainsley
- \* Cllr Howard Williams

\* In attendance

---

**15/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mrs Carol Coleman and Cllr Alison Griffiths.

**16/16 MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

Minutes of the Joint Committee on 23 January 2017 were agreed and approved as an accurate record.

**17/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest.

**18/16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]**

The Chairman Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos made the following announcement:  
 "This is my last Joint Committee meeting as Chairman, as the Chair will rotate between Surrey County Council and Spelthorne Borough Council. Therefore, I am handing the Chairman's role to Cllr Harvey this evening, who will chair the remainder of this meeting."

**19/16 SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL LEADER & VICE CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 5]**

The Vice Chairman and Leader of Spelthorne Borough Council, Cllr Ian Harvey, thanked Mrs Saliagopoulos for all her work as Chairman.

Cllr Harvey announced the following:

- The spring edition of the Bulletin is being delivered from 18 March and includes articles about changes to recycling collections, Kempton Park and the Spelthorne Rent Assure scheme.
- New market stalls have been delivered and were used for the first time on Friday. Market traders are very pleased with them. Photos were taken of Cllr Gething, traders and market manager.
- Spelthorne Youth Awards (13 March) 33 young people were recognised for their achievements and 10 received “star awards” (trophy and £50 in cash).
- The Council has prosecuted a man who ran an illegal waste management company and dumped unsightly rubbish in Spelthorne and neighbouring boroughs. Guildford Crown Court heard that on various dates during 2015 Ryan Smith of Staines-upon-Thames removed waste for payment from residential properties but avoided disposal costs by fly-tipping the rubbish in Staines, Stanwell, Chertsey and Twickenham. Smith pleaded guilty to nine offences. He was sentenced to 10 months imprisonment, suspended for 2 years and was ordered to carry out 200 hours of unpaid community service. He was also ordered to pay £3,900 in compensation and £3,900 in costs.
- The Homesafe initiative which is a joint scheme between Spelthorne, Elmbridge and Runnymede Councils aimed at helping vulnerable clients to be discharged from hospital, has just received funding from Surrey County Council for a further 150 referrals. The Homesafe package includes an emergency keysafe to enable Independent Living staff and district nurses to access the person’s home, a welfare telephone call, provision of meals on wheels and an emergency personal alarm. Spelthorne has had the highest number of referrals to date, receiving 23 over a six month period during 2016. Spelthorne staff have participated in joint training of hospital staff and others and in the provision of information boards which are displayed at St Peter’s hospital and the Woking Bedser hub centre.
- Cllr Chris Frazer has announced that he is standing down from his position as ward councillor for Ashford East. A by-election will be held in the Ashford East ward alongside the Surrey County Council Elections on Thursday 4 May. More details on the candidates will be available on the Council’s website in due course.
- A new outdoor gym has been installed at Hengrove Park in Ashford.

## **20/16 PETITIONS & PETITION RESPONSES [Item 6]**

Two petitions were received and the petitioners spoke for three minutes each. The petition response reports were presented by the SCC Area Highway Manager (NE).

**(i)** The Spelthorne Joint Committee received a petition from Mr Richard Buckland which contained 64 signatures and was concerned about the level and speed of traffic going through Gresham Road, Staines-upon-Thames and associated roads in the area.

**The Spelthorne Joint Committee resolved to AGREE to:**

- (i) Proceed with a full speed and traffic management assessment in the context of a feasibility study, noting that funding of approximately £5,000 would need to be allocated for this purpose.

Reason: Recommendations are made to enable the 2017-18 Highways programmes funded by the Joint Committee to be decided in good time to facilitate timely delivery of those programmes.

**(ii)** The Spelthorne Joint Committee received a petition from Mrs Claire Peters which contained 96 signatures calling on Surrey County Council to 'Change the Speed Limit on Wraysbury Road (B376) from 40mph to 30mph'.

**The Spelthorne Joint Committee resolved to AGREE to:**

- (i) Proceed with a full speed assessment in the context of a feasibility study, noting that funding of approximately £5,000 would need to be allocated for this purpose.

