

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Woking LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 6.00 pm on 6 March 2013  
at Woking Borough Council Civic Offices, Gloucester Square, Woking GU21  
6YL.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Mrs Liz Bowes (Chairman)
- Mr Mohammed Amin
- \* Ben Carasco
- \* Will Forster
- \* Mrs Linda Kemeny
- \* Mr Geoff Marlow
- \* Mrs Diana Smith

**Borough / District Members:**

- \* Cllr John Kingsbury (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Cllr Tony Branagan
- \* Cllr Bryan Cross
- \* Cllr Kevin Davis
- \* Cllr Tina Liddington
- \* Cllr Derek McCrum
- \* Cllr Richard Wilson

\*In attendance

---

**PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT ITEMS**

The meeting was preceded by a public engagement session. The notes of this session are set out in Annex 1.

**1/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Mr Mohammed Amin gave apologies for absence.

**2/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes of the last meeting held on 5 December 2012 were agreed with a correction made on page 11 to the name of a member of the public from Cllr Hennessey to Mr Hennessey. The minutes were then signed.

**3/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of pecuniary interests.

#### 4/13 PETITIONS [Item 4]

In accordance with Standing Order 65, Mr Malcolm Cuckow presented the following petition on behalf of local residents. The petition received 43 signatures.

Residents within the Close are anxious to have road repairs undertaken urgently before a major accident occurs at the junction of Dean Close and Old Woking Road.

Related issues are:-

1. Car travel over the affected area is very uncomfortable for the passenger but, equally important, damaging to car suspensions unless great care is taken.
2. The road is subject to ponding and in the present weather conditions could freeze and be invisible to users, if covered with a sprinkling of snow - the worst possible condition at a major junction. It is an accident waiting to happen.
3. The whole situation has been very much aggravated by the residents of Ellesmere, leaving 3 cars permanently parked on the road thus reducing the exit/entry to Dean Close to single way working.

Mr Cuckow introduced the petition and showed the committee some photographs of the condition of the road. He noted that over the past 20 years there have only been a few repairs undertaken and these have since broken down leaving an unstable road base. Over time the road surface has stretched and there are a number of deep pot holes. When there is heavy rain, the road becomes flooded, and residents are concerned that if this freezes the junction will become very dangerous. The petitioners would like essential road works to be undertaken.

The Chairman invited Andrew Milne to respond. Andrew explained that, subject to committee approval later on in the agenda, the road would be resurfaced by the end of the summer.

The Chairman thanked the petitioner for coming.

In accordance with Standing Order 65, Mrs Libby Davis presented the following petition on behalf of local residents. The petition received 47 signatures.

The road surface in Holyoake Avenue is full of potholes, and also very uneven. These potholes require constant repair by the council, resulting in yet another small patch of tarmac, leaving the rest to deteriorate to the point where one of us complains, and the process starts again.

The surface has also subsided in many places, making the problem much worse. Therefore even if the potholes were all remedied the surface would still be uneven and difficult to drive over.

There is also a real risk of damage to vehicles, and injury to pedestrians who may wish to cross the road.

Residents have been advised that plans are in hand to resurface the left hand side of the road (looking towards the end of the cul-de-sac). Whilst this would be an improvement, it will not address the potholes and uneven surface on the right hand side. To the best of my knowledge, no one living in Holyoake Avenue can remember the road ever having been resurfaced, and it is high time these problems were sorted out once and for all.

Mrs Davis introduced the petition, showed some photographs, and explained the residents' concerns. Cars tend to park on the right hand side of the road, which means the left hand side is heavily used. Since the recent snow, the potholes have got worse. It would also be useful if the pavements could also be reviewed as some elderly residents have tripped.

The Chairman invited Andrew Milne to respond. Andrew explained that, subject to committee approval later on in the agenda, the road would be resurfaced later in the year, hopefully before the end of the summer.

Cllr Davis asked for clarification as to whether the proposed works covered just the road, or whether the pavements were included as well. Andrew Milne understood that it was just the road, but would provide clarification to Members outside the meeting.

The Chairman thanked the petitioner for coming.

In accordance with Standing Order 65, Mrs Coffey presented the following petition on behalf of local residents. The petition received 114 signatures.

