



SURREY

COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of meeting

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

Date: THURSDAY 22 MARCH 2007

Time: 7.00 pm

Place: PEASLAKE MEMORIAL HALL, WALKING BOTTOM, PEASLAKE,
GUILDFORD GU5 9RR

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 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)
Ms Diana Lockyer-Nibbs (Normandy)
Mr Nigel Manning (Ash Vale)
Mr Terence Patrick (Send)
Mr Tony Phillips (Onslow)
Ms Caroline Reeves (Friary & St Nicolas)
Mr Sheridan Westlake (Merrow)
Ms Jenny Wicks (Clandon & Horsley)

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007**

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

- Proposed mobile telephone mast on the highway in Shalford (Mrs Sue Doughty and local residents)
- Safety at the junction of the A248 and A25, repairs to potholes in Shere (GBC Cllr Keith Childs, on behalf of John Tenner, Shere Parish Councillor)
- The slip road by Chilworth Rail Station, width restrictions on Blacksmith Lane and Halfpenny Lane, Chilworth, potholes (Colin Hayward, St Martha Parish Council)
- Signage on Halfpenny Lane, Chilworth (Tim Harrold, CPRE)
- Upper Street, Shere: Safety and traffic, effects on people and buildings, 20 mph zone, traffic monitoring, pinch points (Roy Davey and local residents)
- Pedestrian crossing on Aldershot Road, Worplesdon (Sandra Morgan, Worplesdon Parish Council)
- Parking in Ash Vale (Peter Monk)
- Need for a crossing in Shalford (Shalford resident)
- Start date for the Merrow Park and Ride facility (Peaslake resident)
- Cleaning of road signs (Peaslake resident)

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

IN PUBLIC

01/07 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Cllr Edward Owen.

02/07 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (14 DECEMBER 2006) [Item 2]

Agreed and signed by the Chairman.

03/07 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Fiona White declared a personal interest in Item 9 being a patient of Ash Vale Health Centre, Item 16 being a governor of Kings College and a committee member of the Park Barn and Westborough Community Association. Marsha Moseley and Nigel Manning declared a personal interest in Item 10 being residents of Wentworth Crescent. David Goodwin declared a personal interest in Item 10 being a CPZ permit holder.

04/07 PETITIONS [Item 4]

2 petitions were received. The petition wording and response is appended to these minutes.

a) Barry Grossmith addressed the Committee seeking a reduction in the speed limit in Green Dene from 40mph to 30mph. He argued that residents' objectives (to reduce accidents, make Green Dene safer, improve the environment and reduce the cost of highway maintenance) all supported SCC's LTP targets. He cited the following reasons in support of a reduced speed limit:

- High accident rate
- High rate of non injury accidents
- Flooding

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007**

- HGV traffic
- Environment.

The Transportation Group Manager explained that the section on Green Dene mentioned in Item 13 was a different section to the one which was the subject of this petition. Members agreed that the item be referred to the Transportation Task Group at their next meeting.

b) Mike Nevins addressed the Committee in relation to Wood Street Village explaining that HGVs continue to cause deterioration to the highway and residents' quality of life, and that some of the schemes identified in the earlier Safety Study have not yet been implemented. Members agreed that the item be referred to the Transportation Task Group at their next meeting.

05/07 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

There were 6 written public questions which are appended, with the answers to these minutes.

06/07 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 6]

There were 6 written member's questions which are appended, with the answers to these minutes.

07/07 DRAFT SURREY MINERALS PLAN – EASHING FARM [Item 14]

Nigel Wilkes of Save Surrey Hills Action Committee (SSHAC) addressed the Committee, requesting the removal of Eashing Farm from the list of proposed minerals sites, raising the following issues:

- The proposed length of time of extraction and type of processing
- HGV traffic in the area
- Strength of opposition (National Trust, Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils, Campaign for Protection of Rural England)
- Protection proposed for the family living with in the site
- Concerns about air and water pollution especially in relation to the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

Compton Parish Cllr Dobson supported this request (on grounds of traffic and safety and the effects on the environment), as did Shackleford Parish Cllr Fran Nowlan.

Tony Rooth thanked the speakers and summarised the arguments against inclusion of Eashing Farm in the list of sites:

- Bargate Stone is not a 'required' mineral
- Traffic and congestion will increase on Hurtmore Road and the A3
- There will be adverse impacts on the hydrology, air quality and environment in the area.

Cllr Rooth put the motion that "The Guildford Local Committee asks the County Council Executive to remove Eashing Farm from the list for preferred sites in the Minerals Plan as soon as possible". Mike Nevins seconded the motion.

DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE 2007

Sarah Di Caprio said that there was clear evidence that this was not an appropriate minerals site, for transportation and other reasons. Fiona White agreed, and proposed that the motion include an Executive meeting date, and that 'as soon as possible' be replaced with 'forthwith', to limit the blight being suffered by residents.

David Davis pointed out that the Plan would be agreed by full Council, not the Executive. He argued that sites for minerals extraction had to be found, and other sites in the county would also have these concerns (of blight, traffic etc). He stated that he did not agree with the motion as proposed.

Members discussed varying the motion as above and concluded by agreeing, without dissent, that:

the Committee asks the County Council to remove Eashing Farm from the list of preferred areas in the Surrey Minerals Plan forthwith at its meeting on 15th May 2007.

Reason for decision: as outlined during the Members' discussion above.

08/07 ASSET MANAGEMENT FOR THE HIGHWAY NETWORK [Item 7]

The Asset Management Group Manager delivered the presentation as appended to the report. Members made the following comments:

- Roads across the borough are in a poor state
- There is not enough money allocated to highways maintenance
- Roads in the worst state can be unsafe
- It cannot be good asset management to repair pothole only to find they need to be repaired again one month later
- What does 'less flexibility' refer to?
- Are roads becoming a litigation liability for the County Council?
- Officers do a good job, but there is great concern about the performance of contractors (mending potholes, clearing gulleys, cleaning signs)
- Are subcontractors used?
- Why did SCC renew the contract with the constructors?
- Constructors are good at large highways schemes, but not minor maintenance problems
- Contract management has been poor
- When kerbstones are loose, the constructor takes them away (weakening the verge) and then claims that there is no money to replace the kerbstones.
- Members locally may need to consider diverting funds from improvements schemes to increase funding on maintenance
- There is concern over the waste of funds that are spent on maintenance. What are the penalties for the contractors for poor work?
- The Senior Engineer for Guildford (John Cheesman) deserves special mention for good work in difficult circumstances
- There needs to be better communication with parish councils and local Members about the timing of work (e.g. when a footway will be repaired)

The Asset Management Group Manager responded to some of these points:

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007**

- The worst potholes are given an emergency temporary repair and repaired permanently later on. There may have been some instances of poor workmanship.
- In response to contractor performance, SCC has taken steps to improve contract management
- Many roads are now in need of significant maintenance (as opposed to preventive treatment)
- 'Less flexibility' refers to prioritisation remaining at a county-wide level, in consultation with local Transportation offices
- SCC has a sound process for handling litigation claims
- SCC's constructors use a mix of direct labour and subcontracted labour
- Highway Inspectors make inspections from once a year to once a month. These staff will soon be SCC (rather than constructor) employees.
- The constructor itself has to pay for repairs to any faulty work.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the content of the report and County Council's approach to asset management be noted.
- (ii) that comments from Members of the Local Committee concerning the contents of this presentation be reported to the County Council Executive.

Reason for decision: to encourage SCC's Executive to allocate more funding to highways maintenance and improve the delivery of this service to users of the highway in Guildford borough.

09/07 REVIEW OF PARKING IN RIPLEY [Item 8]

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the restrictions relating to Ripley outlined in the plans attached to the report as ANNEXES 3 TO 5 be approved for formal consultation.
- (ii) that the intention of Surrey County Council to make Orders under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, including sections 1,2,4,32,35 and 36 and Parts III and IV of schedule 9, giving effect to the proposed Controlled Parking Zone be advertised.
- (iii) that following consideration and, where possible, resolution of any objections received, the Orders be made.
- (iv) that any objections which cannot be resolved be reported back to the Committee.

Reason for decision: to progress the parking scheme in Ripley, to allow any formal objections to be made, and to not delay implementation of parking schemes elsewhere in the borough.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007**

10/07 REVIEW OF PARKING IN ASH [Item 9]

Marsha Moseley thanked officers for their work and recommended the approval of the recommendations.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the restrictions relating to Ash outlined in the plans attached to the report as ANNEXES 3 TO 14 be approved for formal consultation.
- (ii) that the intention of Surrey County Council to make Orders under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, including sections 1, 2, 4, 32, 35 and 36 and Parts III and IV of schedule 9, giving effect to the proposed Controlled Parking Zone be advertised.
- (iii) that following consideration and, where possible, resolution of any objections received, the Orders be made.
- (iv) that any objections which cannot be resolved be reported back to the Committee.

Reason for decision: to progress the parking scheme in Ash.

11/07 GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING ANNUAL REPORT [Item 10]

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the information contained in the report be noted
- (ii) that future performance reports be brought annually to the Committee.

