



MINUTES ANNEXE 1: ITEM 6 & ITEM 7

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE – 24th June 2013

AGENDA ITEM 6

MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTION TIME

1. Cllr Chris Frazer will ask the following question:

“Please report the results of inquiries into how Hounslow BC has spent monies allocated towards the Clockhouse Lane bridge and whether/how SCC has matched such funding?”

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

“Surrey County Council's Local Committee for Spelthorne has for some time been interested in improving the Clockhouse Lane railway bridge for pedestrians and cyclists. There are also ongoing concerns over the speed of traffic using the bridge, use of the route by HGVs, and perceived safety concerns. For example a report presented to Committee in December 2007 describes the progress up to that date. At that meeting Committee agreed in principal that the funding for the project should be shared 50/50 between Surrey County Council (SCC) and the London Borough of Hounslow (LBH).

In September 2010 Committee made available £30,000 from its Members' Revenue Budget 2010 / 2011 to fund jointly with LBH the design of a pedestrian / cycle bridge over the railway at Clockhouse Lane. In November 2012 officers of LBH provided to officers of SCC what they termed a draft "final feasibility report" together with draft contract documentation to facilitate tender a design and build contract for the new bridge. At the time the LBH officers had "identified couple of items which need to be carried out by consultant [Mouchel] in order to complete the final feasibility report". The Chairman has seen copy of the draft documentation from LBH.

SCC officers have not received any further correspondence from LBH officers since November 2012, despite requests for updates in February and June 2013. SCC officers have asked LBH officers whether final versions of the consultant's documentation is now available, for a breakdown of the consultant's costs, and for a comment on the likelihood of LBH securing funding for the bridge.

At the present time SCC has not identified any funding to deliver this project. Until such a time as both SCC and LBH secure sufficient funding, the project cannot be delivered.”

2. Cllr Chris Frazer will ask the following question:

“Please will traffic lights be installed on the Clockhouse Lane bridge, even on an experimental basis, to guarantee safe passage-time for pedestrians and cyclists?”

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

“The Clockhouse Lane railway bridge is entirely within the London Borough of Hounslow (LBH). Therefore any deployment of temporary traffic signals, even on an experimental basis, would have to be approved by LBH. SCC officers will pass on this request to LBH officers. Any response from LBH will be provided to Committee and Cllr Frazer.”

3. Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos will ask the following question:

"Regarding the Moormede Residents' Parking Scheme. There are residents who live at the far end of Water's Drive (near to the Memorial Park). There is a section of land opposite which I would propose should be used for parking. Can I ask officers to urgently investigate this please? I would also appreciate (as would residents) urgent guidance as to tradesmen using the Moormede Estate. Can we have guidance as to who they obtain a permit to work - i.e. window cleaners, groundsmen etc."

Jack Roberts, Highways Engineer, will give the following answer:

“If tradesman are working on a property and are actively going back and forth between a works vehicle, then this could be classed as building works for which exemptions to the parking restrictions can be made. Gardeners working on the private lawns for the flats will need to park on the private car parking areas that are allocated to the flats in order to avoid the parking restrictions. Residents also have the option of providing any specific worker, that they have employed, with a visitor permit, if exemptions are not able to be made.

Regarding parking by the park, assuming this is referring to the wide section of footway by the bridge, the majority (but not all) of this is part of the public highway that the adjacent double yellow lines apply to. Therefore parking on this footway is in breach of the double yellow lines. The access to the bridge is dropped and strengthened to allow vehicle access, but the sections of footway are not and are therefore not suitable for official parking to take place “

4. Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos will ask the following question:

"Regarding Wraysbury Gardens, Staines - yet again we see another residential road in Staines being blighted by commuter parking. [These photographs are some of many incidents.] Can I ask that our parking

officers look at this situation again please? Can they come up with some suggestions to give some relief to residents in this road which is in the middle of Staines and near to the shopping centre and offices?"

Jack Roberts, Highways Engineer, will give the following answer:

"This is currently on the list to be assessed as part of the next Spelthorne Parking Review which begins in December. A restriction to deter commuters will be considered."

5. Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos will ask the following question:

"I have just seen the advertisement relating to the long awaited yellow lines in the borough (where they have been requested).

Can I ask that you remove Church Street, Staines from the list. This area will be the subject of a traffic survey which has agreed funding from allocation last year. It may be that the yellow lines proposed will be superfluous. Please confirm that they will be removed from the proposals on this occasion. With many thanks".

Jack Roberts, Highways Engineer, will give the following answer:

"Surrey County Council plan to carry out a traffic study of Church Street, between Wraysbury Road and Bridge Street. This study will be looking at a number of possibilities including a one way system, 20mph zone, traffic calming and parking measures. There will be a consultation with residents about this later on this year.

In January, Spelthorne Local Committee approved the advertisement of double yellow lines on the north side of Church Street and it is possible that the traffic study may recommend that some sections of this originally proposed restriction is required.

