



# SURREY

## COUNTY COUNCIL

### Minutes of meeting

#### **GUILDFORD LOCAL COMMITTEE**

**Date:** THURSDAY 26 MAY 2005

**Time:** 7.00 pm (The formal Committee began at 7.20pm.)

**Place:** COUNCIL CHAMBER, GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL,  
MILLMEAD HOUSE, GUILDFORD GU2 4BB

### Members present:

#### **Surrey County Council**

Mr John Ades (Ash)  
Mr Bill Barker (Horsleys)  
Mr David Davis (Shere)  
Ms Sarah Di Caprio (Guildford South-East)  
Mr David Goodwin (Guildford South-West)  
Mr Mike Nevins (Worplesdon)  
Mr Edward Owen (Guildford East)  
Mr Tony Rooth (Shalford)  
Ms Pauline Searle (Guildford North)  
Ms Fiona White (Guildford West)

#### **Guildford Borough Council (for Transportation matters)**

Mr Keith Chesterton (Stoke)  
Ms Vivienne Johnson (Christchurch)  
Ms Liz Hogger (Effingham)  
Ms Merylyn Spier (Merrow)  
Mr Sheridan Westlake (Merrow)  
Mr Tony Phillips (Onslow)  
Ms Jenny Wicks (Clandon & Horsley)  
Ms Diana Lockyer-Nibbs (Normandy)  
Mr Nick Brougham (Burpham)\*

\* Substitute

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

- Consultation on, and effect on dog-walking of the proposed designation of Local Nature Reserves (in Item 9 of the agenda) (Mr Peter Hattersley)
- Legal considerations relating to the proposed designation of Local Nature Reserves (in Item 9 of the agenda) (Mr R Milton)
- Changes to the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Cranley Road area (Mr Maurice Barham)

---

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

**IN PUBLIC**

**37/05 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Terence Patrick and Nigel Manning (substituted by Nick Brougham).

**38/05 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (3 March 2005) [Item 2]**

An amended version of the minutes was available to and agreed by Members. The amended version corrected the reference in minute 20/05 to Nick Brougham's interest in Item 8 of that meeting, which had been included in error.

**39/05 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

Pauline Searle declared a personal interest in relation to Item 9 as she lives nearby Chitty's Common. Sheridan Westlake declared a personal interest in relation to Item 11 as he has a beneficial interest in property within St Luke's development. David Goodwin declared a personal interest in relation to Item 11 as he has a parking permit.

**40/05 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

A petition was received from Mike Nevins on behalf of Jacobs Well residents, concerning a number of highways issues in the area. A report will be prepared and brought to the next appropriate meeting of the Committee.

A petition was also received from residents of Trodds Lane. A report will be prepared and brought to the next appropriate meeting of the Committee.

**41/05 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

Questions had been received from Peter Hattersley (East Horsley resident) and Lee Anderton/John Allen (who both run businesses on Woodbridge Road). (Both questions and answers are appended to these minutes.)

**42/05 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

Questions had been received from Sheridan Westlake (Merrow) and Keith Chesterton (Stoke). (Both questions and answers are appended to these minutes.)

**GENERAL MATTERS**

[LIGHT GREEN]

**EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS**

**FOR DECISION**

**43/05 NOTIFICATION OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON FOR THE SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE IN GUILDFORD [Item 7]**

Members were notified that Bill Barker and Fiona White had been elected as Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson respectively by SCC's full Council meeting on 24 May 2005.

[Sheridan Westlake arrived at the meeting.]

**44/05 REPORT ON BUDGETS DELEGATED TO LOCAL COMMITTEES [Item 8]**

Members agreed the officer recommendations i), ii), iii), iv) and vi). Members agreed to allocate £50,000 of the £100,000 capital allocation for transportation purposes, and to defer decision on the remaining £50,000 until the Local Committee meeting on 21/7/05.