Reason for decision: to update the Committee in a timely way on the financial and operational performance of on-street parking in Guildford.

12/07 A324 DAWNEY HILL, PIRBRIGHT: PIRBRIGHT ARCH PEDESTRIAN FACILITY FEASIBILITY STUDY [Item 11]

Woking Borough Councillor Philip Goldenberg addressed the Committee, supporting the officer recommendations. Pirbright Parish Council Chairman Burnham Clinton claimed that the objections to Option 1 (the option preferred by Pirbright Parish Council) had been overstated in the report and that Option 2 did not fully address the safety concerns.

Keith Chesterton objected to Option 2, saying that it would be unsafe for pedestrians. Mike Nevins supported Option 2 but suggested that further measures might be needed in the future.

The Transportation Group Manager responded to these points.

The Committee agreed:

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007**

- (i) that Option 2 as set out in the report and Annexes be included in the Minor Improvements list for future funding.
- (ii) that the Committee welcomes and accepts the offer of £30,000 part funding of the scheme costs by Local Committee (Woking) and £10,000 Planning Gain offered by Councillor Mike Nevins on behalf of Guildford Borough Council.

Reason for decision: to implement a scheme with an appropriate balance of improving the safety of pedestrians without producing severe delays to traffic and resulting displacement effects.

Keith Chesterton voted against the recommendation.

13/07 VOLUNTARY SECTOR BRIEFING [Item 15]

The Senior Policy and Development Manager presented the report, inviting comments from Members. Members made the following comments:

- The relationship between SCC and the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) is deteriorating, putting services and the goodwill of volunteers at risk
- SCC and GBC services could not meet needs without the contribution of the VCS
- Some VCS services cost less than local authority-run services
- GBC contributions to the Guildford Voluntary Grants Panel will become increasingly imbalanced or reduced if the Primary Care Trust and SCC reduce their contributions
- There needs to be more security and certainty over (longer term) funding
- Guildford Voluntary Grants Panel is an example of best practice, locally administered and making links with Waverley where appropriate. A 'one size fits all' approach to VCS funding across the county would not be welcome.
- The Compact works for some VCS organisations but not others
- SCC provides funding for VCS as grants and for commissioned services
- Some VCS organisations are not efficient and could share costs e.g. premises.

Members agreed that a report should be brought back to the June 14th Committee meeting with more detailed breakdown of funding for VCS organisations in Guildford borough.

The Committee agreed the recommendations to:

- (i) Consider and discuss the briefing report.
- (ii) Consider to what extent the issues outlined reflect the needs and issues identified locally
- (iii) Ensure that these needs and issues are clearly highlighted in the development of the renewed SCC Strategy in relation to the VCS.

Reason for decision: to promote a positive relationship between SCC and the VCS that improves services for Guildford residents.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007**

14/07 LTP PROGRAMME 2007/8 ONWARDS [Item 12]

Sheridan Westlake proposed that discussion on Table 3 and decision on recommendation (iii) of the report be deferred until the next meeting.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the progress made in delivering the minor improvements programme since last year be noted, including the completed projects set out in TABLE 1 of the report be noted.
- (ii) that the recommendations of the Transportation Task Group regarding new schemes put forward since last year be approved as set out in TABLE 2 of the report.
- (iv) that the recommendations of the Transportation Task Group regarding schemes to be retained in the programme as set out in TABLES 5 & 6 of the report be approved.
- (v) that those schemes shown in TABLE 5 of the report be progressed as indicated during 2007/08.
- (vi) that proposed allocation of funds set out in TABLE 4 and paragraphs 8 and 9 of the report be approved.
- (vii) that officers be authorised to proceed with any necessary actions including traffic orders, advertisements and notices of intent in order to deliver these projects.

Recommendation (iii), that the recommendations of the Transportation Task Group regarding the deletion of schemes as set out in TABLE 3 of the report be approved, was deferred until the next meeting.

Reason for decision: to progress an agreed list of highways minor improvements schemes in 2007-8 and to plan schemes for future years.

15/07 SPEED LIMITS [Item 13]

The Transportation Group Manager explained that scheme '7/286 Wodland Ave, Guildford - Traffic calming or partial Road closures', was being proposed for deletion from the Minor Improvements Assessment List (Item 12), but ought to be added to the list for assessment for a 20 mph speed limit.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the updated Speed Limit programme shown in TABLE 1 of the report be approved and Officers be authorised to progress the assessment and implementation of these during the 2007/2008 financial year, subject to the level of funding available and to their meeting the requirements of the County Council's Speed Management Policy.

DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE 2007

(ii) that where appropriate, Parish Councils or others be invited to consider making a financial contribution towards these schemes.

(iii) that the intention of the County Council to make the necessary speed limit orders be advertised and that if no objections are maintained, the various orders be made.

The Committee also agreed that a request for a 20mph limit in Wodeland Avenue be added to the list to be considered.

Reason for decision: to progress the assessment and implementation of the Speed Limit programme during the 2007/2008 financial year.

[The Chairman thanked GBC Cllr Keith Chesterton for his contribution to the work of the Local committee.]

16/07 PROPOSALS FOR THE COMMITTEE'S REVENUE AND CAPITAL ALLOCATIONS (Item 16)

The Committee approved the proposed expenditure from the Members' Revenue Allocation budget listed in paragraph 3 (and detailed in Appendix A) of the report.

Members agreed in principle to support all the Capital bids (paragraph 8 and Appendix B of the report), funding projects a) to d) (and part of project e)) from the 2006-7 fund, and the remainder to be confirmed from the 2007-8 fund at the 14th June 2007 Committee meeting.

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

17/07 FORWARD PROGRAMME

Members agreed the Forward Programme.

Reason for decision: to allow appropriate planning for future meetings.

[Meeting ended 11.30 p.m.]

.....(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 14 June 2007, - venue to be confirmed.)

Principal petitioner/ organisation	Date received	Division / Ward	Summary of concerns and requests	Date reported to GLC	Proposed action Progress achieved
Mr Barry Grossmith on behalf of 106 residents of Green Dene	22.02.07	Horsleys/ Clandon & Horsley	The following residents of Green Dene who are in favour of a reduction in the current speed limit from 40 to 30mph.	22.03.07	<p>At its meeting on 30 January 2007, the Transportation Task Group considered a request to reduce the speed limit on the <u>derestricted</u> section of Green Dene to 30mph. This matter is included in the Speed Limit report (Item 13 on this agenda, page 5, Table 2, line 4). The length of road in question does not meet the County's criteria for a 30 mph limit, and the Task Group recommendation is that no further action be taken.</p> <p>This petition, however, refers to the <u>40mph</u> section of Green Dene. It is the provisional view of officers that the assessment under the Speed Limit Policy is likely to result in the same outcome. If the Committee wishes, the matter could be referred to the next meeting of the Task Group.</p>
Cllr. Mike Nevins on behalf of 246 residents of Wood Street Village.	30.01.07	Worplesdon/ Worplesdon	We the undersigned residents in Wood Street Village request Surrey County Council to make a full highways safety assessment of Wood Street Village, in particular Broad Street and Frog Grove Lane which carry a large volume of traffic accessing the Aldershot Road, Rydes Hill and Park Barn Estate. Excessive speeds, flooding, accident levels, 20 mph safety zone around Wood Street School and school parking together with pedestrian safety are top of our list of concerns which must be addressed.	22.03.07	<p>A Village Safety Study was carried out of Wood Street Village in 2001. This resulted in a package of measures being implemented, including gateways, signs, road markings, a school zone and junction alterations. The Committee may therefore feel that Wood Street Village should not therefore be revisited while there remain other communities which have received no such attention.</p> <p>Alternatively this request may, if the Committee agrees, be reported to the next meeting of the Transportation Task Group which will consider whether it should be added to the Minor Schemes forward programme. The Task Group is the established mechanism for considering the introduction of new schemes to the minor improvements forward programme. The existing programme is under great pressure, as the report at Item 12 on this agenda sets out.</p>

GEORGE M GUNSON, 32 TRODDS LANE, MERROW, GUILDFORD

Q1 At the SCC Local Committee Meeting of March 30th 2006, in answer to a question regarding the accident record on Trodds Lane and whether it would be closed during the construction of the Park and Ride, the answer acknowledged that the Lane had a poor accident record and during the 10 year period to 2004 there had been 35 personal injury accidents which had prompted the traffic calming measures installed in one section of road in 2004.

The plans for these were drawn up in the year 2000, and a closer analysis of the figures obtained from Surrey County Council and from the Surrey Police show that they cover the entire two mile stretch of Lane, and 28 of the 35 accidents occurred at the junctions with the A25 and the A 246. There were only 2 accidents in the section where the traffic calming measure were installed but the remaining 5 occurred in the continuing stretch of road further south but still within the 30mph speed restriction zone (from Swaynes Lane to the end of the 30mph limit).

On this basis should not this stretch of road likewise qualify for traffic calming measures such as ramps on what is accepted as a dangerous road? It has a higher accident rate than the stretch which in 2000 merited the installation of two build-outs, and since then both traffic numbers and speeds have increased.