Bearing in mind that the legal process to introduce parking restrictions is a lengthy one, in order to avoid any unnecessary delay to the introduction of a traffic scheme within Church Street, the proposed double yellow lines are being advertised in their entirety now. Therefore, if there is a need for sections of these restrictions to be introduced as part of a traffic scheme, it could go ahead more swiftly, as this stage of the legal process (the formal advertisement) would already have been carried out.

No decision will be made on the double yellow lines or traffic measures until the traffic study and associated consultation has been carried out.

Comments or objections to the double yellow line proposal can be made now by writing to SCC at: Surrey Highways, Parking Services, Rowan House, Merrow Lane, Guildford GU4 7BQ, or via www.surreycc.gov.uk/parking/spelthorne, or can be made once the traffic study begins, which will incorporate all traffic and parking options. Any information submitted will be taken into consideration during the traffic study."

AGENDA ITEM 7

PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTION TIME

1. Mr John Carruthers will ask the following question:

“SCC has Referral Units (RRU) specifically for Surrey Schools to transfer them their difficult to handle and control pupils. The PRU are specialists Units set up specifically to turn these difficult pupils round, so that they can be returned to and integrate into their schools.

This seems to work well and ensures that only a very few pupils are eventually absolutely rejected and have to be sent to a very expensive ‘final solution’ education.

We are finding that some schools are permanently excluding their difficult pupils at the first stage, so that the pupil arrives at the PRU already permanently excluded. They thus have to remain at the PRU although brought back to acceptable standard, and do not gain the benefit of a main school education.

This surely cannot be right as it negates the whole point of having a PRU.

Please can direct instructions be given to all Surrey schools that a decision to exclude cannot be taken at such an early stage, and it can only be considered after a PRU has had its attempt to rescue the pupil.

I have described a situation that is costly and bad for progressing the education of certain pupils after they have been ‘straightened out’. The cause being certain schools ejecting pupils just for their own convenience and advantage. So, please would the Committee please consider this, and endorse a recommendation to County Cabinet as described?”

Kerry Randle, SCC Area Education Officer - NE, will give the following answer:

“All maintained schools regardless of status must pay regard to statutory guidance on exclusions either fixed or permanent. The guidance states that permanent exclusion should be the last resort recourse to action that a school takes to improve a child’s behaviour. The County Council provides clear on line information for schools on the guidance and also provides the advice service of exclusion and reintegration officers to both schools and parent/carers to ensure that processes and guidance are followed.

Guidance states that exclusion should not be used or extended for non-disciplinary reasons such as:

- truancy or lateness
- pregnancy
- minor incidents such as failing to do homework

- simply because the school feels a student has additional needs or a disability it is unable to meet (DfE 12)
- poor academic performance, except where pupils repeatedly disobey academic instructions (DfE 12)
- breaches of school rules on uniform and appearance, except where such breaches are so persistent they constitute open defiance of school
- punishing pupils for the behaviour of their parents, for example where parents refuse or are unable to attend a meeting (DfE 12)
- the failure of a pupil to meet specific conditions before they are reinstated. (DfE 12)

Guidance stresses the importance of early, proactive intervention to analyse and alleviate any underlying causes of poor behaviour in school, particularly in relation to pupils with statements of SEN and looked after children. Guidance is that head teachers should as far as possible avoid permanently excluding any pupil with a statement of SEN or a looked after child. (DfE 23)

Guidance also states that:

A decision to exclude a pupil permanently should be taken only as a last resort:
in response to serious or persistent breaches of the school's behaviour policy;

and

if allowing the pupil to remain in school would seriously harm the education or welfare of the pupil or others in the school. (DfE 15)

A decision to exclude a child permanently is a serious one and should only be taken where the basis facts have been established on the balance of probabilities. It will usually be the final step in a process for dealing with disciplinary offences following a wide range of other strategies, including multi agency involvement, have been tried without success.

Therefore the message to schools is already there embedded in the statutory guidance and also the guidance for Academies contains the same message. Permanent exclusion at what may appear an early stage may be the result of a one off serious incident or persistent breach of a schools behaviour policy or potential harm to other pupils.

Unless it has been found that a child needs a special education place, all permanently excluded children will be reintegrated into mainstream school when ready; this is processed through In Year Fair Access Panels locally which are required by central government. The panels follow protocols

ITEM 2

which have been drawn up between the County Council and Head Teachers and which are monitored by the Surrey Admissions Forum.”

2. Mr Andrew McLuskey will ask the following question:

“Can the Chair give a progress report on the inquiry currently being conducted into the County Council Planning Department?”

Dominic Forbes, SCC Planning and Development Group Manager, will give the following answer:

“Surrey County Council is currently undertaking a review of the planning service, which is responsible for determining planning applications for minerals, waste and county council owned developments such as schools and libraries. The aim of the review is to identify and implement service improvements that will deliver an enhanced planning provision to all users. Planning is facing significant changes both in legislation and demand so we want to ensure that our service is prepared and processes are effective and efficient.

The review is ongoing, involving a wide range of stakeholders and includes bench marking against other comparable local authorities. The review is programmed to report its findings by the end of August. The team is currently producing a newsletter to update all stakeholders on progress to date, which will be circulated widely within the next two weeks.”