Reason: Recommendations are made to enable the 2017-18 Highways programmes funded by the Joint Committee to be decided in good time to facilitate timely delivery of those programmes.

**21/16 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 7]**

One member written question was received from Mr Robert Evans regarding companies running car parks and issuing tickets.

The question and answer from Cllr Ian Harvey, Vice Chairman of Spelthorne Joint Committee and Leader of Spelthorne Borough Council, is set out in Annex 1 to these minutes.

Mr Evans asked a supplementary question regarding Spelthorne Council taking action as other councils have done so. He said that under civil law the fee must be related to the amount of loss suffered by the owner and he questioned the loss in this case. Mr Evans was also concerned regarding signs being placed on lamp posts.

Cllr Harvey said that Mr Evans would receive a written reply from Spelthorne Council via email.

## 22/16 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 8]

Five written public questions were received from:

Mr Andrew McLuskey, Mr Kye Gbangbola, Karen Howkins, Michelle Redman, Mr Ken Snaith.

The questions and answers are set out in Annex 1 to these minutes.

Supplementary questions:

1. Mr McLuskey asked if the quality of the teaching at Matthew Arnold School could be improved so that there were not so many spare places at the school.
2.
  - i) Mr Gbangbola queried whether a correction needed to be made in respect of Paragraph 4 in the written answer which explains that “there is no unacceptable risk”.
  - ii) Mr Gbangbola then asked a supplementary question relating to the written response, asking whether the purpose of replacing the air bricks was a desperate attempt to prevent future deaths and asked the Committee to explain the concerns leading to the Surrey County Council letter.

The Leader of Spelthorne Borough Council, Councillor Ian Harvey, began the response by expressing his sympathies to the Gbangbola family. There was a brief discussion as to whether a response could be provided verbally by officers in attendance, or whether it should be provided in writing.

In addition to the written response provided to the original question, which is provided in Annex 1 to these minutes, the Pollution Control Officer for Spelthorne Borough Council responded to the supplementary question regarding the air bricks at the meeting, providing the following information:

There is no specific data that identifies that an actual risk to health already exists. The County Council’s approach has been a precautionary one taken due to the recognition of a potential risk. No specific monitoring or recording has taken place to identify what gases may be present in or close to landfill sites, or in what concentration.

Since there is a potential risk that waste material in landfill sites may produce harmful gases, which may then migrate to nearby properties, the use of airbrick covers may increase the risk of any these gases becoming trapped beneath a property in a flood when the airbricks are covered. There is no increase in risk in normal conditions.

Mr Gbangbola will receive a written response to his first question (i), which is provided in Annex 2 to these minutes.

- 3) Karen Howkins asked when the gates, bought by Charlton Village residents in February, would be installed by SCC Highways. The Area Highway Manager responded.
- 4) Michelle Redman was not present to ask a supplementary question.

- 5) Mr Snaith asked why the rubbish was not yet removed. The Area Highway Manager said that the situation was due to be reviewed after the vegetation had been removed. Due to financial restrictions, this work had not yet been carried out.

**23/16 CELIA CRESCENT CONSULTATION UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION)**  
**[Item 11]**

---

The Chairman called for a 5 minute comfort break from 8pm – 8.05pm.

The Chairman then took the following items out of order.

Item 9, Item 10, Item 11 were received in the following order: Item 11, Item 9, Item 10.

---

The SCC Area Highway Manager (NE) introduced the Celia Crescent item and explained that Option 2 was the preferred option for technical reasons, but that he considered Option 3 to be feasible.

The Chairman invited a Celia Crescent resident, Mr Martin Shortland, to speak on behalf of the residents. The Chairman explained that this was not the usual procedure but he wanted to be sure that residents were able to present their views.

Mr Shortland has been working with the Area Highway Manager on all the options. Residents were also concerned about possible flooding. He felt that the negatives of Option 3 could be managed and that Option 3 was the preferred choice. Mr Shortland informed the Committee that residents were prepared to fund a permanent closure of the road at the junction with Kingston Road (Option 3).