**45/05 PROPOSED DECLARATION OF 8 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL OWNED SITES AS LOCAL NATURE [Item 9]**

Members expressed concern that there had not been adequate consultation on the proposals, and the effect of the proposals on access to the commons. There was particular concern that the details of the proposal in relation to the Worplesdon group of commons was not clear in the report.

Members supported the proposed designations in principle but agreed that:

- i) SCC Executive be asked to defer their decision on the proposals until individual Members and the Local Committee have been properly consulted
- ii) if SCC Executive does consider the proposals on 5 July 2005, they be asked to note the concern by Members of Guildford Local Committee regarding the costs of the proposals and the access to the sites
- iii) if SCC Executive does consider the proposals on 5 July 2005, they be asked to delete the Worplesdon group of commons from the list of proposed sites for the time being, due to lack of clarity on the details of the proposals for this site.

**46/05 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 10]**

Sheridan Westlake requested that a future report include some commentary on the relation between Park and Ride and the On-Street Parking Account.

Members noted the Forward Programme

**TRANSPORTATION MATTERS**

***NON-EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS FOR DECISION***

***EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS FOR DECISION***

**47/05 REVIEW OF THE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE, GUILDFORD [Item 11]**

3 people had requested to address the Committee:

John Cummings (Chairman, Cranley Road Area Residents Association) supported the extension of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and made a number of suggestions for future parking arrangements in the area.

Cllr Sarah Creedy (Holy Trinity) supported some of the proposals in Holy Trinity and made a number of further suggestions for future parking arrangements in the area.

Cllr Andrew Hodges (Christchurch) urged officers to proceed with the eastward extension of the CPZ as soon as possible.

Several Members made comments relating to the proposals in specific areas, and the timescale for further consultation and decision on the changes to the CPZ.

The Parking Manager (GBC) responded to the points raised. He explained that it would be difficult to complete the consultation adequately in time for a decision by Members at the July 21 meeting of the Committee, and that it was more likely that the report be brought to the meeting on 15 September.

Members agreed the officer recommendations in the report.

[Meeting ended 8.15 p.m.]

.....(Mr Bill Barker - Chairman)

**Contact:**

Dave Johnson (Area Director)

01483 517301

[dave.johnson@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:dave.johnson@surreycc.gov.uk)

Diccon Bright (Local Committee & Partnership Officer)

01483 517336

[diccon.bright@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:diccon.bright@surreycc.gov.uk)

## Item 5: Written Public Questions

**PETER HATTERSLEY,  
RESIDENT OF WEST HORSLEY**

### **Q1 RIGHTS OF WAY BUDGET**

It has long been accepted that the ROW budget has not been sufficient for the maintenance of the Borough's/County's extensive network of footpaths and bridleways. Work has needed to be prioritized and supplementary funding sought.

With the walking strategy, the success of the Surrey Hills project, the implementation of the improvement plans required by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, the local initiatives like the Jubilee Trail and the Lovelace Trail, the usage of the footpaths and bridleways is increasing significantly. This increase will require a higher level of maintenance than hitherto.

1. What additional provision has been made in the ROW budget to ensure that our footpaths and bridleways do not deteriorate in view of the higher usage?
2. What is the length of the easy access ROW trails in Surrey?

- A**
1. No additional provision has been made in the rights of way budget. However, we do occasionally receive grants to improve rights of way within specific areas.
  2. Twenty four routes are promoted as easy access paths in our free booklet 'Easy Walks Around Surrey'. The length of those routes, which include the Thames Path, River Wey towpath, Downs Link, Blackwater Valley Path, and the Basingstoke Canal towpath, is estimated to be 120 km. (75 miles). In addition there are a number of rights of way throughout the County that are easily accessible.

### **Q2 ROAD TRAFFIC ORDER NOTICES**

What mechanism exists to retrieve Road Traffic Order notices after their display period has expired?

