



SURREY

COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of meeting

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

Date: THURSDAY 27 SEPTEMBER 2007

Time: 7.00 pm

Place: CHRIST'S COLLEGE, LARCH AVENUE, GUILDFORD GU1 1JY

Members present:

Surrey County Council

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

Guildford Borough Council (for Transportation matters)

Mr David Carpenter (Merrow)
Ms Liz Hogger (Effingham)
Mr John Garrett (Lovelace)
Ms Diana Lockyer-Nibbs (Normandy)
Mr Terence Patrick (Send)
Mr Tony Phillips (Onslow)
Dr Anne Meredith (Friary & St. Nicolas)
Ms Melanie Wilberforce (Stoke)
Ms Jenny Wicks (Clandon & Horsley)

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 13
DECEMBER 2007**

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

- Graham Hibbert (East Guildford Residents Association) – the South East Plan
- Becky Astin (Worplesdon Resident) – road safety on A323 near Worplesdon Primary School
- Mr McGerr (Normandy resident) – proposed speed limit in Normandy
- Peter Hattersley (Horsley resident) – Merrow Park & Ride
- Richard Sharman – environmental impact of future Park & Ride developments
- Bob Bromham (Holy Trinity Amenity Group) – pedestrian subway in town centre near YMCA.

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

IN PUBLIC

36/07 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Cllr Moseley and GBC Cllr Manning.

37/07 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (14 JUNE 2007) [Item 2]

Agreed and signed by the Chairman for that meeting Cllr Fiona White.

38/07 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Cllr Goodwin declared a personal interest in Item 10, being a holder of a CPZ parking permit. GBC Cllr Meredith declared a prejudicial interest in Item 10 being a resident in one of the roads consulted. Cllr Owen declared personal interests in Item 12 having a relative living in Normandy, and Item 17 being a member of Guildford Library.

39/07 PETITIONS [Item 4]

One petition of 205 signatures was received from residents of Effingham. GBC Cllr Hogger addressed the Committee reporting that a Community Speedwatch scheme was being set up in Effingham to help enforce the new speed limits should they be implemented. The Committee agreed to refer the matter to the Transportation Task Group. The petition and the response are attached to these minutes.

40/07 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

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

Mr Bob Bromham, representing the Holy Trinity Amenity Group asked whether parking on pavements could be prevented to encourage more walking in Guildford town centre.

Mr David Small on behalf of Nick Wenman, representing the Save Blackheath Common Action Group, remarked that the second part of his question had not

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 13
DECEMBER 2007**

been answered (i.e. what action was going to be taken by the Committee). The Chairman responded that the Committee has a good track record of representing local views.

41/07 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 6]

There were no written Members questions.

42/07 GUILDFORD YOUTH COUNCIL [Item 16]

The Local Committee welcomed 6 members of the Youth Council to the meeting and held a brief discussion. The Youth Council outlined some of their activities, membership, and the projects they have funded with Youth Opportunities Funding. Other issues discussed were:

- Outcomes since the November 2006 meeting
- Using the media i.e. BBC Southern Counties Radio
- Public transport
- Need for a youth café
- Future attendance at each others' meetings

Reason for decision:

To improve services and facilities for the different groups of young people in Guildford.

43/07 PARK & RIDE STRATEGY [Item 7]

The Local Highways Manager corrected a detail on page 9 of the report: it is planned that Merrow Park & Ride will open in Spring 2008. He also noted that Guildford Borough Council's Executive recently passed a similar resolution to the one in this report.

Tim Harrold (Campaign to Protect Rural England) made a number of points in objection to current and future Park & Ride developments around Guildford Town centre, and raised concerns that the Strategy would not receive adequate consultation.

Cllr Davis pointed out the negative effect of Objective 1 of the Strategy on rural village shops.

The Committee agreed:

(i) that the Transportation Task Group be used together with appropriate SCC and GBC Officers to consider the draft Strategy and develop it into a document that can be adopted by both authorities.