Ms Denise Turner-Stewart thanked officers and residents for all their work to try to find a solution. The Chairman said that it was an excellent example of everyone working together.

The vote was unanimous to agree the new recommendation.

**The Spelthorne Joint Committee resolved to AGREE to:**

A new recommendation, proposed by Cllr Ian Harvey and seconded by Ms Denise Turner-Stewart:

- (i) To promote a permanent traffic regulation order for the closure of Celia Crescent at the junction with Kingston Road (option 3 from the public consultation).**

Reason: To **replace** the report recommendation:

- (i) To promote an experimental traffic regulation order for the closure of Celia Crescent on its east-west section, between the north-south arm leading to numbers 9 to 36 and the north-south arm leading to numbers 1 to 8 (option 2 from the public consultation).

**24/16 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - WIDER STAINES AREA (STAINES-UPON-THAMES/STANWELL/NORTH ASHFORD) (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 9]**

The item was introduced by Spelthorne Borough Council's Group Head, Regeneration and Growth.

**The Spelthorne Joint Committee resolved to AGREE to:**

- (i) The allocation of £365,000 of CIL monies to the Wider Staines STP for the financial year 2019/20.

Reason: The CIL Task Group is satisfied the application meets all the criteria in the Joint Committee's 'Framework for Decision Making' on CIL, has significant merit and represents substantial financial leverage.

**25/16 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 10]**

The Area Highway Manager (NE) presented the report.

**The Spelthorne Joint Committee resolved to AGREE to:**

- (i) Authorise the Area Highway Manager to make appropriate changes to budget allocations and programmes of work for next Financial Year 2017-18 when Committee's Highways budgets for next Financial Year have been confirmed, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and affected Members of the Joint Committee (paragraphs 2.36 to 2.40 refer).
- (ii) 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.

Reason: Recommendations are made to enable the 2017-18 Highways programmes funded by the Joint Committee to be decided in good time to facilitate timely delivery of those programmes.

**26/16 HIGHWAYS UPDATE ANNEXES C, D AND E [Item 10a]**

**27/16 DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 12]**

The Decision Tracker was acknowledged.

**28/16 STAINES-UPON-THAMES TOWN CENTRE UPDATE (SERVICE MONITORING & ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 13]**

The report was acknowledged for information.

**29/16 SURREY FIRE & RESCUE SERVICE IN SPELTHORNE: ANNUAL REPORT (SERVICE MONITORING & ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 14]**

The Surrey Fire and Rescue Service Group Commander and Assistant Group Commander, Spelthorne Borough, were present for the item.

The report was acknowledged for information and Committee members thanked the Fire and Rescue Service for all their work.

**30/16 SPELTHORNE HEALTH & WELLBEING STRATEGY UPDATE (SERVICE MONITORING & ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 15]**

The report was acknowledged for information. Members welcomed the report and said that really good work was being carried out by Spelthorne Council. Members said they knew of some health units closing that would effect Spelthorne residents and they would like the Joint Committee to monitor any issues and developments.

**31/16 BUCKINGHAMSHIRE & SURREY TRADING STANDARDS WORK IN SPELTHORNE (SERVICE MONITORING & ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 16]**

The report was acknowledged for information. Mr Richard Walsh thanked volunteers referred to in paragraph 1.3. He also said the Scams conference (paragraph 1.4) was very useful and highlighted issues, especially for elderly residents. He thanked Spelthorne Council officers for attending the Scams conference and he welcomed joint working, as described in paragraph 1.19.

Members also welcomed Buckinghamshire and Surrey Trading Standards working together.

Cllr Richard Smith-Ainsley said he found the e newsletter from Trading Standards very useful and that anyone can sign up to receive it. Cllr Smith-Ainsley would have liked to have seen all eight Spelthorne Eat Out Eat Well members listed in paragraph 1.7 of the report, rather than just three.

