

DRAFT

**Minutes of the meeting of Surrey County Council's
Local Committee in Elmbridge held at
4.00pm on Thursday 14th June 2012 at
Elmbridge Borough Council**

Surrey County Council Members

- * Mr Michael Bennison (Chairman)
- * Mr Nigel Cooper
- * Mrs Margaret Hicks (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Ernest Mallett
- A Mr Anthony Samuels
- * Mr John Butcher
- * Mr Peter Hickman
- * Mr Ian Lake
- * Mr Thomas Phelps-Penry

Elmbridge Borough Council Members

- * Cllr Barry Fairbank
- * Cllr Jan Fuller
- * Cllr Ramon Gray
- * Cllr Stuart Hawkins
- * Cllr Peter Harman
- * Cllr Neil Luxton
- * Cllr Dorothy Mitchell
- * Cllr John O'Reilly
- * Cllr Karen Randolph

PART ONE

IN PUBLIC

1/12 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN [Item 1]

The Committee noted that the Council had appointed Councillor Michael Bennison as Chairman and Councillor Margaret Hicks as Vice Chairman.

2/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 2]

There was one apology from Councillor Anthony Samuels.

3/12 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 3]

The Minutes of the meeting held on 27 February 2012 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

Councillor Neil Luxton requested clarification on Manor Road's inclusion on the Local Speed Management Plan and it was agreed that this would be provided outside of the meeting.

4/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

Councillor Stuart Hawkins declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 in that his wife worked for Surrey County Council and undertook some youth related work.

Councillor Neil Luxton declared a personal interest in agenda item 13 in that he lived on one of the roads due to be considered.

5/12 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 5]

The Chairman noted that Councillor Alan Hopkins had stepped down from the Elmbridge Local Committee and, on behalf of all Members, thanked him for his work during 2011/12.

6/12 APPOINTMENTS OF ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL CO-OPTED MEMBERS [Item 6]

The Committee noted that Elmbridge Borough Council had nominated the following nine Borough Councillors and six substitutes to serve on the Local Committee for the municipal year 2012/13. It was confirmed that Surrey County Council's Chief Executive had agreed the nominations.

Members of the Committee:

Councillors J. Fuller, R. Gray, S. Hawkins, D.M. Mitchell, J. O'Reilly, P. Harman, N. Luxton, Mrs. K. Randolph and B. Fairbank.

Substitutes:

Councillor Mrs. R. Mitchell, J.A. Vickers, E. Cooper, R.J.M. Lyon, C.R. Sadler and A. Davis.

7/12 PETITIONS & LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION [Item 7]

Three letters of representation were submitted as follows:

Ockham Lane, Cobham – Request for HGV Restriction

A petitioner spoke at the Committee to request that Surrey County Council introduce a 7.5 tonne Heavy Good Vehicle (HGV) weight limit on Ockham Lane. The petitioner explained that due to Ockham Lane's close proximity to the motorway, it was frequently used as a cut-through despite not being suitable for such traffic. The Committee was informed that the lack of a public footpath combined with a narrow road made HGV use of Ockham Lane a particular hazard to other traffic, pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. The petitioner added that the Guildford Local Committee had already introduced a 7.5 tonne HGV weight limit on the Guildford section of the road and urged the Elmbridge Local Committee to do the same.

The Local Highway Services Group Manager, Richard Bolton, outlined the officers response, as contained in the agenda. He stated there were low numbers of collisions on the Elmbridge section of Plough Lane / Ockham Lane, with only three recorded injuries within the last three years and that none of collisions had involved HGVs. It was added that Old Lane was currently subject to an existing 7.5 tonne weight restriction throughout its length and that the introduction of a weight restriction in Guileshill Lane and the Guildford section of Ockham Lane would effectively prevent HGVs from entering Plough Lane / Ockham Lane in Cobham, other than for access. As HGVs would not be able to proceed beyond the junction of Old Lane, it was felt that there was no need for a weight restriction to be placed on the Elmbridge section of Ockham Lane / Plough Lane and that the existing bans would create a self-enforcement effect.

A number of Members expressed their support for the petitioners and the proposed HGV ban. It was felt that advisory signs would not deter some HGV drivers and that a complete ban on both sections of the road would be the best solution.

RESOLVED: That

- i. the letter of representation be noted;
- ii. the officer response be noted;
- iii. the same 7.5 tonne weight restriction on Ockham Lane agreed by the Guildford Local Committee on 21 March 2012 be implemented on the Elmbridge section of the road.

