



SURREY

COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of meeting

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

Date: THURSDAY 14 DECEMBER 2006

Time: 7.00 pm

Place: GUILDFORD METHODIST CHURCH, WOODBRIDGE ROAD,
GUILDFORD GU1 4RG

Members present:

Surrey County Council

Mr Bill Barker (Horsleys) (Chairman)
Ms Sarah Di Caprio (Guildford South-East)
Ms Marsha Moseley (Ash)
Mr Mike Nevins (Worplesdon)
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)
Ms Jenny Wicks (Clandon & Horsley)
Ms Caroline Reeves (Friary & St Nicolas)
Mr Nick Brougham (Burpham) (substitute)
Ms Merilyn Spier (Merrow) (substitute)

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 22
MARCH 2007**

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

- The community activities of the Guildford Methodist Church (Dr Nevin Stewart, Guildford Methodist Church)
- Eashing Farm possible minerals extraction site
 - Conservation issues
 - Traffic and access issues (Sarah Hill, Save Surrey Hills Action Committee)
 - Reasons for inclusion of the site (Nigel Wilkes, SSHAC)
 - Consultation process (Tom Kitson, Hurtmore resident)
 - Bargate Stone (Richard Magnell, Peper Harrow resident)
 - Response to questions (Philip Randall)
- Flooding in Fairlands (Sandra Morgan, Fairlands Community Association)
- Flooding in Fairlands (Shirley Brown)
- Flooding in West Horsley (Robert Spackman, Chairman of West Horsley Parish Council)
- Fairlands Post Office (Sue Doughty)
- Shortage of social work staff at SCC (Mary Laker, Normandy Parish Council)
- Pavement obstruction near Wyke Primary School, Normandy

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

IN PUBLIC

57/06 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from David Davis, David Goodwin, Sheridan Westlake (substituted by Nick Brougham) and Tony Philips (substituted by Merilyn Spier).

58/06 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (28 September 2006) [Item 2]

Agreed and signed by the Chairman.

59/06 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Eddie Owen declared a personal interest in relation to Items 8, 11 and 14, being a Chairman of GAVS (Guildford Associations of Voluntary Services) and having a relative living in Normandy. Nick Brougham declared a prejudicial interest in any discussions relating to Eashing Farm, having a commercial arrangement in the area.

60/06 PETITIONS [Item 4]

None.

61/06 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

None.

62/06 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 6]

There were 5 written Members' questions which are appended, with answers, to

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 22
MARCH 2007**

these minutes.

[The Chairman noted that two of the reports for the agenda (Item 15 and, at the request of GBC Executive Item 16) had been published late, but which he considered urgent because it was unreasonable and an undue length of time to keep interested parties waiting and residents would be irritated if the matters were delayed until the next meeting (22 March 2007).]

**63/06 CONSULTATION ON CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S TRUST FOR
SURREY [Item 7]**

Following the officer's presentation of the main proposals, Pete Brayne of Guildford YMCA addressed the Committee applauding the vision of the proposals but asking that the voluntary, community and faith sector, and also the voice of young people, be represented and involved in the Governance Board.

SCC Members then made the following comments:

- There must not be too much bureaucracy
- Where is the child in these proposals?
- There should be one point of contact [for each child/family] with the funding to spend [on that child/family]
- Young people need to be involved in the decision-making process
- This model [i.e. the joining-up of agencies] has been needed for some time
- Concern that SCC is not currently providing the statutory minimum service in some social care areas
- There needs to be a lead agency of the partnership to take responsibility, lead and encourage other partners. The issue of leadership needs clarification.

Guildford Borough Councillors also present made the following comments:

- A joined-up approach is welcome
- Agencies must be obliged to share information appropriately, and not use the general or their own data protection arrangements as a barrier
- The localised approach is welcome
- Pooling budgets will be difficult
- Will Connexions lose its identity (on merging with SCC)?

64/06 SELF RELIANCE IN GUILDFORD BOROUGH [Item 8]

Keith Chesterton described the benefits of projects in Stoke ward i.e. a Family Centre worker at Weyfield School working with children with challenging behaviour, and support for two residents' associations to build capacity and engagement in Bellfields and Weyfield. He urged that agencies continue to support the projects so that resources put in already would not be wasted.

Fiona White described the Healthy Living Programme projects as essential, listing the Barn Youth Project, Community Development work in Westborough, the Park Barn Community Association and the Youth Café as examples.

Nigel Manning welcomed the recognition in the report of Ash Wharf as an area of relative deprivation, and asked that any funding commitments be made over the long term.

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 22
MARCH 2007**

Rachael McLeod, Manager of the Healthy Living Programme thanked the Members for their comments. She stressed the importance of the work of community development workers in supporting and building the infrastructure of a community, often in a way that is invisible.

