

#### Minutes of meeting

#### SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

Date: THURSDAY 28 SEPTEMBER 2006

**Time:** 7.00 pm

Place: WORPLESDON MEMORIAL HALL, PERRY HILL, WORPLESDON RD

(A322), GUILDFORD

#### **Members present:**

#### **Surrey County Council**

Mr Bill Barker (Horsleys) (Chairman)

Mr David Davis (Shere)

Mr David Goodwin (Guildford South-West)

Ms Marsha Moseley (Ash)

Mr Edward Owen (Guildford East)

Mr Tony Rooth (Shalford)

Ms Pauline Searle (Guildford North)

Ms Fiona White (Guildford West) (Vice Chairman)

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

Mr Keith Chesterton (Stoke)

Ms Liz Hogger (Effingham)

Ms Vivienne Johnson (Christchurch)

Mr Nigel Manning (Ash Vale)

Ms Diana Lockyer-Nibbs (Normandy)

Mr Terence Patrick (Send)

Mr Tony Phillips (Onslow)

Ms Jenny Wicks (Clandon & Horsley)

Ms Caroline Reeves (Friary & St Nicolas)

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

- Flooding and surface drainage (Shirley Brown, Barry Gamble, Cllr Nigel Manning)
- Speeding in Worplesdon (Harry Pickup, Worplesdon Parish Council)
- Protection of horse margins (Bob Milton, British Horse Society)

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

#### **IN PUBLIC**

#### 42/06 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Sarah Di Caprio, Mike Nevins and Sheridan Westlake. Nick Brougham, substituting for Cllr Westlake also gave his apologies at short notice.

#### 43/06 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (15 June 2006) [Item 2]

Agreed and signed by the Chairman.

#### 44/06 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None.

#### 45/06 PETITIONS [Item 4]

None.

#### 46/06 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

None.

#### 47/06 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 6]

There were 2 written Members' questions which are appended, with answers, to these minutes.

[The Transportation Manager gave a brief verbal update on Highways matters at Cemetery Pales and Pirbright Arch.]

# 48/06 REVIEW OF PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN AREAS OUTSIDE GUILDFORD TOWN CPZ [Item 7]

Several members of the public commented on the proposals including representatives from Ripley Parish Council, Newark Lane Residents Association, residents and local shopkeepers. There was a range of views expressed including comments about safety concerns, the different parking needs of residents and shopkeepers, and enforcement of any parking restrictions. Cllr Marsha Moseley welcomed the proposals for Ash.

Members agreed the officer's recommendations that:

- (i) the proposed changes to the parking restrictions in Ripley and Ash be subject to informal consultation.
- (ii) if there are only minor amendments requested as a result of these consultations that they are discussed with the Local Members and if agreement is reached the proposals are formally advertised as an intention to make an Order under section 1,2,4,32,35 and 36 of parts III and IV of schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, and if no objections are maintained, the Order be made,
- (iii) if there are significant changes requested as a result of the informal consultation that a further report be presented to the Committee.

# 49/06 GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING PERFORMANCE MID-YEAR REPORT 2006-7 [Item 8]

Members made some comments and noted the information in the report.

#### 50/06 A246 MERROW PROPOSED GAP CLOSURE [Item 9]

Bob Milton (representing the Open Space Society and the British Horse Society) addressed the Committee supporting Option B in the report.

Members did not agree recommendation (i), but agreed recommendation (ii) i.e. that an exemption to the proposed traffic regulation order be made allowing the gap to be used by equestrians and pedestrians, but not by vehicles.

[The Chairman and Members of the Committee thanked the West Area Transportation Group Manager Bob Moodie for his contribution to the County Council and the Local Committee and wished him well in his retirement.]

# 51/06 DRAFT SURREY MINERALS PLAN – IMPLICATIONS FOR GUILDFORD [Item 10]

Tony Swift (Clerk of Shackleford Parish Council) addressed the Committee, objecting to the inclusion of the Eashing Farm site in the draft Plan, including the following points:

- the many individuals and agencies who have raised objections
- dissatisfaction with the consultation process
- likely destruction of countryside and implications for people in the surrounding area.

