

## **Minutes of Steering Committee No 58, Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> September 2025,**

### **By Teams Video, 6.45pm to 8.15pm**

**Present:** Mike Kelly (Chair), Alan Sloan, Melanie Frobisher, Terry Barnett, Debbie Garland, Fred West

- 1) Apologies for Absence;** Albert Jamieson, Erik Juul-Mortensen
- 2) Approval of Minutes of Meeting No 57;** Approved
- 3) Declaration of personal interest in topics to be discussed;** None.
- 4) Designation of Committee members following AGM;**  
The following responsibilities were unanimously agreed by the Committee;
  - a) Mike Kelly; Chairman
  - b) Alan Sloan; Vice Chairman
  - c) Fred West; Finance
  - d) Debbie Garland; Secretary and Trees/ Hedges
  - e) Melanie Frobisher; Publicity and Membership
  - f) Albert Jamieson; Parking and Speed Limits
  - g) Eric Juul-Mortensen; Business and Commerce
  - h) Terry Barnett; Honorary Member and initial review of Planning applications
- 5) Accounts:** A report on financial activities was presented to the Committee and approved. There were various outgoing administration expenses for running the Committee and some initial costs associated with the Central Area Hub Project during the month'
- 6) Membership:** The number of members for whom we now hold e-mail addresses is 377
  - b) Volunteer drive:** Amanda Willis at EGVRA has said she will be having a stand at the Refreshers event in October at RHUL and asked if we want her to ask for volunteers for our projects. Mike to reply.
  - c) Publicity and website:** Melanie to sort out the website this month
- 7) NDHA update:** See attached report
- 8) Parish Council - Community Governance Review:** See attached report
- 9) Projects arising from the Neighbourhood Plan**
  - a) Parking, CPZ, Speed Limits:** See attached report
  - b) Liveable neighbourhoods, National Cycling route 4:** Consultation was supposed to start in August. Nothing seen yet
  - c) Transport Hub:** The S278 agreement is agreed and submitted along with the fees. We await Surrey CC ratifying it. Alan and Mike have visited Bill Kear, the selected contractor, and they are now preparing a contract for the works based on a B of Q and prices agreed earlier. Once these documents are signed, Bill Kear will proceed with method statements, work permissions and the like in preparation for carrying out the work.
  - d) Trees and Hedges Project:** An application for grant funding has been made to RBC CIL fund for the first phase of the hedge and trees project. This is no longer specifically for Bond Street but is renamed the 'Trees and Hedge Project'. The grant application proposes that, should we be awarded the grant, we discuss with

RBC where the Project is executed and allow them to choose from a number of sites that were recommended in the NP.

Debbie has agreed to look after this project if it progresses.

- e) **Forest Estate gardening project:** a document entitled 'Estate Improvement Policy' authored by RBC has been identified by Debbie (see attached). This could be used to agitate for improvements such as the Gardening Project. Mike and Debbie to discuss.

#### **10) Planning**

The Phone mast has been passed apparently.

None of the Planning applications listed in the agenda appear to be contentious.

Terry Barnett has agreed to continue to have a first look at incoming Planning Applications and report if he feels any need further examination and a response. It was agreed that all Planning Applications in the month should be listed in the agenda, whether contentious or not .

#### **11) AOB.**

None

**Next Meeting-** Monday 13th October 2025 at 7.30 p.m. at the Village Centre (note later time)

## **Update for EGVNF Steering committee meeting on 11 September**

1. **NDHA's** - Mike Corbett at RBC has confirmed that the revised NDHA list will go to the Planning Committee meeting on 24 September for final approval.

2. **Speed limits:**

**Priest Hill** - Marisa Heath reported at the July Councillors' Surgery meeting that legal agreement has been reached between SCC and RBWM regarding the bottom 100m of Priest Hill, which falls within Windsor and Maidenhead. The recent accident involving a car, horses and riders, with the death of a horse might cause the process to be expedited.