Reason for decision:

To develop the draft strategy which will help reduce congestion in the town centre, to contribute to GBC's Parking Strategy and SCC's Local Transport Plan, and to help secure developer funding.

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 13
DECEMBER 2007**

44/07 PARK & RIDE (NORTHERN SITES) [Item 8]

The Local Highways Manager noted that Guildford Borough Council's Executive recently passed a similar resolution to the one in this report.

Bob McShee (Chairman Worplesdon Parish Council) raised concerns about the environmental impacts of a Park & Ride site and asked why the Parish Council had not been consulted.

Cllr Nevins agreed that there was a need for Park & Ride for Guildford but made a number of initial objections to Site 1 (in the report) and said that much work needed to be done on the proposals. Cllr Searle regretted any use of greenbelt land in this way, but explained that there is no land available in Stoughton which is already very congested and in need of a Park & Ride scheme.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the progress made on the Merrow, Artington and Manor Park sites be noted.
- (ii) that officers of both authorities carry out further work to determine the feasibility of Park and Ride along the A322 corridor taking account of site constraints, access to the town centre and other detailed considerations.
- (iii) that officers of both authorities carry out further work to facilitate the acquisition of Site 1 in the report.

Reason for decision:

To enable officers to carry out further work towards developing a Park and Ride site on the northern corridor into Guildford town. Site 1 is a visible from and adjacent to the main feeder road, with sufficient capacity and on a route with relatively high demand.

45/07 PARKING - RIPLEY [Item 9]

Bob Gale (Chairman of Newark Lane Residents Association) reiterated concerns of Newark Lane residents and asked that there be a review and amendments to the scheme as soon as possible. Mr James also from NLRA asked for spaces to be left where they currently are, and for parking to be allowed on the pavement, as was being proposed in another area.

The Committee agreed that:

- (i) the objections are not supported other than those relating to the restrictions outside Perseverance Cottages,
- (ii) the scheme be implemented with a minor change to the boundary as set out on the plan in ANNEXE 3 of the report,
- (iii) a traffic regulation order be made under the relevant sections of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 giving effect to the proposals.

Reason for decision:

To improve safety for road users and pedestrians, improve traffic flow, allow parking where safe and practical and improve access for the disabled.

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 13
DECEMBER 2007**

46/07 CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE REVIEW [Item 10]

Amanda Mullarkey (Tyting Society) thanked the committee for the proposals in the report and made requests concerning safety of parking bays at a junction and sensitivity of CPZ signage on Warren Road.

Sam Parker (Downsedge Residents Association) asked for upper and lower ends of Tangier Road to be treated separately; he asked for a breakdown of consultation responses and comments, and asked for a different scheme design.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the boundary of catchment areas C and H be changed to incorporate Pewley Way into area C.
- (ii) that additional parking places should be created as set out in the plan attached as ANNEXE 2 to the report.
- (iii) that the boundary of catchment areas B and F be changed so that the part of Wodeland Avenue currently in area B is incorporated into area F.
- (iv) that the intention of Surrey County Council to make an order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 be advertised to give effect to the proposals in (i), (ii) and (iii) above and that if no objections are maintained the Order be made.
- (v) that further consultation be conducted on a possible eastward extension of the Controlled Parking Zone based on the plan attached as ANNEXE 3 to the report.

Reason for decision:

- (i) – (iv) To make the use of space more flexible in particular areas where there are parking problems.
- (v) To allow a full discussion on the type of controls and an assessment of the likely levels of displacement parking which different scenarios would cause.

47/07 A281 MILLBROOK (DEBENHAMS) SUBWAY [Item 11]

The Local Highways Manager reported the recent results of consultation. Of 19 responses, 16 groups or individuals were in favour of the proposals, 3 were against. A number of detailed comments had been made and these will be taken account of as the design progresses.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that, subject to the necessary funding being secured, the scheme as described in the report and the associated drawing be approved in principle.
- (ii) that officers be authorised to proceed with any necessary actions including traffic orders, advertisements, notices of intent and any necessary legal agreements in order to deliver this project.

