



Minutes of meeting

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

Date: TUESDAY 12 FEBRUARY 2008

Time: 7.00 pm

Place: LORD PIRBRIGHT'S HALL, PIRBRIGHT GREEN, PIRGBRIGHT GU24 0JE

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)
Mrs 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 John Garrett (Lovelace)
Ms Diana Lockyer-Nibbs (Normandy)
Mr Nigel Manning (Ash Vale)
Mr Terence Patrick (Send)
Mr Tony Phillips (Onslow)
Dr Anne Meredith (Friary & St Nicolas)
Ms Jenny Wicks (Clandon & Horsley)
Ms Caroline Reeves (Friary & St Nicolas)
Ms Gill Harwood (Stoughton)

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

- Maintenance of footways in the Horsleys (Peter Hattersley)
- Road Safety at Pirbright Arch (Simon Toller, Burnham Clinton, Cllr Mary Laker, Cllr Mike Nevins)
- Programming of installing dropped kerbs (Peter Monk)
- Traffic issues in Stoughton (Cllr Wendy May, Paul Kassell)

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

IN PUBLIC

01/08 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Eddie Owen, Liz Hogger (substituted by Gill Harwood), Melanie Wilberforce (substituted by Caroline Reeves), and David Carpenter. It was also noted that David Carpenter had given his apologies for the previous meeting, but in error this had not been recorded.

02/08 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (13 DECEMBER 2007) [Item 2]

Agreed and signed by the Chairman, with the amendment that Diana Lockyer-Nibbs had asked that an HGV ban on Cobbetts Hill Road should now be reconsidered.

03/08 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

David Goodwin and Anne Meredith declared a personal interest in Item 10, being CPZ permit holders.

04/08 PETITIONS [Item 4]

A petition of 31 signatures was received and a written response provided (appended to these minutes).

05/08 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

There were 4 questions which are appended with the written answers to these minutes. In relation to his second question, Mr Norris felt that officers were not adequately recognising the needs of pedestrians. The Chairman offered to visit the location. Mr Burchett asked SCC to look again at its signage and lighting policy.

06/08 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 6]

There was one question which is appended with the written answer to these minutes. The Committee agreed that officers will carry out further consultations and bring a full report on the matter (the possible introduction of a 7½ tonne weight restriction on Cobbett Hill Road in Normandy, Guildford) to a future meeting of the Committee.

Reason for decision:

So that the matter may receive proper re-consideration.

07/08 PROPOSED CYCLE TRACKS ORDER: PUBLIC FOOTPATHS Nos. 24 GODALMING & 474 SHALFORD [Item 8]

The Countryside Legal Team Manager explained that the route would be too narrow and not appropriate for a bridleway.

The Committee agreed:

(i) that a Cycle Tracks Order be made and advertised under the Cycle Tracks Act 1984 over the routes of Public Footpaths Nos. 24 Godalming and 474 Shalford at a width of 2.0m as shown on Drawing No. 3/1/19/H12 as shown in ANNEXE 1 of the report.

(ii) that if no objections are received it shall be confirmed. If objections are received it will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Transport for confirmation.

Reason for decision:

The route will serve as a useful link for cyclists.

08/08 PUBLIC BRIDLEWAY No. 473, SHALFORD: PROPOSED DIVERSION [Item 7]

The Committee agreed that The Surrey County Council Bridleway No. 473 (Shalford) Public Path Diversion Order 2006 be submitted to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for determination if the two objections received to it are maintained.

(If the objections are withdrawn the Order can be confirmed under officers' delegated powers.)

Reason for decision:

Because of the benefits it will bring to all users.

