

## MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 24 APRIL 2008

### BOROUGH OF SPELTHORNE

#### AT THE MEETING OF THE SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, KNOWLE GREEN, STAINES ON THURSDAY 24 APRIL AT 7.30PM

Ayers F.	Dunn Mrs S.A.	Pinkerton Mrs J.M.
Bain Ms M.M.	Flurry K.E.	Pinkerton J.D.
Bell Mrs E.	Grant Mrs D.L.	Rough Mrs M.W.
Bhadye S. (Deputy Mayor)	Hirst A.P. (Mayor)	Royer M.T.
Bouquet M.L.	Hyams Ms N.A.	Sider R.W.
Broom Ms P.A.	Jaffer H.R.	Smith-Ainsley R.A. (Deputy Leader)
Budd S.E.W.	Leighton Mrs V.J.	Spencer Mrs C.L.
Chouhan K.	McShane D.L.	Strong C.V
Colison-Crawford R.B.	Nichols Mrs C.E.	Thomson H.A.
Collis M.J.	Nichols L.E.	Trussler G.F.
Crabb T.W.	O'Hara E.	Weston Mrs P.
Davis C.A.	Packman J.D. (Leader)	

Miss Sue Faulkner - Vice-Chairman, Standards Committee

Councillor A.P. Hirst, The Mayor, in the Chair

#### **115/08 WELCOME**

##### **Sue Faulkner**

The Mayor, Councillor A.P.Hirst, extended a particular welcome to Sue Faulkner, the Council's recently appointed Independent non-elected Member and Vice-Chairman of the Standards Committee, to her first Council meeting.

##### **3<sup>rd</sup> Staines Scouts**

The Mayor extended a welcome to the scouts who were sitting in the public gallery from the 3<sup>rd</sup> Staines Scouts Group. He wished them every success on behalf of the Council, in achieving their community badge.

#### **116/08 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors I.J. Beardsmore, G.E. Forsbrey, C.D.G. Kuun and Mrs. I. Napper.

#### **117/08 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2008 were approved as a correct record.

**118/08 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE MAYOR**

**Presentation of Honorary Alderman and Honorary Freeman Badges**

The Mayor presented Honorary Alderman and Honorary Freeman badges to past recipients of these prestigious awards.

The first presentation was an Honorary Alderman badge for former Councillor Peter Williamson who passed away in December last year. His two sons, Martin and Steven Williamson received the Honorary Alderman badge on behalf of their father.

The Mayor then presented Honorary Freeman badges to former Councillors Fred Smith and Gerry Ceaser and an Honorary Alderman badge to former Councillor Frank Davies.

The Mayor also informed the Council that he had personally visited Ian Allan at his home to present him with his Honorary Freeman badge.

**Musical Extravaganza**

The Mayor announced that a musical extravaganza was being held on Saturday 26 April at the John Crooks Theatre, Halliford School. Tickets were still available from the Mayor's secretary or on the door on the night.

**119/08 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

The Mayor reported that under Standing Order 13 two questions had been received from Mr Keith Johnson concerning the Benwell Day Centre Consultation and the validation of planning applications.

**(1) Question from Mr Keith Johnson**

"I only learnt of the planning application to demolish and rebuild the Benwell Centre by reading the Surrey Herald. Worse still, the majority - if not all - of the many people who raised their concerns over the closure of the Centre by written question, presentation and petition, have not been notified.

The application was not available for public scrutiny at the Council's front desk when I asked to see it on 17 April and there is no formal yellow notice posted outside the site.

Despite this lack of information, the public are expected to respond by 1st May.

The Design and Access Statement provided by Notting Hill Housing states:

Firstly "*the application is for a day centre and 39 mixed-tenure extra-care flats*" and, secondly "*consultation has been held with the planning officers over an extended period of time before and after the bid*".

There has been a serious lack of consultation with the public and the following questions should be answered:

- 1) Will the planning officers hold a meeting with the public to answer questions relating to the design submission and why their implied approval is built into the submission?
- 2) Who on behalf of the Council has assessed the adequacy of the design to meet the requirements of PPS3?
- 3) What are the relative numbers for market and rented flats - as these are not quoted?
- 4) Considering the lack of appropriate consultation, availability of documents and difficulties of reading drawings on the Web, is the Council prepared to extend the closing date for responding to the planning application?"