Reason for decision:

To improve pedestrian accessibility and reduce crime and the fear of crime. To improve the link between the two sides of the A281 Millbrook, to the benefit of the local economy, while providing a greatly improved environment and reducing street clutter.

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 13
DECEMBER 2007**

48/07 NORMANDY VILLAGE SAFETY SCHEME – SPEED LIMIT OBJECTION [Item 12]

GBC Cllr Lockyer-Nibbs welcomed the proposals and hoped the committee would support the recommendation. Cllr Rooth asked that consideration be given to extending the 30 mph limit into Wanborough at some future date.

The Committee agreed:

that the objection to the proposed 30mph speed limit on the A323 Guildford Road, Normandy be overruled and that the intention of the County Council to make a Speed Limit Order under Section 84 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which would be to lower the existing speed limit of 40mph to 30mph on the A323 Guildford Road, Normandy, be published, the Order be made and the scheme implemented.

Reason for decision:

To allow officers to proceed with the speed limits as proposed, which will improve both road safety and the quality of life for residents.

49/07 NATIONAL CYCLE ROUTE 22 (NCR 22) [Item 13]

The Local Highways Manager updated the Committee regarding consultation outcomes: the British Horse Society had raised no objections to the project.

The Committee agreed:

that those parts of the revised route of National Cycle Route 22 (NCR22) within the borough of Guildford as described in the report be approved for implementation.

Reason for decision:

To allow the completion of NCR22, avoiding high gradients and environmentally sensitive areas.

50/07 WEIGHT RESTRICTIONS AMENDMENTS [Item 14]

Some Members asked for a report to be brought back to the Committee concerning a future County Lorry Routeing Strategy.

The Committee agreed:

(i) that the intention of Surrey County Council to make an Order under Sections 1, Part III of Schedule 9 and Part IV of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to change the existing weight restrictions Orders listed in ANNEXE A of the report from 17 tonnes to 18 tonnes be advertised and that if no objections be maintained, the Order be made.

(ii) that consideration and if possible resolution of any representations received as a result of advertising the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders be delegated to the Highways Group Manager (West).

(iii) that, in the event that any objections are maintained despite recommendation (ii), the Highways Group Manager (West) in liaison with the Local Committee Chairman and local Members be authorised to over-rule these on the grounds that the proposed changes are a legislative requirement.

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 13
DECEMBER 2007**

Reason for decision:

The proposed changes are required by law and the County Council is therefore obliged to make these, and to deal with any objections which may arise against that background.

51/07 TASK GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE [Item 15]

The Committee agreed the Terms of Reference for Task Groups as attached in ANNEXE A to the report.

Reason for decision:

To ensure greater transparency of decision-making for members of the public.

52/07 LIBRARIES STAFFING REVIEW AND OPENING HOURS [Item 17]

Members raised a number of issues:

- Consultation with Library staff
- Surrey History centre – design and lending collection
- Possible developments at Ash Library
- The General Enquiries service
- Mobile library provision
- School visits

The Committee agreed that:

- (i) It supports the approach of seeking improvements to opening hours and services through efficiency gains from Self-service new technology.
- (ii) It supports the proposed new Group structure – three Groups of libraries, A ('Town' centre), B ('District' Centre) and C ('Local' Centre), with a geographic / strategic approach.
- (iii) It approves the resulting improvements in opening hours at the three Libraries in Guildford – Ash, Guildford and Horsley.

Reason for decision:

To secure genuine efficiency gains from enhanced automation and the introduction of self-service technology for library users. To measurably improve hours of access in libraries in Guildford borough.

