

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Spelthorne JOINT COMMITTEE**  
held at 3.00 pm on 30 November 2020  
at Virtual meeting.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Mr Richard Walsh (Chairman)
- \* Mr Robert Evans
- \* Mr Tim Evans
- \* Mr Naz Islam
- \* Miss Alison Griffiths
- \* Mrs Sinead Mooney
- \* Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

**Borough / District Members:**

- \* Cllr John Boughtflower (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Cllr Maureen Attewell
- \* Cllr Chris Bateson
- \* Cllr Sue Doran
- \* Cllr Tom Fidler
- \* Cllr Jim McIlroy
- \* Cllr Joanne Sexton

\* In attendance

---

**45/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Cllr Jim McIlroy from Spelthorne Borough Council.

**46/19 MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes of the 16 December 2019 were approved as an accurate record.

**47/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

No declarations of interest had been received.

**48/19 DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 4]**

It was noted that there was only one outstanding item which was the visit to the Cemex site in Stanwell Moor. The visit had not taken place due to Covid restrictions but was anticipated to take place in early January 2021

**49/19 PETITIONS & PETITION RESPONSES [Item 5]**

Petition 1: Cycle/pedestrian bridge over Clock House Lane to Bedfont Lakes

The Lead Petitioner, spoke for three minutes. He brought the petition as he and his sons are avid cyclists and have found it dangerous to use the bridge to visit Bedfont Lakes. The petition attracted the support of 798 signatories who were Surrey residents.

The Divisional Member spoke in support of the petition, noting that this has been an issue for a number of years and that the bridge had seen a fatality back in 2001. However it was later stated that there had been a low level of casualties since and this was probably due to people avoiding crossing the bridge on a bike or on foot.

The Committee discussed the item, noting the history of the site and the level of funding that would need to be secured in order to implement provision for cyclists and pedestrians. It was also noted that as the bridge is located on the boundary with the London Borough of Hounslow, they would have a joint responsibility for sourcing the funding.

The Committee supported the proposal for new pedestrian and cycle facilities on the bridge and wanted to explore design and funding options.

The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) agreed:

- i. To indicate its support for new pedestrian / cycle facilities connecting Ashford to Bedfont Lakes along the Clock House Lane corridor, noting that funding options need to be clarified – including CIL and any contributions from the London Borough of Hounslow – and also noting that further exploration is needed to identify potential options.**

Reasons:

- i. The Joint Committee recognises the benefit of the proposal to the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.
- ii. The Joint Committee recognises that there are various design options and funding opportunities that need to be investigated before committing to this project.

#### Petition 2: Road Safety Changes to Long Lane, Stanwell.

The Lead Petitioner was unable to attend this meeting. The Divisional Member spoke in support of the petition which attracted the signatures of 222 Surrey residents. The road in question is a village road which is often used by HGVs who are visiting nearby Heathrow airport or the local warehouses. In addition to the concerns raised around the tragic incident in question, the councillor had been contacted by a number of residents about their ongoing safety concerns. The Member went on to say that he would like to see some specific measures being taken rather than the report just being noted. This stance was supported by a local borough councillor and the Vice-chairman.

The Area Highways Manager proposed that a feasibility study that is being discussed in item 10 could be extended to include road safety measures for Long Lane.

The amended recommendation was put forward and agreed by the Committee so that further investigation into possible measures could take place.

The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) agreed to:

- i. Note that the location and collision history have been discussed at the road safety partnership of Surrey County Council and Surrey Police and that investigative measures are ongoing **and the Committee agree to work with agencies to look at possible ways to address this situation.**

Reasons:

- i. The Committee recognises the potential dangers of the road in question and would like to examine ways to mitigate these.

Petition 3: Road safety improvements to Laleham Road (Commercial Road and Wheatsheaf Lane)

The Lead Petitioner spoke to support his petition highlighting the dangers for local residents including the elderly population and pupils to nearby schools. He also noted that there was a number of incidents of damage to parked cars which does not get captured by the police accident statistics. The Divisional Member also spoke in support of the petition and requested that a feasibility study could be included so that this proposal could be considered.

The Area Highways Manager stated that a number of options for this road was currently being considered including the active travel programme and that this location could certainly be considered for prioritisation should any of the current options not come to fruition. As the Committee supported this proposal, the amended recommendation below was agreed.

The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) agreed to:

- i. **Include a scheme for a pedestrian crossing on the list for prioritisation on future schemes.**

Reasons:

- i. The Committee recognised the potential safety benefits of a pedestrian crossing for local people.

**50/19 MEMBERS ALLOCATIONS [Item 6]**

The latest breakdown of the Members Community Allocations was noted. There were no further comments.

**51/19 WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 7]**

Three written questions were submitted about the local fire service and a response was received from the service and published as part of the supplementary agenda.

Due to the full agenda and the time constraints of the meeting, the Chairman requested that any follow up questions could be submitted to the Partnership Committee Officer in writing.

**52/19 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 8]**

Three written questions were submitted relating to the Stanwell quarry site currently owned by Cemex and earmarked for a nature reserve as part of Heathrow expansion plans. The last question enquired about the new community funding available and whether this could be used to restore the site. A written response was supplied for each one and this was published as part of the supplementary agenda.

In view of the full agenda and the time constraints of the meeting, the Chairman invited the questioner to submit any follow up questions in writing to the Partnership Committee Officer. The Chairman also acknowledged that since receiving the written response, the questioner had indicated that he would be happy to work with the officer to find out more about 'Your Fund, Surrey'.