Mr Robert Evans was concerned about scams relating to parking issues, for example residents receiving parking ticket fines when they have gone to the machine to buy a parking ticket. He believes Trading Standards should be involved and he asked Mr Walsh to intervene. Mr Walsh asked Mr Evans to contact Steve Ruddy, Head of Surrey Trading Standards, with details. Mr Walsh said that if anyone had a complaint they should contact Trading Standards, as Trading Standards monitors the level of complaints received.

**32/16 FORWARD PROGRAMME 2017/18 [Item 17]**

The forward programme was agreed.

**33/16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 18]**

To be held on Monday 17 July 2017 at 6.30pm in the Council Chamber, Spelthorne Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames TW18 1XB.

(6.30pm – 7pm: Informal Public Question Time)

---

This was the last Joint Committee meeting in the current municipal year and the Chairman said that there may be changes to membership as there will be

Surrey County Council elections in May. He thanked Committee members for all their work.

The meeting which commenced at 6.30pm ended at 8.55pm.

Meeting ended at: 8.55 pm

---

**Chairman**



## **SPELTHORNE JOINT COMMITTEE – 20 March 2017**

### **Minutes: Annex 1**

#### **AGENDA ITEM 7**

##### **WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS**

**1. Mr Robert Evans will ask the following question:**

“Residents are increasingly concerned about ‘cowboy’ companies running local car parks and issuing ‘parking tickets’. What action can Surrey and Spelthorne take together to restrict these companies?”

**Cllr Ian Harvey, Vice Chairman of Spelthorne Joint Committee and Leader of Spelthorne Borough Council, will give the following answer:**

“As Mr Evans is aware, neither Surrey County Council or Spelthorne Borough Council has any control over the activities on any privately owned site.”

#### **AGENDA ITEM 8**

##### **WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

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

“It has recently been reported that there are insufficient school places in Staines. Is that still the case and if so what action is being taken to remedy the situation?”

**Melanie Harris, SCC School Commissioning Officer NE Surrey, will give the following answer:**

“It is unclear from the question whether this refers to primary or secondary school places and the origin of the report of a place shortage is also not specified.

It is the legal responsibility of Surrey County Council to ensure that there are sufficient school places in its administrative area ie across Surrey. For

primary place provision we plan in smaller local areas within a borough; and for secondary places we provide them on a borough wide basis. The forecast demand is constantly reviewed throughout the year as new birth, housing or pupil movement trend data becomes available. We are currently planning up to the 2026/27 academic year for both phases.

There are currently 240 primary school places in the Staines and Laleham Planning area spread across four schools. The demand for September 2017 was 239 first preferences so we can meet this demand.

The future forecast demand, (based on the **current** available birth and housing data, and the three year trend of movement in and out of borough and planning area) is that this will be between 236 and 245 places. Therefore, potentially we could be short of around 5 Reception places per year in this area. However, it may be possible to make a reasonable offer of a school place to some families in the neighbouring planning area of Egham and Thorpe in Runnymede Borough. In this area, close to Staines, there is a school called The Hythe which is forecast to have current and future vacancies sufficient to accommodate Staines pupils living close to the bridge. As some Staines pupils have traditionally attended this school this appears to be a reasonable solution to the small deficit of places in Staines. Of course we are keeping this planning area under close review in case the demographics change significantly.

In terms of secondary places for 2017 we have a combined Published Admissions Number (PAN) of 1156 and the first preference demand for places was 1063, leaving a surplus of 93 places or three forms of entry. Many of these spare places are in Matthew Arnold School in Staines.

Looking to the future, the current forecast data indicates that we will have sufficient secondary places in Spelthorne until September 2020. We have planned to add more places into the Ashford area in 2018 thus increasing the borough PAN to 1216 and meeting the rising demand coming from Ashford primary schools. We also plan to expand Sunbury Manor School by 2020, again adding to the net number of places in the borough.

Our strategy is to supply places ready for the years when the demand rises so that we are not funding surplus places and schools are not carrying too many vacancies. This is the best use of public funding.