DRAFT

Elm Tree Avenue, The Dittons – Request for Carriageway Repair

A petitioner spoke at the Committee to request that Surrey County Council urgently rectify a number of road safety failings on Elm Tree Avenue. The petitioner stated that since submitting the petition the County Council had attended and many of the reported issues had been fixed. However, it was felt that the petition was still required in order to bring attention to the fact that the process for reporting and fixing highway problems was slow. There also remained some potholes that needed attention and it was requested that details of these be passed to the Highways Team.

The Local Highway Services Group Manager accepted the list of outstanding potholes and stated that the information would be passed back to the Highways Team. It was explained that Surrey County Council did rolling checks on the road network and that required work was prioritised based on the type and severity of damage before being scheduled in. However, damage would often occur in-between official checks and the County therefore urged residents to report highway problems using the official website or by phone. The Local Highway Services Group Manager added that his team had to adhere to strict criteria when prioritising repairs.

RESOLVED: That

- i. the letter of representation be noted;
- ii. the officer response be noted.

Weston Avenue, West Molesey – Request for Traffic Calming

A petitioner spoke at the Committee to request that Surrey County Council implement traffic calming measures on Weston Avenue to address speeding motorists. It was explained that the same petition had been submitted to the Elmbridge Local Committee in September 2011 and that the Committee had initially encouraged residents to use Community Speed Watch to combat the problem. However, in the months that had passed, petitioners did not feel that the problem had been addressed and had therefore requested that the Local Committee reconsider the matter. In the interests of promoting and encouraging public engagement, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman had agreed to this request.

The lead petitioner stated that Weston Avenue was used as a “rat run” by motorists, many of which drove at high speeds. Data from the Community Speed Watch campaign had indicated that average speeds were between 37 and 51mph. Whilst residents had been encouraged to park on the road to slow traffic, many felt this could potentially lead to their vehicles sustaining damage. It was also reported that residents did not feel that the Police were making use of the data obtained by

DRAFT

residents and that incidents were not being taken seriously. The lead petitioner stated that additional 30mph signage at both ends of the road and the introduction of a single chicane would help address the problem.

The Local Highway Services Group Manager informed the Committee that the view of the Highways Team remained unchanged and that officers did not support the request.

The County Council collision database, supplied by Surrey Police, of personal injury collisions showed that there has been one personal injury collision in Weston Avenue itself (2006) and three at the junction with Hurst Road (two in 2006 and one in 2010) in the past five years. Based on the data available, it was felt that it would not appear to be value for money to install traffic calming measures. The Local Highway Services Group Manager added that department for Transport policy did not allow Local Authorities to place repeat 30mph signs where there existed residential street lighting as the lighting itself indicated the legal speed limit.

Councillor Ernest Mallett stated that he was concerned with the current situation in Weston Avenue and would support the introduction of a single chicane and a 30mph speed limit painted on the road. Councillor Nigel Cooper also urged the Committee to consider taking some form of action.

Councillor Stuart Hawkins stated that whilst he understood resident's concerns, the Committee had to acknowledge that the area was one of industry and restricting access had the potential to damage local businesses. As a result, he stated he could not support the introduction of a chicane. Councillor Ian Lake also stated that he was unable to support the petition and discouraged Members from attempting to design traffic schemes at Committee.

The Local Highway Services Group Manager stated that it was his understanding that speed limits painted on the road were only meant to be located where there was a speed limit change and would therefore not be appropriate for Weston Avenue.

Following a vote, the Local Committee agreed not to take any action.

RESOLVED: That

- i. the letter of representation be noted;
- ii. the officer response be noted.

One petition was submitted as follows:

Tartar Hill Footbridge – Request not to remove the structure

Note: This petition was taken immediately before item 11.

A petitioner spoke to the Committee to request that Surrey County Council consider reinstating Tartar Hill Footbridge. The petitioner stated that the bridge provided a safe crossing point for pedestrians and that its removal would create safety concerns. The petitioner added that, if the bridge's removal was unpreventable, the only alternative that would be supported would be the installation of a fully controlled pedestrian crossing.

RESOLVED: That

- i. the letter of representation be noted;
- ii. the petition be considered during consideration of item 11.

One officer response was submitted in relation to a petition submitted at the previous meeting:

Westcar Lane, Hersham – Request for Traffic Calming Measures

A letter of representation was received at the meeting on 27 February 2012 requesting that traffic calming measures be introduced on Westcar Lane, Hersham, to prevent speeding.