**Response by the Leader of the Council, Councillor J.D. Packman:**

- a) No.
- b) Council officers will now assess the plans and extensive supporting material.
- c) There will be 39 units, 12 for purchase, 15 for shared ownership and 12 for rent.
- d) I can confirm that not only has the application been advertised fully in line with Council policy but we have additionally consulted with neighbours over a wider area than usual and notified both LOSRA and the Green Street Action Group directly. All the plans and supporting material have been on the Council web site prior to the normal 3 week consultation period and plans have been made available for inspection at the Council's reception to every one who has asked to see them. In addition we have been able to get the press to include details in the local newspaper. Therefore, this particular application will provide ample opportunity for residents to respond, over and above normal arrangements."

**(2) Question from Mr Keith Johnson**

"The Department of Communities and Local Government issued "Draft Guidance for Local Planning Authorities on the Validation of Planning Applications" in August 2007. This has become mandatory since 6 April 2008.

Under Local Requirements in paragraph 16, the process for determining the Local Information Requirements List for different types of application used to be determined by resolution of the relevant committee. This is after consultation with relevant stake-holders, including residents' groups.

Such adopted list by the local authority should be provided to the Government's Planning Portal as soon as possible and before 6 April 2008 as required by paragraph 18.

I should like to know:

- 1) Has the Council drawn up a local information requirements list for the validation of different types of planning application?
- 2) If so, why has this not been sent to residents' groups for comment?
- 3) If not, what is the Council's intended programme to produce such a list? "

**Response by the Chairman of the Planning Committee, Councillor E. O'Hara**

"The Government has introduced arrangements requiring those who apply for planning permission to submit all necessary key information with the application so it is available to all at the outset. Authorities are advised to adopt any local list of information after consultation.

Whilst there is a requirement to produce the lists, there is no mandatory deadline to adopting the local lists or statutory regulations prescribing the form of consultation.

Consultation has already taken place with the 20 planning agents who submit the greatest number of applications and with all nine key consultees. Details of the proposed arrangements have been placed on the Council's web site so anyone else can comment."

**120/08 AIRTRACK**

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive on the Council's response to BAA on their first preliminary Airtrack consultation.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the early consultation on track alignment and station options be welcomed.
2. That the recommendations in (Appendix 1, Sections 2.0 to 8.0), in relation to the consulted options be agreed particularly 8.11 (in Appendix 1) in relation to Overhead Electrification.
3. To agree the recommendations on the additional matters at paragraphs 9.3 of (Appendix 1) which a detailed scheme must address which relate to:-
  - (a) Need to justify the development in the Green Belt and have regard to any impact on its openness.
  - (b) Minimise impact on existing landscaping.
  - (c) Minimise construction impacts particularly on sensitive locations.
  - (d) Importance of good design to minimise visual and noise impact.
  - (e) Appropriate replacement land for lost common land and SSSI.
  - (f) Need for good pedestrian links between the new and existing station and across the Elmsleigh Surface Car Park.
4. That the Council affirm that in accordance with its Airtrack Planning Brief it will make a judgement on the Airtrack Scheme as a whole once it has seen a fully detailed proposal.

**121/08 REVISED CODE OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive on the revised Code of Corporate Governance. The Monitoring Officer explained that the only issue before the Council was set out in recommendation 2.2(a) of the recommendations of Executive to Council.

**RESOLVED** that the Council's Code of Corporate Governance be amended to reflect the new Guidance in Delivering Good Governance in Local Government, as attached to the report to the Executive from the Performance Management and Review Committee.

**122/08 AMENDMENTS TO THE COUNCIL CONSTITUTION**

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive to update the Council's Constitution, including the Scheme of Delegations to Officers and Contract Standing Orders.

**RESOLVED** that the revisions to the Council's Constitution, including the Scheme of Delegations to Officers, Access to Information Rules, Financial Regulations, Terms of Reference of Committees, Standing Orders for Council, Contract Standing Orders and other associated changes as set out in the report of the Deputy Chief Executive to the Executive be approved.