Further secondary places almost certainly will be required post 2020 and nearer the time we will analyse where the demand is most acute and will negotiate with appropriate schools as to which ones will expand. We do not anticipate requiring more than another four forms of entry (up to 140 places) before 2026 so there is no demonstrable requirement at present for a new school. A four form entry secondary school would not be operationally or financially viable. If there were ever the need for another school of at least 6 FE under the present legislation it would have to be a Free School or an academy and thus would not be managed (or probably even built) by Surrey County Council.”

## **2. Mr Kye Gbangbola will ask the following question:**

*“Question to Surrey CC Spelthorne Joint Meeting - Constituency Households, Flooding, and Landfill*

My question is with regard to the duty of care incumbent on Local Authorities such as Spelthorne BC and Surrey CC, as laid down in the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A. The 1990 Act requires Local Authorities to seek and deal with unacceptable risk posed by land in order for us all to have quality of life free of the significant risk of harm being caused.

Surrey CC wrote to certain residents in late November to say that the use of self closing airbricks and air brick covers may not be suitable for properties within 250 metres of a landfill site due to the requirement to maintain a ventilated subfloor area and the potential for the airbricks to restrict airflow. Hundreds of Surrey and Spelthorne residents had this equipment installed after the 2014 floods at considerable cost to the public purse; they are now to be replaced - again at the public's expense.

As we are all aware of the current Government squeeze on funding for Local Authorities and that there is a duty of care is to protect us all from *significant* harm then it follows that this remedial action would only be authorised if there is such a significant risk of harm: May I ask:

Exactly what that risk is, and what action Spelthorne BC is taking to protect residents of the Lavenders, South Lake land, Chertsey, which an Environment Agency 2010 report by Peter Brett Associates, Geotechnical Consultant, refers to the land as being an ‘Unacceptable Risk’; defined in the Act as ‘grounds for land to be considered contaminated under EPA Part 2A’, and other landfill within the Borough?”

## **Cllr Ian Harvey, Vice Chairman of Spelthorne Joint Committee and Leader of Spelthorne Borough Council, will give the following answer:**

“Firstly I am sure my colleagues on this committee will join me in conveying our deepest sympathies to Mr Gbangbola and Ms Lawler on the tragic loss of their son Zane. I will endeavour to address Mr Gbangbola's question.

One aspect of Mr Gbangbola's question refers to duties under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and he also asks what action in particular Spelthorne Borough Council is taking to protect residents of the Lavenders, South Lake land, Chertsey.

I would like to emphasise that Spelthorne Borough Council takes any potential risk very seriously. Under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act, the Council has made a strategic inspection of all land within its borough. It has done this through a review of readily available information such as historic and current maps to identify potential landfill sites. This review identified the Lavender's Pit South to be a closed landfill site in which with mineral

excavation occurred in the early to mid-1950's and filling completed by the end of 1971.

In 2010 a study was undertaken in relation to the erection of a relief lockkeeper's hut on the Thames side adjacent to the Lavender's Pit south landfill. This study prepared under the planning regime rather than the Part 2A regime, took a precautionary approach as the authors of the report did not have access to monitoring data for the landfill or any previous assessments. The authors consequently concluded that there was a moderate potential for ground gas generation but did not conclude that there was an unacceptable risk at this site.

Following the flooding in 2014, the Council prepared a desk study report to collate all information available and concluded that the Lavender's Pit South site should be kept under review pending information arising from the inquest relating to Zane Gbangbola's death. At the inquest hearing last year, additional information was presented from the Environment Agency and the landowner Brett Aggregates in respect to monitoring information for the site and for land to the north. The Environment Agency, having reviewed the monitoring information, concluded that it had found no data to suggest the presence of hazardous gases and in any event not at a level which might pose potential harm to life.

The Council under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act has undertaken to rewrite its Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy and this will be taken to Cabinet and then to Council in June and July 2017 respectively. The new strategy will look forward over the next five year period to 2022, and will set out the Council's strategic approach and priorities under Part 2A. The Council's approach to identifying and remedying potentially contaminated land will principally be via the development control process. The Council will also ensure the continued compliance and enforcement of the duties under Part 2A through both desk based strategic inspection and detailed inspection including intrusive investigation where necessary. Surrey County Council does not have any enforcement role in the regime.