65/06 YOUTH FACILITIES & SERVICES [Item 9]

Pete Brayne of Guildford YMCA addressed the Committee commenting on the report and recommendations.

Members made various comments including:

Surrey Council for Voluntary Youth Services should have been invited

We must feedback to young people

Young people need a more positive press

The Youth Development Service (in Ash) is unable to recruit staff

Transport in Ash is a problem for young people

Members agreed the officer recommendations i.e. that the Committee

1. Thank attendees for coming and participating in the meeting, particularly the young people who attended and youth workers from SCC's YDS.
2. Request that SCC Executive provide extra funding to the Youth Development Service for operational Youth work staff to provide outreach youth work as well as increased staffing (and opening hours) at youth centres, and consider other ways in which youth work (at youth centres and in outreach settings) might be increased, including the use of volunteers and services of other agencies.
3. Consider ways in which the Local Committee and the Guildford Youth Council could work together, particularly on funding issues, and School Councils for those schools in each of their divisions.
4. Request that Guildford Borough Council consider hosting a larger event at Spectrum leisure centre similar to those held in Spelthorne (the 'Youth Shout' event)
5. Negotiate with the Surrey Advertiser to give regular column space to promote a more positive image of young people, and ask SCC and GBC officers to develop ways of organising cross generational events at schools and/or day centres in the borough
6. Review progress made on the range of issues in 6 months time, with a report on progress made to young people and agencies that attended the event.

Reasons for decision: to improve services and facilities for young people in Guildford.

66/06 LOCAL COMMITTEE PROTOCOL [Item 10]

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 22
MARCH 2007**

Members made various comments about the proposed protocol; the Local Committee Officer responded to some of the points raised.

The Committee agreed and adopted the revised protocol attached as Appendix A to the report, including the aspects relating to delegation of decisions on Members' revenue allocations.

Reasons for decision: to help members of the public engage with the work of the Committee, and to expedite smaller revenue proposals between formal Local Committee meetings.

67/06 PROPOSALS FOR THE COMMITTEE'S REVENUE AND CAPITAL ALLOCATIONS [Item 11]

The Committee approved the proposed expenditure from the Members' Revenue Allocation budget listed below:

- a. £2000 for Improved signage and markings on York Rd. & Chertsey St. (£1000 each from David Goodwin & Sarah Di Caprio)
- b. £1110 for Bellfields Residents Association (Pauline Searle)
- c. £1000 for the Stoughton Youth Club (Pauline Searle).
- d. £2000 for the development of a business plan for Guildford Together Consortium (Eddie Owen).
- e. £4679 for the outdoor area at Meroo Infants School (Eddie Owen)
- f. £3000 for the refurbishment of St Albans Hall, Wood St (Mike Nevins)
- g. £1500 for water fountains at Pirbright Village Primary School (Mike Nevins)
- h. £2000 for the turning circle & fencing at Worplesdon Primary School.
- i. £1000 for wicket restoration work at Normandy Cricket Club.
- j. £1000 for the clearance, levelling and reseeded of the area adjacent to the Millennium Well for Jacobs well Residents Association. (Mike Nevins).

Reasons for decision: to enhance the wellbeing of Guildford residents.

68/06 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 12]

Members commented on the Forward Programme, many Members recognising the need to reduce the number of items for the March 2007 meeting and in general for future meetings.

69/06 ALDERSHOT ROAD, ASH – PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN ISLAND [Item 13]

The Committee agreed that the pedestrian refuge as set out in the report and annexes be approved for installation.

Reasons for decision: to provide a safe crossing point to the local shop.

70/06 NORMANDY VILLAGE SAFETY SCHEME PROPOSED SPEED LIMIT ALTERATIONS [Item 14]

The West Area Transportation Group Manager made some corrections to paragraph 7 of the report to include the following:

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 22
MARCH 2007**

30 mph on Bailes Lane, Beech Lane, Green Lane East and Flexford Road east of Glaziers Lane.

Members made various comments on the proposals.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the proposals detailed in the report (as corrected) and as shown on plan GU/0818 be approved for implementation.
- (ii) that the intention of the County Council to make the necessary Speed Limit Orders under Sections 82, 84 and part IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 as set out in the report be advertised and, if no objections are received, the orders be made.
- (iii) that following consideration and, where possible, resolution of any objections or representations, the Orders be made.

Reasons for decision: to effect the implementation of lower speed limits on various roads in Normandy to reduce speeds and improve safety and perceptions of safety.

71/06 SPEED MANAGEMENT PLAN [Item 15]

Members noted the report, making various comments.

72/06 PARKING ISSUES IN ST OMER AND TANGIER ROADS (Item 16)

John Twining of Downsedge Residents Association (DRA) addressed the Committee reporting on the parking issues in the area and possible solutions, including the consideration of separate solutions for the two roads.