**123/08 REPORT FROM THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

The Leader of the Council, Councillor J.D. Packman, presented his report, which outlined the various matters the Executive had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

**124/08 AUDIT COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Audit Committee, Councillor Jack .D. Pinkerton, presented his report, which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

**125/08 IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Improvement and Development Committee, Councillor Mrs P. Weston, presented her report, which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

**126/08 LICENSING COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Licensing Committee, Councillor R.W. Sider, presented his report, which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

**127/08 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND REVIEW COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Performance Management and Review Committee, Councillor F. Ayers, presented his report, which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

Councillor Ayers wished to place on record his appreciation for the work of both Members and officers over the past year.

**128/08 PLANNING COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Planning Committee, Councillor E. O'Hara, presented his report, which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

Councillor O'Hara wished to place on record his thanks to officers and Members for their help and assistance during a demanding year with meetings every fortnight.

**129/08 MOTIONS**

Under Standing Order 16.3, a Notice of Motion had been received regarding closure of Post Offices throughout the country.

**Councillor R.W. Sider proposed and Councillor Mrs V.J. Leighton seconded the following motion:**

"That this Council deplores the Government's decision to close a selected number of Post Offices throughout the country without the necessary infrastructure in place to sustain such closures".

In accordance with Standing Order 18.6 (iii), Councillor C.V. Strong proposed and Councillor Mrs S.A. Dunn seconded the following amendment:

That the following paragraph be included at the end of the motion:

"This Council is further disappointed by the Executive's failure to submit a formal response opposing the recent proposals to close the Nursery Road and Woodthorpe Road Post Offices"

In accordance with Standing Order 21.4, a request was made by Councillor C.V. Strong for the voting on the amendment to be recorded. The vote was as follows:

FOR ( 7 )	Councillors Mrs E.M. Bell, R.B. Colison-Crawford, T.W. Crabb, Mrs S.A. Dunn, Mrs C.E. Nichols, L.E. Nichols and C.V. Strong
AGAINST (28)	Councillors F. Ayers, Miss M.M. Bain, S. Bhadye, M.L. Bouquet, Miss P.A. Broom, S.E.W. Budd, K. Chouhan, M.J. Collis, C.A. Davis, K.E. Flurry, Mrs D.L. Grant, A.P. Hirst, Miss N.A. Hyams, H.R. Jaffer, Mrs V.J. Leighton, D.L. McShane, E. O'Hara, J.D. Packman, Jack D. Pinkerton, Mrs J.M. Pinkerton, Mrs M.W. Rough, M.T. Royer, R.W. Sider, R.A. Smith-Ainsley, Mrs C.L. Spencer, H.A. Thomson, G.F. Trussler and Mrs P. Weston.

The amendment was lost.

In accordance with Standing Order 21.4, a request was made by Councillor R.W. Sider for the voting on the original motion to be recorded. The vote was as follows:

FOR (35)	Councillors F. Ayers, Miss M.M. Bain, Mrs E.M. Bell, S. Bhadye, M.L. Bouquet, Miss P.A. Broom, S.E.W. Budd, K. Chouhan, R.B. Colison-Crawford, M.J. Collis, T.W. Crabb, C.A. Davis, Mrs S.A. Dunn, K.E. Flurry, Mrs D.L. Grant, A.P. Hirst, Miss N.A. Hyams, H.R. Jaffer, Mrs V.J. Leighton, D.L. McShane, Mrs C.E. Nichols, L.E. Nichols, E. O'Hara, J.D. Packman, Jack D. Pinkerton, Mrs J.M. Pinkerton, Mrs M.W. Rough, M.T. Royer, R.W. Sider, R.A. Smith-Ainsley, Mrs C.L. Spencer, C.V. Strong, H.A. Thomson, G.F. Trussler and Mrs P. Weston.
----------	--

The motion was unanimously carried.

**RESOLVED** that this Council deplores the Government's decision to close a selected number of Post Offices throughout the country without the necessary infrastructure in place to sustain such closures.

### **130/08            QUESTIONS ON WARD ISSUES**

**Under Standing Order 14, Councillor R.W. Sider asked the following question:**

"I am aware that under the terms of the Clean Neighbourhood Bill that the Council is legally required to take action to remove illegal portable advertising boards or advertising signs such as A Boards and unlicensed tables and chairs from the public highway.