John Dobson (Member of Compton Parish Council) urged that the proposal concerning Eashing Farm be rejected, including the following points:

- the objections of residents
- the likely intensity of traffic flow of HGVs using the site (up to 1 HGV every 6 minutes, 270 days per year)
- the need to consider the human rights implications on nearby residents.

Nigel Wilkes (Save Surrey Hills Action Committee) argued that the Eashing Farm site should be withdrawn from the list of possible sites, including the following points:

- the environmental, health and traffic implications of the proposal
- the range of individuals and groups that had raised objections
- implications for the family living within the site boundary.

Members discussed and the Principal Planning officer responded on the following issues:

- Government mineral requirement figures
- equipment to be used for extraction (including washing and crushing)
- the nature of the minerals at Eashing farm (sand/Bargate stone)
- the identification of the 18 sites across Surrey
- · concerns or objections of various consultee agencies
- possible HGV traffic
- perceptions of the consultation process

Cllr Tony Rooth as local Member asked that all the consultation material be reviewed thoroughly and alternative sites for soft sand (as proposed in 2004) be revisited. He questioned the government figures and whether the Eashing Farm site should remain in the list.

Members noted the details of the draft Minerals Plan relating to Guildford and the feedback on the consultation, and agreed that the Committee receive a further item on this subject at its meeting on 22 March 2007 in order to influence the SCC Executive decision on 11 May 2007.

#### 52/06 COMMUNITY SAFETY IN GUILDFORD [Item 11]

Members noted the contents of the report and the activities of the Partnership in the year 2005-2006 and offered comments on the work of the Partnership and on priorities for the future. The following comments were made:

- The report contained too much jargon.
- Greater priority should be given to addressing speeding.
- Some people find it difficult to report incidents to the Police.
- Community safety work in the town centre is going well.
- Guildford borough has specific community safety needs in relation to countywide issues.
- The Community Incident Action Group and Joint Action Group are good examples of partnership working.
- Community policing has made a real difference.

David Goodwin nominated, Pauline Searle seconded, and Members agreed that Fiona White should represent the Local Committee on the Guildford Local Strategic Partnership when it considers community safety matters.

Members agreed to delegate the £24,000 community safety funds to the Area Director to support the work of the Safer Guildford Partnership.

#### 53/06 LOCAL DEMOCRACY WEEK [Item 12]

Members noted the report and made various comments. Members commented on activities from previous years (e.g. visiting a school council, participating in political 'speed-dating') and possible future events (e.g. a 'question time' debate). Individual Members agreed to participate in visiting a school and/or youth centre in partnership with GBC, the Parish Council and the Police. It was suggested that the Guildford Youth Council be asked to fund more music equipment and sports equipment for young people.

#### 54/06 GUILDFORD AREA PROFILE [Item 13]

Members noted the information in the report and commented on specific statistics. Members commented on the good work that has been done in North Guildford, and that future reports should identify what more could be done in North Guildford and in other areas. It was suggested that further work could be done to help integrate older and young people, and that pockets of relative disadvantage can now be identified within affluent wards.

Members agreed to receive a report at its meeting on December 14th 2006 concerning progress on the County Council's Self Reliance policy and its implications for Guildford.

# 55/06 PROPOSALS FOR THE COMMITTEE'S REVENUE AND CAPITAL ALLOCATIONS [Item 14]

#### Members

- 1. approved the proposed expenditure from the Members' Revenue Allocation budget. i.e.:
- a. £230 for Skip hire for clearance and restoration of Hall Dene woodland. (proposed by Eddie Owen)
- b. £2500 for the Young Enterprise Programme in infant/junior schools in the 'Shere' division (proposed by David Davis)
- c. £2000 for the Victoria Cross display at the Queen's Royal Surrey Regiment Museum, Clandon (proposed by David Davis).
- d. £1000 for camping equipment for Send Scout Group (proposed by David Davis).
- e. £500 for workshops for the visually impaired at the Nomad Theatre (proposed by Bill Barker)
- f. £750 for the Ripley Youth Club (proposed by Bill Barker)

- g. £2000 to support the work of the Guildford Community Family Trust (proposed by David Goodwin, Eddie Owen, Fiona White, Pauline Searle, and Sarah Di Caprio)
- 2. approved the proposed expenditure from the Capital Pot i.e. £5000 for music equipment for Guildford and Park Barn community centres.
- 3. decided in principle to adopt delegated decision-making to the Area Director, for revenue sums up to £1,000.