09/08 SHAWFIELD ROAD, ASH: OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING [Item 9]

The following members of the public addressed the Committee with the following points:

- Mrs Tyler: the scheme will lead to increased congestion and road noise; ambulances and volunteer ambulance drivers will be adversely affected.
- Peter Royston: speeding is a problem and there should be a crossing at Japonica Court, but the scheme will lead to extra noise, damage to vehicles, back and neck injuries for drivers, an invisible underwater hazard in times of flooding, danger for motorcyclists, increased emergency response times; speed cameras would be better; the proposal was poorly publicized.
- Richard Tolley: response to consultation was poor, publicity was poor; the scheme will affect local businesses.
- Peter Monk: Parked vehicles will prevent vehicles (especially emergency vehicles) from 'straddling' the humps; 70% of respondents preferred Vehicle Activated Signs.

FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 23 APRIL 2008

- Rebecca Howells: Police have confirmed there is a speeding problem; the majority of Shawfield Road residents support the scheme; the proposal was advertised; if the road suffers extreme flooding it is closed; a petition in support of the scheme has been signed by 166 Shawfield Road residents.

Cllr Nigel Manning argued for the proposals (Option A in the report): the scheme has been through a process of consultation; speed data shows a clear speeding problem; emergency vehicles and buses can go over the speed cushions; Ash Parish Council supports the scheme. Cllr Marsha Moseley agreed, stating that speeding problems do not just occur at one end of Shawfield Road. Cllr Tony Rooth spoke in favour of the proposals.

The Local Highways Manager said: Emergency services were consulted and did not object; there will be no damage to cars going at 30mph or below; the scheme will not be dangerous for cyclists or motorcyclists; Vehicle Activated Signs are popular but may have only a temporary effect.

The Committee agreed:

(i) that the objections to the proposed traffic calming measures on Shawfield Road, Ash be overruled.

(ii) that the County Council proceed under Section 90 (A) to (I) of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended), to introduce traffic calming measures in the form of road cushions on the B3206 Shawfield Road, Ash.

Reason for decision:

The scheme is supported by the majority and will address the accident rate.

10/08 GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING ANNUAL REPORT [Item 10]

Members and the GBC Parking Manager discussed the following:

- Consultation on Sunday parking
- Permit pressure i.e. numbers of permits and spaces
- Fairness of allocations of permits to households
- Car Clubs
- Work constraints caused by the introduction of the Traffic Management Act

The Committee agreed

(i) that the information contained in the report be noted.

(ii) that approval be given to formally advertise the changes proposed in ANNEXE B, as outlined in paragraph 20 of the report.

(iii) that the number of permits issued in area D be increased by 18 in line with the increase in space, as described in paragraph 25 of the report.

Reason for decision:

To ensure the restrictions are up to date and that residents can obtain access to their property across newly constructed dropped kerbs. To make the best use of the available space and make parking available to more residents.

11/08 MINOR IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMME 2008/9 [Item 11]

The Local Highways Manager informed the Committee that the funding available for schemes was likely to be in the range of Option A in the report as opposed to Option B.

Cllr Pauline Searle urged the Committee to address the traffic needs of Stoughton, by agreeing a traffic survey across the Stoughton area to investigate the different problems for example in Manor, Stoughton and Grange Roads. She described how Surrey Police and Stoughton residents had made efforts to seek solutions. Some other Cllrs spoke in favour of addressing the traffic needs in Stoughton.

Cllr Nigel Manning asked for an objective way of ranking the schemes by Annual Rate of Return, Benefit/Cost Ratio or Personal Injury Accidents. Cllr David Goodwin suggested a Task Group meeting was needed. Cllr David Davis supported the funding of capital maintenance schemes.

The Local Highways Manager explained the different aspects of a traffic survey in Stoughton that would be needed but expressed concern about this use of funds without a scheme in mind.

Members discussed various ways of proceeding. The Committee agreed:

(i) that in the event that funding in the region of £380,000 is made available, the schemes set out in paragraphs 15 and 16 should form the **provisional** basis of the minor schemes programme for 2008/09.

(v) that the £12,000 developer funding be used to fund a feasibility study into the A25 Midleton road cycle facilities.

(vi) that officers be authorised to proceed with any necessary actions including traffic orders, advertisements and notices of intent in order to deliver these projects as soon as 2008/09 budgets are known.

The Committee also agreed to hold an informal meeting and an extraordinary formal meeting before the end of April 2008.