It is noted that after what I can only term a 'purge' in High Street, Staines, Officers will now be focusing on Ashford and Shepperton Town Centres. It is a cold, hard fact that since this inception, and having already had our banners advertising community events removed, small businesses in Shepperton are already feeling a loss in revenue, with residents and shoppers now believing that their business has moved or closed due to their A Boards being no longer displayed.

For instance, our post offices have a photograph machine for passport photographs, a chiropodist operates above the baker's, and a picture framer operates 30 yards adjacent to the BP Garage.

The pavements are wide in Shepperton and my observations are that the A Boards concerned do not obstruct the pavement. What can be considered to obstruct the pavement are the large black fixed litter bins, and bench seats which shoppers can rest upon. From my own extensive inquiries I have no evidence to suggest that any pedestrian, be they blind or visually impaired, has had an accident caused by an A Board. Perhaps of more importance is the fact that one can well be run over by cyclists on the pavement or electric buggies.

Will the Leader join me in condemning this heavy handed legislation, and will he agree with me that Shepperton and Ashford bear no resemblance whatsoever to Staines High Street with its large stores, and that villages such as Shepperton, and towns such as Ashford are fast becoming ghost towns due to ever increasing business rates, and that this 'purge' will further exacerbate the problem causing businesses to close and bring further misery to these communities?"

**The Chairman of the Planning Committee, Councillor E. O'Hara, responded as follows:**

"Thank you for raising this concern Councillor Sider. Unfortunately, you have hit the nail on the head in relation to moveable advertising boards being illegal. The Council cannot, therefore, be selective in what action it takes over such matters.

However, I would like to focus much more on the needs of people with disabilities, particularly those in wheelchairs and the partially sighted, as well as parents with pushchairs. The Council has had complaints from such users and this is why, on a regular basis, we do take such action and have done so over a number of years. Therefore, although I sympathise with Councillor Sider's comments, this is not a matter the Council can renege on."

**Under Standing Order 14, Councillor Mrs C.E. Nichols asked the following question:**

"Now that the planning application for Benwell is in, will the Portfolio Holder confirm that the actual density sought by Notting Hill Housing Trust is 182 per hectare, not 170 dwellings per hectare as stated in her previous answer (Council 21 Feb 2008)? Would she also explain in what way Benwell "will not follow traditional planning guidance" and could she provide the reference for the Department of Health guidelines which will be applied to this development? If Benwell is the Borough's "first" extra-care facility what is Beechwood Court?"

**The Portfolio Holder for Adult and Elderly Services, Councillor Mrs V.J. Leighton, responded as follows:**

"I am delighted that this scheme is progressing through the planning process and look forward to the day it is completed and occupied by 39 of our elderly citizens who, along with daily users, will receive the care they need in an independent way.

Beechwood Court is of course an extra-care facility, but Benwell is a first in Surrey in terms of the provision of day care as well as the availability of units for rent, for purchase and for shared ownership. Furthermore, the complex partnership arrangements to bring this about are also a first in Surrey.

By their nature extra-care facilities are different to general housing schemes. They have their own specific requirements in terms of internal space and fittings, provision of communal areas, parking and operational needs. The architects have taken account of appropriate Department of Health guidelines, as we would expect to ensure this will be a first class facility in every respect. Whilst on the basis of the application site area, the scheme density is 180 dwellings per hectare, in relation to the whole of the Benwell site the density is 170 dwellings per hectare. The site, therefore, is actually slightly smaller than the area of that site being transferred to Notting Hill Housing Association. The building will be exactly the same size; the difference in density is solely due to where the application site boundary has been drawn".

**In accordance with Standing Order 14.2, Councillor Mrs C.E. Nichols asked the following supplementary question:**



“In view of the planning process timescale, will the three weeks consultation period be extended to allow nearby residents and those who attended the presentation given at St. Paul’s College, to be consulted?”

**The Portfolio Holder for Adult and Elderly Services, Councillor Mrs V.J. Leighton, responded as follows:**

“The thirteen weeks allowed has provided long term consultation on this scheme. There is no need to extend this period further. Comments will still be accepted up until the matter is considered by the Planning Committee”.

