



SURREY

COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of meeting

GUILDFORD LOCAL COMMITTEE

Date: THURSDAY 20 JANUARY 2005

Time: 7.00 pm (The formal Committee began at 7.30pm.)

Place: WORPLESDON MEMORIAL HALL, WORPLESDON RD.,
GUILDFORD

Members present:

Surrey County Council

Mr Nick Brougham (Guildford East)
Mr John Ades (Ash)
Mr Tom Sharp (Guildford South)
Mrs Mary Laker (Worplesdon)
Dr Joe Bullock (Guildford West)
Dr John Hobrough (Guildford North)
Mr Bill Barker (Horsleys)
Mrs Veronica Stiastry (Shalford)
Mr David Davis (Shere)

Guildford Borough Council (for Transportation matters)

Mr Keith Chesterton (Stoke)
Ms Vivienne Johnson (Christchurch)
Ms Jenny Wicks (Clandon & Horsley)
Ms Diana Lockyer-Nibbs (Normandy)
Mr Terence Patrick (Send)
Ms Marilyn Spier (Merrow)*
Mr Mike Nevins (Pirbright)
Mr Tony Phillips (Onslow)
Mr Tony Rooth (Pilgrims)*

* Substitute

The following issues were raised during the informal public questions session:

1. Spectrum Park and Ride, Bridleway 581 and works at Trodds Lane (Peter Hattersley)
2. Traffic issues in Stoughton (Nigel Horton – Chairman, Stoughton Action Group)
3. Traffic issues at Stoughton Railway Bridge (Mrs Pat Niven)
4. Traffic issues in Guildford town centre (Maurice Barham – Guildford Society)
5. Works at Trodds Lane (Keith Childs – Guildford Borough Councillor) (Cllr Childs' question and answer are appended to these minutes.)

All references to Items refer to the Agenda for the meeting.

IN PUBLIC

01/05 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Robert Blundell (substituted by Merilyn Spier) and Nigel Manning (substituted by Tony Rooth).

02/05 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (9 December 2004) [Item 2]

Agreed and signed by the Chairman.

03/05 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mary Laker declared a personal interest in Item 7, being a co-opted member of Guildford and Waverley Primary Care Trust. Terence Patrick declared a personal interest in Item 17, being a member of West Clandon Parish Council and a Member of the Clandon Society.

04/05 PETITIONS

None received.

05/05 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

A question was received from Burnham Clinton, Chairman of Pirbright Parish Council. The question and answer are appended to these minutes.

06/05 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Questions were received from Mike Nevins, David Davis and Tom Sharp. The questions and answers are appended to these minutes.

GENERAL MATTERS

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS FOR DECISION

07/05 SELF RELIANCE ANNUAL REPORT (ITEM 7)

Members thanked the Local Director for the report and made various comments:

- The need to review the formula set by SCC for funding of schools in relatively deprived areas and availability of other resources such as Connexions. The Committee to support efforts to increase this funding in deprived areas.
- Support for initiatives such as the North Guildford Children's Centre, Timebank and Credit Union.
- The need to address areas of relative deprivation in all wards.

08/05 WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (ITEM 8)

Elizabeth Finnis (Guildford Anti-Incinerator Network) was invited to address the Committee. She made a number of comments on each of the four Issues Papers, querying the methodology and accuracy of the research, and strongly advocating alternatives to incineration.

The Minerals and Waste County Development Manager outlined the process of consultation on the Waste Development Framework, noting that the consultation period had been extended until the end of February 2005 as three additional sites have been evaluated, and that comments can be made via the SCC website.

Jenny Wicks stressed the importance of the consultation process, but was concerned that the methodology used was flawed. She called for the weightings applied to the criteria in the papers to be reassessed, and only one of the sites suggested for safeguarding for waste development in Guildford borough to be safeguarded.

Tom Sharp argued that landfill should not be at the bottom of the waste hierarchy where inert materials were concerned. He said that incineration should be looked at on its merits, but that the apparent preference for incineration in the consultation papers should be toned down.

Joe Bullock questioned the fairness of the sites assessment when a disproportionate number of sites fell in Guildford borough (5 of the 19 sites identified for Surrey).

Keith Chesterton was disappointed that more progress had not been made on composting of waste, for which sites could be located in greenbelt areas. He said that incineration might not be needed in Surrey for another 15-20 years.