Hermitage roundabout serves as a major route leading towards Woking, Guildford, Chobham and St Johns. In the mornings especially it is very busy. There are no pedestrian crossings or traffic lights anywhere at this roundabout. Pedestrians find it very difficult to cross the roundabout at these busy times. The roundabout also lies on a way to the Winston Churchill School and many students have to cross this dangerous crossing without any protection. Children often have to run to avoid the cars coming around the corner because there is also limited visibility on some corners. Disabled people would not be able to cross this roundabout safely. There is more and more traffic and the situation is unlikely to get any better. This petition invites the council to consider a safe pedestrian crossing with a traffic light on all corners of Hermitage roundabout.

Mrs Coffey introduced the petition and explained that the changes that have recently been made to the roundabout were helpful for pedestrians and had increased visibility, but there was still an issue with cars not slowing down at the roundabout and people not using their indicators. Disabled people really struggle with crossing the road.

The Chairman invited Andrew Milne to respond. Andrew explained that the committee had also recently approved a reduction in the speed limit to 30mph, which should have helped pedestrians. As the works to the roundabout have only just been completed, it is recommended that the works are left a while before reviewing them. If speeding continues to be an issue then this would be taken up with the police for enforcement.

It was agreed that an item would be added to the forward plan for 6 months time to see how the changes have worked, and look at what supplements might be possible longer term if required.

The Chairman thanked the petitioner for coming.

#### **5/13 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

Three member questions were received and tabled. A copy of the questions and answers can be found in Annex 2 of these minutes. Supplementary questions and responses are set out below:

**Question 1:** Mr Thomas explained that planning permission was granted more than 3 years ago. Condition number 19 required the developer to carry out certain roadworks under a S278 agreement. Why are you now negotiating another S278 agreement – was a S278 never signed? The Chairman agreed that a response would be given in writing outside the meeting.

**Question 2:** Cllr Barker asked what the timescales were for Thames Water to repair the drains, and the improvements at Brewery Road. Andrew Milne explained that the council does not have legal powers over Thames Water to expedite works. Regarding Brewery Road, an answer would be provided outside the meeting.

#### **6/13 WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

Three member questions were received and tabled. A copy of the questions and answers can be found in Annex 3 of these minutes. Supplementary questions and responses are recorded below.

**Question 1:** Will Forster asked the Chairman if she believed that the bus stops in Old Woking High Street mitigated the impacts of the developments at Gresham Mill; and under the response to New Central (b), where has the £223,000 been spent or will be spent? The Chairman agreed a written answer would be given outside the meeting.

**Question 2:** Will Forster asked what sanctions would be available if the 6 month timescale is not met. Andrew Milne suggested that he thought this was an aspirational deadline, and would get a written response outside the meeting.

**Question 3:** Cllr Davis commented that he was grateful that something is being done. He also noted his concern that with new developments the drainage system may not be able to cope.

## **7/13 A322 BROOKWOOD CROSSROADS CORRIDOR CONGESTION ISSUES [Item 7]**

[The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8.10pm to enable members of the public to make comments in relation to the congestion at the A322 Brookwood Crossroads. The meeting reconvened at 8.22pm.]

Iain Reeve introduced the officer report which set out possible options to address congestion on the A322 in the vicinity of Brookwood Crossroads, including available funding streams, and responded to comments made by members of the public during the adjournment. Additional information requested by the Chairman in advance of the meeting was also presented, which set out the costings of a possible study of the A322 corridor, and also possible timings, assuming that funding could be made available.

Member comments are summarised below:

- Blackhorse Road is used as a rat run to avoid the crossroads.
- Why did the Highways Planning Application for both the homes and the school not say there would be a serious traffic impact? A response would be given outside the meeting by relevant officers.
- In addition to Brookwood Farm, there are also approx 100 new houses being built in the vicinity of the crossroads which haven't been taken into account.
- Cars can often queue for 20 minutes on A324 at Brookwood.
- Need to look at modal shift, especially for journeys for 1.5 to 2 miles.
- Need to look at smaller solutions as well as larger ones, and an update for members on the proposal of box junctions on the A322 was requested outside the meeting.

Members agreed that something needed to be done at this location, and that 2019 was too far away for action to be taken. There is already congestion on this movements corridor, and members expect it to get worse with the Brookwood Farm development, new school and other local developments and action needs to be taken. Members wanted to see a scheme developed as soon as possible, and were concerned about the assumption that the local transport body was the only source of funding. Members requested that all funding avenues should be looked into, and a request should be made to the Cabinet Member for Transport for an A322 corridor study to be carried out. Members would also welcome inputting suggestions for possible solutions into the study.