**Under Standing Order 14, Councillor Mrs E. Bell asked the following question:**

“There is much speculation by residents in my ward concerning plans by London Irish to redevelop the Avenue site for 'alternative use' as announced on their website and the national press. The Planning Department is treating London Irish's approach regarding this redevelopment as confidential. When was the Council first approached by London Irish and please would the Leader give an assurance that the public will be consulted well in advance of a planning application being submitted? Is the Planning Department considering recommending a relaxation of the Protected Urban Open Space status currently afforded to this site?”

**The Chairman of the Planning Committee, Councillor E. O’Hara, responded as follows:**

“London Irish have indeed announced on their website an intention to pursue the redevelopment of their site in The Avenue, Lower Sunbury.

As a Council, we encourage developers to have discussions with officers prior to submitting planning applications. This enables developers to understand at an early stage the constraints and requirements that may apply to a site and what the Council would expect to see in schemes that in principle may be acceptable. Where advice is heeded by developers, this can avoid schemes being submitted where there is no chance of getting consent and, where details need to be resolved, this is done before the application is made. This process saves Council tax payers’ money and helps developers submit better schemes than might otherwise be the case. Furthermore, developers are charged for this advice.

Developers **usually** have these discussions on a confidential basis. This will be for a variety of reasons, including their wish to get advice before they finalise their own thinking on what to do and, secondly, developments may involve other parties who need to be notified before they can make matters public. Whatever their reasons, when we are trusted with confidential information in this way, we always honour that trust.

There are a number of examples where I am pleased to say this approach has proved beneficial and welcomed by local people and I hope it is done more and more. However, we cannot force developers to do this.

In the case of London Irish, I can say that if, in due course, they bring forward proposals in pursuit of their stated aspiration to develop their existing site, **our**

**officers will advise them very clearly of all the Council policies they must comply with, including the very important policy of protecting urban/public open space.** If they seek to pursue a development we would, as a matter of course, ask them to engage in pre-application consultation, hopefully with the local community and local Members.”

**131/08 GENERAL QUESTIONS**

**Under Standing Order 14, Councillor C.V. Strong asked the following question:**

“Given the recent appalling decision by a Planning Inspector to allow the proposed Hotel on the site of the Garage at the Bulldog junction to go ahead, will the Leader please outline how the Council intends to respond to this unwanted development?”

**The Chairman of the Planning Committee, Councillor E O’Hara replied as follows:**

“The Council refused planning permission for two planning applications, each proposing a hotel of 172 bedrooms on the VW garage site at the Bulldog junction. The applicants appealed to the Secretary of State and a public inquiry was held on 18 to 21 February 2008. The appointed inspector upheld both appeals and issued a decision letter on 27 March 2008.

I am extremely disappointed at this outcome. The only action an authority can take is to challenge a decision through the High Court where it considers there is a legal basis to do so. Unfortunately, Appeal decisions cannot be challenged on their planning merits.

Officers have already sought the advice of the barrister who led our case to see whether there was a legal basis for a challenge through the High Court. He advised that he could see no legal flaw in the decision and therefore no basis for a challenge.

I regret there is no more that the Council can do so far as the appeal decision is concerned. There are, however, a large number of conditions on the permission which relate to the operation of the proposed valet parking and transport arrangements to the airport. I can assure this Council that we will do all we can to ensure that these conditions are strictly enforced.”

**In accordance with Standing Order 14.2, Councillor C.V. Strong asked the following supplementary question:**

“Will the On-Street Parking Partnership introduce parking controls in the area?”

**Under Standing Order 14, Councillor R.B. Colison-Crawford asked the following question:**

“Has the Council taken up Tetrapak’s offer to local authorities to install Tetrapak recycling facilities at designated ‘bring’ sites and, if so, when can we expect the collection of Tetrapaks to commence?”

**The Leader, Councillor J.D. Packman replied as follows:**

“Our legal team have already drafted a service level agreement for Tetrapak banks to be located at our bring sites. We are now awaiting a response from Tetrapak, which we hope will include a timetable for installation of the banks and we trust this will be as soon as possible.”

**Under Standing Order 14, Councillor L.E. Nichols asked the following question:**

“With reference to the “Your Council Tax 2008/9” leaflet circulated to all households, I note that the Use of Reserves figure of £1.047m does not include the following elements:

1. An estimate of the erosion in the real capital base arising from attributing all the interest earnings of £1.8m to revenue
2. The allocation of £272k of capital to “capital salaries”

Since both of these elements represent a real use of reserves, why are they not included in the statement presented to Council Tax payers?”