- A**
- Notices of this sort should be placed, maintained and removed by SCC's term contractor, in order to ensure compliance with the requirements for the advertisement of traffic orders etc. We are aware that the system is not operating as effectively as it should, and are therefore reviewing our procedures. Ensuring that the contractor carries out his instructions in full would increase the cost to SCC. One option would be to reduce the number of notices displayed since these are not all legally obligatory. Reliance would then be on the published newspaper advertisements (which are obligatory). This would reduce both costs and litter, but may reduce public awareness of our proposals. It has also been suggested that officers of GBC may be able to provide a more cost effective service. The review will seek to provide the most cost effective service which properly informs those affected by highway proposals and does not generate litter.

## Item 5: Written Public Questions

### LEE ANDERTON ON BEHALF OF ANDERTON'S MUSIC CO & JOHN ALLEN ON BEHALF OF ALLEN PHYSIOTHERAPY

**Q3** My question to the Committee relates to the proposed bus lane on Woodbridge Road (between the railway bridge and the York Road roundabout).

I run a retail business, Anderton's Music Co, which has a £6 million turnover and employs over 30 people from a site on the Woodbridge Road. The bus lane proposals would remove current customer access to the site by taking away parking but most important of all, it will prevent us from receiving deliveries to the site; causing huge damage to our business and putting many of our employee's livelihoods at stake.

"Allen Physiotherapy & Rehabilitation" has been established 20 years in the adjacent property. Many of its disabled and injured patients would have difficulty, and increased personal risk, if they cannot have continued access/parking, directly outside the premises. Surely this has been overlooked when carrying out the safety audit.

Along with our neighbours, we were never informed of the proposals; but we did "find out" about them approx 1 year ago. Apparently a lack of resources meant that SCC could not send us the consultation letter. Since finding out, we have had sporadic communications with SCC Highways officers and although more recently they have been more co-operative we have made no progress whatsoever in retaining the needs of our businesses. There is a simple solution; but it will cost SCC. In order that the bus lane can proceed & we retain suitable access a delivery lay-by and drop off point can be created. The pathway along this section of Woodbridge Rd is over 5m wide – easily big enough for a lay-by & pavement. Whilst SCC is at last looking into the cost of this, We can almost hear the answer coming back "sorry it is too expensive".

We no longer want to hear about how this is part of a phased development of bus lanes; We want to hear how we are supposed to run our businesses when you want to take away the ability to access them. We want to know why you felt our businesses (and the adjoining one) were so unimportant as to not warrant notifying; and we do not want to hear the answer that "we didn't have to let you know". We have taken many years building up these businesses (Anderton's is now one of the largest Music stores in the UK) and we want to know why you feel that you can ride rough shod over all of what we have achieved.

**A** Mr. Anderton's question raises three fundamental issues; each is addressed below.

#### ***1. Has the process of public engagement been carried out properly?***

Most highway proposals involving traffic orders receive at least two levels of consultation. The first is informal, at the outline design stage, and the second is formal, involving posting of notices and placing of advertisements in the local press. The latter takes place at the detailed design stage. The Guildford bus lanes had an additional level of consultation before outline design began but when the concept of bus lanes was being investigated in principle.

The initial consultation took place in 2000, involved exhibitions in the Friary shopping centre, and was widely publicised. To our knowledge, Mr. Anderton did not comment on the proposals at this stage. The informal (outline design) consultation took place in 2004. Mr. Anderton commented in detail at this stage, and copied his comments to a number of people including local County and Borough Members and SCC's portfolio holder for transportation. Since then officers have been working to resolve the issues he has raised without compromising the overall objectives of the project.

Mr. Anderton has subsequently written several letters to officers and others, including a

## **Item 5: Written Public Questions**

recent letter requiring provision of information under the Freedom Of Information Act. Since the amount of information he requested exceeded the level which the Council is obliged to provide free of charge, he has been invited to inspect the files at our offices at a mutually convenient time, and arrangements are in hand to facilitate this.