**Prune Hill - 60mph to 30mph** - out for consultation

**Bakeham Lane to Callow Hill - 40mph to 30mph** - out for consultation

**St Jude's Road (Middle Hill to the A30) - 30mph to 20mph** - part of SCCs 2025/26 integrated transport scheme programme – experience suggests that this will be delivered across 2 financial years (includes undertaking surveys in roads across Englefield Green)

**Outside schools (Bagshot Road and Barley Mow Road)** - sadly no interest by school Heads due to lack of resources

3. **Local Cycling, Walking and Infrastructure Plans (LCWIP)** - at the July Councillors' Surgery meeting Marisa reported that consultation would commence in August. Hopefully this would inform our proposals for any one-way systems in Englefield Green. Nothing further has been heard and therefore I will request an update at the Councillors' Surgery meeting on 13 September.
4. **Progress towards establishing a Parish Council in Englefield Green** - initial consultation period closes on 15 September. As of 10 September, there had been 564 responses to the survey. Approximately 6416 residents were eligible to respond and therefore to date a response rate of just under 9% has been achieved. The next stage, following consultation, is for RBC Officers to develop draft recommendations and present them to the Corporate Management Committee (CMC) and Full Council for approval during the period 16-23 October. These will take the consultation responses into account, along with the statutory criteria, government guidance and best practice. Once approved by the CMC and Full Council, the Draft Recommendations are

published, and a second public consultation commences (3 November – 15 December). This sets out the specific recommendations and invites responses to support or disagree with them. Respondents are invited to give additional evidence to support their views where relevant.

5. **Barbara Clark House** - Update expected at the Councillors' Surgery meeting on 13 September.
6. **Former Birchlands Care Home** - contract awarded to 'Places for People'. Now in detailed design stage. I will request an update at forthcoming Councillors' Surgery meeting including, if known, dates for construction and the Highways improvements.
7. **HMO's** – RBC officers are producing an HMO licensing report which will go to Committee in December. A copy of the report will be available prior to the meeting. I will request an update from Cllr Trevor Gates at Councillors' Surgery meetings. Separately, on 24 July, Jack Rankin MP said he thought there might be a way to fast track the Article 4 direction process and I awaiting to see a copy of his advice.

Alan Sloan

10 September 2025

## **FINAL MEETING NOTES**

**Present: SCC Cllr. Marisa Heath, SCC Parking Peter Wells, and members of the PPP Group Cllr Trevor Gates (RBC EG East), Albert and Sean     Apologies: PPP Group members Mel, Jill, Steve and Cllr Andrea Berardi (RBC EG East)**

### **SCC 2025 Runnymede Parking Review**

**The group's proposals for EG were confirmed and noted as per the Statement of Reasons, all obviously fully supported bar a minor objection to the double-yellow line link up proposed for the Southern end/East side of Harvest Rd – both support and objection comments will be submitted before the online deadline. Peter and Albert, in loco inspection post meeting, by Aug 28.**

**Two Disabled bays have been repainted in Harvest Rd and Alexandra Rd. We agreed at the time of our submissions that all bays can be painted out as part of the PR implementation (not just left to fade) because they are advisory only; everyone parks in them; and they are not enforced thereby being confusing to residents. Peter subsequently explained there is a process for blue badge holders to apply for bays and to have them repainted they must provide a copy of their badge and proof of residence in the road, he will investigate the specific instances. Peter, in loco and with SCC colleges, by Sep 15.**

**A short discussion took place on the council's position on pavement parking bans.**

### **CPZ/Permit Parking Project**

**Noted this will be a stand-alone project and not tied to the Parking Review processes, save for the understanding that legally the 2025 PR must run its course before any consultation on a permit parking scheme for the PPP area**

can be considered. Accordingly the timescale for the implementation of a permit scheme will be during 2026. All.

Peter Wells' idea for a residents permit parking scheme in the (slightly extended) PPP area, circulated prior to the meeting, was well received and endorsed bar several small modifications (see below), which were accepted subject to *in loco* inspections immediately post the meeting: -

Most boundary positions for the scheme are in order, only the Parsonage Rd and East end of South Rd signage possibly need adjustments. Peter and Albert, *in loco* inspection, by Aug 28.

The Armstrong Rd boundary slightly South of the North end/East side apartment household doors was noted - residents may still apply for permits if the address/postcode is Armstrong Rd. Exceptional cases can be considered. Peter, Sean.

The reasons for there being zero survey data for Parsonage Rd in the Mar/Apr 2025 survey were outlined, Albert provided the road's 2021 SCC survey results as noted at that time in Peter's SCC council report and the reasons for not implementing a scheme then. The Forum PPP group is opposed to its inclusion as there is no current evidence that Parsonage Rd residents support a permit scheme, unlike the rest of the surveyed area that had c. 80% support. Cllr Heath will survey Parsonage Rd in the coming weeks (copies of the Forum's September 2024 and March 2025 survey sheets to be emailed to her – Albert & Sean). Marisa, by Sep 14.