53/07 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE – BOROUGH PLAN FOR GUILDFORD [Item 18]

The SFRS Area Manager advised the Committee of some of the achievements of the service locally in 2006/07, e.g. fitting 200 new smoke detectors in properties in Park Barn, with plans to repeat the project in Bellfields later in 2007. He highlighted the work of the Fire and Emergency Support Service (FESS) in attending to the welfare needs of fire and accident victims and their families.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed that it:

- (i) recognises the achievements of the Borough Teams within Guildford and supports their commitment to embrace new technology and improved initiatives to reduce risk and make Guildford safer through the delivery of the borough plan.
- (ii) supports the achievement of the Retained duty personnel at Guildford and Gomshall and acknowledges the availability offered by employers who release staff, and those who are self-employed.

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 13
DECEMBER 2007**

- (iii) notes the targets and initiatives set within the Guildford borough plan for 2007/08 and supports the Fire and Rescue Service in the delivery of this plan.

Reason for decision:

To support the service in

- a) seeking to reduce: dwelling fires and the associated injuries/deaths, road traffic collisions, unwanted calls and arson.
- b) developing a number of initiatives focused on the local risk and aiming to make our communities safer and stronger.

54/07 PROPOSALS FOR THE COMMITTEE'S REVENUE AND CAPITAL ALLOCATIONS [Item 19]

The Committee:

- (i) noted the allocations agreed under delegated authority from the 2007/8 budget since the last meeting (paragraph 4 in the report)
- (ii) approved the proposed expenditure from the Capital Allocation budget listed in paragraph 3 of the report i.e.:
 - a. £5,000 for CCTV in subways at Egerton Rd and Southway
 - b. £2,485 for display units for Guildford Library (with £609 coming from Cllr Barker's (£429) and Cllr Davis' (£180) revenue allocation)
 - c. £5,000 Improvements in Park Barn Drive
- (iii) approved the proposed expenditure from the Members' Revenue Allocation budget listed in paragraph 5 of the report i.e.
 - a. £4,000 for St Nicolas' Infant School outdoor classroom (David Goodwin)
 - b. £3,500 for musical instruments for Sandfield Primary School (David Goodwin)
 - c. £1,500 for Youthlink at Kings College (Cllrs White, Davis and Di Caprio each proposing £500). (Cllr White reported that 2 young people had benefited from this project in the past and were now members of the Youth Council.)

Reason for decision:

To enhance the wellbeing of Guildford residents.

55/07 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 20]

The Local Committee Officer reported that the date for the last meeting of 07/08 would be changed from 6th March 2008 and would be advised in the near future.

The Committee agreed the Forward Programme 2007/8, as outlined in Appendix 1 of the report.

Reason for decision:

To enable officers to prepare the necessary reports.

[Meeting ended 10.00 p.m.]

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

Contact:

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 13
DECEMBER 2007**

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 Committee will be on Thursday 13th December at 7pm at
Normandy Village Hall.



SURREY
COUNTY COUNCIL

SUMMARY OF PETITIONS

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

27th SEPTEMBER 2007

SUMMARY

This report shows the status of recently received petitions to the Committee together with an update on progress made.

GUILDFORD B.C. WARD(S)

COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISION(S)

EFFINGHAM

HORSLEYS

LEAD OFFICER

DEREK LAKE, LOCAL HIGHWAYS MANAGER

TELEPHONE NUMBER

01483 517501

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Petitions referred to in the report

MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 13 DECEMBER 2007

PETITIONS

ITEM 4

Principal petitioner/organisation	Date received	Division / Ward	Summary of concerns and requests	Date reported to GLC	Proposed action Progress achieved
Cllr. Liz Hogger on behalf of at least 165 residents of Effingham	27.08.07	Effingham / Horsleys	<p>We the undersigned call on Surrey County Council to implement revised speed limits in Effingham as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 A 30 mph limit on the A246 through the village, from the village boundary near Woodlands Road to the current start of the 50 mph limit west of the traffic lights. 2 A 40 mph limit on the A246 from Effingham through to East Horsley, instead of 50, from the current start of 50 mph limit west of the traffic lights through to the start of 40 mph near Green Dene. 3 A 30 limit on the residential cul-de-sac of Dirtham Lane 	27.09.07	<p>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 Speed Limits list. The Task Group is the established mechanism for considering the introduction of new improvement schemes and speed limits.</p>

MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 13
DECEMBER 2007

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

ITEM 5

R.J. BROMHAM, SECRETARY, HOLY TRINITY AMENITY GROUP

Q1 What action is being considered and taken to tackle the worsening problem of parking on the pavements in Guildford?