Another aspect of Mr Gbangbola's question refers to letters from Surrey County Council about self-closing airbricks and airbrick covers. This precautionary measure was taken following advice from the Environment Agency that products which restrict airflow beneath a building's floor (such as self-closing airbricks or airbrick covers) may not be suitable for properties within 250 metres of a current or historical landfill site. The letters were sent to households which had installed self-closing airbricks or airbrick covers with a grant from the Government's Repair and Renew Grant scheme and were within 250 metres of a historic or current landfill site. There seems to be an assumption that the decision to offer residents financial help towards removal and replacement of the products would only be authorised if there was a significant risk of harm. In fact, the letters were sent and the financial contribution authorised only as a precaution. It was not due to a significant risk of harm or any specific incident which might trigger an investigation under Part 2A."

**3. Karen Howkins will ask the following question:**

“We would like Charlton Village to be recognised as an area of Spelthorne that requires a higher priority on road safety issues. Our questions to this committee are as follows:

- (i) Is not 7 accidents in 6 weeks along the same stretch of road sufficient to warrant urgent action from Surrey CC?
- (ii) If not what is the magic number or is it as Cllr Walsh told us only a death that will make a change?
- (iii) When will Surrey implement the traffic routing policy?
- (iv) When will they help us to STOP Eco Park vehicles consistently running through the Village?
- (v) When will Surrey CC sort out the Village flooding or does this have to wait until there is another accident before priority is given?
- (vi) When will Surrey CC start to consider their use of Preferred Suppliers when it is costing them in excess of 2½ the amount of other suppliers?”

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

“The Divisional Member for Laleham and Shepperton requested a feasibility study to investigate traffic speed and road safety in Charlton Village, following concerns that had been raised by residents. This feasibility study is now complete, and is included as part of the main agenda.

The study assesses evidence from traffic surveys and from the casualty history, before considering a number of options. The traffic survey evidence suggests a good level of compliance with the 30mph speed limit. There is no dominant pattern evident from the casualty history.

In view of the good level of compliance with the speed limit, and that the frequency of casualties is relatively low when compared to similar roads elsewhere in the County, no engineering measures are recommended at the present time.

In response to the specific points raised by Karen Howkins:

- i) Surrey County Council monitors Personal Injury Collisions in partnership with Surrey Police. Damage only incidents and near misses are not monitored or included in any assessment as there is no record of these. When there is a Personal Injury there is a legal obligation to report an Road Traffic Collision to Surrey Police, which means there is a consistent database for assessment and

comparison purposes. Every six months Surrey County Council's own Road Safety Team reviews new and existing patterns and clusters of Personal Injury Collisions with Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team. If a new pattern or cluster of Personal Injury Collisions were to emerge, this team would review the site and the circumstances of the collisions, and assess whether an engineering intervention might reduce the frequency of casualties. As the report on the main agenda details, there is no dominant pattern evidence from the casualty history. In view of this and the good level of compliance with 30mph speed limit, no engineering measures are recommended at the present time.

- ii) There is no threshold in terms of the number or nature of Personal Injury Collisions before a site is considered. Rather all new and existing clusters and patterns are prioritised to ensure the most needful sites are treated in any given Financial Year. In Spelthorne, for example, the A308 corridor was identified as having a high frequency of Personal Injury Collisions, and as a result a scheme was promoted to reduce the speed limit. Just to the south of Charlton Village, a pattern of Personal Injury Collisions was identified at the junction of Charlton Lane, Charlton Road and New Road, and as a result the 30mph speed limit was extended southwards and new traffic islands constructed.
- iii) Contained within the Eco Park construction project's Construction Environmental Management Plan that was submitted as part of the planning application is a requirement for construction traffic to use a particular route to and from the site via the main A244. In addition temporary warning signs have been installed since the start of the construction works to advise construction traffic drivers that the route they are currently on is not suitable for Eco Park construction traffic.