A The 'urban' (northern) section of Trodds Lane was 'traffic calmed' during 2002, principally by means of two chicanes or priority give-ways. This followed extensive public consultation facilitated by the Merrow Residents' Association. Complimentary measures were also carried out, including sharpening of the junction at the southern end near Newlands Corner to slow vehicles as they enter the road, surface dressing, 'slow' road markings, improved signage and closure of the gap leading on to the A25 Epsom Road at the northern end of the road. These measures were designed to address the accident record on the road, and in particular to improve safety on that part of the road where there was the greatest occurrence of turning movements into and out of driveways and side roads, and where the likelihood of pedestrians walking along or crossing the road was greatest.

There are no formal criteria by which a road 'qualifies' for traffic calming or other measures. As Members are aware the decision on whether or not to include a scheme on the minor schemes forward programme is considered by officers, recommended by the Transportation Task Group and agreed by this Committee (Item 12 on this agenda is relevant here).

All traffic calming is controversial. Letters are still received complaining about the existing measures in Trodds Lane, seeking their removal, repositioning or replacement with other forms of traffic calming. Members will recall the recent controversy which surrounded measures in Cemetery Pales, Pirbright.

It is the view of officers that the measures in Trodds Lane are sufficient and that it would be inadvisable to invite further controversy by reopening this issue. Alternatively this request may, if the Committee agrees, be reported to the next meeting of the Transportation Task Group which will consider whether it should be added to the Minor Schemes forward programme. The Task Group is the established mechanism for considering the introduction of new schemes to the minor improvements forward programme. The existing programme is under great pressure, as the report at Item 12 on this agenda sets out.

CLLR. JENNY WICKS

Q2 The allocation of secondary school places to children in my ward is giving rise to enormous concern and incomprehension. Would you please explain-

1. What form the consultation on the new arrangements took and how many individual responses were received?
2. Whether it was pointed out that one of the results of the new system would be that some children would be travelling past their nearest school on their way to a school much further away?
3. Whether whoever assessed the travel to school distances realised that money has just been invested by Surrey County Council in a cycleway from Horsley to Effingham which reduces the travelling distance and encourages children to cycle to school?
4. Whether account has been taken of the increased carbon emissions and congestion resulting from transporting children ten to twelve miles to school in congested areas instead of three miles to the nearest school?
5. Why such a small percentage of Horsley children (said to be 6%) were allocated to any of the schools for which they expressed a preference (except for siblings).
6. Whether account has been taken of the social repercussions of the total uncertainty about secondary education for children in the Horsleys, likely to result in families with children choosing to live elsewhere, leaving a community of childless people and the elderly?
7. Whether SCC is embarking on urgent discussions with the Howard of Effingham School to see whether, as in one year in the recent past, an extra class might be added to this year's intake?
8. Why a child from West Clandon, at primary school in Send, has not been allocated to George Abbott School like her classmates, even though she lives nearer to George Abbott than many of them?

A 1. The consultation was a two-stage process:

Stage 1 - October 2005 – December 2005

MVA were commissioned to undertake a survey/consultation on behalf of SCC. This consisted of:

- a) A postal survey whereby the relevant documents were sent to 38,511 stakeholders including:
 - i) Parents of pupils aged 2-3 years (Early Years) in year 1 and year 5,
 - ii) All headteachers and chairs of governors in Surrey's maintained schools
 - iii) 6 diocesan boards
 - iv) 14 neighbouring Local Authorities
 - v) Surrey County Councillors, borough / district councillors
 - vi) Parish councils
 - vii) Surrey's Admissions Forum
 - viii) Local Transportation Directors
 - ix) Colleagues in Sustainable Development
- b) 7215 responses were received.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007
ITEM 5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Stage 2 - January 2006 – February 2006

On 17 January 2006 the Executive having considered the responses in Stage 1 of the consultation agreed to consult on changing the Surrey Admission Criteria for September 2007.

a) The consultation documents were sent to:

- i) Headteachers/Chair of school Governors and Parent Governors of all Surrey maintained Nursery/Primary and Secondary schools
- ii) Early years
- iii) Neighbouring Local Authorities
- iv) Dioceses
- v) Surrey county Councillors
- vi) All schools within Surrey's relevant area
- vii) The Passenger Transport Group

b) 199 responses were received as follows:

- i) 68% (135) from the primary sector
- ii) 21% (41) from the secondary sector
- iii) 41% (82) from Headteachers
- iv) 28% (56) from Governors
- v) 26% (51) from parents
- vi) 0.5% (1) from the Diocese
- vii) 5% (9) from the Surrey County Councillors
- viii) 1% (2) from the Local Committees
- ix) 3% (5) from neighbouring Local Authorities
- x) 2% (3) from other stakeholder groups

(Where total number do not tally and where percentages do not total 100% will be because the respondents were able to give more than one answer.)

c) ***Anne Macavoy attended all Local Committee meetings to discuss the changes.***

d) ***Focus groups held across the 11 boroughs / districts in Surrey.***

e) ***500 face to face interviews with members of the public.***

2. The Local Authority commissioned Scot-Wilson to model the affect of the proposed changes using current and historical data. This showed that in the majority of cases traditional patterns of admission to popular, oversubscribed schools were maintained. However, we could not predict the effect of changing to an Equal Preference System.
3. The Local Authority only recently became aware of the bridleways/cycleways in Horsley and Effingham. However, we are now in the process of changing the home to school measurements to reflect the use of these.
4. If we have to provide transport to alternative schools, then depending on the final numbers involved, the Local Authority will provide free transport using the most economic mode of transport possible in order to minimise the number of cars on the roads at peak times.
5. Unfortunately, where we cannot meet parental preferences the only alternative open to us is to offer places at the next nearest school(s) with places.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007
ITEM 5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

6. No intention to undermine local communities.
7. Once the waiting lists have been finalised taking into account the cycleways the Local Authority will offer places from the waiting lists. We are hoping that the majority of Horsley residents will be offered places. If not, we will review the situation in conjunction with the Headteacher and Governing Body of the Howard of Effingham School.
8. In order to answer this question, the Local Authority needs the child's personal details in order to check that an error has not been made. If an error has occurred and the child has been disadvantaged the Local Authority will put this right.

SAVE SURREY HILLS ACTION COMMITTEE

Q3 Question One

The inclusion of Eashing farm in the last 18 preferred sites for mineral extraction was the result of The Surrey Minerals Plan, Primary Aggregates Land Assessment Report . The sites were selected by both subjective judgements and the use of sieves, which used a system of four point scale for Ecology, Transport (Access & Impacts), Landscape, Hydrology and Houses.

Firstly, We would like to focus on Hydrology and Ecology for which SCC gave a grade of 4 – “No significant risks to hydrology likely and No significant impacts on Ecology”. This classification is NOT consistent with other supporting documentation such as: The Environment report states: There should be a presumption against working within or immediately adjacent to statutory sites including SSSIs, SPAs, SACs and RAMSAR sites. And in response to our Hydrology report the EA stated I quote “we have previously raised concerns over this proposed mineral extraction”.

Therefore can the committee explain why a huge mineral extraction operation is proposed

- a. directly adjacent to a nationally protected site of Special Scientific Interest especially as there is a risk of significant ecological impact on the rare invertebrate species that are supposed to be protected; and
- b. the site lies 2km from an SPA (Special Protection Area) which is clearly within the 5km buffer zone given to an Internationally protected site where developments are greatly restricted by international law.

In conclusion: Would the committee agree that there must have been a mistake with the original assessment of “no significant impacts on ecology’ and the site should have read “locally designated sites damaged” thus giving the site a classification of 2* for hydrology and 2 for ecology. Or more importantly given the site is within an SPA buffer zone the site should not have been included.

Question two

We would ask the committee: With regard to Transport Issues The original classifications were 3 for Access and 4 for Impact. Eashing Farm was originally removed from the last 18 sites due to highways issues. The HA raised serious safety concerns about HGV’s entering the A3 northbound and major improvements would be required to the junction including bridge works. They go on to state that until a feasibility report is completed demonstrating how these works can be achieved without detriment to the local environment Officers consider that the zone should NOT be considered for inclusion in the MDF. A report was subsequently submitted commissioned by the potential developer and it concludes that SCC concerns are no longer valid. An independent highways report has since been commissioned which refutes this statement . And indeed the HA only accepts the proposal ‘in principal’. We therefore believe the grades should be reclassified to 2 for Access and 3 for Impact. Would the committee agree with this argument.

Would the committee also agree that lorries wishing to enter and exit the site to and from the south would could not be stopped by putting restrictions in place and that lorries would not go further up the A3 to the Puttenham mini-roundabouts and turn around, if indeed they did this, this would create further problems. David Munro has stated, there are no government guidelines to restrict lorries movements; therefore the increased traffic on what is a junction to serve the local community would be totally unsuitable and dangerous.

Therefore with this in mind should the developer not be required to re-submit an amended report incorporating lorry movements on and off the southbound slip roads and associated bridge works before Eashing Farm can be considered for inclusion in the next stage.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007**

ITEM 5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question Three

We would like to ask the committee why housing was given a grade 3 which was arrived at due to the fact the proposed site is surrounded by small villages.