GBC Cllr Andrew Hodges addressed the Committee arguing that changes to parking arrangements in this small area could be advertised immediately without the need for further consultation by officers, and that this would not cause delay to reviews of the CPZ elsewhere in the borough. He felt that there would be negligible displacement beyond St Omer and Tangier roads if parking were to be restricted.

Vivienne Johnson echoed the points of Andrew Hodges and proposed that, following the completion of reviews in Ash and Ripley, changes to parking arrangements in St Omer Road be advertised, and double yellow lines be extended in Tangier Road immediately.

Other Members made various comments:

- There is a shortage of resource and work in other areas would be delayed
- Residents were warned of the effects of displaced parking
- There would have to be consultation in the wider area (not just St Omer and Tangier roads)
- Residents of Ash and Ripley have similar parking pressures and have been waiting many years
- Reviews of Stoughton and Westborough should not be delayed

The GBC Parking Manager advised that

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 22
MARCH 2007**

- without informal consultation there would not be the opportunity to discuss issues with those residents who did not participate in the DRA survey.
- The legal advice is to consult fairly and fully with residents
- Carrying out work or tendering the work to a contractor both involve significant resources
- The two roads should be considered together
- There will be some displacement beyond St Omer and Tangier Roads

[The Chairman briefly adjourned the Committee.]

The West Area Transportation Group Manager advised that

- There were some people who had not responded to the DRA survey, but had responded to previous surveys against any parking control measures
- There will be displacement
- The Local Committee agreed the programme of CPZ implementation and reviews 2 years ago

The Chairman asked that some action be taken with regard to access protection markings.

The Committee agreed:

(i) that the need for review of the parking situation in Tangier Road and St. Omer Road be accepted.

(ii) that for the reasons set out in the report the previously agreed programme of parking reviews across the borough be adhered to.

(iii) that Guildford Borough Council be informed that the Committee, while recognising the concerns of the residents and the Downsedge Residents Association, regretfully cannot agree to greater priority being given to a review of parking controls in this area in preference to those in other parts of the borough.

Reasons for decision: to not cause delay to the reviews of other areas inside and outside the CPZ areas and to make the best use of resources.

[Meeting ended 10.30pm]

.....(Mr 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 22 March 2007 Peaslake Village Hall.)

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON
22 MARCH 2007**

CLLR. TONY ROTH, SCC MEMBER FOR SHALFORD

Q1 In view of the request at the previous meeting, would the officers report on the progress of the current review of those PMZ sites originally designated for "inclusion" in the Minerals Development Framework in 2004 which do not now appear as the 18 "preferred areas " in the Preferred Option Consultation Surrey Minerals Plan?

In particular, would the officers ensure their review thoroughly and comprehensively explains the basis in detail on which

i) those previously "included" sites have now been "excluded" and should not be re-introduced in each case

i) Eashing Farm (designated in 2004 as AGLV and also adjacent to SSSI) is now considered "environmentally preferable" to various originally "included" (but now "excluded") sites ,several of which were designated in 2004 with No SPA/AONB/AGLV/SSSI

ii) there is now no " access constraint " to Eashing Farm (which was shown to exist in 2004)

iv) Eashing Farm was first "included" in the Plan this year and should remain a "preferred area" notwithstanding the information and feedback received in during and since the consultation ?

A SCC is currently reviewing the draft minerals plan, with the objective of producing a final draft for submission to the Secretary of State next June. This draft will then be the subject of a further six week consultation, with a public examination of the plan scheduled for Easter 2008. The submission draft plan will be published with a number of supporting documents (including a strategic environmental assessment/sustainability appraisal, and a methodology which explains how preferred areas were selected).

The preferred option consultation draft of the minerals plan (published in April 2006), represented the County Council's views as to how the need for minerals could be met with the least impact on Surrey's communities and environment when considering Surrey as a whole, based on the information available at the time. SCC received over 3000 representations on the draft plan, which have all been considered. In some cases the representations provided additional information which will be a factor in selecting the Potential Mineral Zones (PMZs) to be included as preferred areas in the submission draft plan. It is not possible to say at the current time which PMZs would be included in the submission draft plan, because there is still further technical work to carry out. However, SCC will be considering all the PMZs afresh, and the final technical decisions regarding the submission draft plan will be taken shortly before it is considered by the County Council Executive next May.

The Highways Agency and the County Councils Highways Officers have no technical objections to the proposed access to Hurtmore Road or the A3, subject to additional technical work being carried out if a planning application is submitted and proves satisfactory. The mineral company considers they have sufficient rights of to access to achieve an acceptable access to Hurtmore Road.