Reason for decision:

(i), (vi) To allow work to begin on schemes in the financial year 2008/2009.

(v) To investigate the feasibility of improving cycle facilities along Midleton Road
To discuss the issues and to decide on the list of schemes to be funded in 2008/09.

[The work of John Davey (Head of Environmental Policy and Design for Guildford Borough Council) over the years with the Committee was much appreciated and thanks and best wishes for fruitful retirement was accorded by the Committee.]

12/08 LOCAL COMMITTEE CAPITAL & REVENUE SPENDING 2006/7 [Item 12]

The Area Director and the Committee thanked the Local Support Assistant, Cheryl Poole, for her hard work in preparing the report.

The Committee noted the review of the Capital & Revenue allocations for 2006/7 and made a number of comments

Reason for decision:

To account for how these budgets are spent and the outcomes they achieve.

13/08 PROPOSALS FOR THE COMMITTEE'S REVENUE ALLOCATIONS [Item 13]

The Local Committee Officer described amendments to 3k and page 16 (to read '£1286 for the Breakfast Club at Guildford Grove') and 3l (to read '£3000') of the report.

The Committee agreed:

a. to note the allocations agreed under delegated authority from the 2007/8 budget since the last meeting (paragraph 2 of the report)

b. to approve the proposed expenditure Members' Revenue Allocation budget listed in paragraph 3 (and detailed in Appendix A) of the report.

Reason for decision:

To enhance the wellbeing of Guildford residents.

14/08 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 14]

Members suggested having all the meetings at 7pm so that GBC and SCC Members, and members of the public, who work may attend.

Members suggested future items on Speed limits in Wodeland Avenue and Permit-free parking.

The Committee agreed the Forward Programme 2007/8, as outlined in Appendix 1 of the report, **agreeing also to hold all meetings at 7pm**

Reason for decision:

To allow better public access to meetings.

The Chairman reported that following the last meeting he had written to the SCC Executive Member for Safer and Stronger Communities concerning both Community Safety and Self Reliance issues affecting Guildford borough. He felt the written response was not entirely satisfactory and the Committee agreed that he should write again.

[Meeting ended 9.45pm]

.....(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 Committee will be on Wednesday 18th June 2008 at 7pm. The venue is to be confirmed.



SUMMARY OF PETITIONS

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

12th FEBRUARY 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)

PIRBRIGHT, NORMANDY,
WORPLESDON

COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISION(S)

WORPLESDON

LEAD OFFICER

DEREK LAKE, LOCAL HIGHWAYS MANAGER

TELEPHONE NUMBER

01483 517501

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Petitions referred to in the report

SUMMARY OF PETITIONS

ITEM 4

Principal petitioner/organisation	Date received	DIVISION / Ward	Summary of concerns and requests	Date reported to GLC	Proposed action Progress achieved
Mr Tim Kaner on behalf of 31 residents of Henley Park and Cobbett Hill hamlet (plus additional "signatures" claimed via email)	4.02.08	WORPLESDON / Pirbright, Normandy, Worplesdon	"We the undersigned request that SCC introduce a 7½ tonne weight restriction on Cobbett Hill Road in Normandy, Guildford."	12.02.08	<p>Normandy Parish Council requested HGV bans for School Lane, Hunts Hill Road and Cobbett Hill Road as part of the Normandy Village Safety Scheme. Officers brought a report to this Committee on 3 March 2005 (Item 12), recommending the 3 proposed bans. Following representations from a local coach operator through a Member of the Committee, the merits of a ban on Cobbett Hill Road were questioned. The discussion included the need for the coach operator to use the road, the use of the disused wireless station site, the development of the nearby Vokes site and the presence of a travellers' site at the southern end of the road. The Committee concluded that a significant proportion of the HGV traffic using the road would be legitimate, that a ban would be ineffective and/or undesirable, and therefore resolved that <i>"the officer recommendations be agreed in relation to School Lane and Hunts Hill Road only. Cobbett Hill Road will be reconsidered and a report brought back to a future meeting of the Committee if necessary"</i>.</p> <p>Since that time, it is understood that the coach operator no longer uses this route, and the development of the Vokes site has taken place. Surrey Police have been consulted informally and are concerned that any ban may be difficult for them to enforce.</p> <p>If the Committee is so minded officers will carry out further consultations and bring a full report on this matter to a future meeting of the Committee in order that it may receive proper re-consideration.</p>

ALAN NORRIS, 3 AVON CLOSE, ASH

Q1 Who decides the priorities for resurfacing of local roads?