1. The National Trust has raised concerns regarding several issues one being 3 cottages that lie very close to the site. Are you aware of this?
2. no consideration at all has been given to the 5 schools in the local vicinity within 1 mile, some of which are boarding schools, for example, Charterhouse school has many children boarding, and is very close to the proposed site. We believe the welfare of the children "our future" deserves to be very much taken into consideration, especially with all the Health and Safety issues that a mining operation can create.
3. a family have lived on the proposed site at Eashing Farm for over 20 years who wish to remain at their home. SCC have offered to erect a noise bund 45metres from their house which we believe is totally unsuitable for a young family, especially as they already have the A3 on one side, having the mineral extraction outside their front door is totally unacceptable. SCC should adopt a 250m buffer zone from housing as have several other counties across England.
4. at various meetings held with Adrian Lynham, Principal Planning Officer of the minerals team, between the Save Surrey Hills Action Committee and Shackleford Parish Council, Mr Lynham stated that if SCC had been aware of any objections from the family who lived on the proposed site, Eashing Farm would have been removed from the plan. This statement has also been lodged several times in the Feedback Report for the draft consultant of June 2006 commissioned by SCC.
5. With this information in mind do the committee agree that the site should be reclassified to a grade 2 for housing.

Question 4

We would ask the committee to consider how the sand at the proposed Eashing quarry site meets the Governments requirement to identify sites in Surrey that will produce 2.62 million tonnes of sand and gravel aggregates per year.

Two minerals have been identified at Eashing :-

1. Low grade building sand sometimes called soft sand
2. Bargate building stone.

Of these two, the only material that could be classified as strategic is the building sand. The Bargate stone is not a strategic resource but it does have a high value.

The County Councils Minerals Plan split the total government aggregate requirement of 2.62 million tonnes per annum (mtpa) into the following estimated proportions :-

Concreting aggregates of sharp sand and gravel 1.62. mtpa

Building sand or soft sand 1.00. mtpa

(See Para 5.11 on p36 Chapter 5 Mineral Production and Reserves)

The Surrey Minerals Plan does not say how it decided upon these proportions.

The County Minerals Plan shows that actual production levels of building or soft sand have been steadily falling from 1 mtpa to 0,5 mtpa in Surrey over the past 10 years Therefore the consumption of building or soft sand in Surrey is based upon production levels and levels of demand and is not dependent upon availability (See fig 5.1 and 5.3 on p35 and 36 Chapter 5 Mineral Production and Reserves)

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007**

ITEM 5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Building or soft sand of the Eashing quality and clay content abounds within Guildford and Waverley and many pits have outstanding planning consent for the working and extraction of this type and quality of sand.

A principal question that has to be asked, thoroughly examined, and convincingly answered is the strategic need at this time to open a quarry for building sand at Eashing.

As far as we have been able to determine, this strategic need has not been addressed in the case of the proposed Eashing quarry. Once, too precious to be spoiled, this site, within 6 months had become top priority for exploitation. (Your Strategic Minerals Plan) We are not even aware that the question of "need" has been asked.

We would remind the County Council that Government Statement MPS 1 states that minerals extraction should not be permitted when this is in conflict with countryside protection policies. We believe that, under the circumstances set out above, the Eashing site is covered by this protective Government Statement.

We want Surrey County Council to answer the following two questions :-

- a) Is the sand at Eashing a strategic and unique source of building sand that is not already available elsewhere in the County of Surrey
- b) Is the extraction of the Eashing sand essential for the use of industry in the UK at this time. Why can't quarrying be deferred.

Surrey County Council will need to be able to defend its answers to these questions in public."

Question five

The residents of Surrey would like to know what you as a committee are able to do to help us remove Eashing Farm from the minerals plan. We are looking to you as our elected representatives to help us stop this scheme from going ahead. We do understand the need for minerals, however David Munro has questioned the government's proportion that Surrey is required to deliver as it is indeed greater than the current demand; and Eashing Farm is NOT the right place for this kind of operation due to the environmental impacts it will have on not only the local community but on the wildlife, flora and fauna that it currently protects and finally the impact on safety on our roads.

A It is important to understand the scoring system within the context of the *Primary Aggregates Land Assessment Methodology* (the methodology) as a whole, rather than viewing it in isolation as a basis for rejecting particular PMZs from the Minerals Plan.

The scoring system was primarily used to develop strategic options for meeting the regional apportionment for sand and gravel, to determine whether one particular option would be more favourable than another in terms of overall economic, environmental and social impacts. This process is described more fully in the methodology. The scores used by SCC reflected the results of assessments carried out by statutory bodies and SCC specialists as follows:

Hydrology – Environment Agency
Landscape – Chris Blandford Associates
Transport – SCC Highways
Ecology – SCC ecologist
Housing – SCC Minerals Plan Team

Most PMZs have a number of constraints/levels of constraint that could affect their potential for future working. The consideration of strategic options was a high level assessment to look at whether ‘rejecting’ PMZs with a particular constraint or combination of constraints would result in an option for meeting the apportionment that would be far more acceptable than another. To do this, each of the 7 strategic options (described in the methodology) weighted one particular constraint more highly than another and used that as a basis for constructing sieves to select the combination of zones for each option.

The 7 strategic options were subject of a combined Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment. The results of this indicated that there was little difference at the strategic level in terms of the overall number of adverse and beneficial impacts for each option and suggested that no one option should be used to identify zones for the preferred option. The SA/SEA did however make recommendations as to how the adverse impacts of each option could be minimised or prevented. These recommendations were incorporated into the preferred area selection process and plan policies, and identified as criteria that planning applications should address.

This, and subsequent stages of the process for selecting the preferred areas are described in the published *Primary Aggregates Land Assessment Methodology*. The methodology will be updated and clarified where necessary, and published alongside the final draft plan.

Question 1

Hydrology score

The hydrology scorings used for the strategic options were based on advice from the Environment Agency (EA).

As set out in the published Hydrological Assessment background paper, the EA assigned each PMZ under a band: 1, 2*, 2 or 3. The band decision indicates the potential hydrological risk and complexity of hydrological issues associated with mineral working (see page 13 of the hydrological assessment for a detailed explanation of the scorings). The EA placed Eashing Farm under band 3 i.e. the EA has no objection to mineral working in terms of groundwater quality or resources.

For the purposes of considering the strategic options, SCC then applied scorings of 1 to 4 to the EA's band decisions. As Eashing Farm was regarded by the EA as being among the lowest risk PMZs it was given the lowest scoring (4) by SCC.

The ecology score

The ecology scores look at the impacts of working PMZs that lie *within* nationally/internationally designated sites, or locally designated sites. Eashing Farm lies adjacent to an SSSI and not within an SSSI (some of the 106 PMZs are designated SSSIs). The location of a PMZ near an SSSI does not necessarily mean that the site cannot be worked, if the development would not have an adverse impact on the notified special interest features of the site. Mineral working is considered unlikely to have any significant impacts on the ecology of the site itself and therefore Eashing Farm was given a score of 4.

This does not mean that the proximity of the site to an SSSI has been ignored. We have consulted the Environment Agency and English Nature from the start of the process of preparing the Minerals Plan. Both statutory bodies have acknowledged the potential hydrological and ecological issues associated with the working of this site in relation to the SSSI, but neither has objected to the inclusion of Eashing Farm in the Minerals Plan. Any planning application would need to demonstrate that there would be no adverse impact to the SSSI.

International and European designations

The county council is required to determine, through an *Appropriate Assessment*, whether or not the proposals in the Minerals Plan will adversely affect the integrity of any site of designated international nature conservation interest. This appropriate assessment is currently being carried out and will be published alongside the submission draft Minerals Plan. The *Appropriate Assessment* is looking at the impact of the potential development of preferred areas that are up to 10km from a designated international site. The assessment is being carried out in consultation with Natural England.

Part (b) of this question appears to relate to the Thames Basin Heath Delivery Plan, which is concerned with planning for housing development.

Question 2

Eashing Farm was not "originally removed from the last 18 sites due to highways issues".

The PMZ report (which considered 106 PMZs) stated that the Highways Agency had raised concerns about the existing access onto the A3 in a north-bound direction. Following this early stage in the preparation of the Minerals Plan, CEMEX commissioned highways consultants to establish whether any works could be carried out that would overcome the constraints of access on to the A3. These proposed improvements are described in the consultants Highways Feasibility Report which has been made available to SSHAC. In the light of this Report, the Highways Agency has agreed in principle to the development of this site for mineral extraction subject to improvements to the A3 slip roads being carried out and funded by the developer.

All the preferred areas were included in the draft Minerals Plan on the basis that they are considered acceptable, ‘in principle’, for future working, recognising that ultimately a decision can only be made once a planning application is submitted with full details of the proposals. It would be unreasonable to expect the level of detail that would be required in support of a planning application at this stage.

Question 2 refers to “an independent highways report”, which we take to mean the report commissioned by SSHAC. The Highways Agency was consulted on this report, but they have not altered their view in the light of it.

Eashing Farm was therefore given a score of 3 (i.e. access is possible with mitigation) and 4 in terms of the environmental impacts associated with achieving a safe access. (i.e. there were no significant impacts assuming the pre-agreed routing.) It is still considered that this is the appropriate score for this site.