Cllr Kingsbury noted that the committee would like Surrey County Council to pay for the study, but if this was not possible, then he would welcome Surrey to come back to Woking Borough Council to see if there would be any possibility of partnership funding.

### **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee (Woking) recommended:

- i) That an A322 corridor study is carried out, to be funded by SCC (the study boundary to be defined but suggested from Limecroft Road to Fox Corner), in accordance with the timescales set out at Committee, and that the report of

the study is brought back to Local Committee within 12 months, subject to the approval of the Cabinet Member for Transport. The study should include identifying possible sources of funding for any identified improvements to the corridor.

### **8/13 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 8]**

Andrew Milne introduced the report which updated members on the delivery of highway schemes and set out for agreement the 2013/14 capital maintenance schemes programme. It was noted that an updated annex 1 had been circulated. Andrew explained that the report did not include LSTF funded schemes.

Mr Carasco asked for an update outside the meeting on which scheme replaced the suspended Victoria Way scheme, asked for confirmation that money that is not fully utilised by the end of the year is not lost, and asked for assurance that the Albert Drive scheme is about traffic management not just traffic calming.

In response to member comments, Andrew Milne confirmed that works on both Holyoake Avenue and Holyoake Crescent would be carried out at the same time if possible.

### **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed to:

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes;
- (ii) Note that a further Highways update report is to be brought back to the next meeting of this Committee.
- (iii) Agree the capital maintenance proposals for 2013/14 (set out in annex 1 as updated), subject to the anticipated provision of capital funding requesting that the works for Holyoake Avenue and Holyoake Crescent are carried out at the same time if possible.
- (iv) Approve the delivery of additional capital maintenance works from the list shown in Annex 1 as updated as a contingency plan in the event of any ITS schemes not being deliverable, or there being an underspend of the ITS capital budget, and to delegate authority to the Area Highway Manager to determine any additional capital maintenance works in consultation with the Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

### **9/13 PROPOSED BUS STOP CLEARWAY IN THE BROADWAY WOKING [Item 9]**

Andrew Milne introduced the report which sought the committee's approval to create bus stop and bus stand clearways in The Broadway, Woking.

The following questions were raised, which would be responded to outside the meeting:

- Could the bus stop outside the Fire Station be included?
- What is the progress with moving the bus stop under the canopy?

- Could the private hire drivers be given some advance notice to let them know about the changes?

## **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed:

- i. That bus stop clearways be introduced in The Broadway at the existing bus stops adjacent to the Railway Station, the restriction to be 'at any time'.
- ii. That a bus stand clearway be introduced in The Broadway at the existing bus stands situated between Duke Street and Locke Way, the restriction to be 'at any time'.

## **10/13 SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE LOCAL PREVENTION COMMISSIONING 2013-15 [Item 10]**

Jeremy Crouch introduced the report which set out recommendations from the Youth Task Group for the Local Prevention Framework for the period 1 September 2013 to 31 August 2015. An amendment to the figures set out in the report was noted – this was as follows: the amount in paragraph 1.4 was amended from £151,000 to £133,000, and paragraph 1.5 was amended from £25,000 to £18,000.

It was explained that if approved, the specification would be written up into a prospectus for potential providers, which would be shared at a providers event on 18 March at Brooklands Museum. It was confirmed that all Woking schools had been invited to the provider event.

In response to members' comments on progress of the current Local Prevention Framework contract, it was noted that a full progress report would be brought to the June meeting of the Committee. Members were concerned about the current performance of the contract and the Chairman requested a further update on progress in May. Mrs Smith also requested some anonymised case studies setting out how the current contract has helped young people in Woking.

Regarding the geographical areas highlighted in Annex 1, Members requested that these be used as a guide, rather than hard lines.

## **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee (Woking):

- a) Approved the allocation of £10,000 to Personalised Prevention (see para 1.3a for details).
- b) Approved the local needs specification (Annex A) to be considered by providers focusing on the identified needs of Woking and the geographical neighbourhoods prioritised by the Youth Task Group.
- c) Requested an update be given to the next private meeting of the Local Committee on 23 May 2013.

## **11/13 LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING - MEMBERS ALLOCATIONS [Item 11]**

The Chairman drew the Committees attention to the tabled addition, which included bids which had arrived after the report was published but were eligible for decision by committee, and an amended amount for Wilson Way footpath.