Our Group raised this question with GLC more than 3 years ago (11/03/04). Since then the problem has worsened.

The area covered by HTAG lies SE of the town centre, and includes some of the centre itself. Our members frequently make their journeys to shops and amenities on foot. Planning policies now require journeys to be made on foot, as new developments are being built in the area with no parking, on the assumption that residents will not own cars. The assumption that more town centre journeys will be made on foot has to be associated with a policy of improving facilities for pedestrians. Widespread parking, and driving, on pavements is dangerous and intimidating to pedestrians, and discourages walking. Just a single car parked on the pavement establishes that the pavement is not reserved for pedestrians as it should be.

At the time we last raised this question there was uncertainty how the changed parking enforcement responsibility would affect the problem. Experience shows that enforcement is completely inadequate; this is probably not the fault of those charged with this duty. During regulated parking hours the police probably feel that they have no responsibility, and the parking attendants evidently do not have authority to fine pavement parkers in all situations; in the evenings when the police should take over they have other priorities.

The situation is not helped by the low curbs that have resulted from many road resurfacings with no associated resurfacing of the adjacent footway. Very few footways have anything like the 125mm curbs required by the SCC design standard. Some are so low that they have the appearance of a continuous dropped curb. The pavement comes to be regarded by vehicle drivers as just an extension of the road.

We hope that you will review how the current system is working, including the extent that records indicate that action is being taken against pavement parking, and put in place some positive measures to overcome the problem.

A HTAG's question, raised in March 2004, was as follows: "What action is being taken to tackle the increasing problem of parking on pavements? How can the public help? There is a commitment to improve pedestrian facilities. Parking on pavements is an increasing hazard for walkers. Not only is there the risk of being hit as cars mount the pavement to park, but also of being forced to step out into a busy road to circumvent a parked vehicle."

The response given at that time was as follows: "Where pavement parking takes place where there are waiting restrictions, enforcement can be carried out by officers of Guildford BC (after June 2004, when GBC assumes responsibility for on-street parking enforcement). Where pavement parking is causing an obstruction, or where vehicles over 7.5 tonnes are involved, this is a matter for Surrey Police. If residents have specific locations in mind, officers will advise accordingly."

There is no *requirement* for journeys to be made on foot, although both SCC and GBC policies both encourage walking for short journeys. Wherever possible parking on footways is discouraged, although it is interesting to note that a recommendation elsewhere on this agenda proposes making an exception (in Ripley) following a sustained campaign by residents to allow footway parking.

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 13
DECEMBER 2007**

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

ITEM 5

The questioner misunderstands the enforcement roles of Surrey Police and GBC (the latter acting on behalf of SCC). Enforcement of waiting restrictions at any time of day is the responsibility of GBC Parking Attendants. Police officers have separate powers to deal with other offences such as obstruction but, as the question acknowledges, such matters often take lower priority than other town centre policing issues.

The situation on-street has not materially changed since GBC took over enforcement duties from Surrey Police. Officers certainly do not accept that enforcement is inadequate. Indeed there are greater staff resources deployed in the town centre and elsewhere than was the case previously. The highly successful enforcement of waiting restrictions by GBC on behalf of SCC includes fair enforcement, good financial management and striking of an appropriate balance between the need of residents, visitors to the town centre and the local economy.

The height of the kerbs is in many places below 125 mm, but this is a modern design standard with which past works do not always comply. Officers are pleased, if a little surprised, to hear that roads in the area have apparently been resurfaced so frequently!

GBC's Parking Manager has further commented as follows:

"I am surprised there is a perception that the situation is worse since March 2004. We adopted DPE in June 2004 and since then have been able to take enforcement action against vehicles parked on the pavement in the CPZ during controlled hours and against those parked in areas marked with double yellow lines at any time.