The principal contractor monitors construction traffic arriving and leaving the site paying attention to any vehicle that does not follow the designated route. Any driver that uses the incorrect route is spoken to whilst on site and if necessary contact is made with the company office to repeat this message. Where the same driver repeatedly uses the incorrect route then they are barred from delivering to the site. This action has been taken on a couple of occasions during the construction period. In addition after an incident of a number of concrete lorries repeatedly using the incorrect route on one particular day action was taken by the principal contractor and the supplier with all lorry drivers replaced with immediate effect. In addition the principal contractor makes every company, that either works at the site or makes deliveries to the site, aware of the correct route to the site via the A244.

At times construction traffic has used alternative routes such as through Charlton village due to the lorry loads being unsuitable to either negotiate the turn at the traffic signalled junction where Charlton Lane meets the A244 because of their length or width or

when the weight of the load is above the acceptable limit imposed by Network Rail on the Charlton Lane railway bridge.

- iv) Since construction of the Eco Park commenced the project Construction Environmental Management Plan has been implemented and enforced by the principal contractor supplemented by regular monitoring by both Suez and Surrey County Council Officers.
- v) Surrey County Council is aware of the ongoing flooding concern in Charlton Village. Some investigatory work has already been completed, but it is reported that the problem still persists. There are a number of flooding concerns in Spelthorne and across the County, and these are investigated in order of priority as resources allow. The flooding concern in Charlton Village is due to be investigated further, but unfortunately no timescales can be given at the present time.
- vi) All activities procured and commissioned by Surrey County Council's Highways Service are subject to competitive tendering processes. The price that was quoted by Highways for the white gates was a typical price from one of Surrey County Council's suppliers. If Surrey County Council had procured the gates, we would have sought a number of quotations from our supply chain to enable us to choose the most economical option."

**4. Michelle Redman will ask the following question:**

"The casualty history on the crash map is not complete & accurate. I have emailed the Area Highways Manager details of 53 year old Gordon White, a motorcyclist, who lost his life 20<sup>th</sup> June 2014, 6 days after a collision with a lorry on the Ashford Rd, Laleham. Another accident took place 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2015, involving a motorcyclist which we believe to be fatal, this is also not showing on the crash map. The Highways Manager is trying to help & find more information on the incidents.

Brett Aggregates are in support of the road being lowered as lorries will be coming in & out for about a year, whilst building the tunnel on the Ashford Rd. I have spoken with them regarding a contribution to this, & they may be open to discussion with the Council.

Could we please ask to have access to Ashford Rd crash reports, change signs to 30 mph & enforce with community speed watch? (This has been promised twice but has never happened.) Once we have all this information, would it be possible for us all to sit down to discuss?

A petition was raised, residents signed, in agreement, to request the speed limit to be reduced to 30mph. These people live next to this road & have to battle to get in & out of drives, not to mention traffic noise, as we are so close to the road. Residents are very willing to be involved with this, please support where we live to find a way to make us feel safe on the road we live."

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

“Casualty data is available to the general public through [www.crashmap.co.uk](http://www.crashmap.co.uk). This website provides the same information that Surrey County Council has access to, drawn from the Police’s database.

With regard to the speed limit, following a petition to the (then) Local Committee in March 2015 the Divisional Member for Staines South and Ashford West allocated funding for a speed assessment and feasibility study to investigate traffic speed in Ashford Road, and in particular whether the speed limit could be reduced to 30mph. This feasibility study is now complete, and is included in the main agenda.

The study assesses evidence from traffic surveys and from the casualty history, before considering a number of options. The traffic survey evidence suggests a good level of compliance with the 40mph speed limit. Traffic speeds are not low enough to reduce the speed limit just by changing signs. Significant traffic calming would be required to reduce traffic speeds to a level commensurate with a reduce speed limit.

The report assesses evidence from the casualty history, and explores a number of options that could be implemented to respond to specific observations.

Officers will review the findings of the feasibility study with the Divisional Member, to facilitate a decision on whether to take any of the options forwards for implementation.