From the PCL report data the following was determined (circulated in prior correspondence): -

- *PCL assess the on-street parking spaces in the roads being considered for permitting as c. 153.*
- *PCL recorded parking stress in these roads as averaging 101% and 131% out-of-term and in-term respectively.*
- *If the objective of the scheme is to reduce parking stress to below 100% then at least 49 vehicles will be disallowed to park in the area.*

*Notes:*

*Per PCL Parking Supply (spaces) : Albert 24; Armstrong 18; Alexandra 21; South 38; Harvest 52 (26 for section between Victoria and South so this has been x2 for the total road) – TOTAL 153*

*Per PCL In/Out Term Parking Stress (%) : Albert 100/75; Armstrong 105/75; Alexandra 205/155; South 90/80; Harvest 155/120 – AVERAGES 131/101*

*Excludes Parsonage Rd and adjustments for position of permit area boundary on the west end of South Rd “*

**These numbers are indicative of possible approximate vehicle displacement of 49 and parking space supply capacity of 153. It is not unusual for permit schemes in existence elsewhere to issue permits in excess of available supply. Given the deficit of parking demand vs supply in the area this is a key reason to not initially include limited waiting bays at the outset and also to move the South Rd scheme boundary thereby maximising available permit capacity.**

**NB. Our PR submissions do create additional limited time spaces in Victoria St, not included in the scheme area.**

**The possible introduction of designated limited waiting time bays within the permit area will be held over until the 6-9 month review of the scheme once it is operational. Such bays can be “retrofitted” once there is proof of capacity. Peter, Oct 2027.**

**Without compromising the legal restrictions related to the ongoing Parking Review referred to above, it is possible to progress with design activity. Peter is happy there is now consensus on the scheme boundaries and some attributes (incl. below) and it is acceptable to now give consideration to and progress with more detailed design elements. He will accept input from the PPP Group on these elements with a view to presenting a fully packaged scheme to Cllr Heath for preliminary approval before the end of 2025. Since the end of the legal exclusionary period due to the PR is not fixed, it is ideal to have a ready to go scheme design for when this occurs and we will work towards this. PPP Group, Peter, Marisa by Dec 2025.**

**It was deemed prudent on a balance of pros and cons and the evident momentum, to work to the council’s latest guidelines for the implementation of such schemes with good resident support now being “What are compelling reasons to not implement...” and given this is a first step in a larger holistic solution to parking problems, not be delayed by lengthy minority**

**consultations i.e. it is envisaged this type of scheme will grow over time and other locations in the village and Egham are likely to spark off it. All**

#### **In Loco Inspections (post meeting)**

**Agreed that not joining up of the short section of double-yellows on Harvest Rd to be considered, thereby not losing 2-3 parking spaces.**

**The proposed permit scheme boundary on the West end of South Rd can be sited at the limit of the double-yellows coming from St Jude's Rd thereby incorporating some 10-12 much needed spaces into the scheme area.**

**The repainted Disabled bays on Harvest and Alexandra were noted. The procedure for this is that a Blue Badge holder must request it and provide a copy of their badge and proof of address nearby - a college in Peter's department handles this and he will investigate. Note: our PR request is to remove these and "paint them out" rather than leave them to fade, even though they are advisory only it causes confusion to residents and our survey indicated no blue badge holders in the areas concerned.**

**Loading zone outside the Happy Man noted as necessary.**

#### **General**

**The issue of on-street parking being given appropriate importance in SCC Highways Development reports, requested by RBC Planning for planning applications, particularly with respect to the central area, was raised with Peter re: Albert and Marisa's meetings with Mike Green and RBC Planning Policy. It's possible that on-street parking commentary may be falling through the cracks. Peter will raise it with Mike Green and Albert will raise it at the meeting being scheduled with RBC Planning DM. The objective is that awareness is heightened amongst the council officers and managers involved that EG is an on-street parking hot-spot, almost exclusively due to RHUL's poor enforcement of its parking strategy, policy and car park management. This was proven by the evidence collected and analysed by the RBC Planning Department commissioned Project Centre Ltd. report on which its PBSA Planning 2022 SPD was based e.g. parking stress in the village central area roads is above 100% in and out of RHUL term time. Peter, by Sep 15; Albert/Marisa at TBA RBC Planning DM meeting.**

**Per**

**Albert Jamieson**

# **RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

## **Estate Improvement Policy Review due: January 2027**

### **1. Introduction**

**1.1 Housing Services has an annual Estate Improvement budget to enable specific additional improvements to Council owned housing estates and blocks of flats.**

### **2. Aim**

**2.1 The aim of this policy is to: • Identify upgrades to communal parts beyond our day-to-day management of areas, using a transparent process that involves residents and benefits them. • Invest in enhancing bio-diversity on our housing estates. • Involve residents in the management and improvement of their estates and neighbourhood. • Publicise estate inspections and encourage resident involvement.**