A Surrey County Council has in the past set priorities for major road maintenance by assessing the condition of each road using visual surveys, and using equipment ('deflectograph') which reveals the underlying condition of the road materials. This priority list was then refined by officers with a knowledge of the level of complaints and insurance claims, and adjusted to ensure, for example, that a new road surface was not laid and then soon after ruined by trenching by one of the utility companies.

This year, this process has been further developed. Each road has been scored using the above criteria, but also on the basis of its importance (A roads, bus routes etc scoring higher) and awarding points for the levels of customer complaints and insurance claims received. In addition elected SCC Members have each been asked to nominate their 'three worst roads', and this has further influenced the scoring system.

This process is being completed at present, and when discussed by the Local Committee and approved by the County Council's Executive will form the programme for next year's major maintenance projects.

Q2 Can some alterations be made at the A331 (Blackwater Valley Road (BVR)) / A323 Aldershot Road at Ash to improve the safety of pedestrians crossing the A331 access roads? I suggest that the access onto the A331 (BVR) from the roundabout both north and southbound be restricted to one lane. This would half the distance pedestrians (and cyclists using the cycle lanes on the bridge) have to cross the road when walking between Ash and Aldershot. Cars can regularly be travelling at 30 - 40 mph at the crossing points when accelerating onto the A331 and this leaves little time for pedestrians to see a car and cross the road safely before the car reaches the crossing. The exit slip roads from the A331 onto the roundabout need to be kept at two lanes but a pedestrian refuge between the lanes would improve the safety of pedestrians at these points.

A Officers accept the reason behind this question. Research has shown, however, that while there have been injury collisions at several locations on the roundabout, there has not been a single injury collision at either of the locations proposed by Mr. Norris (involving pedestrians or otherwise). It is possible that the suggestion may lead to traffic congestion on the roundabout carriageway, and possibly therefore to accidents elsewhere on the roundabout. For these reasons, officers advise against this proposal.

ALAN NORRIS, 3 AVON CLOSE, ASH

Q3 Has any 'after survey' (including a pedestrian survey) been conducted at the pelican crossing in Ash Church Road since it was installed in 2005? In the proposals / papers put before the Guildford Local Committee on 17 June 2004 para 14 of the proposals sets out the monitoring carried out or planned. These include as an 'after survey' a repeat of pedestrian surveys, straw poll of users and a canvass of views of those who have already commented. It was stated in the proposals that in a 12 hour survey in October 2003 there were 482 people (including 182 children) who crossed the road within 100m of the Church of the Holy Angels, of which 231 (including 103 children) crossed the road just to the east of Ash Grange School. In the proposals para. 6 it was also stated 'It is assumed that the crossing will have the effect of drawing all 482 pedestrians to it as a safer crossing facility.' Has this been achieved?

A Pedestrian counts have not been carried out, for financial reasons. Officers have canvassed the school, church and local elected Members. The school is very much in favour of the crossing. Ash Parish Council fully supports the crossing, and comments that it is in a very good position, right by one of the local primary schools and Roman Catholic Church, close to St Peters, Anglican church and the Ash Cemetery. It also provides a good crossing for those walking to Ash Station and using the facilities at St Peter's Centre that has daily childcare facilities. Two Members have commented. Their comments include:

"I fully supported the project and the crossing is in the best location for the most vulnerable road users as it right by the primary school and one of the two local churches. It is also only a short walk past the Parish cemetery to the other church. It also provides a suitable crossing for those walking to Ash Station and in the other direction for those crossing over for the childcare facilities at the St Peter's Centre. Overall it seems to contribute to a great many community uses and serves the population of Ash South Ward well."