Vivienne Johnson suggested that every borough and district should be asked to identify a site for composting.

David Davis commented that all boroughs and districts had been written to ask if there were any sites within their areas that could be suggested but that few had offered any. He asked for people to put forward further sites if they knew of any.

The Minerals and Waste County Development Manager answered points raised in the discussion, emphasising the need for sites for facilities and the difficulty of finding suitable sites in Surrey. Veronica Stiastry (as Chairman of the Environment and Economy Select Committee) thanked Members for their views which will all be given consideration.

[Veronica Stiastry left the meeting.]

09/05 ADULT AND COMMUNITY LEARNING (ITEM 9)

Members made various comments:

Access to each of the two parts of the Guildford site is reasonable. Surrey County Council should consider reviewing its policy on adult and community learning.

The good facilities of the Harvey Road site (particularly the space available for students) should be retained in the future.

The service provides an excellent range of courses for developing key life skills.

10/05 LOCAL COMMITTEE CAPITAL ALLOCATION FOR 04/05 (ITEM 10)

Members agreed the proposals (as recommended) to fund the following schemes from the £35,000 capital allocation for the Local Committee:

Tongham Community Centre	£10,000
New Youth Centre	£5,000
Holbury St Mary Youth Hostel	£5,000
Teen Shelters	£10,000
Waterside Centre	£5,000

11/05 MEMBERS REVENUE BIDS (ITEM 11)

Members agreed the following proposals:

- £887 proposed by Mary Laker for a Riding for the Disabled scheme
- £2,000 proposed by Veronica Stiastry for the design of a possible picnic site on the Hogs Back
- £3,150 proposed by Bill Barker for the replacement of the existing Community Bus for the Horsleys
- £210 proposed by John Ades, Joe Bullock and John Hobrough (£70 each) for plaques to promote the 'Walking for Health' scheme in North Guildford and Ash areas
- £200 proposed by John Ades for furnishings in Relate West Surrey counselling rooms

12/05 ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE IN SURREY AND GUILDFORD (ITEM 12)

The Group Manager for Sustainability Projects and Assessments introduced the report.

Jenny Wicks expressed concern that the draft strategy was not encouraging public involvement in reducing climate change, and suggested rewording the strategy's Overall Aim and Objectives accordingly.

Tom Sharp and Mike Nevins both called for the strategy to contain specific actions to explain how targets and objectives would be achieved.

13/05 FORWARD PROGRAMME (ITEM 13)

Members commented on the Forward Programme.

TRANSPORT MATTERS

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS FOR DECISION

14/05 NEWARK LANE: PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS (ITEM 14)

Sally Erhardt (Newark Lane Residents Association) addressed the Committee, reading from a letter from Bob Gale, NLRA Chairman, strongly advocating an alternative kerb build-out location, described as Option 1 in the report.

The Local Transportation Director and Principal Engineer explained the reasons for recommending Option 2 for the scheme.

Members agreed the officer recommendations in the report:

- (i) that the proposed kerb build out and associated works detailed in the report be approved in principle.
- (ii) that the proposal be designed in detail and subsequently implemented subject to funding being made available.
- (iii) that the intention to construct a kerb build out at the proposed location be advertised by notice in accordance with Section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

[The plan referred to in the report is Plan Number 6405-Figure 3b revision B, which was on display at the meeting].

[Following the meeting it was found that Section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as cited in recommendation (iii) of the report, does not apply to this scheme. The Chairman has agreed that recommendation (iii) of the report need not now be implemented by the Transportation Service.]

15/05 OCKHAM ROAD SOUTH, EAST HORSLEY: PROPOSED PUFFIN CROSSING (ITEM 15)

Members agreed the officer recommendations in the report.

[The plan referred to in the report is Plan Number 5269/03, which was on display at the meeting].

16/05 EFFINGHAM JUNCTION: PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN REFUGE (ITEM 16)

Vivienne Johnson commented on the proposal on behalf of Cllr Liz Hogger. She supports the scheme in principle but is concerned about safety issues and possible changes in driver behaviour that needs observation and monitoring.

Members agreed the officer recommendation in the report. [The plan referred to in the report is Plan number G744 revision A which was on display at the meeting].

17/05 PARK & RIDE PROGRESS REPORT (ITEM 17)

The Chairman invited 3 speakers to address the Committee.