Access routes to and from the site

The issue of access routes to and from the site will be considered and determined as part of any planning application for mineral extraction at this site. The Highways Agency have raised no objection to the use of the A3 Puttenham junction and it is not clear from the question precisely what the nature of SSHAC’s concerns are in that respect.

Cemex have already indicated that they would be prepared to accept traffic routing arrangements and they would be expected to commit to this in a legal agreement as a requirement of any planning permission.

Given the above, it is not considered necessary to require Cemex to submit any more information at this stage.

Question 3

Housing scores

The housing scores reflect the number of properties within 100km of the boundary of each PMZ. Page 17 of the *Primary Aggregates Land Assessment Methodology* describes the four categories used in considering the proximity of PMZs to housing – these are “very high”, “high”, “medium” and “low”. These were scored 1 to 4 respectively by the county council.

Eashing Farm falls within the ‘medium impact’ category and therefore given a score of 3, because compared with other PMZs, there are a lower number of houses within 100m of the boundary (see page 17 of the methodology for an explanation of the categories)

National Trust Cottages

When selecting the preferred areas, the consideration of detailed constraints may include the consideration of any potential impacts on properties within the wider area where relevant. However, the National Trust owned cottages are over 400 metres from the southernmost boundary of the preferred area and in a valley, and therefore very unlikely to be affected by any mineral working at the site.

Protection of the property within the preferred area

The size of a buffer zone required to prevent unreasonable disturbance to nearby residents, or for reasons of land stability will vary from site to site, and may vary at different points along the boundary. The county council therefore takes the approach of considering the particular circumstances at each site before a buffer zone is fixed at the most appropriate size.

An initial assessment carried out by SCC's noise engineer suggested that a protective buffer zone of 45 meters would be required for the Eashing Farm bungalow. However, the exact size of the margin can only be determined at the planning application stage when details of how the site would be worked are known. The planning application would also be required to address issues of stability, which might further influence the size of any margins.

Quote from My Lynham

The quote from Mr Lynham was included in the minutes of the meeting between Shackleford Parish Council and SSHAC. These minutes were quoted in several representations to the draft Minerals Plan and for this reason appear in the Feedback Report. Mr Lynham was not asked to agree the minutes before they were published.

Schools

The detailed constraints that were considered when selecting the preferred areas included the potential impact on schools (see appendix 3 of the *Primary Aggregates Land Assessment Methodology*). Several of the 18 preferred areas have schools within the local vicinity, and in some cases the schools are very close to the boundary of the site. Measures such as the incorporation of un-worked margins and bunding can be used to protect the amenity of schools. The SCC noise specialist has given an initial view on the extent of margins required, but the matter would need to be addressed in detail at the planning application stage.

With regard to the potential health affects of mineral workings I quote from page 8 (paragraphs 2.20 –2.21) of the published Preferred option consultation feedback report (September 2006).

"Sands and gravels are not intrinsically toxic materials, and they are made up of materials such as silica which are very abundant in the environment. The Surrey and Sussex NHS Trust was consulted on the report of Potential Mineral Zones and the Surrey and Sussex Strategic Health Authority and Surrey Primary Care Trusts have been consulted in preparing the draft plan to ensure that health impacts are properly considered.

Health risks for the extraction of minerals found in Surrey are not exceptional compared with any other type of development. Minerals Policy Statement 2 provides further guidance on the factors that need to be taken into account to minimise any significant adverse environmental effects that may arise from mineral extraction. Health issues are addressed in more detail as appropriate if a planning application is submitted."

Question 4

Question 4 was submitted to the Environment and Economy Select Committee on 26th February 2007. I attach our response to it.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007
ITEM 5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Question 5

The County Council has the statutory responsibility to plan for minerals supply within a prescribed development plan system that ensures comprehensive assessment of issues and options. The Committee can submit its views on Eashing Farm, and the County Council will consider these within the wider framework of the other potential sites.

A very small team of officers has already devoted much time to answering often repetitive questions on Eashing Farm similar to those put to the Committee, and to explaining the selection of Eashing Farm amongst the 18 preferred areas in the draft Minerals Plan. Unless further questions raise substantive new issues, responses will be limited to brief reference to previous responses and already published material.

A planning inspector will independently assess the Minerals Plan once it is submitted to the Secretary of State. This will include an assessment of the issues relating to sites that are identified in the final draft plan. Residents will have a further opportunity at that stage to submit written evidence and appear at a public hearing.

MRS. SUE SPRINGALL, HEAD TEACHER OF SEND C. OF E. FIRST SCHOOL

Q4 I would like to draw the Local Committee's attention to the continuing traffic problems on the A247 outside Send Church of England First School.

For some years now, concern has been growing amongst Send residents over the speed and quantity of traffic passing through the village, especially on the section of Send Barns Lane immediately outside the School and nearly opposite the Village Health Centre.

The problem is at its worst at the beginning and end of the school day, when parents drop-off and collect their children, often parking their vehicles on both sides of the road and reducing the flow of through traffic to a single lane in the middle of the road.

This traffic chaos makes it difficult and dangerous for families to cross Send Barns Lane safely, particularly if they are walking to school from the direction of the roundabout at Burntcommon. The provision of a pelican crossing would enable parents and children to cross the road safely and stop vehicles parking immediately outside the school at the beginning and end of the school day.

Under their new parish plan, the Send Parish Council has identified alternative parking arrangements that could be provided for parents on a little-used triangular section of road within 100 yards of the school. By making this section of road one-way, it would make an ideal drop-off and collection point for parents and children arriving at school by car. Send Parish Council forwarded this suggestion to Surrey Highways, who stated that such a scheme wouldn't be possible, without giving a satisfactory reason for their refusal.

Similarly, the School suggested that a school crossing patrol should be provided to assist young children and their parents to cross Send Barns Lane at busy times but the school was later informed that it did not meet the necessary criteria for such a patrol.

We feel that as a school, we have attempted to tackle this very important issue of child safety from every angle and we would appreciate that a solution to this traffic problem is found soon, before a child is killed or injured.

A The road outside the school is the A247, and as a principal road is an important link between Guildford and Woking, and a road on which medium distance traffic is signposted in preference to other, less suitable routes. The problems outside the school at the beginning and end of the school day are acknowledged, and are similar to those outside many, if not most schools in Surrey and beyond.

The difficulties in crossing the road are accepted, and for this reason a scheme to provide better pedestrian crossing facilities along and/or across the road is included in the minor schemes forward programme (see Item 12 on this agenda). Provision of a pelican would require painting of zigzag lines to ensure visibility, and this would reduce the parking available to parents collecting and delivering children to the school. This will have to be considered in detail when the scheme proceeds.

SCC officers have worked closely with Send Parish Council on their draft plan and considerable progress has been made on highway issues. The Draft Plan is to be discussed by the Parish Council at a meeting to be held on 26 of March 2007. Highway issues in the plan include signing and road markings, road safety issues, vegetation, cleansing and street lighting. The minor, low cost and maintenance issues will be addressed as soon as possible. Waiting restrictions in the vicinity of the post office will be investigated as part of the review of parking in areas outside the CPZ

The parking on one of the arm of the green triangular area is already taking place. It is not normally SCC policy to provide parking facilities at public expense outside schools (or elsewhere). The Parish Council, with whom we have worked very closely, is fully aware of this.

The school crossing patrol (SCP) was the subject of a risk assessment carried out in December 2006. This concluded that the proposed location was unsuitable due to visibility being obscured by parked vehicles, including parking in the lay-by across the pedestrian desire line. This conclusion was revisited in March 2007 by officers who had not previously been involved. The previous conclusion was confirmed, but a suggestion was made that a SCP could be allowed provided that (a) parking by parents and others on the far side of the road from the school is prevented, and (b) a build-out is constructed within the lay-by to improve visibility. Both of these suggestions will be considered in detail when the scheme referred to above is funded.

With regard to parking outside the school discussions have taken place between the Parish Council and the School with a view that part of land owned by the school be provided for parking. The school is considering this issue positively.

KAREN CLIFFORD

Q5 I have an ongoing situation with SCC Highways - ref: 82005567. This relates to a blocked drain opposite the driveway to my house. I reported it on March 1st by answerphone and then again on March 2nd when I spoke to someone and obtained this reference number. I was told then that an engineer would come out to look at it within 5 working days and get back to me. No-one contacted me, so on 12th March I rang and spoke to someone at Highways who said they would contact the engineer and get him to ring me. Nobody did. I then rang again the next day and was told the same thing. Yesterday (14th) I called again and spoke to someone in Highways who told me that he didn't know whether it had been looked at and could tell me absolutely nothing except that the name of the engineer was Mr. Copping and he would ask him to call me. So much for the 5 days! The blocked drain caused a very large puddle which flooded across half the pavement and most of the road, ending up pouring down our drive. We have had to put a 'sleeping policeman' type arrangement on our drive because of this problem, which guides the water into the stream. The top part of the drive has become very broken up because it had water pouring down it constantly for nearly 2 weeks. Anyone walking along the pavement (which is all the children who attend Peaslake School and walk from the village) got soaked by every passing car. The white lines painted on the road have started to break up because they were submerged for such a long time. Luckily the weather was not freezing, otherwise there would have been an ice rink.