"This crossing is definitely in the correct place, and is well used as this is a very difficult road to cross without a crossing. Certainly I agree that this crossing contributes to the general amenities in this area, and was certainly well worth the money it cost."

"This crossing well serves the school children, the congregations of two local churches and many commuters who need to access Ash Railway Station. Ash Church Road is a very busy road and without the crossing there were be dangers to residents trying to cross this particular stretch of road.

The priest of Holy Angels RC Church reports that he was initially opposed to the project, believing that the crossing would be better sited by St. Peter's church, to the east of the chosen site. He reported a degree of acceptance of the crossing now that it is in place. The vicar of St. Peter's church believes that a pedestrian crossing would be better placed outside his church. However this location is less than ideal being on the brow of a hill.

From September 2008 Ash Grange School is to become a Childrens' Centre, providing extra support to children and their families in the area. These activities will take place between 8 am and 6 pm 48 weeks of every year. This is likely to increase the pedestrian activity in the area, and reinforces the need for the controlled crossing.

**ALAN BURCHETT, LITTLE GLAZIERS, GLAZIERS LANE,
NORMANDY**

Q4 In introducing the 30 mph Speed Limit in Normandy, the signage is inferior when compared to that in for example, Pirbright, Ash or Wood Street. Why has Normandy become the “poor relation”?

What is the SCC policy relating to the introduction of new speed limits with regard to:

- signage to advise regular users of a road that the limit has changed?
- roundels on the road surface?
- the design and visibility (especially on unlit sections of main roads) of repeater signs and the use of reflective yellow backing boards, as in other local villages?
- the position of signs relative to other signage (e.g. ‘Give Way’ signs, and vegetation?)
- the implementation of 30mph speed limits in poorly lit side roads, such as Glaziers Lane, where street lamps may not be visible to drivers in daylight?

Is the Committee satisfied that:

- these policies are the most effective for all Guildford residents?

the County Council has implemented the 30mph speed limit in Normandy with the same relative financial input and quality of signage as in other local villages and in the best possible way to achieve the aims of the scheme?

A The signage in Normandy has been designed to national standards. It is not normal practice to put up additional (temporary) signs to inform drivers that a speed limit has changed. The fact that new signage is in place should be sufficient.

Roundels on the road are not mandatory. They may be used at entry points to a speed limit (but not as ‘repeaters’). Experience shows that their effect is limited, and they wear out quite quickly, and therefore require regular ‘refreshing’, stretching overstretched maintenance budgets still further.

Repeater signs are provided on unlit roads, and their size and separation are defined by national legislation. Yellow backing boards are not mandatory, but are provided on occasions where there are known problems of visibility of signs or non-compliance with speed limits. The repeater signs are fully reflective, and therefore despite the lack of street lighting should be visible in car headlights.

Positioning of signs can be complex. Where possible we try to combine several signs on a single pole to avoid street clutter and urbanization. This is the case at the junction of Hunts Hill Road and the A323 where the speed limit and HGV ban signs have been combined. It is not legal to do so for Give Way signs, however, which must be on their own pole.

Where there is a system of street lighting, repeater signs are not permitted by law; this is the case in Glaziers Lane.

In summary the speed limits in Normandy meet all appropriate standards. Some Parish Councils have elected to provide, at their own expense, signage of a higher standard. At the same time the County Council is often criticized for erecting too much signage, leading to street clutter and urbanization. Other than completion of the agreed signage and replacement of signs which have gone missing, the County Council has no plans for further alterations to signage in Normandy.

CLLR. DIANA LOCKYER-NIBBS

Q1 Following the discussion at the last committee meeting, would the Local Highways Officer provide a report for the introduction of a 7.5 tonne weight limit on the entire length of Cobbett Hill Road, Normandy at the next meeting of this committee?"

A See the officer response to the petition presented at Item 4