The Local Highway Services Group Manager outlined the response to the petition, as contained in the agenda. It was explained that Westcar Lane had been added to the Boroughs Speed Management Plan and that speeds would be monitored on a six monthly basis with additional enforcement carried out. The Police had also agreed to place a temporary Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) in Westcar Lane on a rotational basis as part of their ongoing speed management programme. The police would also provide random speed enforcement and offer Community Speed Watch training through their regular panel meetings.

The Committee discussed whether the introduction of signs stating that the road was unsuitable for HGVs would be beneficial but ultimately felt that they would provide little value.

RESOLVED: That

- i. the officer response be noted.

With the permission of the Committee, one late letter of representation was admitted to the agenda:

Ash Island – Request for Residents of Ash Island to be included in the Area G Permit Scheme

A petitioner spoke at the Committee to request that residents of Ash Island be made eligible for resident parking in permit zone G. The petitioner explained that at the last meeting of the Local Committee members had agreed not to include Ash Island residents in permit zone G as there was a concern that there would be insufficient parking for other residents. However, residents were now having to park their car a considerable distance from their homes, despite there being plenty of spare capacity within zone G.

Councillor Nigel Cooper stated that he was aware of the concerns and that, provided there was capacity for all residents, he supported the petition.

The Parking Project Team Leader, Rikki Hill, stated that the original intention had been to include Ash Island residents in permit zone G and officers would therefore support such a decision.

RESOLVED: That

- i. the letter of representation be noted;
- ii. the Parking Officer's verbal response be noted;
- iii. residents of Ash Island be included in eligibility for permits in the Area G permit scheme;
- iv. the County Council's intention to make the above change and amend the relevant traffic regulation orders be formally advertised, and subject to statutory consultation;
- v. any unresolved objections to the advertised proposals be dealt with according to the council's constitution.

8/12 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 8]

There were two public questions received as set out in Annex A with the answer. Supplementary question were asked and answered on these questions.

9/12 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 9]

There was one member questions received as set out in Annex B with the answer.

Councillor John O'Reilly stated that he was not happy with the answer provided, particularly as it implied that the signs never existed. He stated that there was no question that the signs had been removed by Surrey County Council and requested that they be replaced. It was agreed that Councillor Margaret Hicks would discuss the replacement of the signs with Councillor O'Reilly outside of the meeting.

10/11 LOCAL COMMITTEE PROTOCOL [Item 10]

The Community Partnership and Committee Officer for Elmbridge, Damian Markland, informed Members that the Local Committee was able to make minor variations to the Standing Orders set out in the Council's constitution in order to improve public engagement at meetings. This was referred to as the Local Protocol and the wording that had been agreed for the municipal year 2011/12 was attached for reference. The Community Partnership and Committee Officer suggested that the Committee may wish to add an additional paragraph to the Local Protocol which would allow it to consider more than three petitions without having to suspend standing orders. Members agreed with the proposal.

RESOLVED: That

- i. the Local Protocol set out in Annex A of the report be agreed for the municipal year 2012/13, subject to the inclusion of the following paragraph:

"The Chairman reserves the right to consider more than three petitions at a single meeting, should they consider it to be in the best interests of residents"

11/12 PROPOSALS FOR THE PERMANENT REMOVAL OF A307 TARTAR HILL FOOTBRIDGE, PORTSMOUTH ROAD, COBHAM [Item 11]

The Committee received a report from the Highway Structures Team Leader which outlined proposals for the removal of Tartar Hill Footbridge in Cobham.

It was explained that the footbridge had been hit by an overheight vehicle on 23 January 2012. There were no pedestrians on the bridge at the time but the main span had been damaged and was to be removed for safety reasons. Prior to this incident, the bridge was last

DRAFT

hit in March 2010 but the 2012 strike was the first one to result in severe damage.

The collision in January prompted consideration of whether it was appropriate to continue to maintain a sub-standard footbridge, particularly given the low proportion of pedestrians that chose to use it. Based upon available data, Surrey County Council did not consider it appropriate to continue to maintain a footbridge in this location and the footbridge was therefore due to be removed. It was confirmed that alternative crossing facilities would be installed to replace the bridge, with the cost of this covered by structures budget.

Whilst the decision concerning the removal of the bridge was one that could be taken by officers, it was felt that the Local Committee should be involved in the development of alternative crossing facilities.