**53/19 ON STREET PARKING REVIEW (FOR DECISION) [Item 9]**

The Parking Engineer presented his report which contained a number of proposals for measures for on-street parking restrictions across the borough. The Chairman went through each division in turn, to allow Committee members to comment on the individual proposals and state any objections. As no objections were raised, the Committee proceeded to approve the three recommendations given in the report.

**The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) agreed that:**

- i. the proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Spelthorne as described in this report and shown in detail on drawings in annex A are agreed.
- ii. the intention of the county council to make an order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on street parking restrictions in Spelthorne as shown on the drawings in annex A are advertised and that if no objections are maintained, the orders are made.
- iii. if there are unresolved objections, they will be dealt with in accordance with the county council's scheme of delegation by the parking strategy and implementation team manager, in

consultation with the chairman/vice chairman of this committee and the appropriate county councillor. An additional member may be invited for comment.

Reasons:

- i. The Joint Committee recognises the benefits of the proposed programme.
- ii. These decisions authorise the Parking Officer to proceed with implementation.

#### **54/19 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (FOR DECISION) [Item 10]**

The Area Highways Manager invited questions on his report. The Chairman noted that the budget stated was £86,000 less than the budget they had been allocated last year and asked if there had been any increase on this since the report was issued. The AHM had stated that this had not changed at this time but there may be further financial adjustments before the end of the municipal year.

It was also noted that in recommendation three, two feasibility studies were mentioned but three were mentioned in the main body of the report. It was agreed that this was an error and will be remedied in the decisions and minutes.

Technical issues meant that the Chairman could not take any further part in the meeting and therefore the Vice-chairman presided over the remainder of the agenda.

The Committee moved to approve the recommendations incorporating the extension of a proposed feasibility study to include Ashford Road as set out in the decisions below.

The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) agreed to:

- i. Approve the proposed allocation of the 2021-22 Highways budgets as set out in table 3 (paragraphs 2.1.6 and 2.1.7 refer);
- ii. Note that the Gresham Road, Staines, scheme is included in Surrey County Council's bid for funding under tranche 2 of the Government's Active Travel programme, and await the outcome of this bid before deciding the next steps for this scheme (paragraph 2.2.2 and Annex A refer);
- iii. Approve the commissioning of **three** new feasibility studies to start in April 2021, as set out in table 4, to be funded from Committee's 2021-22 capital allocation (paragraphs 2.2.3, 2.2.4 and Annex B refer); **to include the extension of the Laleham Village 20mph feasibility study to consider a review of the speed limit in Ashford Road.**

- iv. Approve the revocation of the traffic order for the redundant bus lane in the right turn lane of the A308 Staines Road West on its eastbound approach to Escot Road (paragraphs 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 refer);
- v. To 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.

Reasons:

- i. The Joint Committee recognises the benefits of the proposed programme
- ii. These decisions authorise the Area Highways Manager to proceed with the programme

#### **55/19 A308 SCHOOL ROAD JUNCTION (FOR DECISION) [Item 10a]**

This report was admitted as a late report to the meeting as it was a key decision affecting more than 2 divisions. It was deemed unreasonable for this item to be held over until the next committee date as this would have had the potential to adversely affect the start of the construction for this project.

The Chairman of the Select Committee (Communities, Environment & Highways) approved the late inclusion of this report in adherence to the Special Urgency Rules (Standing Orders 56.1 and 56.2) and this abided by the Council's Constitution Standing Order 44.2 and the Local Government Act 1972 (Article 6) relating to late agenda items.

The Area Highways Manager presented the report saying that it was hoped that work could start by March, hence the need to bring it to this committee. Preparation work for the logistics was already underway and a legal agreement to transfer funds from Highways England was being prepared. The AHM also confirmed that this project was now fully funded and did not require any Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding.

Many of the members of the Committee remembered this item being previously brought to Committee for approval and were happy to see this project now come to fruition. It was recognised that this junction would bring safety benefits to the community. The decisions that were approved are listed below and gave the Highways team the authority to begin the implementation of the project.

#### **The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) agreed to:**

- i. Authorise the advertisement of the Legal Notice for the proposed signalised toucan crossings across the A308 Staines Road West (eastern arm of

junction) and across School Road (see **Annex A** for location of proposed toucan crossings).

- ii. Authorise the advertisement of a notice in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to implement any new waiting restrictions that are required at the junction in relation to the proposed new toucan crossings, revoke any existing traffic orders necessary to implement the changes, and, subject to no objections being upheld, that the order be made.
- iii. Authorise delegation of authority to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Divisional Member(s) to consider any representations and resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals.
- iv. Approve the construction of the scheme subject to the outcome of (ii) above

Reasons:

- i. The Joint Committee recognised the benefit of this scheme to local people
- ii. The decision allows the Area Highways Manager to proceed with the project.

#### **56/19 FORWARD PROGRAMME 2020/21 [Item 11]**

The Forward Plan was approved.

It was noted that the recommendations for the Community Infrastructure Levy should also be added to this plan. A joint council report on flood alleviation and riparian ownership (homeowners who have a responsibility for watercourses running across their properties) was also requested.

It was also noted that the report on task groups had been deferred to a future meeting in preparation for the next municipal year.

#### **57/19 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]**

The date of the next meeting was noted and it was stated that this would be a remote meeting.

Meeting ended at: Time Not Specified

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank