



SPELTHORNE JOINT COMMITTEE – 16 December, 2019

AGENDA ITEM 8

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question 1: Submitted by Mr Andrew McLuskey

“Given the steadfast refusal of officers or members of the committee to give satisfactory answers to the questions I raised regarding Stanwell Quarry at the July and September meetings of the Committee can I now be given an answer as to why this stonewalling has occurred?”

Officer response:

We acknowledge the questions that you have raised to the two earlier Joint Committees and the deep concerns that you have on the impact of the community of Stanwell. Many of these concerns are shared by both the Borough and County councils as has been stated in previous responses to you.

However, it is important to recognise the limits of influence that the Joint Committee and its respective councils have on the issues you raise. Heathrow expansion and the Esso pipeline project (an issue about which you have also raised concerns) are large, complex programmes of national interest, the outcomes of which will be determined by processes within central government. Whilst local authorities are consulted on such projects and can lobby for certain outcomes, they do not possess the prerogative to determine the ultimate decision. Nor do they have the power to compel private companies to allow them access to their assets such as in the case of the requested visit to the Cemex site. Therefore, whilst this action remains open on the Joint Committee decision tracker, a recommendation has been put forward to close this as the Committee has carried out all the actions that it undertook to do within its purview. The recommendation goes on to suggest that the issue is revisited as part of the Forward Programme for 2020/21.

We are unable to accept your view that officers have not been forthcoming in addressing your concerns and would actually assert that the opposite is true.

Alongside providing you with formal written responses, officers have attended Committee to discuss this topic publically and in detail, and have in addition, made themselves available to enter into private, detailed correspondence with you outside of this. If however, you have any specific instances of any named officers or committee members undertaking their roles in a way that is anything less than exemplary, we would be happy to signpost you to the correct procedure with which you can register your grievance.

Question 2: Submitted by Mrs Caroline Nichols

Spelthorne Joint Committee meeting in March 2019 approved a feasibility report for traffic calming and extension of the 20MPH zone in French Street. Six months later, in mid-September, Surrey Highways sent a circular letter with diagram to households in French Street, but not to the surrounding roads, inviting comment. The letter included no deadline for reply but stated 'It is anticipated that the scheme will be constructed early 2020'. Some residents did not see the letter. One resident secured the repositioning of a set of the speed cushions and the plan was finalised but without reissuing street letters to residents to show the change. A final formal notice to comment was issued on 25th October through the standard channels of the local newspaper, email to local councillors and three notices on lamp posts inviting comments by 22nd November. I raised a concern ten days before the closing date which was rejected on the grounds that there was no time left to modify the scheme.

Is Spelthorne Joint Committee satisfied that residents were sufficiently informed early enough in the process for their considered views and objections to be taken into account?

Officer response:

The French Street 20mph Zone extension project is intended to be an incremental element of a Lower-Sunbury-wide 20mph Zone type treatment. This area wide treatment is listed on Committee's prioritisation list of future improvement schemes, but the current level of budget provision would not allow the entire area to be treated all at once. Therefore Committee has been promoting elements of the wider scheme as the opportunity allows. At the present time we are moving forwards with two elements – French Street and the Green Street / Church Street one-way triangle. A few years ago Committee enhanced and formalised the 20mph Zone in Thames Street. The consultation was designed to cater for the French Street element, and so residents fronting on to the scheme were consulted. This consultation was successful; the question itself cites one resident's representation, which resulted in a tweak to the design for the scheme.

Question 3: Submitted By Mrs Caroline Nichols

www.surreycc.gov.uk/spelthorne

Surrey County Council has submitted Sunbury Adult Education Centre to the Spelthorne Local Plan for inclusion in the housing allocations. Why does SCC want to close the centre and what is the expected closure date?

Officer response:

There are no intentions known at this time to close the Adult Education Centre. Property works closely with all District & Boroughs to look at potential opportunities for closer collaboration working under the umbrella of the One Public Estate, which examines the ability to provide Public Services in a more joined up approach. Any future review of the locality will ensure service requirements, such as Adult Education, are met and are looked at on a place-shaping basis.

This page is intentionally left blank