



SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE – 21st January 2013

AGENDA ITEM 6

MEMBER QUESTION TIME

1. Mr Richard Walsh will ask the following question:

"Please can SCC officers inform the Local Committee of the current situation regarding Brooklands College applying to be a University Technical College (UTC)."

Cass Hardy, SCC Commissioning Manager, Services for Young People, Children, Schools and Families, will give the following answer:

"Brooklands College has decided not to proceed with its application for a University Technical College (UTC). Kingston University, its partner on the expression of interest, has withdrawn to focus on internal matters and without a university partner the application is invalidated.

We are continuing with our plans to commission a feasibility study to explore the need for a UTC in Surrey and also look at whether there is a need for colleges to offer direct provision for 14-16 year-olds, following the announcement that colleges can recruit year 10 and 11 students from September 2013."

2. Mr Victor Agarwal will ask the following question:

"Please can Spelthorne Borough Council confirm its charges for collection and disposal of large domestic white goods from residents' homes and indicate how this compares with other councils, specifically those whose boundaries join Spelthorne, including Hounslow?"

Jackie Taylor, Head of Streetscene, Spelthorne Borough Council, will give the following answer:

"The amounts for collection and disposal of white goods from domestic homes are as follows:

Spelthorne:	£45 for up to 3 items (£32 concessionary) plus £5 per additional item
Surrey Heath:	£30 for 1 item £15 for additional items
Runnymede:	£34 for 1 item £37 2-4 items £51 for 5-7 items
Elmbridge:	£34 for 1 item £43 2-4 items £51 5-7 items
Guildford:	£14.75 for 1 item £21-50 for 3-5 items
Hounslow:	£6.50 per item –minimum charge of £32-50."

3. Mr Victor Agarwal will ask the following question:

“More than a year after Abellio Surrey took over the 441/555/557 bus routes amongst others, why is it the phone number at bus stops in Stanwell and at Heathrow continue to display the incorrect Abellio number of 01932 745230, making it impossible for Stanwell and Stanwell Moor residents to track the frequent cancellations and delays?”

Also given the number of times both residents have complained to me and I have personally experienced delays and cancellations, what are Abellio’s official figures for punctuality and cancellations on the 441/555/557 routes?

For the financial year 2011/2012 how much subsidy did Surrey County Council pay Abellio and what is the agreed figure for 2012/2013?

When is the contract due for renewal and is there a break clause if certain performance standards are not met?”

Paul Millin, SCC Group Manager, Travel and Transport will give the following answer:

“At those stops managed and maintained by Surrey County Council, the timetables for services 441, 555 and 557 show the current Abellio contact telephone number. However, most of the bus stops in the Stanwell/Heathrow area are owned and maintained by London Buses. It was identified that their timetables showed the correct Abellio telephone number for services 555 and 557, but not for service 441. This previously undetected error was to be rectified by them in autumn 2012.

Using data derived from the electronic Real Time Information/Tracking system, Abellio’s figures for the percentage of on-time departures from the termini are:

441: August 2012 91.2%, September 87.4%, October 79.2% (Abellio are already taking action to remedy the decline in the figure)
555: August 2012 94.9%, September 94.2%, October 92.0%
557: August 2012 94.7%, September 86.3% (latter figure depressed by 3 day road closure at Chertsey for burst water main), October 92.8%

In 2011/2012, the value of Surrey County Council contracts held by Abellio for all the services they ran was £1.91m. Note that service 441 is operated by Abellio on a commercial basis, without a contract or subsidy from the County Council.

For 2012/2013 it is projected to be £1.98m (additional contracts held compared to previous year + inflationary uplifts). The individual amount for services 555 and 557 is projected at £738,000; this is the same as 2011/2012 with an annual inflationary uplift applied.

Contracts are generally awarded to cover individual services, rather than being all-encompassing. Those with Abellio are scheduled to expire on various dates, including 31 August 2015 for the majority of their services in Elmbridge, Runnymede and Spelthorne, such as 555 and 557. The standard Bus Contract Conditions allow for the imposition of financial penalties if whole or part journeys are not operated without good reason and break clauses can apply if it is thought appropriate to exercise that option in extreme circumstances.”

AGENDA ITEM 7

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

1. Mr John Carruthers will ask the following question:

“There have recently been at least two meetings between SCC headed by its Leader and the Federation of Small Businesses (FSB), about encouraging local Surrey businesses to go for SCC issued work. This obviously helps Surrey employment and also recycles the money within Surrey.

As a member of FSB I obviously know this, but what about the rest of the Community and our local businesses? What action are you taking to ensure that at least Spelthorne area receives maximum benefit from this initiative? The sooner the better.”

Andrew Forzani, SCC Head of Procurement & Commissioning will give the following answer:

“There are a number of other initiatives beyond the work SCC Procurement is doing with the FSB, to target the wider business Community.