### **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed:

- (i) Agreed the items presented for funding from the Local Committee's 2012/13 revenue funding as set out in paragraph 2 of this report and the tabled additions.

Phoenix Cultural Centre - £5,000  
Woking District Scouts - Handicamp - £3,000  
Woking Malayalee Cultural Association - £3,078  
Woking Malayalee Association - £840  
St Michaels Church and Community Hall - £3,604  
The Oaktree School - £2,580  
Westfield Primary School - £954  
Grit Bin – East Hill/Mayhurst Ave - £1,000  
Woking People of Faith - £1,500  
All Saints' Church Woodham - £1,107  
Grit Bin – Birnham Road/Clinton Close - £1,000  
Byfleet Heritage Society - £3,000  
St Mary's Church Byfleet - £3,000  
Brooklands Museum - £3,000  
Dot Sign Language Ltd - £3,500  
Surrey Care Trust - £521  
Old Woking and District Community Association - £3,851  
Eden Grove Allotment Society - £1,000  
Barnsbury Primary School - £1,000  
St Mary's C of E Primary School - £3,000  
Park Road Neighbourhood Watch - £100  
Mayford Village Hall - £2,360  
Walton Road footway - £1,000  
Wilson Way footpath - £4,713  
Beacon Hill Grit Bin - £1,000  
Orchard Mains Grit Bin - £1,000

- (ii) Noted the expenditure approved since the last Committee by the Community Partnerships Manager and the Community Partnerships Team Leader under delegated powers, as set out in paragraph 3.

## **12/13 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 12]**

Noted as in the report with the addition of an update report on the Hermitage roundabout petition in six months time.



As this was the last meeting of the municipal year, given the County Council elections on 2 May, members gave thanks to Diana Smith and Geoff Marlow, who were at the committee for their last time before stepping down. All committee members were thanked for their work this municipal year.

Meeting ended at: 9.50 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

## Annex 1

### Notes from Public Engagement Meeting

#### 1. Open Public Question Session [Public Engagement Item 1]

##### **Question 1:** Mr Malcolm Head

There is traffic chaos along Victoria Way where traffic is squeezed into one lane by the fire station.

Andrew Milne explained that they are aware of the issues and there is an ongoing project to link the traffic signals along Victoria Way. There are also other alterations in the pipeline linked with the new development. Further written clarification would be given outside the meeting.

##### **Question 2:** Cllr Melanie Whitehand

Parking outside the Knaphill Lower School is an issue, which could become worse with the new development. Could the County Council deliver cones to the school so they could be put out before and after school?

Mrs Kemeny has taken up the parking issues at Knaphill Lower and Junior schools with officers and will follow up on the response outside the meeting.

##### **Question 3:** Mr Godfrey Chapples

The site of the former Manor School in Byfleet has been vacant for over 5 years. What is proposed for the site and if a scheme is envisaged, will there be a public consultation? There is a great need for school places and something must be done.

The Chairman advised that a written response would be given outside the meeting.

##### **Question 4:** Mr Kemp

Regarding Chobham Road crossing - Please could I have clarification on:

1. Who is responsible for the works?
2. What is the timetable of events?
3. Will highway related safety measures be addressed including the speeding issue.

The Chairman advised that a written response would be provided outside the meeting.

##### **Question 5:** Cllr Tina Liddington

Could I please have clarification on whether the traffic signals on Lockfield Drive/Victoria Way have been changed, or will be changed?

Andrew Milne confirmed that the project with traffic signals was on going. He noted that a compromise needed to be reached between all highway users and this was being looked at.

**Question 6: Mrs Kemeny**

Regarding the Travel Plan at the Marist School – it has been agreed that there should be a pelican crossing in Old Woking Road. When will this work be done and what has caused the delay?

Andrew Milne explained that this is part of the LSTF works and preliminary works have been done. A response would be given outside the meeting which will clarify the reason for delay and expected timings.

**Question 7: Cllr Cross**

Regarding the amended right of way that will be implemented by Blockbuster in the town centre, has modelling been done to see the effect on traffic coming past the fire station, and if so what did it show?

Andrew Milne explained that these works are connected to the development and will be funded by the developer. Transport Development Planning will be asked to provide a response outside the meeting.

**Question 8: Cllr Kingsbury**

Could the speed of response of the pedestrian crossing by the market in the town be made longer? Do we need the lights at Forge End?

Andrew Milne would ask Traffic Signals to provide a response for Councillors outside the meeting.