**The Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services, Councillor M.L. Bouquet replied as follows:**

“As stated in the published Reserves Policy, when the decision was taken to cease crediting the Capital Fund with interest, the value of the interest transfer was approximately £250k; with declining interest rates this will fall slightly. The decision was taken in light of healthy financial reserves and anticipated capital receipts. Spelthorne Borough Council has much healthier capital and revenue reserves than many other district councils in Surrey and this is due to the very efficient way in which this Authority manages its finances. At an annual rate of £272k it would, ignoring other anticipated expenditure, take approximately 70 years to draw down our current capital reserves. The Council's annual share of Right to Buy (RTB) receipts from A2 Housing offsets this draw down of capital resource; for 2007-08 RTB receipts were £441k. The impact of this change was not drawn out in the summary Council Tax leaflet as the net level of investment income credited to the revenue account was largely unchanged, and in the tight constraints of the space of the summary Council Tax leaflet, there was not room to go into all the detailed ins and outs of movements on the revenue account. The non-crediting of a reserve is not a use of a reserve. The allocation of £272k, which represents approximately 3% of direct employee costs to capital, was not drawn out in the summary Council Tax leaflet as the estimated figure is unchanged from 2007-08 and therefore does not impact on how the revenue budget had moved, which is the focus of the summary Council Tax leaflet.”

**In accordance with Standing Order 14.2, Councillor L.E. Nichols asked a supplementary question on the following lines:**

At the Performance Management and Review Committee on 4 March 2008, I submitted written questions about capitalised salaries and what the CIPFA financial guidance was on calculating such capitalised salaries budgets. Will the Portfolio

Holder for Corporate Services confirm that the Council will continue to observe the CIPFA guidance on this in future?

**The Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services, Councillor M.L. Bouquet, responded as follows:**

“I have noted the points made by Councillor Nichols, and I will ask the officers to investigate.”

**Under Standing Order 14, Councillor I.J. Beardsmore posed the following question, which in his absence was read out by the Mayor:**

“How many planning applications for 10 or more dwellings were submitted in July 2007? On what dates were they submitted and when did they come to the Planning Committee? Are any still outstanding?”

**The Chairman of the Planning Committee, Councillor John O’Hara replied as follows:**

“The number of planning applications for 10 or more dwellings submitted in July 2007 was nine. One was subsequently withdrawn and the remaining eight have been determined. I will not burden Members and the public by reciting the detailed information requested on each application. I will however arrange for Councillor Beardsmore to be sent the detailed information and also have it recorded in the minutes.”

The information requested is set out below:-

APPL NO	ADDRESS	PROPOSAL	DATE RECEIVED	CTTEE DATE	DELEGATED DATE (IF REFUSED)
07/00753/FUL	89-93 Vicarage Road Sunbury on Thames Surrey TW16 7QB	Demolition of 91 & 93 Vicarage Road and erection of a building with 3 floors incorporating 14 dwellings, access drive, car parking, car port/bin and cycle store building and landscaping.	31.07.2007		15.10.2007
07/00742/FUL	46 Station Crescent Ashford Surrey TW15 3HJ	Erection of five no. two bedroom terraced houses and eight no. one bedroom flats within two no. two storey attached blocks, together with vehicular access and parking following demolition of existing bungalow.	31.07.2007	09.01.2008	