#### 56/06 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 15]

Members agreed the Forward Programme and requested these additional items: Cycling and Walking strategies and the work of the Forums A report on Highways staffing and budgets since the Business Delivery Review

[Meeting ended 9.45pm]

 	(М	r Bill Barker - (	Chairman)

#### **Contact:**

Dave Johnson (Area Director)

01483 517301 dave.johnson@surreycc.gov.uk

Diccon Bright (Local Committee & Partnership Officer) 01483 517336

diccon.bright@surreycc.gov.uk

(The next meeting of the SCC Local Committee (Guildford) will be at 7pm on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2006 at Guildford Methodist Church, Woodbridge Rd, Guildford.)

#### WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS

ITEM 6

### CLLR SARAH DI CAPRIO GUILDFORD SOUTH EAST

Q1

Regarding the inclusion of sites in the Surrey Minerals Plan and with reference to the Eashing Farm site in particular:

- what further investigation will be carried out into the suitability of the sites and when will this take place
- what format will these investigations be and what aspects will be covered bearing in mind the concerns raised locally and those acknowledged by Surrey Police into access and traffic implications
- will there be further opportunities for public and/or member involvement at this next stage and if not when will the next opportunity be?



#### **Further Investigations**

Two significant pieces of work which will be carried out are an Appropriate Assessment of the plan under the Habitats Regulations and a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. We will also been carrying out some more detailed work on a site-specific basis as required. In terms of Eashing Farm specifically we have asked for further information regarding the geology of the site, methods of extraction and processing, markets for the sand and Bargate stone, and means of access to/from Hurtmore Road. Further issues may require investigation once we have had a chance to look at the consultation responses in more detail.

#### Police concerns and traffic implications

The Surrey Police have been consulted during the preparation of the draft plan, and on the draft plan itself. They raised no concerns or comments through this consultation, but we will continue to work with them as the process continues to ensure the road safety and capacity issues are properly addressed. In response to newspaper enquiries following the Surrey Police Authority meeting on 29 June 2006, the police issued a statement in relation to the Eashing Farm proposals which said they had not raised any objections, but would be working closely with the Council on police-related road traffic issues to ensure disruption to the local road system and any risk to public safety is minimised.

#### Further Stakeholder Involvement

Following this statutory consultation, a further workshop-based consultation has been organised for October to discuss in more detail the way sites were selected, restoration, and monitoring and enforcement. Representatives of the local communities in the Hurtmore area have been invited to attend.

A further six-week statutory consultation will be held in June 2007 when the final draft of the plan is submitted to the Secretary of State, and following this there will be an examination in public.

#### WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS

ITEM 6

### CLLR SARAH DI CAPRIO GUILDFORD SOUTH EAST

In a written response to John Pettett of Downsedge Res Assoc at the last meeting of the Local Committee, it was suggested that the next CPZ review for that area would take place in Spring 2007. Is there a more definite date yet and if not are we on course for a review in the Spring?

Α

The timetable for the start of the next CPZ review is dependent on completing the review of areas outside the CPZ and the level of work and consultation this requires. It is anticipated that with the current proposals work could begin on the CPZ review in late spring 2007 and a scoping report outlining the issues which need consideration could be brought to the Local Committee GLC at or about June 2007. This assumes that only the amendments to parking arrangements in Ash and Ripley will take place prior to that time. Any consideration of areas such as Stoughton or Park Barn will therefore be deferred until after the CPZ review.