We have no data on the number of contraventions we have identified because it is all classed as parked in a restricted street. We did a survey 6 months after taking on the powers and that showed generally that compliance had significantly improved. This survey focused on all contraventions and was not explicit about footway parking.

I am well aware from the correspondence I see and people that I speak to that action is taken against footway parking in the CPZ. We get very few complaints from people about the presence of vehicles on the footway in the CPZ but get a significant number from those who have been issued with tickets. My interpretation of this is that when it occurs it is being dealt with.

Outside the hours of control we only enforce areas marked with double yellow lines and we enforce these when issues are brought to our attention or we observe problems.

There are instances, in the area covered by HTAG, where owners try to squeeze vehicles onto hard standings and as a result the front of the car over hangs the footway. When pavements are narrow this can cause a problem to pedestrians but as no part of the vehicle is in contact with the highway we can not argue that they are parked on the highway and do not ticket them. However if the vehicles wheels are in contact with the highway we do take action.

I would be interested to know where and when the problems Mr. Bromham refers to occur. If he thinks it would help I would be happy to meet him on street to look at the problems."

**MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 13
DECEMBER 2007**

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

ITEM 5

NICK WENMAN, on behalf of the SAVE BLACKHEATH COMMON GROUP

Q2 Is the committee aware of the extent of Star Energy's proposals for gas appraisal and storage at Albury, which would result in large scale industrialisation of Albury Park and the surrounding Surrey Hills, causing a serious impact for recreational users, residents and wildlife in this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty? Given the strength of public opinion, with around 2000 objections to Star's recent plans, what action does the committee intend to take to support public sentiment and protect our countryside?

A Perhaps I might allay Mr. Wenman's concerns by saying that both the Chairman of the Committee and County Councillor Davis are Divisional Members of the very area Star Energy wish to develop their gas storage project and are not only very aware of the plans but are following the initial proposals very closely. The Local Committee is fully aware of the fragile ecosystem at Albury after the pummelling it has endured as a landfill site and fully understands the reasons why Blackheath Common action group would wish to see Star Energy locate elsewhere. The villagers elsewhere in the current proposal have identified serious problems of road use during the eighteen month construction phase and are not satisfied that eventual re-instatement of land after installation of pipe line route will not scar landscape of SSSIs.

However, mindful of the fact of the strategic importance of a project of this sort to the wider benefit of the Country as a whole and the fact that the responsible UK Oil Majors have over many years constructed a pipeline network of oil and gas over vast swathes of the countryside, one has to guard against over dramatising the effects of this project.

Blackheath Common Action Group can rest assured there will be equally determined residents in other affected villages making sure the project does not harm the environment, given also that the reservoir for gas storage does indeed lay 4-500 metres below our beautiful countryside over 10 sq km. which rather limits the choice for topside process plant.

Procedural note:

Star Energy have submitted an application to the Department of Business, Enterprise & Regulatory Reform (BERR) under the Gas Act. Surrey County Council, like other agencies, were asked for an initial technical response (which was handled under delegated powers available to SCC's Head of Environment and Regulation) which it submitted to BERR by 7th September. The procedure for this initial submission was more akin to the scoping process for Environmental impact Assessments where matters are dealt with on a technical basis. (SCC's response was distributed as a late item for information at SCC's Planning and Regulatory Select Committee meeting on 12th September. (The report and minute of the meeting are available on request.)

The making of a Gas Storage Authorisation Order is a two-stage process and involves a preliminary submission of proposals to the Secretary of State (SoS) for him to consider whether Star can proceed with the proposals in a formal application. The view of the SoS might not be known till November or later.

The SoS may refuse permission to proceed, or allow them to proceed with or without modifications. The SoS will give written notification of his decision on the preliminary submission to both Star and other interested parties. If the application proceeds to the next stage the public will then have 28 days to comment (with SCC & GBC allowed 2 months).