The third and final consultation stage has not yet taken place, but will do so within the next three months.

### ***2. How should the needs of individual residents or objectors be dealt with?***

Wherever possible we attempt to meet the needs of frontagers or others affected by highway alterations. In this case, it is true that the two businesses concerned have enjoyed loading facilities to date. However the highway does not exist to provide private facilities for specific premises, and many retail companies and others enjoy no such facilities. It is also the case that many shops and other commercial premises cannot receive deliveries at certain times of day (for example those in Guildford High Street).

The bus lanes are intended to maintain and enhance Guildford's accessibility without increasing traffic congestion, thereby protecting and enhancing Guildford's economy. Where an objection is received to such a proposal, the effect of the objection and/or the cost of mitigating it must be considered against the overall benefit and cost of the proposal.

### ***3. What should be done in this case?***

Officers are reviewing the design of the project to determine whether Mr. Anderton's request can be accommodated and if so at what cost. At this stage, it is felt likely that the civil engineering costs will be relatively modest. If, however, the diversion of utilities' equipment is required, the cost could be enormous. Officers will continue the dialogue with Mr. Anderton over this issue with a view to a resolution which is satisfactory to all parties.

The formal advertisement of the traffic regulation orders will occur in the next few weeks. Officers will strive to resolve any objections received as a result of this. Failing this it may be necessary to bring a report to Committee. Whether the final decision is made by officers or the Committee, an appropriate balance must be sought between the objectives of the project (and therefore the benefits to Guildford's economy overall), the costs of the project, and the views of individuals affected by the project.



**Q1** Can an update be provided on the Merrow Park & Ride, including the status of the developer, Clayment Ltd, in meeting its obligations under the Section 106 agreement?

**A** The highway design and tendering procedures have been completed, and Balfour Beatty has been appointed as the County Council's contractor for the construction of the roundabout. The commencement of the construction contract awaits the signing of the development agreement and the provision of a bond (see below).

The legal agreement between SCC, GBC, the developer and the landowner is close to completion. The agreement is complex, as it is intended to ensure that each party carries out its obligations to the other parties. Broadly, these are as follows:

**Surrey County Council must:**

- Carry out and complete the highway works.
- Take over the highway works as publicly maintainable highways.
- Provide a bus service, determining its operating hours and frequencies in consultation with GBC.
- Provide advertising space for the developer on the buses.

**Guildford Borough Council must:**

- Design and construct the park & ride car park and associated access roads.

**The Developer must:**

- Contribute the sum of £285,000 towards the highway works.
- Provide a bond to ensure payment of the highway contribution.
- Carry out the proposed development (golf course, club house and leisure facilities) in full.
- Contribute the annual sum of £30,000 towards SCC's bus operating costs for ten years, this sum to be index-linked.
- Sub-let certain areas of land to GBC.

**The Land Owner must:**

- Dedicate certain areas of land to become public highway.
- Lease certain areas of land to the developer.

The signing of the development agreement awaits final satisfactory proof of title by the Land Owner and discharge of a number of planning conditions.

## Item 6: Written Members' Questions

**CLLR. SHERIDAN WESTLAKE  
GBC MEMBER FOR MERROW**

**Q2**

What plans does Surrey County Council have to sign up to the Campaign to Protect Rural England's (CPRE) "Clutter Challenge"?

**A**

For Members' information, the following is brief summary of information on the Clutter Challenge from the CPRE website:

*"The volume and speed of traffic on rural roads and through villages is a major threat to the tranquility and character of the countryside. Highway authorities have a key role to play in managing traffic. In undertaking this task, however, it is important that countryside character is respected. A profusion of signs, the over zealous use of painted lines on roads, or poor attention to the detail of design in new street furniture increases the impact of transport on the countryside. We commit to:*