Central to this is the development of a series of networks under the 'Supply2Surrey' banner, whose key objective is to increase the amount of spend across Surrey with local suppliers.

The first network will focus on the Construction Industry ('BuildSurrey'). As will be the case with other future networks, this is not limited to the County but importantly includes representatives from the Districts and Boroughs, amongst other organisations. Terry Collier, Assistant Chief Executive at Spelthorne, sits on the Steering Committee. Further, Procurement representatives from each District and Borough have been provided communications to forward to their own local supply base around this initiative, including an invite to a large kick off event on February 7th.

To build awareness more generally, we are presenting at a number of forums outside of the FSB. These have included breakfast briefings to the Caterham Branch of Business Network International and later this month, an evening

presentation as part of Waverley's annual Business Consultation. We will look to expand our presence at such events during the course of 2013 and would be very keen to participate in any held within Spelthorne."

2. Mr Andrew McLuskey will ask the following question:

"Following on from my request at the last meeting of this committee for officers to produce a report on Jimmy Savile and Duncroft - and in the light of the recently published Met/NSPCC report - can I reiterate my suggestion that officers produce as soon as possible a full report on the lessons to be learnt from this tragic episode?"

Julian Gordon-Walker, SCC Head of Safeguarding, will give the following answer:

"This is a national enquiry and there are lessons to be learnt for all local authorities. The County Council are working closely with all our partners to make sure that these are fully embedded throughout Surrey."

3. Ms Nilufar Nathoo will ask the following question:

"Why don't Spelthorne residents receive a 'Freedom Pass' like London residents who live next to us? This is for free public transport, ie train, tube, bus."

David Ligertwood, SCC Transport Projects Team Manager, will give the following answer:

"Shire authorities like Surrey County Council, Kent County Council and others are bound by different primary legislation than London is, and are funded in a different way. In terms of public transport and specifically bus services, the bus market outside London is deregulated. This means that commercial bus operators can run bus services where they feel there is a commercial opportunity to make money, and set the fares as they see appropriate. Where bus operators are unable to provide a commercial bus service because they believe there is not sufficient demand to make a profit, but there is a clear need, Surrey County Council as Transport Authority for the area, is required to fund such a service. During 2012/13 Surrey County Council will spend over £8 million supporting local bus services.

In London the bus market is regulated. Essentially this means that the Mayor, through Transport for London, specifies the bus services including hours of operation, service frequency, fares etc. Transport for London control the whole network and are able to offer schemes such as the Oyster card and the various permutations including the 60 plus. For 2012/13 London will spend some £1.8 billion on bus service contracts. Where the TfL bus services cross the border into Surrey we do of course recognise the many benefits some of our residents can enjoy, such as with the 403. Generally, TfL is able to provide more frequent buses, longer operating hours and cheaper fares, which is what you might expect from a world city such as London. There are

many residents in Surrey who are slightly envious of those who live on a TfL bus route.

Surrey, as Transport Authority, is also responsible for the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (ENCTS) which I am sure that you are aware provides free travel after 9.30am for those people who are over 60 and disabled people. The ENCTS pass also allows free travel on TfL bus services. During 2012/13 Surrey is expects to spend £7.5 million funding this scheme. As an organisation we need to look carefully at how we spend our funds to ensure that our residents benefit across the county in a fair and equal manner. Given the financial pressures facing all local authorities, we have to take a firm line with any costs which are over and above the statutory requirements.”

4. Mr John Seaman will ask the following question:

“The Environmental Permit granted by the Environment Agency for the proposed Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Shepperton allows 350000 tonnes of waste to be accepted onsite each year. How many lorry movements would this generate and will (or have) these be included in the Spelthorne Freight Study?”

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

“There are approximately 320 HGV movements each weekday associated with the current waste transfer operation at Charlton Lane. These will reduce to between 179 and 196 movements each weekday once the Eco Park is constructed. This is a result of a reduction in the quantities of waste being accepted at the site and reductions in volumes due to waste being processed at the site. The capacity of the site is limited by both the planning consent and the fixed throughput of the gasifier and anaerobic digester to 143,750 tonne per annum.

Whilst the Environmental Permit may permit up to 350,000 tonnes of waste per annum, the planning consent and physical capacity of the site mean that the maximum capacity of the Eco Park will always be limited to 143,750 tonnes per annum with the associated traffic movements as set out above.”

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

“The Freight Study included a review of GIS information relating to existing land uses, and local plan information relating to potential future land uses. As such the Charlton Lane site was highlighted as a waste site, but the study did not look at the detail of any future proposal. However the data gathered could be used as base data in the context of a Transport Assessment to predict the HGV traffic that could be expected on different routes once the proposed Eco Park is operational. There are no plans to undertake this work in the context of the Freight Study.”

This page is intentionally left blank