I have been told on a previous occasion some years ago that the pipe under the road is broken which is why the water drains so slowly and the drain gets blocked up so easily. If this is the case, why has it not been mended? The odd visit of a drain unblocking lorry remains a very temporary solution. Please can something be done? And could the meeting consider the problem, or have an answer for, not only me but most of Peaslake Lane as well! As I send this I am still waiting to hear back from my original report - after 9 working days!

A The enquiry was received on the 2 March 2007. On the 20 March 2007 the gully was cleansed, and now appears to be functioning correctly. However, an additional CCTV survey is planned to ascertain if there is any further work required. The road markings will be refreshed as part of the normal cyclic maintenance programme.

We receive a great deal of enquiries from the general public (approximately 1000 per week for the west area), and it is our intention to deal with all as promptly and as efficiently as possible. Unfortunately due to limited staff resources following an internal reorganisation, a large backlog of enquires has built up. New processes are now in place with the intention of removing this backlog and providing better customer service.

ROGER LEGASSICK, MANOR ROAD

Q6 On the 10th July 2003 I posed a formal question to Surrey County Council's Local Committee meeting held at the Hope Centre, Stoughton. The question requested that the investigation into traffic problems in Manor Road be addressed as a matter of urgency.

The problems are the high level of traffic now using Manor Road and the problem of speeding traffic.

Speeding traffic in Manor Road. In June 2002, Surrey County Council carried speed and traffic volume surveys in Manor Road. Extracts from the summary of this data are as follows.

- In the evening the 85%tile speed of southbound vehicles reached 39.1 miles per hour
- Seven drivers travelled FASTER than 61mph – the highest category recorded.
- 3,264 vehicles a day were travelling through Manor Road

Most of the vehicles using Manor Road are rat-running – drivers using Manor Road as a convenient alternative to Worpleston Road; these should be using the surrounding roads.

I received a fair and sympathetic hearing, but my request was turned down but with the following condition.

'Officers and Members therefore express sympathy and concern to local residents, but ask that they be patient, and that a full review of the situation, including, an assessment of the appropriate speed limit, be carried out when the development of over 600 new dwellings at Queen Elizabeth Park is complete.'

As the Queen Elizabeth Park development is now finished I contacted Surrey County Council to find out what the current situation is. I was told that the problems of Manor Road have been incorporated into other issues and traffic problems relating to Stoughton and this would be considered at some time in the future.

Manor Road has fared badly as a result of past strategic decisions.

- When the A3 bypass was constructed Weyside Road was closed, the loss of this north south route meant that traffic diverted to Manor Road.
- To improve the Manor Road - Stoughton Road - Grange Road junction New Cross Road was closed. This diverted further traffic onto Manor Road.
- Barrack Road was made one way northbound in the interest of the Cardwells Keep development, more traffic is diverted onto Manor Road.
- These road closures have left Manor Road as the only north-south route in the A322 Worplesdon Road, A320 Woking Road, Saltbox Road triangle.
- The introduction of automatic traffic signals at the Stoughton Road - Manor Road junction meant that traffic which once had difficulty moving out from Manor Road or Grange Road, now has the benefit of separate signal stages in the signal sequence. This made Manor Road an attractive route for drivers bound for Bellfields Estate, Grange Park Estate and beyond.
- Traffic calming schemes have been implemented in north and south Stoughton

I have queried most of these 'improvements' and I have been assured by officers at SCC that the effects will be monitored. This monitoring has not taken place.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007
ITEM 5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

At the planning stage of Queen Elizabeth Park we were assured that Impact Assessments would monitor the effect of this development on surrounding roads. We have requested sight of this document and have been sent a copy of the Queen Elizabeth Park Travel Plan by Mr Derek Lake.

I believe that Surrey County Council has acted irresponsibly if not negligently. Manor Road has a history of personal injury road traffic accidents. The fact that officers are aware that each day seven drivers travel at over 60mph on a 5.35m wide residential road is a disgrace.



Manor Road looking to the south. This is a straight downhill gradient that encourages fast driving

In the past I have raised this matter with officers at all levels up to the Chief Executive. We have pointed out that the fact the Surrey County Council website has a section on setting an appropriate speed limit. I have applied that criteria to the conditions in Manor Road and this sets the speed limit at 20mph.

The traffic problems in Stoughton are now critical and I have joined with others calling for a strategic area wide assessment of all the problems. This is long overdue. But in the meantime can we request that you take action look at the problem of speeding traffic as a matter of urgency.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007
ITEM 5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Text of previous (2003) question from Mr Legassick and the response:

Manor Road, Guildford

We are told that Manor Road is on the Minor Improvement Assessment List. However, Local County and Borough Councillors have agreed that the matter be investigated when the Queen Elizabeth Park development is completed. We request that this investigation be brought forward and the problems of through traffic and traffic speed be addressed as a matter of urgency. The justification for investigating the problems now is set out on the following page.



Manor Road looking south, taken early afternoon, from Manor Gardens. The road is straight, on a steep downhill gradient and this encourages high vehicle speed.

Manor Road, the case for dealing with the problem now

A wait of two years until the development is complete is unnecessary and will prolong suffering, inconvenience and an increasing exposure to traffic danger. Modern Impact assessment practice can produce accurate forecasts of the effects of the development.

We are now faced with an unacceptable level of traffic. We are suffering incessant noise and environmental pollution and the risk of further accidents is increasing.

In May of this year a pedal cyclist was hit by a car in Manor Road. As a result the pedal cyclist suffered serious injury, a broken leg. Earlier this month (June 2003) safety fencing protecting temporary road works was hit by a speeding car; this accident resulted in damage only.

Traffic calming measures have been introduced in Stoughton Road, to the north of Manor Road, and Woodbridge Hill to the south. Research produced at the Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) show that speed on adjacent roads increases when an area is 'traffic calmed'.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007**

ITEM 5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Manor Road is a residential road; with the exception of two small shops at the northern end its usage is entirely residential. The road is straight on a very steep downhill southbound gradient, see photograph. When a southbound driver clears Stoughton Road, the driver is likely to be further delayed by parked vehicles in Manor Road, on clearing the parked cars (by Manor Gardens) the straight downhill section 'invites' the driver to speed'. This section of road is very narrow, approximately 5.5m wide, with approximately 30 private drives connecting directly to the road. The potential for a major accident in this area is now high and is increasing.

Vulnerable road users. Manor Road is used every day by a number of children travelling to and from school. Several elderly pedestrians say that they now feel intimidated and threatened by the speed of traffic in the road. High numbers of cyclists and pedestrians use the road to reach the A3 footbridge to the south, to reach Guildford town centre. Cyclists are forced to use the pavement, endangering elderly pedestrians. *Pedal cyclists have now been injured in 3 separate personal injury road traffic accidents since 1998.*

Manor Road has fared badly as a result of past strategic decisions.

- When the A3 bypass was constructed Weyside Road was closed, the loss of this north south route meant that traffic diverted to Manor Road.
- To improve the Manor Road - Stoughton Road - Grange Road junction New Cross Road was closed. This diverted further traffic onto Manor Road.
- Barrack Road was made one way northbound in the interest of the Cardwells Keep development, more traffic is diverted onto Manor Road.

These road closures have left Manor Road as the only north-south route in the A322 Worpleston Road, A320 Woking Road, Saltbox Road triangle.

The introduction of automatic traffic signals at the Stoughton Road - Manor Road junction meant that traffic which once had difficulty moving out from Manor Road or Grange Road, now has the benefit of separate signal stages in the signal sequence. This made Manor Road an attractive route for drivers bound for Bellfields Estate, Grange Park Estate and beyond.

In June 2002, Surrey County Council carried speed and traffic volume surveys in Manor Road. Extracts from the summary of this data are as follows.

- In the evening the 85%ile speed of southbound vehicles reached 39.1 mph hour
- Seven drivers travelled FASTER than 61mph – the highest category recorded.
- 3,264 vehicles a day were travelling through Manor Road

The location where the speed survey was taken, by Manor Gardens, is NOT the fastest section of Manor Road. Drivers are travelling considerably faster by the time they reach No 23 Manor Road, further to the south.

Most of the vehicles using Manor Road are rat running – drivers using Manor Road as a convenient alternative to Worpleston Road; these should be using the surrounding roads.

The SCC website has a section '*Putting people first*'. This covers the council's policy on speed management. This policy balances the perceived safe speed for residents and the community with the average speed of drivers along that road. The document has developed a practice for assessing an appropriate speed limit based for roads by taking into account details in local environment, conditions and circumstances of that road. When that calculation is carried out using Manor Road conditions the speed limit of 20mph applies.

We request that the authorities take urgent steps to protect residents and vulnerable road users from the traffic problems in Manor Road. We request that the authorities undertake investigations with the specific purpose of arriving at measures to reduce 'through traffic' and lower vehicle speed in Manor Road.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007**

ITEM 5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Answer (2003)

This matter has been raised on a number of recent occasions. There are two distinct parts of Manor Road. The northern section is heavily parked (despite waiting restrictions) with, as a result, inadequate road width, resulting in vehicles mounting the footway to pass each other. This presents a risk to pedestrians, and/or a perception thereof. The southern section has little parking, is effectively much wider, and suffers from excessive speed as a result. Manor Road is a bus route. The questionnaire survey revealed marked difference in opinion between the residents of the two parts of the road as to the possible solution to these problems; residents at the northern end were most concerned with parking, while those to the south were concerned with speed.

The 24 hour traffic flow of some 3300 vehicles per day amounts to an average of some 125 vehicles per hour in each direction during the busiest 12 hours of each day. This is clearly sufficient to cause inconvenience to residents. Many roads in Guildford carry similar or higher traffic flows.

The 85th percentile speeds averaged over a 24 hour period were as follows:

	<u>Southbound</u>	<u>Northbound</u>
Northern (narrow) section	32.4	31.1
Southern (wide) section	37.4	34.9

The figure quoted by Mr. Legassick is the pm peak hour 85th percentile speed of southbound traffic in the wide section.

The accident record for Manor Road shows 11 accidents in the 10 year period ending March 2003, of which 9 were slight injuries and 2 were serious. In the past 3 years, there have been only 2 accidents (both slight). If anything, there appears to have been a decline in the accident rate over the past 10 years. The reasons for this are unclear.

As a result of the above, a meeting took place on 3rd March 2003 attended by Cllr. John Hobrough, Cllr. Mrs. Fiona White (GBC), Kaz Banisaied and Derek Lake of the Guildford Local Transportation Service and PC Keith Ramplin of Surrey Police. The difficulties experienced by residents of Manor Road were fully acknowledged. The meeting considered the range of problems, including vehicle speeds, cars mounting the footway, rat-running traffic, and the recent questionnaire survey of local residents. It was concluded, with the agreement of all those present, that the only short-term action which should be taken was an increase in enforcement activity by Surrey Police.

Both the Transportation Task Group and the Local Committee have agreed that any action to investigate or implement safety improvements in Manor Road should be deferred until the completion of the Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP) housing development. The urgency attached to this issue by residents is fully appreciated, but there is no consensus regarding potential solutions, the officers who have considered this informally can foresee no simple solutions which can be justified against Local Transport Plan criteria, and the minor improvements programme for the current year is fully committed. If swift action were taken, and traffic patterns change as a result of the QEP development to the detriment of local road conditions, the County Council will have wasted scarce resources, and may be accused by residents of not taking proper account of the effects of QEP.

Officers and Members therefore express sympathy and concern to local residents, but ask that they be patient, and that a full review of the situation, including an assessment of the appropriate speed limit, be carried out when QEP is complete.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14 JUNE
2007
ITEM 5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

A The problems experienced by residents and users of Manor Road are acknowledged. A scheme to address these was originally in the 'deferred list' of the minor schemes programme, on the grounds that action prior to the completion of the QEP development would have been premature.

Since then QEP has been largely completed, and the Stoughton Community Association (SCA) has been very active in promoting measure to deal with traffic problems in the area. The SCA, of which Mr Legassick is an active member, has insisted that there should be no piecemeal solutions, and that an area-wide holistic view should be taken. For this reason a project to do exactly that has been incorporated into the forward programme, and the Manor Road scheme (together with another for Barracks Road, also previously on the deferred list) has been deleted as an independent project.

When the Stoughton-wide project is funded, the problems on Manor Road will be considered alongside all others in the area. If the Manor Road scheme were now reinstated in its own right, this would not enjoy the support of SCA.

Regarding Mr Legassick's accusations of irresponsibility or negligence, these should be considered against a County-wide accident rate in a typical year of some 5 – 6,000 injury collisions, around 10% of which involve serious injuries, and some 70 to 80 result in fatalities. Insufficient funds are available to address all of our known highway problems at any one time, and prioritization is therefore necessary.

The issue of traffic in Stoughton was considered by the Transportation Task Group at its recent meeting (see report at Item 12 on this agenda). If the Committee is so minded Manor Road may be referred to the next meeting of the Transportation Task Group which will consider whether it should be added to the Minor Schemes forward programme in its own right, separately from the Stoughton-wide project. The Task Group is the established mechanism for considering the introduction of new schemes to the minor improvements forward programme. The existing programme is under great pressure, as the report at Item 12 on this agenda sets out.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14
JUNE 2007
ITEM 6 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

CLLR. DAVID DAVIS

Q1

With regard to the provision of the highway and transportation service in the Guildford area:-

- (a) What are the imminent changes in the structure of the former Transportation Division, and what should these changes mean for the future management and development of transportation services and the maintenance of the roads and bridges asset in the Guildford area?
- (b) On a more local level, what improvements are expected from the introduction of Community Highways Officers?
- (d) What changes are being made to the contractual arrangements for achieving highway works and the resources available for this work?
- (e) Appendix 1, extracted from an e-mail dated 24th November 2006 from the West Area Transportation Group Manager, lists the type of work that might or might not be performed by the community gang.

Appendix 2 lists the work that I hoped, following consultations with the Parish Councils and the receipt of representations from individuals and groups, might be completed by the community gang in Shere Division early in 2007. Everyone understands that the work in individual divisions can be delayed due to adverse weather conditions and emergencies elsewhere.

Of the items in Appendix 2, which has been completed, what other agencies are involved in the completion of the uncompleted items, and when is completion of the SCC work expected?

Appendix 1

E-mail of 24th November 2006 : What work can be carried out by the gangs?

The typical work that will be undertaken by the Community Gang is likely to include the following :-

- Minor gully clearing
- Small drainage works – clearing grips, resolving localised flooding problems, etc
- Bollard installation/replacement
- Cutting of highway vegetation, clearing sight lines
- Sign cleaning, replacement, realignment,
- Installation of posts for signage
- Replacement of damaged kerbing
- Replacement of damaged footway covers
- Small scale carriageway, footway or verge repairs
- Town Centre pavioir resetting
- Removal of unauthorised advertising/fly posting
- Replacement of damaged railings

What types of work will NOT be carried out by the gangs?

The gangs do not carry specialist materials or equipment and use hand tools only. Their time is limited so they cannot carry out major tasks. The following are examples of tasks which they cannot carry out:

- Cutting back private vegetation (householder responsibility)
- Carriageway patching with hot material
- Footway patching where hot material is required
- Major gully clearing
- Grass cutting
- Major tree felling (where a specialist tree surgeon is required)
- Street cleansing (borough council responsibility)

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14
JUNE 2007
ITEM 6 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

Appendix 2

Shere Division – Work for Community Gang, January 2007

(A) Gomshall,

1. A25 - there is a drainage problem on the north side of Station Road, in the vicinity of No. 40, causing access and internal problems for this and adjacent properties. I do not know what the problem is, but suspect it is a blocked or damaged pipe. I think it is the subject of a reported problem, number 60983307. There is also a drainage problem at the junction of Goose Green and Station Road. The pavement from Goose Green to Tanyard Hall needs sweeping and the drain in the pavement cleared.
2. Burrows Lane. A long-standing problem has been rainwater running down the drive of Whispering Oaks, GU5 9QE. A number of gullies have been put in, but have not cured the problem as they are not at the low point. Please regrade the dip across the entrance, raise the entrance setts, and put a fillet of bitmac across the drive at the back of the verge, like a mini speed hump, so that water does not run down the drive and flood at the front of the house.

(B) Shere,

1. Hook Lane - potholes and generally bad condition.
2. there is another drainage problem on the north side of Gomshall Lane, opposite the end of Middle Street, causing considerable distress to the occupants of Vine Cottage. I suspect the problem here is a blocked gully or drain. The short term immediate solution is to clear it, but I suspect the long term solution is to solve the problem of wash down from London Lane - this may be a problem for Guildford BC as Land Drainage authority. Rights of Way have attempted a solution in the past with a soakaway just up from Upper Street, but I suspect the real problem is much wider than the Right of Way.
3. Also drains in Middle Street (even the pavement over the bridge is flooding) and the junction with Lower Street, up Church Hill and outside the Doctors' Surgery in Gomshall Lane.

(C) Holmbury St. Mary,

1. another drainage problem, on the east side of Horsham Road, low and damaged kerbs allow rain water to run down the drive and into part of Winterdown, RH5 4NL. The solution is probably to replace the kerb or entrance setts.
2. drain clearance around the Glade and from Pitland Street House down to the junction of Pitland Street with the Horsham Road
3. another drainage problem, on the west side of Horsham Road, a blocked drain is causing problems of access and usage for the occupants of Holmside, RH5 6NE, some 200 yards south of Pitland Street. This is the subject of report 60989707. I will forward separately details of this problem.

(D) Farley Green,

1. Shophouse Lane - a large puddle across the road, just south of the entrance to Mardons, probably a blocked drain or soakaway - it was too deep for me to investigate.
2. Shophouse Lane - I am receiving bad reports about the road between "Treetops Bottom" and "Woodley", including potholes and edge fretting.