The Community Speed Watch is an initiative promoted by Surrey Police. Residents would need to make a direct approach to Surrey Police on this matter.”

**5. Mr Ken Snaith will ask the following question:**

“Again referring to the rubbish left behind in Sheep Walk, Shepperton, following ditch clearing by SCC and remains part of a decision tracker it was stated at the last joint meeting that there are no funds available for this until the new financial year. As we will be in the new financial year in a few weeks time can I formally request on behalf of the Shepperton Residents Association that this is funded as a priority.

The minutes refers to a kind offer made by Cllr Griffiths to use her community group to do this, but post-meeting discussion indicated that the type and volumes of rubbish would not be able to be handled by that group.

A significant pile of clay and other material was fly-tipped on the Sheep Walk highway and subsequently removed by SCC. If funds can be found to remove third party rubbish why has there been such a delay in dealing with that left by SCC?”

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

“Surrey County Council is responsible for making safe any fly tip on the Public Highway, which occasionally necessitates removal of a fly tip by Surrey County Council, for which budget provision is made.

It is normal practice for the arisings from a ditch clearance to be left on the verge adjacent to a ditch, and for nature to be allowed to take its course. These arisings do not present a safety concern. Any removal of the ditch arisings would need to be funded by the Joint Committee.

A cost estimate has been obtained for the removal of the arisings from the ditch clearance, and this has been provided to the Divisional Member. A decision will need to be taken as to whether it is a high priority to clear the ditch arisings, when the Joint Committee’s Highways budgets for next Financial Year 2017-18 have been confirmed.”

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes 20 March 2017 - Annex 2****Written response to Mr Kye Gbangbola**

In relation to Mr Gbangbola's assertion that there is an error in paragraph 4 of the Council's original written response, the following should be noted:

Mr Gbangbola appears to be referring to a report published in 2010 by environmental consultants Peter Brett Associates, who undertook a desk study on behalf of the Environment Agency in respect of a planning application for the erection of a relief lock keeper's hut on Thames Side adjacent to the Lavender's Pit South landfill. The written response given in relation to Mr Gbangbola's original question to the Joint Committee is correct because the report does not **conclude** that there is an 'unacceptable risk'.

Whilst the study reported a high *potential* for *some* contamination to be present at the former landfill, it does not find that there is likely to be *significant* contamination, stating that the *potential* for contamination to be present on the lock keeper's site was "very low". The report was prepared under the planning regime and not under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Under planning laws an "unacceptable risk" is where the risk is "above minimal risk", a much lower threshold than the threshold for considering risks under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, for which there must be "significant potential of significant harm".

Further, the study did not have access to any monitoring data for the landfill or any previous assessments. The authors consequently took a cautious approach and concluded that there was a "moderate" potential for ground gas generation.

Additionally, since 2010 when the Peter Brett Associates Report was published, testing has been undertaken and no data has been found to suggest the presence of hazardous gases, much less at levels that pose a potential harm to life.

**Additional written response**

Since Zane Gbangbola's very sad death in 2014, Spelthorne Borough Council has supported the family's search for answers through the Coroner's inquest process. The Council was fully involved in the two year process and participated in a five week inquest in July last year. The findings of the inquest have been widely reported and the Coroner's verdict (which was released in September 2016) is publicly available. The Coroner found that the cause of Zane's death was carbon monoxide from a petrol pump and not hydrogen cyanide emanating from nearby landfill.

It is not appropriate for the Spelthorne Borough Council, or indeed this Joint Committee, to question the findings of what was a detailed inquest which explored a range of issues and examined a substantial amount of information, technical data and witness evidence.

The Coroner's factual finding in the inquest was that "whilst it is clear from the evidence that landfill can be a potential source of toxic gases, including HCN, none of the land/ soil or water testing conducted at the house or the land behind it... found any evidence of a source of HCN (or any other toxic gases)".

Whilst the Council has the utmost sympathy for the family for the loss of their beloved son Zane, it is important to reiterate that there remains no evidence of a link between Zane's tragic death and the landfill close to the family home.

This page is intentionally left blank