**Question 9: Cllr Hussain**

There are two springs in Anchor Hill causing congestion, as well as a potential accident site.

Mrs Smith explained that Cllr Hussain should speak to Chris Higgs. The problem has been checked by the water board, and it is the householders' responsibility.

**2. Update on Woking Library [Public Engagement Item 2]**

John Case and Jennifer Burke gave a presentation on Woking library and its usage since it was refurbished and reopened last June. A survey with users has been carried out, and the results were shared with the committee. The public reaction has been excellent and book issues have increased dramatically. One area that the public were concerned about was signage to the library, and the County are working

with the Borough Council to improve this, which will include a 3d sign above the entrance.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- The moving display board behind the customer services desk is for the public to use.
- Links have been made with the Job Centre to try to do more to help the unemployed.
- Signage within the library could be improved. It was noted that staff are being encouraged to walk around the library to engage more widely with members of the public.
- Surrey was the first authority to introduce a virtual tour of the library.
- The meeting room will be sound proofed. When this is done it will be available as a meeting room, and could be used for member surgeries.

Members welcomed the presentation and noted the very positive feedback on the library, and the Chairman thanked John and Jennifer for attending the meeting.

### **3. Surrey Fire and Rescue Update [Public Engagement Item 3]**

Charles Fairfull introduced the report which set out the key points in the next Public Safety Action Plan for the county covering the period 2013-16. It was noted that there are no plans at present to remove the second pump from Woking. A new location for the fire station in Woking has been identified, but is currently still confidential.

During discussions, the following points were noted:

- The current proposal is that the two pumps at Woking will be whole time, but this is subject to change in line with any subsequent review of Public Safety Plan.
- Throughout the county there is close working with other blue light services, for example, the Police work out of Chobham and the Ambulance Service work out of Reigate. There are currently no plans at this time for the new station at Woking to be joined up with other blue light services.
- The service works with the regional paramedic Hazardous Area Response Team (HART) unit which can get to the same hazardous areas as the fire service to administer treatment and care where necessary.
- The Fire Service intends to carry on supporting Junior Citizen.
- The service has an active manager for volunteers, and this is working well.

Members welcomed the presentation and the Chairman thanked Charles for his presentation.

This page is intentionally left blank



**LOCAL COMMITTEE  
(WOKING)**

**WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

**6 MARCH 2013**

**1. Question from Mr Richard Thomas**

Can you advise when the outstanding SCC work will be complete by the developer? We were advised that the work was to be delayed until the Olympic bike ride was over that was July 12.

**Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:**

I understand that you are talking about the Anchor Trust Development at West Hill, off Parvis Road, West Byfleet.

Surrey County Council (SCC) expected the developer to complete the S278 Agreement so that they could begin the highway works on Parvis Road once the Olympic bike race had finished in 2012, in accordance with the condition on their planning permission. However, various issues relating to the terms of the county council's standard agreement have been raised by the developer's solicitor. SCC's legal team are working with the developer to resolve these issues. The senior enforcement officer at Woking Borough Council is being kept up to date with the situation and we are all working together so that the agreement can be completed as soon as possible enabling the developer to begin works on Parvis Road.

**2. Question from Cllr Ann-Marie Barker**

Could Highways please tell me what action has been taken in response to my question to the previous local committee three months ago in respect of 'puddling' problems at the following locations:

- the lower part of Church Hill, Horsell
- the junction of Brewery Road with the Arthur's Bridge Road roundabout, Horsell
- Brewery Road, Horsell outside the entrance to the WWF building site
- the pedestrian crossings over Chobham Road and then Victoria Way into Woking town centre
- the pedestrian crossing over Victoria Way by the Lightbox into Woking Town Centre

**Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:**

In the previous Woking Local Committee meeting, the following response was provided to these issues:

“It is not the case that resurfacing work, or making amendments to the highways network, generally causes drainage problems. The opposite is usually the case.

During the design and implementation of major maintenance schemes on the highway, the site will be inspected, and if there are any existing drainage problems, an effort is made to address these as part of the resurfacing work, both by making minor adjustments to the profile of the new surface, and also by making minor or significant improvements to the drainage system. Where schemes on the highway involve changes to kerblines, or the introduction of features such as dropped crossings, the design process takes levels into account to ensure effective drainage.