- 1 Develop a policy in the Local Transport Plan (LTP) to protect and enhance countryside character and to bid for additional funding in the LTP to implement it.*
- 2 Work with others to develop a traffic management manual and design guide. This will set out the principles and practices which the Authority will use to manage traffic on roads in its area, in ways which are consistent with retaining countryside character.*
- 3 Undertake a Clutter Audit across the Authority's area using the design guide and manual to assess each piece of street furniture (including signs and lines) to examine whether it still fulfils a purpose, or could be amended to better reflect the character of its surroundings.*
- 4 Undertake a clutter free pilot scheme to manage traffic in the countryside during the first two years of the life of the Local Transport Plan.*
- 5 Write to CPRE informing it of our commitments under the Clutter Challenge and to issue a press release to help publicise these in the local media."*

SCC is aware of the CPRE Clutter Challenge, and in finalising the draft of the second LTP is considering how best to meet this. This question raises county-wide issues, and has therefore been referred to the Head of the Local Transport Plan Group who will, in conjunction with Helyn Clack, portfolio holder for Transportation, determine how to approach a number of such matters in LTP2.

SCC supports the principles of avoiding street clutter, and the Guildford Local Transportation Service, often working with colleagues from Guildford Borough Council, seek to minimise signage wherever possible. Examples are mainly in the urban areas where signage levels are greatest, and include improvements in Chapel Street, Guildford and the Town Centre Accessibility Studies which are beginning.

There are, however, cases where signage levels which some people consider excessive are unavoidable for legal reasons. These include signage of 'prescribed routes' (banned turns, prohibitions and the like), speed limits and parking restrictions. To this extent CPRE's valuable influence might best be directed at central government which is the source of the regulations concerned. It is also true that many residents feel that inadequate signage is provided, particularly of speed limits. Members may also recall that the chairman of CPRE (Surrey), albeit acting as chairman of the Tyting Society, brought a request to the Committee for additional signage to discourage HGVs using the lanes between Guildford, Albury and Chilworth.

**Q3** CHINTHURST HILL

At the old GPATS meeting of 13 Feb 2002, when the Committee decided on the officers' recommendation not to agree that there was a ROW from the lodge gates to the summit of Chinthurst hill, SCC officers explained that the public did have a right by virtue of the conditions of sale to SCC, to use that route. Moreover, the officers agreed, in response to a request from me, to ensure that appropriate signage was put up at the beginning of this route to make it clear that pedestrians could use this route, as the beginning looks very private. Arrangements were also going to be made for disabled people to be able to use the route by car. Neither of these has happened in the last 3 years despite occasional reminders from me. When are these assurances going to be implemented?

**A** Under the terms of the agreement between SWT, as manager of the site on behalf of SCC, and the landowner, signs are to be provided by the landowner explaining that pedestrian access is available along the privately-owned access track leading to a private house. The agreement also approved gates restricting unauthorised vehicular access up this track. The agreement, however, requires only that suitable signs be erected in the event that a gate is installed, since if there is no gate, there is nothing to prevent access. To date, neither the signs nor the gates have been provided. SCC retains access rights along this track for the duration of the current 10 year agreement. At the end of this period, the terms of the agreement are to be reviewed.

The overall improvements to the site include the now markedly improved car park (accessed from Wonersh - Chilworth direction, and shown on Ordnance Survey maps) and the improved pathway leading from the car park to the top of the hill. The alternative access has now been restricted to pedestrians only although buggies, pushchairs and wheelchairs are welcome and will be accommodated through provision of an unlocked 'kissing gate' (to be provided by the landowner). This modification has been implemented in consultation with local people through the aegis of Wonersh Parish Council. The Site Ranger has observed a considerable increase in use of the site since the improvements to both car park and path have been put in.

On re-checking the agreement between SWT and the landowner, it has been noted that the landowner's responsibility is to pay for the signage. In view of this, if and when a gate is erected officers will instruct SWT to provide the necessary signs and to recover the cost from the landowner.

Officers would be happy to meet Cllr. Chesterton on site to discuss these issues further if necessary.