Council, 24 April 2008 - Continued

07/00725/FUL	211-215 Staines Road West Sunbury on Thames Surrey TW16 7BH	Erection of part two storey, part three storey building to provide 14 no. 2 bedroom flats with associated amenity space, cycle store, parking (partially undercroft) access from Scotts Avenue and new boundary wall following demolition of existing dwellings.	30.07.2007	10.10.2007	
07/00723/FUL	147-153 Charlton Road And Front Part of 143-145 Charlton Road Shepperton Surrey TW17 0RL	Demolition of 147, 149, 151 and 153 Charlton Road and erection of 13 dwellings with associated parking and access onto Charlton Road (Amended Proposal, Amended Plans, Amended Address)	30.07.2007	05.12.2007	
07/00708/FUL	22-26 Exeforde Avenue Ashford Surrey TW15 2EF	Demolition of existing properties and erection of a 3 storey block of flats comprising 6 no. 1 bedroom and 6 no. 2 bedroom units. Provision of associated parking spaces.	26.07.2007		12.10.2007
07/00662/FUL	217- 219 Charlton Road Shepperton Surrey TW17 0SG	Demolition of existing dwellinghouses and erection of 6 no. 2 bedroom terrace houses, 2 no. 2 bedroom semi-detached houses and 2 no. 4 bedroom semi-detached houses. Creation of new access and associated parking.	10.07.2007	10.10.2007	
07/00651/FUL	467-473 Staines Road West Ashford Surrey TW15 2AB	Demolition of existing dwellings and erection of a block of 13 flats. Creation of new access and associated car parking area	10.07.2007	12.09.2007	
07/00469/FUL	77 Worples Road Staines Surrey TW18 1HJ	Demolition of existing bungalow and outbuildings, and erection of a 2-storey building incorporating 10 flats, with ancillary access and parking.	03.07.2007	09.01.2008	
07/00676/OUT	Land To Rear Of 85-89 Upper Halliford Road and 1 and 2 Chestnut Grange Upper Halliford (with access of Annett Close).	Erection of a 3 storey building comprising 12 apartments, with associated vehicular access, car parking and landscaping.	23.07.2007	13.11.2007	

07/00741/FUL	51-53 Poplar Road Ashford Surrey TW15 1EJ	Erection of two storey block fronting Poplar Road to provide 4 no. 2 bedroom flats, and part two storey part three storey block to the rear of the site to provide 5 no. 2 bedroom flats and one no. 2 bedroom house with associated access amenity space and parking for both following demoliiton of existing bungalows.	31.07.2007 (Application Withdrawn 22.10.2007)		
--------------	---	--	--	--	--

**Under Standing Order 14, Councillor Mrs C.E. Nichols asked the following question:**

“This question is with reference to the Executive decision of 15 January 2008 that a Leader's task group be set up to work with officers on the draft specification of the Grounds Maintenance Contract. Given that the Liberal Democrat group has been denied the opportunity to participate in the drafting process on both the Leader's task group and the scrutiny task group, will the Leader please give an update on the draft specification of the Grounds Maintenance Contract. Have all the milestones for week 22 of the project been met?”

**The Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People Services, Councillor Mrs D.L. Grant, responded as follows:**

“Thank you for your question Councillor Nichols.

You may not be aware that the Executive also received a report on 12 February 2008 with an updated Gantt chart, which updates that of 15 January 2008.

In reference to week 22 of the revised schedule, we are about two weeks behind, but we have a leeway of about five weeks built in to the schedule, which will enable us to catch up. The reason for the delay is that officers have, as I am sure you are aware, successfully taken on the highway verge maintenance from Surrey County Council. This work had been anticipated to start on 21 January 2008 but couldn't start, for logistical reasons, until mid March 2008. A new schedule is being finalised and will be presented to future working groups.”

**In accordance with Standing Order 14.2, Councillor Mrs C.E. Nichols asked the following supplementary question:**

“Could we have an early Seminar on the outcomes, so that all Members can have the opportunity to feed into the process?”

**The Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People Services, Councillor Mrs D.L. Grant, responded as follows:**

“I will keep this in mind if assistance is needed. However, at the moment all boxes have been ticked.”

**132/08 APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEES TO CHARITIES**

**(1) Appointment to serve as a Nominative Trustee on the Ashford Relief In Need Charities.**

It was proposed by Councillor J.D. Packman and seconded by Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley and

**RESOLVED** that Mrs. Mary Haarer of 71b Parkland Grove, Ashford be appointed as a Council Nominative Trustee to Ashford Relief in Need Charities for a four year term of office.

**(2) Appointment of two representatives to serve as Representative Trustees to the Staines Parochial Charity.**

It was proposed by Councillor J.D. Packman and seconded by Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley and

**RESOLVED** that Councillor E. O'Hara and Mr Alan Collins of West Lodge, Ridgemean, Englefield Green, be appointed as Council Representative Trustees to Staines Parochial Charity, each for a four year term of office.

**133/08 THANKS**

The Leader, Councillor J.D. Packman thanked Councillor A.P. Hirst, the outgoing Mayor, for his stewardship and year in office in presiding over the proceedings of the Council.