(E) Little London,

1. you promised some action when we met by the railway bridge a few weeks ago.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14
JUNE 2007
ITEM 6 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

(F) East Clandon,

2. clear the very overgrown verges/hedge base along Snelgate (between New Manor Farm and Snelgate Cottages),
3. Clear an area of verge, about 5m wide (from the kerb up to near the noise bund or the hedge line where there is one) from the junction with the A246 round to the large conifers outside Collis Cottage on the Old Epsom Road. Nothing needs to be done to the bund which is regarded as a wild life haven.
4. Clear the blocked drain in Back Lane just before it joins the Ripley Road.
5. Another drainage problem near the end of Back Lane outside Holmhurst Cottage and The Old Barn (the other arm of the lane, towards the dead end)
6. The large conifers outside Collis Cottage need cutting back/topping - they were done a few years ago - but inevitably have grown back - The Parish Council think they are a SCC responsibility.
7. Finally, on the north side of The Street, opposite Church Cottage, against the holly hedge surrounding the Churchyard there is a large and growing pot hole (into which a resident fell the other week and twisted her ankle) that needs mending.

(G) West Clandon,

1. please clean the signs and remove vegetation that blocks sightlines to signs along the A247, and A25 from Newlands Corner to the Clandon Cross-roads.
2. the very thin bollard at the junction of A247 with the A3 Slip Road is very difficult to see when driving along the A247 - you only see the edge! Please replace it with one that can be seen from both directions along the A247.

(H) St. Martha,

1. On the part of Halfpenny Lane which runs East West from the corner north of Chilworth Manor to the corner by 'Longmead' a number of tree branches have come down in the bad weather and have been 'cleared' to the sides of the road effectively narrowing an already very narrow Lane.
2. flooding is occurring in Dorking Road near its junction with Pine View Close. Flooding does not normally occur there and it is highly probable that the rainwater drains are blocked at that point.
3. There is a particular bad pothole on Sample Oak Lane and a general problem with potholes on Halfpenny Lane and Sample Oak Lanes.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14
JUNE 2007
ITEM 6 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

- A**
- (a) This is a complex question and the changes are significant but have not been fully decided. It is not possible to provide full details here. It is intended to hold a briefing session for Members in due course. The principal changes are:
- The division of the former transportation service into two – ‘Surrey Highway’ and ‘Transport for Surrey’
 - An increase of some 38 posts across the two services, mostly in the area offices
 - Expansion of the roles of Local Transportation Managers (who will in future be Local Highway Managers) to include some maintenance functions
 - Reduction in the number of improvements engineers in each local team from 4 to 2, with those staff displaced forming a pool to allow more flexible resourcing across each area.
- (b) The existing resource level is one Highway Steward per borough. This will increase to one Community Highways Officer per three County Member divisions (approximately). The CHOs will be equipped with vans and laptop computers and will be primarily mobile staff. They will report to the Local Highways Managers, and will act as their eyes and ears on the highway network. They will also carry out other duties currently the responsibility of others, including the inspection of utilities works and reinstatements
- (d) Full details are contained with a report to the County Council’s Executive scheduled for the 26 March 2007 meeting. Annex 1, section 2.2 refers. This is available on the County Council website, or alternatively copies will be provided upon request.
- (e) A response has been provided to Cllr. Davis regarding the detailed points in this part of the question. Officers would be happy to follow up on point on this as necessary.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14
JUNE 2007
ITEM 6 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

CLLR DAVID DAVIS

Q2 The improvement of road safety is a principal aim of the transportation service. Can I be reassured the aim is being realized at the following two specific sites, with particular reference to the factors indicated?

(a) Peaslake Lane connects important amenities in the northern and southern parts of Peaslake, and is used by many pedestrians including school children. The road is narrow, and without a footway for much of its length. It is a through route for car traffic and buses. The road surface and drainage is poor. What improvements can be made to improve conditions, especially safety, for vehicular and pedestrian traffic, and what is the expected time scale?

and

(b) The improvement works at the Silent Pool Junction (A25 and A248) are substantially complete. Is the primary objective of improving safety at this junction likely to be met in the long term? Will the current layout and provision of signing be reviewed in the near future with the benefit of operational experience of the current layout?

A (a) With regard to Peaslake, this issue has been looked on a number of occasions. There were some additional signing and road marking carried out, however due to lack of space, no further works could be done. The issue of pedestrian safety can only be resolved if the adjacent properties were prepared to provide a 2m wide margin to be used as a path. Building a footway would also be expensive, and the Transportation Task Group would need to take a view as to the value for money this might represent compared with other schemes in the programme. Traffic calming was also considered, but would require street lighting so would be unlikely to command public support in this location. In any event care would need to be taken to avoid urbanization in this pleasant rural location.

(b) The to Silent Pool scheme was deigned in response to its identification by the Accident Working group as a location where many accidents had occurred. It has been independently safety audited at three stages, although some of the remedial works suggested by the third audit have not yet been implemented, and we plan to provide additional signing and road makings. It is not uncommon for newly installed schemes to suffer teething problems. We will continue to monitor the situation.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14
JUNE 2007
ITEM 6 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

CLLR LIZ HOGGER

Q3 Effingham Common Road, leading from Effingham village down to Effingham Junction Station, was scheduled to be resurfaced in 2004, but the work was deferred due to lack of funding. Since then the road surface has deteriorated even further. There is significant subsidence near the junction with Leewood Way, which encourages those who know the road to move out into the centre of the road to avoid it. There is another dip on the approach to the station, which floods in heavy rain and again causes traffic to move out into the centre of the road, or else drive through and risk soaking pedestrians walking to the station. There are other areas where the surface has deteriorated so as to be dangerous for cyclists and those on motorbikes, as well as causing noise for nearby residents. In 2005 a petition signed by 200 residents and the head teacher of the local primary school was submitted asking for a lower speed limit, resurfacing of the road and traffic management. Residents are pleased that the speed limit is now recommended for reduction to 40 mph, but this road will still carry heavy traffic travelling at speed past residential properties. For this reason, a noise-reducing surface should be laid when the road is resurfaced. Would officers please advise me when Effingham Common Road will be resurfaced, and can they reassure the residents that a noise-reducing surface will be used.

A This road was scheduled for major maintenance during 2004 when 'Prudential' funding was at its height. Due to increases in cost elsewhere the works could not be afforded that year, and the road must now take its turn alongside all other roads in the County, depending on its condition. Item 7 on the agenda of this committee is relevant here. Recent surveys indicate a clear visual problem with the road's condition, but this may not be confirmed by technical work to determine the condition of the underlying road structure. The current rolling programme shows Effingham Common Road being scheduled for 2009/10, but this may change depending on differential rates of deterioration across all the roads in the programme.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14
JUNE 2007
ITEM 6 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

CLLR LIZ HOGGER

Q4 The Clerk to Effingham Parish Council submitted a request to the SCC Contact Centre for road markings to be re-instated at the end of 'The Crossroads' in Effingham (and was given a reference number 92006789). Both the 'give way' line and the centre-line marking have largely been obliterated. The junction is onto a side spur of the A246, and cars tend to exit from 'The Crossroads' too fast and on the wrong side of the road. Two dangerous 'near misses' have been reported by an elderly lady pedestrian at this spot.

After some confusion about whether it was in Guildford or Mole Valley (it is clearly within the Guildford area) and site visits to the wrong location, it would seem we are being told there is no funding for this very small piece of white-lining. Please could officers tell me when this site will be properly inspected (I suggest the Clerk is contacted to lead someone to it!) and when this danger to pedestrians can be rectified.

A There appears to have been a breakdown in communication here as a result of the wrong agency having been approached initially and some confusion at SCC's Contact Centre. There has never been any question of affordability for this minor request. The request will be actioned when the white lining gang is next in the area.

CLLR SHERIDAN WESTLAKE

Q5 What is the status of the Merrow Park & Ride project? What changes have been made to the size or scale of the associated Golf Course / Health Club development? What is the latest anticipated date for the opening of the scheme?

A No changes have been made to the size or scale of the associated golf course/health club development. When the Local Planning Authority is assured that all the pre-commencement conditions are satisfied, the scheme will be progressed.

**DRAFT MINUTES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 14
JUNE 2007
ITEM 6 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

CLLR KEITH CHESTERTON

Q6 I have reported problems of lack of accessibility for wheelchair and electric buggy users due to lack of dropped Kerbs a number of times. On some of these occasions I have been promised action "before the end of the year", but nothing has been done. The lack of dropped kerbs forces wheelchair users to go on and off the road unnecessarily making a hazard for them and other road users. The list, from my latest EMail of Dec 16th 2006 was as follows:

- Stoughton Road cemetery on North side
- Badger Close
- Woking Road at the Woking Road depot crossing
- drive to house just on from 4. Wheelchair users wishing to use the pedestrian crossings across Ladymead at its junction with Woking Road/Stoke Road have to cross Woking Road twice, to get round these 2 obstacles."

When will these dropped kerbs be dealt with so that wheelchair users can have the same access as the rest of us?

A Cllr Pauline Searle has contributed a sum of money from her Member Revenue Allowance towards provision of dropped kerbs in Stoughton Road. It should be possible to fund the others through West Area budgets and action these at the same time. This work will not be started until the new financial year.