Councillor John Butcher raised concern that officers were able to take the decision to remove the bridge without having to seek Committee approval. In particular he drew reference to Part 3 of the Council's constitution (Section 3) which stated that officers may not "declare land or property surplus to requirements".

In response, the Highway Structures Team Leader stated that having sought legal advice, "property" was taken to mean real-estate and therefore not applicable to Tartar Hill Footbridge. She assured the Committee that the decision did rest with officers and that the purpose of coming to Committee was to both keep Members informed and ensure that they could have input into the development of alternative crossing arrangements.

Councillor Butcher stated that irrespective of whether the decision was constitutionally permissible, he was not comfortable with the way in which the process had been handled. Whilst he welcomed the opportunity for the Local Committee to help determine alternative crossing facilities, he was worried that having to wait for the next available meeting for a decision could potentially result in a situation where pedestrians had no suitable crossing point.

Councillor Dorothy Mitchell stated that provided a fully controlled pedestrian crossing was installed, she did not believe the bridge was necessary. Councillor Jan Fuller agreed, stating that the nature of the bridge made it unsuitable for many individuals anyway, particularly those with reduced mobility.

RESOLVED: That

- i. The content of the report be noted;

DRAFT

- ii. Officers put together detailed proposals for a controlled pedestrian crossing facility for consideration and agreement by the Local Committee;
- iii. Subject to (iv), the Local Committee delegate consideration and agreement of the proposed controlled pedestrian crossing to the Area Team Manager (in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant Borough Members) should a decision be required before the next meeting of the Elmbridge Local Committee;
- iv. The matter be brought back to the Elmbridge Local Committee should a controlled pedestrian crossing facility not be feasible.

12/12 HIGHWAYS UPDATE – PROPOSED 2012/13 PROGRAMME [Item 12]

The Committee received a report from the Local Highway Services Group Manager which set out proposed budget allocations for the development of the 2011/12 programme.

The Officer outlined the report and explained that Members had made it clear at a workshop that they wished to allocate £40,000 to each Division in addition to their Community Pride budget. The proposals contained in the report provided a pragmatic approach to how this could be achieved whilst also providing the facility to undertake schemes of high priority across the Borough.

The Chairman of the Elmbridge Local Committee stated that he fully supported the proposals set out in the report and felt confident that the proposed budget allocations would give local Councillors much more control over the type of work carried out in their respective areas. He stated that it was important that County Councillors worked closely with Borough Councillors to identify required work and suggested that Members put together a clear spreadsheet to assist highway officers. The Chairman also proposed that Members should have until the end of November 2012 to allocate funds to projects and that, after this point, the local highway engineer have permission to use unallocated funds as they saw fit.

Following concern that not all Members would have time to identify all highway issues that required attention, the Chairman explained that the local highway engineer would also be providing Members with potential schemes and that the proposals simply gave local councillors more control over spend.

In response to a question from Councillor Peter Hickman, the Local Highway Services Group Manager informed the Local Committee that

DRAFT

unallocated Community Pride funding from 2011/12 had been rolled forward into 2012/13 on a Member basis.

In response to a question from Councillor Jan Fuller concerning missing school warning signs on Leatherhead Road, the Local Highway Services Group Manager stated that he would chase.

Councillor Peter Harman informed the Committee that he was very interested in seeing the development of the parking area at Weybridge Station (on the south side of the railway line) and wondered whether the proposed introduction of a crossing facility on Brooklands Road could be combined with this wider work. He suggested that a meeting between Surrey County Council's Highway team, South West Trains and Elmbridge Borough Council would be beneficial. Highway Services Group Manager stated that this sounded sensible and that he would feed back the request.

RESOLVED: That

- i. The proposed revenue allocations in Table 1 of the report be agreed;
- ii. The proposed capital Integrated Transport Programme in Table 2 of the report be agreed;
- iii. The principles of the capital maintenance budget be agreed;
- iv. Further to (i) and (ii), authority be delegated to the Area Manager in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair and locally affected Members to amend budgets throughout the year if required to ensure the budget is allocated and spent in a timely manner;
- v. the proposed Community Pride allocation per Member be agreed;
- vi. A cut-off point of End November 2012 for any unallocated funds to be reallocated if appropriate elsewhere in the Borough be agreed;
- vii. Should a County Member not respond within two weeks to a proposed project put forward by the Maintenance Engineer, the Maintenance Engineer be permitted to proceed.