Patrick Robson (Merrow Residents Association) questioned the accuracy of some of the estimates and financial aspects of the proposal. He argued that the scheme will place an excessive burden on SCC and GBC, that the project should be shelved and funds used instead to progress a Park and Ride site at Manor Park.

Andrew Oliver (representing Tim Harrold from the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England) claimed that the Merrow Park and Ride site was not justified and had no credible business case. The proposed frequency and journey time of buses would not attract users. He said the scheme would mean a loss of funding for other sites and a loss of greenbelt land. He urged the Committee to reconsider.

Sheridan Westlake (GBC Councillor for Merrow) expressed concern that discussion at GBC's Executive had been behind closed doors. He claimed the scheme was wanted by a minority but would be paid for by the majority.

The Chairman stated the reasons for the late distribution of the report. It could not be published earlier as it was necessary to await the outcome of Guildford Borough Council's Executive, which discussed the overall Park and Ride strategy at its meeting on Thursday 13th January 2005. Despite this the report is considered urgent since the contract for the highway works may commence as early as late February, prior to the next meeting of the Committee. He was prepared, as Chairman, to allow discussion of the report.

The Local Transportation Director commented that neither the development agreement nor the construction contract would be signed until after the SCC Executive meeting on 15/2/05.

Nick Brougham said he agreed with the three speakers and moved the following motion:

(i) That no further works be proceeded with while the contractual arrangements with Clayment are clarified and brought to this Committee, especially in light of the Planning Application of 23/12 for a variation of conditions,

(ii) To ensure that the scheme represents best value for money, that a full report be brought to this Committee for consideration and approval about the future implications of the Merrow Park and Ride on the on-street parking account, its effect on future parking charges and availability of revenue for Manor Farm and any other future Park and Rides,

(iii) That the Executive of Surrey County Council be urgently requested to approve that the consequent unspent capital in this financial year be spent on bringing forward other schemes from this Committee's list of priorities.

The motion was seconded by Terence Patrick.

Members discussed the issues relating to the Park and Ride scheme and the motion before the Committee.

The Local Transportation Director and GBC's Director responded to the points raised by the speakers.

The motion was put to a vote. The motion fell by 4 votes (in favour) to 9 votes (against). There was no further vote or decision as the Item was for information only.

(The meeting ended at 10.50 p.m.)

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT
ITS MEETING ON 3 MARCH 2005**

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

ITEM 5

BURNHAM CLINTON CHAIRMAN, PIRBRIGHT PARISH COUNCIL

Q1 *PIRBRIGHT RAILWAY ARCH AND VILLAGE SAFETY ISSUES*

1. Why, despite assurances given at the 21st October meeting of the Local Committee, has no general maintenance yet been carried out on the railway arch? By general maintenance I mean sweeping the road, repainting the lines, cleaning the signs.
2. What progress has been made towards cleaning and painting the walls? Although not specifically minuted, I recall that the chairman asked for these matters to be brought back to committee on 20th January.
3. What progress has been made on the feasibility study referred to in the minutes of the meeting of 21st October? Please note that we raised all these matters in our letter to Mr. Lake of 2nd April 2004 and, despite some items being of a routine maintenance nature, nothing has been done.

- A**
1. Signs have been cleaned and drainage attended to. Road markings are carried out on a rolling programme and are prioritized according to safety. This type of work is also weather-dependent and the marking gang is only available to us one week each month, so it may be some time before this can be addressed. (See also the answers to Cllr. Nevins' questions under Item 6).
 2. See the answers to Cllr. Nevins' questions under Item 6.
 3. As explained at the meeting in October, it is only possible to carry out a feasibility study when funds have been allocated. No such funds are available this financial year, and no decisions have been taken about future years' allocations. No work has therefore been carried out on this matter since it was last discussed.