It is not possible or practical to ensure that there is never any ponding on the public highway, and it is evident that after heavy rain, ponding will occur. What is critical is the scale of ponding, and the length of time water remains on the public highway for. Resources are prioritised towards those instances of ponding that affect public safety, or the ability to reasonably enjoy the use of the highway.

To ensure that problems of this nature do not continue, it is important that instances of concern are reported to Surrey Highways as soon as possible through the existing reporting systems (including the Surrey website), so that individual sites can be assessed by local Highways staff and appropriate action taken.”

Since the last Local Committee meeting, jetting has been carried out to address the ponding occurring at the lower part of Church Hill, Horsell, and the junction of Brewery Road with Arthur's Bridge Road roundabout, Horsell. Both of these locations are linked, and the cause of the ponding has been identified as a defect in the main Thames Water drain that the highways



drainage system feeds into. This matter has been taken up with Thames Water to ensure that repairs are carried out.

Initial investigation of the limited ponding outside of the entrance to the WWF building site has been carried out by the Community Highways Officer (CHO), Matt Borrie. This work is ongoing.

No notable ponding has been observed at the remaining sites raised as concerns, but these sites will be monitored by the CHO, and remedial action taken if required.

### **3. Question from John Bond**

I understand that Surrey County Council have changed the criteria used to decide whether a planning application affects the highway. If so, can you please advise me of the changes?

#### **Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:**

The County have not changed the criteria used to decide whether a planning application affects a highway. There has been a shift in advice provided at a national level in relation to the consideration of transport impacts arising from development, and it might be this that the question is alluding to.

In March 2012, the Department for Communities and Local Government produced a revised suite of National Planning Policy, which swept up many separate documents into one called the National Planning Policy Framework. This now provides the context and basis upon which all development plans are produced, and planning applications considered. It starts with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through all aspects of planning. It provides specific advice on the Transport elements contributing to achieving this aim in Section 4, which is headed "Promoting Sustainable Transport". Paragraph 32 clearly states that "development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe." This introduced the concept of "severe" impact, as being the measure against which transport effects are assessed, and this relates to transport impacts arising directly from the development, not where there might already be severe problems on the existing networks.

This page is intentionally left blank



**LOCAL COMMITTEE  
(WOKING)**

**MEMBER QUESTIONS**

**6 MARCH 2013**

**1. Question from Will Forster, Surrey County Council**

Developer contributions in the form of Section 106 money and the new Community Infrastructure Levy are there to mitigate the impacts of developments and reduce the gap between the cost of providing the new infrastructure to support new housing and mainstream Council funding sources.

Developer contributions from one development will never cover the full cost of the infrastructure needed to support that development.

Please could Surrey County Council confirm how much funding it has already, and/or has committed to spend in future, to mitigate the impacts of each of the following developments:

Brookwood Farm,  
Gresham Mill,  
Hoe Valley,  
Moor Lane and,  
New Central?

**Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:**

Section 106 of the Planning Act was introduced as a means to enable mitigation of the impacts of new development on services, facilities and amenities providing that the need could be proven and a relationship shown

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/woking](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/woking)

between the development and the requirement secured in the legal agreement. In some instances, generally on significant strategic sites or for very large developments, the total cost of infrastructure provision would be met through the Section 106 or direct provision would be made by the developer, for example, provision of new roads, schools or community buildings. Central Government has now introduced new legislation that provides for Planning Authorities to collect monies through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). While part of the evidence for setting a charge under CIL relates to the infrastructure funding gap the demonstrable link between the scheme and the infrastructure to be built using the monies collected is broken; as viability is taken into account it is not expected that the CIL will provide all the infrastructure requirements of an area and alternative funding sources need to be pursued. Woking BC is aiming to have its CIL Charging Schedule in place by 1 April 2014 which is the statutory cut off date after which monies for infrastructure will not generally be permissible under Section 106. The CIL is a charge that once adopted by Woking BC will apply to some new development applications submitted post adoption. The Council is currently consulting on its Draft Preliminary Charging Schedule.

The CIL will apply to developments that are commenced after it has been formally adopted.

The transport impacts of the listed developments were or, in the case of Moor Lane are, being assessed under the current pre-CIL planning obligations regime. Generally the Council seeks direct delivery of any necessary mitigation or works rather than having to design and audit the scheme to cost it. In this way the entire cost of the scheme is met by the developer rather than the Council taking the risk of a shortfall in funding which would threaten delivery.

The main transport-related planning obligations that were secured for the listed development sites are briefly summarised below. Moor Lane is not included in the list as the planning application has yet to be decided.