13/12 PARKING UPDATE [Item 13]

The Committee received a report from the local Parking Project Team Leader which asked Members to consider minor amendments to the parking controls in Elmbridge and provided an update on progress in other areas.

Councillor Ian Lake informed the local Parking Project Team Leader that some residents in Pine Grove had concerns over the proposed introduction of double-yellow lines, particularly as many had expressed their dislike of the proposals during the prior consultation. The officer stated that the proposals were currently being formally advertised and that residents had a statutory period of 28 days to object. This applied equally to other residents potentially affected by the new parking scheme. Any objections would be considered and discussed with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant Borough Members. The Parking Project Team Leader also informed Councillor Neil Luxton that he was aware of the issues concerning bus clearway markings in Walton and was looking into the matter.

RESOLVED: That

- i. The residents of 15, 15A and 19 Bridge Road be removed from eligibility for permits in the East Molesey CPZ and included in eligibility for permits in the Area G permit scheme (in Hurst Road, Riverbank and Feltham Avenue);
- ii. Business permits A be renamed business permits G;
- iii. The county council's intention to make the above changes and amend the relevant traffic regulation orders be formally advertised, and subject to statutory consultation;
- iv. Any unresolved objections to the advertised proposals be dealt with according to the council's constitution;
- v. Bus stop clearways be installed in the bus stand in Central Square, West Molesey at any time and at the bus stops outside Oak Lodge and 1Embercourt Road and next to Imber Cross in Embercourt Road, Thames Ditton between 7am and 7pm);
- vi. The outcomes of the informal consultations detailed in Annex A be noted.

14/12 APPROVAL OF YOUTH SMALL GRANTS BIDS [Item 14]

The Committee received a report from the Assistant Director for Young People which requested that the Local Committee consider the applications received for the Youth Small Grants Allocation and make decisions on the allocation of funding.

The Youth Contract Performance Officer, Jeremy Crouch, explained that as part of the transformation of Services for Young People, the Local Committee had been allocated a Youth Small Grants fund to deploy for the year 2012/13. The Committee were asked to approve the officer recommendations as set out in Appendix B of the report.

Following a question from Councillor Margaret Hicks, the officer explained that the Youth Task Group would be responsible for overseeing the use of the money once allocated and that Members on the Group may wish to visit organisations to see how the projects were progressing.

RESOLVED: That

- i. The bids received be noted;
- ii. The recommendations as set out in Annex B of the report be agreed.

15/12 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT [Item 15]

The Committee received a report from the Chairman which set out the work of the Elmbridge Local Committee and the wider work of the Community Partnership Team in Elmbridge during 2011/12.

RESOLVED: That

- i. The report be noted.

16/12 REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES / TASK GROUPS [Item 16]

The Committee received a report from the Community Partnership and Committee Officer for Elmbridge which requested the appointment of Local Committee Members to outside bodies and task groups for the 2012/13 municipal year. The report also requested that the Local Committee agree the terms of reference for its task groups.

DRAFT

RESOLVED: That

- i. Councillor Margaret Hicks be appointed to represent Surrey County Council on the Elmbridge Community Partnership for the municipal year 2012/13;
- ii. Councillor Ernest Mallett be appointed to represent Surrey County Council on the Elmbridge Business Network for the municipal year 2012/13;
- iii. The terms of reference for the Elmbridge Parking Task Group and the Elmbridge Youth Task Group, as set out in Annexes A & B of the report, be approved;
- iv. The Chairman, Vice Chairman and Borough Portfolio Holder for Highways be appointed to the Elmbridge Parking Task Group for the municipal year 2012/13;
- v. County Councillors Margaret Hicks, Nigel Cooper and Ernest Mallett, and Borough Councillors Ramon Gray, Barry Fairbank and Peter Harman be appointed to the Youth Task Group for the municipal year 2012/13.