### **3. Scope, definitions and legislation**

**3.1 Estate Improvements are an opportunity to improve the appearance of blocks, roads or an estate and can help improve residents' quality of life.**

**3.2 As the budget is funded by the Housing Revenue Account all proposals must benefit Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) tenants and the improvement should be on Housing land.**

### **4. Suitable Proposals**

**4.1 Some suitable projects are likely to be (not an exhaustive list); • Community gardens and landscaping • Railings and other new security features • Bike or buggy stores and racks • Bin shed/enclosures • Tables and benches • Pathways • Installation of solar panels • Recycling facilities • Cycle storage • Parking improvements**

**4.2 Approval of projects is subject to land ownership, building regulations and planning permission being considered. All proposals are considered on a case-by-case basis.**

### **5. Submitting a Proposal**

**5.1 Proposals can be made by RBC tenants and leaseholders, Councillors and Council Officers.**

**5.2 All suggestions should be made to the relevant Area Housing Manager in the Tenancy Services team, who will review the application and put forward a proposal.**

**5.3 The following will be taken into account when considering each proposal:**

**• Urgency of work • Anticipated cost of the proposal • The scope for the proposal to be funded from another source • Benefits of the proposal, including the number of residents who would benefit from it • Feedback from tenants impacted by the proposal • Severity of issue that proposal aims to address • Other projects that have been undertaken or are currently in progress in the location • Ongoing cost of maintenance and upkeep of the improved area and whether this has an impact on service charges.**

**5.4 RBC will complete an inspection when considering a proposal request. A panel comprising Head of Housing Technical Services, Head of Housing Services & Business Planning, Head of Tenancy Services and impacted tenants (if applicable) will consider any proposal. All impacted tenants will be informed as to the outcome of their proposal following the Panel meeting to consider requests received.**

**5.5 Although a preliminary decision will be made at this meeting, further investigation could mean a scheme is not feasible, due for example, to Planning restrictions, actual cost of delivering the scheme, extent of benefit, lack of resident support for proposal following consultation. All impacted tenants will be kept informed of any developments with their proposal, as it progresses.**

**5.6 Due to the limited budget available and the scale of preparations required, not all proposals may be taken forward immediately. They may need to be deferred to the following year and a programme of improvements will be established.**

## **6. Tenant and Leaseholder Engagement**

**6.1 Tenant and Leaseholder Engagement ensures we understand our residents' expectations, so we can deliver services according to their needs and priorities.**

**6.2 We will work with residents to help shape how services are provided and to ensure they can hold us to account.**

**6.3 Runnymede Council tenants have been consulted in the preparation of this policy.**

## **7. Monitoring and performance management**

**7.1 We aim to review this policy in three years to ensure it reflects current legislation and latest examples of best practice.**

**7.2 The Estate Improvement Budget will be monitored to ensure that the policy is fair, that expenditure is not disproportionate in one area and that schemes can be brought forward to ensure parity.**

**7.3 A 3 year plan will be drawn up to ensure that all areas are considered for improvements and officers and tenants are encouraged to bring schemes forward in unrepresented areas.**

**7.4 The Head of Tenancy Services will have responsibility for the management of the Improvement Budget.**

**7.5 The Housing Panel will consist of a minimum of 2 officers and will be convened within 7 working days of a proposal being made.**

## **8. Equalities Implications**

**8.1 In producing this document an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been carried out.**

**8.2 An EIA is a way of assessing the impact, or likely impact, that a particular policy, procedure or decision will have on particular groups. This is used to assess whether in making the decision whether the Council has complied with its public sector equality duty under S149 of the Equality Act 2010 (as amended) to; eliminate discrimination and any other conduct that is prohibited under this act and to advance equality between those who share a protected characteristic.**

**8.3 The screening found a full impact assessment is not required. As time goes on and projects are considered, data will be available on who was positively and negatively affected by decisions made.**

## **9. Related strategies/Documents**

**RBC's Climate Change Strategy**

**Information on the Planned Capital Programme**

## **10. Version Control**

<b>Version Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Amended</b>	<b>Comments</b>
-----------------------	-------------	----------------	-----------------

<b>Approved V1</b>	<b>November 2023</b>	<b>First draft</b>	
--------------------	----------------------	--------------------	--

<b>Author</b>	<b>Approved By</b>	<b>Date</b>
---------------	--------------------	-------------

<b>Abigail Travers</b>	<b>Housing Committee</b>	<b>completed January 24</b>
------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------