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT
ITS MEETING ON 3 MARCH 2005**

WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

ITEM 6

**CLLR. MIKE NEVINS
GBC MEMBER FOR PIRBRIGHT**

Q1 PIRBRIGHT RAILWAY ARCH AND VILLAGE SAFETY ISSUES

I note from the agenda, there is no item on the Pirbright Arch as promised at the Pirbright GLC meeting. You may remember when this item came before this committee in Pirbright I and many other members raised concerns over the safety of pedestrians walking through this arch. After a considerable long debate the officers agreed to talk to GBC and Rail Track with a view on trying to find away of doing something ASAP, simple, low cost and report back to this committee in January on the outcome of their discussions. You said at the time, you cannot bring back a full report in such a short time, but you promised to speak to GBC and Rail Track with a view to find some funding to do some simple tasks i.e. cleaning the drain that's been blocked for many months, signs, cleaning and lighting and you will update members in the January meeting. This was not recorded in the minutes, but that is what you promised. GBC have offered officer time and limited funding, the police have offered £300.00 to kick start the project, Rail Track are still waiting for a commitment from SCC. And nothing from the authority who is responsible, SCC. You have known about the problems at this arch since the summer when our Chairman, Bill Barker received a petition from the local residents. Why are you and the officers doing nothing to move this project on? And when will you start to do the jobs you promised to do?

A Officers of the County and Borough Councils have met on site to discuss how best to progress the arch issue prior to phase 2 of the Village Safety Study. It has been agreed that the existing two lighting units should be upgraded. Since the meeting of the Local Committee in Pirbright, GBC officers have discovered that funding had already been allocated for improvements in this area. It has therefore been agreed that GBC will pay for the improved lighting, while SCC will undertake its design. GBC officers will contact Network Rail as soon as the design is complete. The two Councils will share the cost of the repainting of the bridge. The work will be carried out in the spring when the weather is more reliable for this sort of activity.

The Local Transportation Service has checked and cleared the drainage system including the gullies, and has cleaned a number of signs in the area. A further suggestion has been put forward as an interim, low cost solution (in advance of the feasibility study to look into a pedestrian phase at the traffic signals or other innovative solutions). This would involve provision of a sub-standard footway on one side of the road only, moving the centre line and lowering the height limit at the bridge. This would need to be the subject of consultation with appropriate authorities.

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT
ITS MEETING ON 3 MARCH 2005**

WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

ITEM 6

**CLLR. MIKE NEVINS
GBC MEMBER FOR PIRBRIGHT**

Q2 ALDERSHOT ROAD PIRBRIGHT

At the same meeting, questions were raised by two speakers, Mr Peter Hinkinson and Mr Paul Allen residents of the Aldershot Road A324. About their concerns on the amount of accidents on this stretch of road, they also asked to lower the speed limit, and why the Highways Authority Maintenance Department left this stretch of road un-touched with a very poor surface, and resurfaced the remainder of the road either side of this stretch, close to the Public House 'The Royal Oak', the exact place of where all these accidents are happening. Again the officers promised full details of the number of accidents on this particular stretch of road and get back to the residents and send copies to me.

The response from Mr Bryan Salway to Mr Paul Allen on the speed limits, I found neither helpful nor explanatory. Mr Salway comments on the area of road that was not resurfaced, "there is no action programmed", again failed to deal with the concerns and answer correctly the questions of the local residents. I kindly ask the officers to take this very seriously the problems and the accidents on this stretch of the Aldershot Road.

Why have the officers not addressed this very serious safety issue along this small stretch of road where the resurfacing was clearly missed off when the entire stretch of the road was resurfaced? Will you kindly reconsider the speed limit and programme in as a matter of urgency the resurfacing of this accident black spot along the Aldershot Road.

A The A324 from the Royal Oak public house southwards toward Vokes was surface dressed some years ago. At the same time, the area of road around the junction and bend was surface dressed using a different process and material of a higher specification in order to produce higher skid resistance than the norm for a straight road. At a later date the A324 was the subject of major maintenance from the point where the surface dressing finished, northwards towards Pirbright village centre. There is no gap between the two lengths of road which were the subject of this maintenance activity. Members of the Committee are aware of the process followed for the prioritization of major highway maintenance following the report the Committee on 9 December 2004. The A324 in this area is considered adequate and no further major maintenance is planned at this location.

There were 4 personal injury accidents from between 2001 and 2004 at the junction of Ash Road, (1 in 2002, 2 in 2003 and 1 in 2004). All injuries sustained were classified as 'slight'. Analysis of the accident statistics shows that all were due to vehicle manoeuvres at the junction. None included speed as a cause.

Officers of the Guildford Local Transportation Service have written to Mr. Allen on this and many other items which he has raised including traffic speeds, speed cameras, resurfacing and construction of a new road through the common. Mr. Allen does not accept some of the points made by the officers, including the relevance of national or local speed policies, the business case required for new safety camera sites, the purpose of village gateway signs or the fact that Surrey County Council has no responsibility for the unmade, private lane that leads to his property.