(continues...)

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON
22 MARCH 2007**

This table shows the PMZ number for each preferred area. In some cases the boundary of the original PMZ is different from the preferred area boundary.

Preferred area	Name	PMZ
A	Addlestone Quarry Extension	107
B	Knight and Bessborough Reservoirs	14
C	Hamm Court Farm	21
D	Milton Park Farm	6
E	Whitehall Farm	5
F	Home Farm Quarry Extension	104
G	Homers Farm	4
H	King George VI Reservoir	1
I	Land North of Thorpe (Muckhatch Lane)	9
J	Manor Farm	10
K	Queen Mary Reservoir	77
L	Watersplash Farm	12
M	Monkton Lane	75
N	Eashing Farm	71
O	Common Field	55
P	Mercers Farm	25 & 74
Q	Oxted Sandpit Extension	27
R	Runfold South Extension	72

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON
22 MARCH 2007**

CLLR. TONY ROTH, SCC MEMBER FOR SHALFORD

Q2 Would the West Area Transportation Group Manager confirm that the County Council:

- 1 will reimburse Guildford Borough Council an appropriate sum for the work carried out at short notice to the setts in Guildford High Street and miscellaneous works pending the Queen's visit in 2006
- 2 will continue to undertake the responsibilities and liabilities of the highway authority in respect of Guildford High Street?

A Yes to both questions.

CLLR. SARAH DI CAPRIO, SCC MEMBER FOR GUILDFORD SOUTH EAST

Q3 Can SCC confirm whose responsibility it is to maintain the historic setts in Guildford's high street; can we have assurances that a timetable of work to maintain and rectify existing damage will be put in place immediately; and funds will be made available to carry this work out on a regular basis?

A The High Street is a public highway and as such the responsibility of SCC as highway authority. We maintain the road in a safe and serviceable condition, for example by carrying out emergency repairs to defects or trip hazards.

SCC policy in respect of highways in historic or heritage environments such as conservation areas is that we will carry out whatever maintenance is required to meet our normal standards of safety or serviceability, using standard highway materials. Where an enhanced material specification is desirable, we are pleased to do so, but look to the borough and district councils to contribute any difference in cost. Such cost differences are normally modest compared to the overall maintenance cost – for example where a standard lamp column is upgraded to a heritage-style design. In the High Street, the cost of the manual work required to lay and repair setts is very high, so the marginal cost is much greater.

Responsibility for the repair and reinstatement of trenches or other excavations by the utility companies lies with those companies. They have set periods of time within which they must carry out permanent reinstatement – normally 6 months. Highway authorities' have an enforcement role in this respect but have no power to insist that reinstatement is carried out earlier. SCC has one officer dealing with utility companies' works covering several boroughs in the west of the County. County records show that there have been 157 utility excavations in Guildford High Street alone since January 2005.

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON
22 MARCH 2007**

CLLR. DIANA LOCKYER-NIBBS, GBC MEMBER FOR NORMANDY

Q4 With regard to the safety and accessibility for children walking to school, there is a problem at Wyke Primary School in Normandy. The children walk to school using either Pirbright Road, Guildford Road or Westwood Lane and on each of these, the footpaths have been restricted by earth, debris and encroaching grass. I am advised by the School that because of budget restrictions no date can be given, when it will be possible for any clearance work to be done and now that it is winter, the paths will become more hazardous.

It is all very well saying that children should walk to school, but this is only possible if the Council provides safe routes for them. I consider that this is a matter of priority and therefore ask for a definite time scale for this work to be done.

A Westwood Lane is on the programme for the annual hedge flailing which will be carried out over the dormant winter period. No date has been fixed for the works to be carried out. The need for the 'reclaiming' of the footway in Guildford Road is accepted and the works will be carried out in the imminent future, although again no date has been fixed. Officers will investigate the position regarding reclamation of the footways on the other two roads.

Q5 There is another dangerous situation on the footpath at the bus lay by on the south side of the Guildford Road adjacent to Glaziers Lane. Here, there is a hole large enough for someone's foot, which was repaired eventually after I pointed out that the Council could be sued. Now we have the same gaping hole back. It is no good just putting a layer over the hole, when by the next day it has fallen in. The contractors are not carrying out satisfactory work and are obviously charging for two repairs when one should be done properly. Can I now have an effective repair?

A The repair referred to was almost certainly a 'make safe' temporary repair. This should have been followed up with either a permanent repair (where the responsibility lies with SCC) or the appropriate utility company. Members are encouraged in future not to wait until meetings of the Local Committee to report these matters, but to do so via the SCC website (www.surreycc.gov.uk and click on 'highway problems and enquires'), via the Contact Centre (08456 009 009) or use the generic email address (swst@surreycc.gov.uk).