#### Brookwood Farm

- (a) new fourth arm on Bagshot Road / Redding Way signal junction and associated works,
- (b) secondary site access onto Coresbrook Way,
- (c) signal controller, software, timing and vehicle detection improvements at Bagshot Road / Redding Way and at A322 / A324 Brookwood Crossroads junctions,
- (d) upgraded bus stops on Bagshot Road,
- (e) new path from development site towards Brookwood through new country park.

#### Gresham Mill

- (a) upgraded bus stops on Old Woking High Street.

#### Hoe Valley

Associated with the housing development on the part of the site by Elm Bridge:

- (a) replacement of Elm Bridge on A247 Kingfield Road,
- (b) improvement to Kingfield Road / Westfield Avenue junction, including A247 right-turning lane and widened side-road junction,
- (c) improved pedestrian and cyclist facilities in both Kingfield Road and Westfield Avenue.

(Note, the borough council would probably consider the Hoe Valley flood relief, new community buildings and environmental works to be themselves very substantial community benefits).

#### Moor Lane

(Not applicable, as undecided planning application).

#### New Central

- (a) £1.5million towards pedestrian tunnels at Victoria Arch,
- (b) £223,000 towards mitigation impact on the highway,
- (c) office / residential travel plan(s) including monitoring fees,
- (d) dedication of land on A320 Guildford Road towards highway corridor improvements
- (e) new signal junction including pedestrian facilities / improvements at the Station Approach / Guildford Road (Heathside Road) junctions, including MOVA and removal of existing Guildford Road pelican crossing,
- (g) radius / pedestrian-crossing Improvements at the railway aggregates yard access opposite 1 Guildford Road,
- (h) new Guildford Road lay-by outside the Tesco store.

## **2. Question from Will Forster, Surrey County Council**

Please could the Local Committee Chairman confirm if the Albion Square Canopy re-development has meet Surrey County Council's highway standards and therefore been finally signed off and formally adopted into the public highway?

### **Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:**

Surrey County Council's Transport Development Planning have been working with Woking BC in trying to bring the previously installed works up to the required standards. Although works are ongoing, they are not yet completed and therefore do not meet adoptable standards.

It is, however, envisaged that the remedial works will be completed and formally adopted within about six months.

## **3. Question from Cllr Kevin Davis, Woking Borough Council**

Various sections of Connaught Road, Brookwood frequently suffer from flash floods when there is prolonged or heavy rain fall. This happens the length of Connaught Road, especially at the crossroads, central areas, the junction with Connaught Crescent and by the Pirbright railway bridge.

Blackhorse Road also suffers severe flooding and this can be especially dangerous at the crossroads when freezing conditions are experienced.

Is there any reason why this happens at these locations and is there anything that can be done to limit the impact?'

**Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:**

The issue of flash-flooding is something that affects many locations, both across the County, and Nationally. In general, drainage at locations that are low-lying or flat, or reliant on water soaking away into the ground, are most sensitive to this type of flooding. In the case of Blackhorse Road, for example, the amount of rainfall that has occurred over the last year (the second wettest year on record) has saturated the ground and raised the water table. In consequence, water which normally soaks away into the surrounding ground is unable to do so, and instead builds up in the ditches until their capacity is exceeded. The junction of Blackhorse Road with Saunders Lane has been raised with our central Drainage Team for inclusion on the 'wetspots list' so that a more thorough investigation can be carried out, with a view to identifying any potential drainage improvements that could be made. This list is prioritised so that the most needy sites across the County are dealt with first, and at this time it is not possible to confirm how long it will be before this site will be reviewed.

With regard to Connaught Crescent, the flooding issue has now been resolved. A blockage was identified in the drainage system installed to address polluted water emanating from the nearby Timber treatment premises, and this has now been cleared by Woking Borough Council.

There are a limited number of things that can be done to limit the impact of severe rainfall on the public highway. The capacity of the drainage system can be increased where practicable and necessary, and assessing and delivering this type of improvement is the purpose of the wetspots programme. Regular maintenance of the drainage systems is also important, as is regular sweeping of the public highway to prevent material from being deposited in drainage systems. Residents can also assist by taking a proactive approach, both by maintaining ditches they are responsible for, and also doing simple things such as brushing away any build up of leaves or pine needles from gully gratings where it is safe to do so, as this can often allow ponded water to immediately escape.