The current 50 mph speed limit and double white lines on the bends were implemented some years ago in accordance with the speed limit policy. As Members are aware the speed management policy does change from time to time, and is due to be reviewed early in 2005. If Members wish, this section of road could be added to the list of speed limits to be reviewed by the Transportation Task Group in the autumn of 2005.

CLLR. MIKE NEVINS GBC MEMBER FOR PIRBRIGHT

Q3 *STREETLIGHTS AT SWALLOW CORNER PIRBRIGHT*

At the last GLC meeting in the Council Chamber at GBC, I raised my concerns about the streetlights around the new roundabout at Swallow Corner at the junction of Guildford Road and Aldershot Road Pirbright. The roundabout has been in place for many months, and as part of the agreed safety scheme, black out areas were to be fitted on the backs of these lights to prevent light spilling out into the adjacent residential properties. You may remember I asked Kaz Banisaied when will these be fitted to the lights. He did not remember that this was part of the original scheme, nor was he able to answer my question, but will ask someone the question and get back to me. Again nothing is done.

Why were these blackouts not fitted as part of the original scheme and not followed up by the project manager before allowing the lights to be switched on, and would the officers kindly confirm back to me the date when they will be fitted.

A Although the roundabout was complete some time ago, the electricity connection for the lamp columns was provided belated by the electricity company. The street lights have therefore been in operation for a relative short period. The shields required cannot be ordered until the extent of light spillage is assessed when the lights are connected. As soon as the lights were operational the shields were ordered. The manufacture of these is under way and we anticipate implementation by mid March.

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT
ITS MEETING ON 3 MARCH 2005**

WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

ITEM 6

CLLR. KEITH CHILDS GBC MEMBER FOR TILLINGBOURNE WARD

Q4 Notification was recently given of the intention to close Trodds Lane to through traffic for a period of seven months. This will mean diverting through traffic along the A 246 past the very point where construction of a roundabout to facilitate access to the new park and ride site will be taking place. The diverted vehicles will exacerbate the congestion, which will inevitably occur. Would the Local Transportation Director please explain the reason and justification for the proposed closure.

A Three separate highway projects will be taking place during 2005, each of which will have some effect on Trodds Lane. The projects are as follows:

1. Earlier this week, Ringway Highway Services began construction of a toucan crossing across the A246 Epsom Road, in the vicinity of St. John's Church. In order for this to take place safely, both for road users and contractors' personnel, it will be necessary to close Trodds Lane to through traffic at its northern end.
2. Secondly, the Trodds Lane traffic calming works have recently been safety audited, and as a result minor adjustments are required. These works, too, will require temporary closure of Trodds Lane, this time in the vicinity of the traffic calming, i.e. in the central section of the road. No date has been fixed for these works, but it is hoped that they will follow item 1, above.
3. Finally, work will commence in March on a new roundabout which will provide access to a new Park and Ride site immediately east of the Merrow Lane Roundabout. Tenders for these works are still being analysed, so we do not yet know the duration of the works, but they are likely to take between 3 and 6 months. The works will cause some traffic congestion, mainly for traffic travelling towards Guildford. This in turn is likely to mean that a great deal of traffic from the A25 will use Trodds Lane instead. Trodds Lane is a predominantly residential road which until recently had a poor accident record. This was the reason for the traffic calming works we carried out in 2004. We do not want to undermine the positive effect of these, so we are proposing to close Trodds Lane temporarily at its southern end during the construction of the Merrow roundabout.

In order to enable these closures, the temporary traffic order we have recently advertised is for the entire length of Trodds Lane, and covers an 18-month period - the maximum allowed by law. The duration will be much shorter than 18 months, but we advertise in this way to give ourselves flexibility and to cover unforeseen eventualities. In practice we will not close the whole length of the road, only a short section in each case. Nevertheless, the closures will prevent the use of the road by 'through' traffic. Access will be maintained for residents, their visitors and deliveries and emergency services' vehicles at all times, although this will have to be from one end of Trodds Lane only.