17/12 LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING [Item 17]

The Committee received a report from the Community Partnership Team Leader (East) which set out the funding available for Local Committee County Councillors' allocations and community safety for 2012/13, and requested that the Local Committee give consideration to the funding requests received. The report also provided a summary of the projects that the Local Committee's member allocations funded in 2011/12

RESOLVED: That

- i. The summary of the local committee's Member Allocation expenditure in 2011/12 as detailed in section 2 of the report be noted;
- ii. The items presented for funding from the Local Committee's 2012/13 revenue funding as set out in section 3 of the report be agreed;
- iii. The items recommended for funding from the Local Committee's 2012/13 capital funding as set out in section 3 of the report be agreed;
- iv. The expenditure previously approved by the Community Partnerships Manager and the Community Partnerships Team

DRAFT

Leader under delegated authority, as set out in section 4 of the report, be agreed;

- v. Any returned funding and/or adjustments, as set out within the report and also in the financial position statement at Appendix 2, be noted;
- vi. That the community safety budget of £3160 that has been delegated to the Local Committee be transferred to the Elmbridge Community Safety Partnership and that the Community Partnership Manager authorise its expenditure in accordance with the Local Committee's decision, as detailed in section 5 of the report.

The meeting concluded at 18:20.

Chairman's signature

APPENDIX A

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 14 June 2012

AGENDA ITEM 8

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question 1 : Tony Palmer, Weybridge Society Transport Panel

The committee will remember that the Weybridge Society presented a petition in February 2010 regarding transport issues in Weybridge.

Our most recent opinion survey shows that the concerns of Weybridge residents expressed at that time still remain, with the highest concerns being:

1. Improving road maintenance, including drains and potholes;
2. Restricting through traffic by large/articulated HGVs, possibly by regulation or charging;
3. Safer road design, for example the Station roundabout and Heath Road bend;
4. Safer footpaths, for example Heath Road, and;
5. Improving Public Transport

Especially given the impending application by Morrisons for another large store in Weybridge, for which there will no doubt be a proposal for large HGV movements to supply the store, can we ask the Committee to commit to finding ways to exclude articulated HGV through traffic from Weybridge? Particularly from the B roads (Heath Road, Hanger Hill, St Georges Avenue and Brooklands Road) which are too narrow for such unnecessary traffic.

Please note that we still have not had a formal response to our Feb 2010 petition and we would ask that a response to this specific question on HGVs be followed by answers to the other points.

The Chairman will give the following response:

Further to receipt of the petition to the Local Committee in 2010, it is understood that a meeting was held with the Weybridge Society involving Highways Officers to better understand the issues and develop a way forward. It was understood that the petitioners were content with this approach rather than officers providing a response at the following Committee.

Since the meeting two phases of restructure have taken place and there are several vacancies within the Team which are being recruited to. It is proposed that once these are filled and the new Area Team Manager takes up his post at the end of July there should be scope for a meeting between a representative of Highways and the Weybridge Society, if this is required.

APPENDIX A

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 14 June 2012

AGENDA ITEM 8

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question 2: Gerald Gilbert, Weybridge

Surrey is reputed to have the worst roads in England, with a repairs backlog of £400 million in highways and £250 million in associated structures. While this backlog is being cleared, further deterioration will take place, and slow down the recovery programme. The expenditure by existing contractors is running at some £40 million a year, and the five-year Medium Term Financial Plan for Capital and Revenue Expenditure on Highways does not suggest that the backlog will be cleared for a long while, if ever.

Does this Committee have a breakdown of the backlog within Elmbridge in terms of mileage and estimated cost; and can it give residents any assurance of when the backlog will be cleared and normal routine service resumed?

The Chairman will give the following response:

Work has recently been undertaken to identify the carriageway backlog in each district and borough in Surrey. As a result I can confirm that Elmbridge has a backlog estimated at £30m within a range of figures from £12m minimum to £69m maximum.

Capital programmes continue to be prioritised in accordance with criteria approved by the Cabinet and investment is based on need assessed across the County. We are currently promoting the introduction of an extended, five-year programme of works to provide efficiencies and greater certainty of funding but it is unlikely that we, or any other authority, will seek to completely remove the backlog. Instead we will seek to achieve a manageable backlog for our various highway assets, including carriageways, with appropriate lifecycle strategies in place to ensure they are then suitably maintained.

APPENDIX B

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 14 June 2012

AGENDA ITEM 9

MEMBER QUESTIONS

Question 1 : Cllr John O'Reilly, Elmbridge Borough Council

The "Welcome to Hersham" signs that greeted visitors when they approached Hersham from the Seven Hills roundabout were removed a number of years ago in preparation for significant infrastructure work in the area. The signs have yet to be replaced.

Could the Chairman inform the Committee where the signs currently reside and when they will be restored?

The Chairman will give the following response:

There are a number of existing signs that officers feel are sufficient for purpose. There appears to be no record of any missing.

Members would be advised that excessive signage can create confusion to highway users and should only be installed where there is an evidenced need.