Some of the residents of Trodds Lane have asked us to consider permanent closure of Trodds Lane. There is no commitment to do so at this stage. No funds have been allocated, the Local Committee has not considered this and we would not recommend such a proposal without first consulting with those affected. We are aware how controversial the traffic calming works were, and would wish to proceed cautiously on this. Nevertheless, the temporary closure of Trodds Lane during 2005 will enable us to consider the pros and cons of making this permanent, enabling both local people and the County Council to make an informed judgement about the proposal.

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT
ITS MEETING ON 3 MARCH 2005**

WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

ITEM 6

CLLR. DAVID DAVIS SCC MEMBER FOR SHERE

Q5 Is the Chairman aware of the questions and answers, relating to the Guildford on-street parking surplus, asked at the County Council Executive on Tuesday?

A The chairman is aware of the questions and answers. The four questions tabled, together with answers, were as follows:

Referring to the Guildford On-Street Parking Surplus account:

- 1** ***What was the balance of this account at the beginning of this financial year, and what is it expected to be at the end?*** The balance at 1 April 2004 was just over £1.17m. The estimated balance on the account at 31 March 2005 is £1.365 Million.
- 2** ***How and when have the requirements of "Financial Framework for Local Committees - Budget Monitoring and Management – paras. (b) to (e) been applied to this account?*** This refers to the arrangements approved by the Executive on 20 July 2004 regarding Executive approval of carry forwards etc for local committees. It is unclear whether it was intended that those requirements should include review and approval of reserve funds held by third parties. The situation is being clarified in terms of accounting standards and further advice will be provided as soon as possible. However, as set out in the new agency agreement between the two authorities, starting with 2004/05, an annual report will be brought to the Local Committee on the accounts of the reserve fund and associated accounts.
- 3** ***What are the key factors which might influence Members of the Guildford Local Committee when considering the Merrow Park and Ride proposal on the 20th January 2005, that are emerging from the latest internal audit of this account?*** The audit has indicated that the income from the Guildford CPZ offset by the costs of collection are correctly accounted for in the CPZ reserve account. Similarly the revenue costs of the Artington park and ride scheme are also properly accounted for as charges against the reserve fund. The audit has however identified that Guildford BC have charged an asset rent of some £14,000 per annum for the Artington site to the Reserve Fund. As the scheme started in the financial year 2000/01, this charge has had the effect of reducing the balance on the CPZ account by a sum in excess of £60,000. Internal Audit together with our Central Accountancy Team are currently considering whether or not this is a proper accountancy practice.
- 4** ***When will the results of the audit be available?*** The audit report should be finalised by the end of January 2005.

Two supplementary oral questions were asked at the meeting of the Executive. These, and the answers given, were as follows:

- 5** ***Arising from these answers, am I right in thinking that the on-street parking reserve can be used at the discretion of the highway authority, reviewing if necessary any current arrangement, on any transportation related revenue or capital expenditure, including the subsidy of socially necessary bus services, the transport of school pupils, and road maintenance?*** Yes.
- 6** ***Is such use of this surplus geographically or otherwise limited by statute?*** No.

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT
ITS MEETING ON 3 MARCH 2005**

WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

ITEM 6

**CLLR. TOM SHARP
SCC MEMBER FOR GUILDFORD SOUTH**

Q6 Has the enquiry into the accident on 4th December at the Tillingbourne Bridge been completed; has a report been made, or will one be made, to the Health and Safety Executive following that enquiry (and is that report, or will it be, in the public domain); bearing in mind the extent of public concern over the accident, can a statement now be made, or alternatively could one at a future date be made, to the Local Committee and the public at large on the matter; and finally, would the Service and in particular the staff who were injured, accept the sympathy of the questioner, and, he imagines, of his constituents near the bridge, in connection with the accident, and his best wishes for a quick and complete recovery?

A The enquiry into the accident is ongoing; officers anticipate the report being ready to send to the Head of Fire Service Performance and Development around the first week in March 2005. The incident has not been reported to the Health and Safety Executive as there is no requirement to inform the HSE of this type of incident or the sickness absences following Road Traffic Collisions. The service does not normally make reports of this nature public documents. Conclusions and recommendations drawn from the investigation will be the subject of an internal action plan with timescales appropriate as necessary.

All such reports are copied to the Risk Management Unit at County Hall.

Thank you for the good wishes, they will be passed on to the staff concerned.

Bob Gibb
Group Manager
Head of Technical Support
Surrey Fire & Rescue Service